

Appeal by Churchill Retirement Living Ltd. against non-determination
of a full planning application for redevelopment to form 39 retirement
living apartments including communal facilities, car parking and
associated landscaping

Station Rd, Great Shelford, CB22 5LT

**PROOF OF EVIDENCE OF ELIZABETH MOON
ON BEHALF OF SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT
COUNCIL**

SOUTH CAMBS DISTRICT COUNCIL REFERENCE: 21/05276/FUL

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REFERENCE: APP/W0530/W/22/3296300

1. Introduction and background to involvement

- 1.1 My name is Elizabeth Moon, and I am an independent urban design consultant providing urban design advisory services to District Councils. I have been providing urban design consultancy services to South Cambs District Council for the past five and half years.
- 1.2 I have a degree and diploma in architecture and am a registered architect. I have over 35 years' experience of relevant urban design experience particularly in the field of residential and mixed-use development.
- 1.3 Prior to becoming an independent consultant I worked at Essex County Council as principal urban designer and manager, responsible for advising the Council on County development and disposal sites and providing advice to District Council / agencies on new development.
- 1.4 My experience includes the preparation of masterplans and development briefs for large and small sites, producing housing layouts and planning applications for residential developments, supporting Local Authorities in negotiations with developers on sites, and overseeing the successful implementation of development on numerous sites across Essex and Cambridgeshire.
- 1.5 I was instructed on the 31st of May 2022 to provide urban design evidence regarding the Council's putative Reason for Refusal relating to the form of the development, its impact on character and amenity of future occupiers.
- 1.6 An urban design officer at the Council provided comment on the planning application prior to the lodging of the appeal. This officer is not available to provide evidence due to capacity issues within the Council. Before agreeing to appear as an urban design witness on behalf of the Council, I reviewed the relevant application papers and appeal documents, and satisfied myself that I could defend the putative Reason for Refusal on urban design matters.

- 1.7 I have presented urban design evidence at appeal covering issues that are relevant to this appeal, including matters of design quality, character, scale and massing.
- 1.8 My evidence considers urban design and townscape issues. In doing so it addresses putative Reason for Refusal 2 as set out in the Council's Statement of Case.
- 1.9 The putative Reason for Refusal also raises issues relating to the quality of the landscaping strategy arising from the limited space for landscaping. This aspect is addressed in the note appended to this evidence, which has been prepared by Greater Cambridge Planning Services Principal Landscape Architects.
- 1.10 I confirm that I have visited the site and familiarised myself with the surrounding locality.

2.0 Scope of evidence

- 2.1 My evidence considers urban design and townscape issues. In doing so it addresses putative Reason for Refusal 2 which relates to character and appearance of the area and states:

'The proposed development, by reason of its density of approximately 134 dwellings per hectare, cramped layout and close proximity to the boundaries with lack of landscaping, siting in close proximity to Station Road, three storey height central and rear sections, substantial size and scale, 'H' plan form, and a poor level of communal and private amenity space, is considered to result in a poor quality design and living environment which would not make a positive contribution the local and wider context. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies S/7, H/8 and HQ/1 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 which seek developments to preserve or enhance the character of the local urban and rural area and respond to its context in the wider landscape; include variety and interest within a coherent, place-responsive design, which

is legible and creates a positive sense of place and identity whilst also responding to the local context and respecting local distinctiveness; be compatible with its location and appropriate in terms of scale, density, mass, form, siting, design, proportion, materials, texture and colour in relation to the surrounding area; deliver a strong visual relationship between buildings that comfortably define and enclose streets, squares and public places, creating interesting vistas, skylines, focal points and appropriately scaled landmarks along routes and around spaces; ensure that car parking is integrated into the development in a convenient, accessible manner and does not dominate the development and its surroundings or cause safety issues; and include high quality landscaping and public spaces that integrate the development with its surroundings, having a clear definition between public and private space which provide opportunities for recreation, social interaction as well as support healthy lifestyles, biodiversity, sustainable drainage and climate change mitigation'.

