

## Application Reference PF/23/1352

Brinton Parish Council resolved at its recent meeting to object to the above application. The District council's advertising notice states the reason for the advertisement is that the proposal 'affects the character and appearance of a Conservation Area'. This application is on the same site as that refused by NNDC in 2020 and the policies affecting the application remain the same.

Whilst the Council appreciates the planning agent's comments regarding consideration being given to the comments made by the Parish Council on the previous application it does not address the harm that the proposal would have on the landscape and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The change of use from arable field to residential is not compatible with the settlement structure of Sharrington where the fields between groups of dwellings function as an important setting to the built form. The recently adopted Conservation Area Appraisal and Management plan, approved by NNDC and Brinton Council states 'The Agricultural fields surrounding Sharrington are the principal contributor to its setting ...'. The report goes on to state 'As pressure for housing increases there is a risk of the spreading of the settlement edges of Sharrington into the landscape of the Glaven Valley. The fields in and around the small groups of dwellings are an important element in the character of the dispersed settlement of Sharrington and it is important that these remain open and undeveloped.' The adopted Management plan goes on to state 'Sharrington's rural character is one of the things that make it so special...with the gradual growth in houses on the edges of settlements .... there is a risk of suburbanisation...'. These factors are also reinforced in the North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment. The site lies within the defined Tributary Farmland Landscape type which is assessed as having moderate to strong strength of character. This document highlights the fact that the settlement structure is often fragmented and leaves considerable gaps between properties or behind them. 'Consolidation of these gaps should be considered very carefully as they often provide a very strong defining characteristic to the settlement and mean that the landscape is not dominated by large tracts of what could amount to ribbon development'. It is considered that the proposed development will result in an unacceptable impact on our Conservation village, the character of the settlement and adverse landscape impact. It is contrary to policies EN2, EN4, EN8.

There is also concern that the essential need to justify the dwelling has not been demonstrated and that the application is contrary to policies SS1, SS2 and HO5. From the information contained in the planning application and supplied at the parish council meeting it has not been demonstrated that there is an essential need for an agricultural worker to be permanently based on the application site and to be available day and night. The current and intended use of the field on which the proposal is sought has been confirmed as 'arable'. Furthermore the proposed dwelling and barn are not located on land which makes up the majority of the farm and are poorly located in relation to the majority of the holding. The applicant's planning statement confirms 'The tenanted land at Valley farm is on a 3-generation agreement, which stipulates that the holder of the tenancy resides in the farmhouse. Mr N Rivett is the second generation to hold the tenancy and his son

Edward is planning to be the third generation' . The farming business operates from Valley Farm site. The agent's planning statement confirms that Valley Farm currently at least meets or even surpasses the necessary standards prescribed by the relevant government legislation, bio security measures as well as monitoring the restricted byway which is adjacent to Valley Farm. The agent's planning statement goes on to say that 'because of the above examples, it is essential that the applicant is close to the affected areas so that he can respond quickly in such instances. Mr N Rivett, as the tenant residing at Valley Farm currently carries out this role from the Valley Farm location. Mr Ed Rivett, if he succeeds to the tenancy, will be able to continue to carry out this role when he in turn resides at Valley Farm.

The agent states in the planning proposal that this proposal 'will enable the succession of an existing farm business to the next generation... and is needed to future proof the business'. The agent goes on to say that Edward 'plans to apply to take over the tenancy within the next 2/3 years'. Even if Edward was able to succeed to the tenancy in the next 2/3 years there is still no prospect of a long term tenancy which ceases with Edward. If Edward was not able to succeed to the tenancy then the tenancy and farming would cease with the applicant Mr N Rivett. The fact that the proposed dwelling and now the barn, would be on land owned by the applicant rather than on the land forming the majority of the farm raised concerns with your Officers in the previous application on this site. ' If the succession to the tenancy was not successful or if the applicant or current holder chose to surrender the tenancy, it is considered the remaining land, ie that owned by the applicant, is unlikely to be sufficient to allow for a farming enterprise that could justify the essential need for a workers dwelling'. The same concerns apply to this current application.

Furthermore it was pointed out at the recent Brinton Parish Council meeting that in the 2018 application for an agricultural workers dwelling on the same site as the current application that Mr N Rivett would not continue working. In fact in 2018 Mr B Rivett's agent stated that 'Mr Nick Rivett's health has been deteriorating in recent years...'.....the existing work load cannot be sustained, even in the short term.' The agent's report in 2018 concluded by saying 'The proposed dwelling will enable the applicant to succeed to the business from his father who is no longer able to physically provide and therefore satisfy the 24/7 operational needs of the farm'. The Landscape appraisal conducted by NNDC in 2019 concurred with Mr N Rivett's desire to reduce his labour input at that point in time. It is legitimate to ask, now 5 years on, how much longer Mr Rivett, senior, could carry out an agricultural labourer's role and therefore justify the criteria of HO5.

This application is for an agricultural workers dwelling in an area of open countryside, in a Conservation Village, where building would not normally be permitted. The proposal therefore has to meet all the criteria set out in policy HO5. Policy HO5 is quite clear that the need for an agricultural worker's dwelling within a countryside location will only be supported in exceptional circumstances where both the functional and financial need have been established. It is not considered that this application meets policy HO5, and is also contrary to SS1,SS2, EN2,EN4 and EN8.

In 2018 the Conservation and Design Officer stated that the introduction of a new dwelling on this site 'with all its associated domestic paraphernalia, would result in harm being caused to the overall significance of a designated heritage asset'. It is considered that the introduction of the new dwelling and barn in this current application raises the same concerns.

The less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Sharrington Conservation Area is not outweighed by any public benefits. The loss of the field to a residential dwelling could not be said to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area which is a requirement of Local Plan policy EN8 .