2.2 From that putative Reason for Refusal 2, I consider that the principal design issues are :

- The layout, height, massing and design of the building and its impact on character
- The size and design of the development and whether it would provide appropriate living conditions
- The relationship of the buildings to external spaces

2.3 Whether the proposal would provide appropriate living conditions is addressed in this proof by reference to the adequacy of the private amenity spaces. Living conditions, in terms of neighbour amenity and Reason for Refusal 3, is a matter covered by Ms. Pell-Coggins.

2.4 I confirm that this evidence reflects my opinions as a specialist adviser in built environment design matters and confirm that they are my true and professional opinions.

3.0 Requirement for good responsive design

Good responsive design is an important aspect of planning policy and guidance at all levels. Below I have highlighted particularly pertinent policies.

3.1 National Policy and Guidance

At a national level, great importance is attached to the design of the built environment in the NPPF. Section 12 of the NPPF provides that:

'The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.'

(Para. 126)

3.2 The NPPF (para 130) also sets out several design criteria which decisions should meet. Of relevance in this case is that decisions should ensure that developments:

a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development.

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change

f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

3.3 The NPPF clearly states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, considering any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes (para. 134). The paragraph goes on to state that where development does reflect local design policies and government guidance and / or results in an

outstanding or innovative design, significant weight should be given in favour of a proposal.

3.4 The National Design Guide

This document forms part of a collection of planning practice guidance. It sets out to illustrate how well-designed places that are beautiful, healthy, greener, enduring and successful can be achieved in practice.

At Para 66 the document states:

'Built form is determined by good urban design principles that combine layout, form and scale in a way that responds positively to the context. The appropriate density will result from the context, accessibility, the proposed building types, form and character of the development.'

3.4 Development Plan Policy

At a local level, the South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Plan (2018) Development Control Policy HQ 1- Securing High Quality Design is cited in putative Reasons for Refusal 2. The policy requires all new development to be of high-quality design, and that, as appropriate to the scale and nature of the development, proposals must (as relevant):

(a) preserve or enhance the character of the local urban area and respond to its context in the wider landscape;

(c) include variety and interest within a coherent place responsive design;

(d) be compatible with its location and appropriate in terms of scale, mass, siting, design...in relation to the surrounding area;

e) Deliver a strong visual relationship between buildings that comfortably define and enclose streets, squares and public places, creating interesting vistas, skylines, focal points and appropriately scaled landmarks along routes and around spaces.

h) Ensure that car parking is integrated into the development in a convenient, accessible manner and does not dominate the development and its surroundings or cause safety issues.

and

m) Include high quality landscaping and public spaces that integrate the development with its surroundings, having a clear definition between public and private space which provide opportunities for recreation, social interaction as well as support healthy lifestyles, biodiversity, sustainable drainage and climate change mitigation

- 3.5 Policy S/7 is a Development Framework policy which is cited in putative Reason for Refusal 2. As relevant, the Policy is permissive of the redevelopment of unallocated land and buildings within development frameworks, provided that (S/7(a)):

‘Development is of a scale, density and character appropriate to the location and is consistent with other policies in the Local Plan.’

- 3.6 Finally, Policy H/8 of the Local Plan is cited in the putative Reason for Refusal. It requires new development to achieve an average net density of 30d.p.h in Rural Centres. The Policy itself acknowledges that the net density on a site may vary where justified by the character of the locality, the scale of the development, or other local circumstances.

- 3.6 As for local design policies, the District Design Guide (2010) is an adopted Supplementary Planning Document for South Cambridgeshire District Council. It sets out important design principles for achieving high quality design based on recognised good practice and explains key requirements that will be considered when considering planning proposals. These include, among other matters, standards of private amenity and the relationship of development to neighbouring properties.

- 3.6 It is against the background of the design policies and advice set out above that urban design and landscape objections to the submitted scheme have been made and the putative Reason for Refusal articulated.

- 3.7 Other relevant documents

HAPPI - Housing our Ageing population: Panel for Innovation - Report 2009. It was published by the Homes and Community Agency and is a non-statutory document. This report considers how to best address the challenge of providing homes that meet the needs and aspirations of the older people of the future. HAPPI highlighted the role of design in making age-inclusive housing a reality. As relevant, the Panel discussed a number of case studies both domestically and abroad and concluded that older people's housing can be entirely compatible with ideas about good place-making, environmental sustainability and interaction with the natural environment – factors that contribute to a better quality of life (p.57). It presents 10 key design principles related to space in and around homes for older populations. Although there have been further Reports published in subsequent years, the recommendations remain relevant and have not been withdrawn.

3.8 Great Shelford Village Design Statement 2005

The document is relevant in understanding the wider context of the area, but is not adopted and carries little weight in my view.

4.0 **The Appeal Site and its surroundings**

4.1 Great Shelford is located approximately 5km south of the centre of Cambridge and 2 km east of the M11 motorway. The village is located at an important crossing over the River Cam and has a long history. The village expanded to the east of the river crossing in the mid-19th century after the railway line linking Cambridge and London opened.

4.2 The site is located south of the station and east of Station Rd on a plot of land between the railway line and Station Road. The site is located just outside the northern boundary of the Great Shelford Conservation Area and to the west of the Stapleford Conservation Area. The existing buildings on site partly occupy the footprints of the former stables and storage buildings associated with the railway and the Railway Tavern which was located immediately to the north.

4.3 The current permitted use of the site is for commercial purposes and there are a range of buildings arranged around its perimeter. Along Station Rd there are

a variety of single and one and half storey elements. Existing buildings of two storeys are visible further within the site along its south boundary.

- 4.4 The area east of Station Rd has historically consisted of commercial uses. It is acknowledged that the character of this area of Station Rd is undergoing change and is transitioning from historic commercial uses to residential, and that a new edge character to the road is emerging.
- 4.5 There is a mixture of different types of development surrounding the site as identified in the Appellant's Design and Access Statement pages 13,18-20 I would summarise the immediate context as follows.
- 4.6 To the north of the site is a contemporary development of town houses of 2.5 storeys with pitched roofs with a small element of three storey element at the rear. Closer to the level crossing the development frontage to Station Rd rises to three storeys with a flat roof.
- 4.7 A care home is consented on the site immediately to the south of the appeal site. The care home building has a relatively limited frontage which is set back from Station Road with a width of 6.6m and a height of 8.9 m approximately. It is set back more than 17m from the road.
- 4.8 Moving further south along Station Rd is Reed House, a two-storey residential development which turns the corner onto London Rd. A two-storey extension is currently being built (Planning Ref S/0108/19/FL) fronting Station Rd. The extension is set back approximately 4.4 m from the highway.
- 4.9 Opposite the site to the west of Station Rd there are domestic two storey semi-detached properties and the boundary fence to the rear garden of No 45 Tunnels Rd which lies within the Conservation Area.
- 4.10 The existing character of Station Rd is therefore of mixed development with a distinct difference between the east and west side of the street. The west side of the street has a less developed edge with a long garden boundary with two

storey low density housing towards the north end of the street. The east side has buildings closer to the edge of the highway with developments of one and two storey height rising to 2.5 and 3 storeys close to the level crossing.

- 4.11 The Appellant's DAS considers the wider context but refers to the immediate context of the site (pages 25&27) in support of certain aspects of the proposal. For example, it is suggested that the architectural features, scale, massing and layout of the proposed scheme draws reference from the adjoining town houses on Station Rd and the Care home to the south of the site.
- 4.12 The immediate local context of a site is clearly important, but I consider that drawing on a wider perspective of development and accepted principles of good building design and urban design from that context is more appropriate than just using the heights and site penetration of adjoining development as cues to the design approach.
- 4.13 In terms of improvement to the local area, clearly any development of a site that, at present, comprises redundant industrial buildings would be likely to constitute an improvement. However, the starting point should be that the site is going to be developed for residential – the question is whether the development is designed and laid out in such a way that is a credit to the surrounding area and will add to the overall quality of the area, or whether the development will be considered ill conceived.

5.0 **Built Form and effect on character**

- 5.1 The building comprises of three linked but distinct blocks. The front block (western end of site) has an elevation facing Station Rd of 2.5 storeys in height which increases to three storeys behind. Behind this front block sits a central block at three storeys in height which links to a taller three storey block at the eastern end of the site.
- 5.2 A principal design concern relates to the form of the building. The National Design Guide defines form at Para 24:

'Form is the three-dimensional shape and modelling of buildings and the spaces they define. Buildings and spaces can take many forms, depending upon their:

- *size and shape in plan;*
- *height;*
- *bulk - their volume;*
- *massing - how bulk is shaped into a form;*
- *building lines - the alignment of building frontages along a street; and*
- *relationship to the plot boundary - and whether they share party walls or not. In the case of spaces, their form is influenced by the buildings around them.'*

- 5.3 The building frontage facing Station Rd is 2.5 storeys high and is approximately 34m in length. It is set approximately 4.75m from the carriageway which allows for a widened footpath. The façade has some minor articulation of the wall plane and ridge line, though the eaves of the building are the same height across the whole length of its frontage.
- 5.4 The frontage of the proposal, reflecting the approach taken to the height of development north of the site, is in marked contrast to the scale of existing frontage on the site which has much more variety of height and roof form. The proposal will significantly increase the level of enclosure to the street as the building has a continuous 2.5 storey frontage with little variety in height and set back.
- 5.5 Whilst the overall height of the frontage building maybe considered acceptable, its form makes no concession to, nor establishes, an appropriate relationship with the smaller scaled two storey development to the south along the frontage to Station Rd.
- 5.6 It is acknowledged that the care home elevation is of a similar height (9m) to the appeal proposal on the Station Rd frontage, however it is set back 17.6m from the carriageway, is two storeys with a gable front width of 6.9m that is comparable with elements of Reed House.

- 5.7 There will be oblique views of the frontage of the west block, together with its flank elevation which has a depth of 11m with a form that rises to three storeys behind. The disproportionate scale and massing of the building will be seen in the context of Reed House and the side elevation to the care home.
- 5.8 For the above reasons, in my view the layout and form of the building does not provide an appropriate response to the context, would be intrusive and have an adverse impact on the street scene.
- 5.9 I note that there are substantial gaps between the proposed west block with its frontage on Station Road and the frontages of adjacent development. It is in the order of 38.5 m between the new extension to Reed Court and proposed frontage of the appeal building, and approximately 16.5 m between the frontage of the town houses and the appeal building. These gaps permit significant views of the development extending back into the site from Station Rd -see Appellant's verified views. Fig 6: View 3A and Fig 04: View 2.
- 5.10 Where the front and back land elements of the building are seen juxtaposed, the extent and large mass of building will be apparent. The substantial massing of the development will be apparent in views when travelling both north and south along Station Road, and longer-range views can be seen across the site from south of the junction with London Road when looking north.
- 5.11 In addition, the central block of the building provides no variety in roof height and has a long 3 storey façade. The ridge height of the building rises further on the east block, adding to the prominence of the development in the townscape. The perception from the road will be of a substantial, dominant building that would be a discordant feature within the street scene.
- 5.12 The roof form of the proposal is also of concern. To maximise development on the site and not exceed the height of the building on the road frontage, the deep plan central block has a complicated and ill-proportioned roof form. The

uncharacteristic shallow fringe of the pitched roof is unconvincing as a means of disguising the depth of development, and is a weak design feature.

- 5.13 For the above reasons, I consider that whilst the site offers the opportunity to improve the character of the site, the height, massing and form of the building is incongruous and harmful to the character of the area.

6.0 **Layout and intensity of development**

- 6.1 The way a building is positioned on a site makes a significant difference to its setting, the way it is perceived and to the sense of space and character.
- 6.2 The proposal is for a distorted H shaped building footprint (referred to as a kinked 'l' shape in the DAS (p.37)). The shape is a complex form which results in residual areas which are awkward and poor in terms of their amenity.
- 6.3 The central portion and eastern wing of the layout have very deep plans. I consider that the design approach which has evolved (as explained in the DAS) is unsuccessful and flawed. That is because the quality of private amenity space has been compromised in the quest for extra capacity.
- 6.4 The arrangement of the parking area and its proximity to the eastern block is also unsatisfactory with only 1.8m between the parking area and living room/ bedroom windows (40040GS/PA1). The layout compromises the outlook and environment for residents in this part of the building.
- 6.5 The explanatory text to the Local Plan provides that: '*Achieving the right density of development for a location is important to the character of a place and quality of life.*' (Para 7.34).

The density of the proposed development is approximately 135d.p.h which is significantly higher than the average net density of the village. Policy H/8 suggests that the net density on a site may vary if justified by the character of the locality, the scale of the development, or other local circumstances. Whilst having a higher density than the average density of the village is not in itself considered an issue in a sustainable location such as this, the proposed

density is an indicator of the intensity of residential development and site coverage, which is relevant when assessing matters of design.

6.5 Building footprint and hard surfacing for vehicles use up 70% of the site area, with only 30% left for green space. In my view, the high level of site coverage results in a cramped appearance and contributes to the appearance of overdevelopment of the site. Consequently, the opportunity to create an attractive setting for the building is too limited, and the layout is unacceptable.

7.0 Private Amenity

7.1 The Council's District Design Guide provides that private amenity space for schemes should be convenient and good quality and should be based on a minimum of 25 sq. m for each apartment (para.6.75, see below). Assessed against that guideline, the layout here would result in an unsatisfactory living environment for future residents.

7.2 The site plan (40040GS/PA01) indicates communal amenity space of approximately 700 sq. m to the south and east of the building, and 90 sq. m to the north.

This represents a considerable shortfall of c.20% in the amount of amenity space that should be provided to meet standards (975 sq. m).

7.4 The District Design Guide at para. 6.75 states that:

'...Upper floor apartments should have use of a private balcony, of a minimum of 3m², plus use of a communal garden, where 25m² is allowed for each apartment.'

7.3 The HAPPI report further recommends as one of its ten criteria for good design that (pp. 38-39):

'Building layouts maximise natural light and ventilation by avoiding internal corridors and single-aspect flats, and apartments have balconies, patios, or terraces with enough space for tables and chairs as well as plants.'

7.6 As to the particular needs of older people for outside space, the HAPPI Report provides (Page 35):

Many older people find it hard to give up their garden even when they are struggling to maintain it. Large, sheltered or semi-enclosed balconies, which can feel more like extra rooms, provide a practical substitute. Outdoor spaces that offer a fully accessible extension to the home, usable for much of the year, are valuable to those who leave the home less frequently.

7.7 Of the 39 units, 28 are upper floor apartments. Of those, only 4 have useable balconies. In my view, this is a gross under provision when considered against the policy and guidance above, and the living conditions of residents would be compromised.

7.8 Further, the design of the grounds surrounding buildings are as important as the design of the buildings themselves (District Design Guide, para. 6.70). The CGI image 5929387 below prepared by the Appellant indicates the amenity area to the north of the building. It is apparent this small area will be very shaded by the building. It is also located next to the accessway and car parking. The environmental conditions will deter use and this area will do little to enhance the visual outlook for the apartments on this side.



- 7.9 The District Design Guide at para 6.75 provides further guidance on Communal gardens. These spaces should be convenient to use and provide a variety of spaces and have interesting planting, hard surfacing and places for socialising. Para. 131 of the NDG also states that: '*Well -designed shared amenity spaces are well overlooked and all of the residents who share them can access them easily*'.
- 7.10 Access from the building to the southern/eastern amenity spaces is very poor for most of the upper floor apartments, particularly for residents with mobility issues. There is only one communal access point from the western block. It should be noted that the only lift on the premises is in the eastern block of the proposal and some residents may have to walk along two long enclosed corridors to gain access to the outdoor amenity area located south of the building. This arrangement could disenfranchise a number of residents from the enjoyment of a valuable, south facing garden area for socialising or other activities.
- 7.11 For the above reasons, the proposals clearly fail to provide adequate private and communal amenity for the residents that would support a good quality of life.
- 7.12 Finally, the considerable shortfall in the amount of amenity space provided results in a poor quality landscape strategy. This is dealt with in the note attached Appendix EM1 , produced by Principal Landscape Architects from the Greater Cambridge Planning Services. Although I am not a landscape expert, I have reviewed that note and agree with the points made.

8.0 **Summary and Conclusions**

- 8.1 I would refer to the introduction in my proof which sets out my qualifications, experience and background to my involvement with this appeal
- 8.2 In my evidence I deal with design objections to the proposal covered by putative Reason for Refusal 2 of the planning application which sets out how

the development is in conflict with Policies HQ/1, H/8 and S/7 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018

8.3 Putative Reason for Refusal 2 relates to the height, massing and design of the building and its impact on the character of the Station Rd, the size and density of the development which has produced a cramped layout, the amount and poor arrangement of outdoor amenity and whether the development can provide an appropriate living environment for future residents.

8.4 Requirement for good responsive design

8.4.1 The requirement for good design is embedded in policy at both national and local level with the NPPF giving emphasis to the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places. A consistent theme is the need to assess design quality not just in isolation but as a response to the local context.

8.4.2 Local design policies and the non-statutory HAPPI report set out some design principles. Of relevance to this evidence is the standard of private amenity expected for apartments.

8.5 Appeal site and surroundings

8.5.1 The site is located on land between the railway line and Station Rd. The site is currently designated as commercial. A range of single and two storey redundant buildings are arranged along its site boundaries.

8.5.2 The area east of Station Rd is gradually transforming from commercial uses to residential and residential care. North of the site residential development is up to three storeys in height, south of the site development fronting the street is two storeys. A care home is approved immediately south of the site which has a two-storey elevation set back 17.6 m from the road. The height of the care facility increases further into its site towards the rail line.

8.6 Built Form and effect on character

- 8.6.1 The scheme is comprised of three linked but distinct blocks. The west block that fronts onto Station Rd is 35m in length and has a 2.5 storeys high façade facing Station Rd. The central block is 3 storeys of the same height as the west block, and this connects to another taller 3 storey block at the east end of the site.
- 8.6.2 The development proposes a continuous elevation to Station Rd of 2.5 storeys with 3 storeys to the rear that will be seen in the context of more moderately scaled building frontages to the south of the site.
- 8.6.3 The proposal does not appropriately relate to these adjacent buildings and the overall form of the western block is considered to have an adverse impact on the street scene.
- 8.6.4 Sizeable gaps along Station Rd between the proposed building frontage and the adjacent development to the north and Reed House to the south will allow views into the back land area where the substantial massing of the building will be apparent and seen as unduly dominating, the appearance of which will be detrimental to the street scene
- 8.6.5 The roof form of the building is complex, ill portioned and is considered to be of poor design.
- 8.6.6 The site offers the opportunity to improve the character of the locality, but it is considered the building form would harm the character of the area
- 8.7 Layout and Intensity of development
- 8.7.1 The position of building on a site is important in creating the appropriate setting and spaces around the building
- 8.7.2 The distorted H shape plan has produced areas that would be poor in terms of amenity value.

8.7.3 The design approach is considered flawed as the quality and quantity of private / communal amenity space has been compromised and the relationship of parking to one of the apartments is unsatisfactory.

8.7.4 The very high density of development (135 d.p.h) has produced a high-level site coverage resulting in a cramped appearance.

8.8 Private Amenity

8.8.1 The District design guide contains standards for the provision of communal gardens and balconies for apartments.

8.8.2 The proposals indicate that there would be a substantial shortfall of approximately 20 % in the provision required for communal gardens and that only 4 of the 28 apartments have balconies. which is a gross under provision when considered against policy.

8.8.3 The District Design considers that 'the 'design of the grounds surrounding a building is as important as the design of the building's themselves'. The amenity area north of the building will be shaded by the building and environmental conditions will deter its use.

8.8.4 Access for most residents to the outdoor communal gardens south and east of the building will be extremely inconvenient. A number of residents could be deprived from the enjoyment of valuable south facing garden areas.

8.9 Conclusion

8.9.1 The height, massing and scale of the proposal will appear dominant in the street scene and have a detrimental impact on its character and appearance.

8.9.2 It is considered that the size and density of development is not acceptable on this site, the design approach unsound, and the quality and quantity of private outdoor amenity space and communal gardens has been compromised in the quest for extra capacity.

8.9.3 The proposal would result in material harm to the living conditions of future occupiers. It would be in conflict Policies HQ/1, S/7, and H/8 of the Local Plan and the Framework which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development relates appropriately to the site and its surroundings, enhances the character of the area, provides a high standard of design that includes high quality landscapes which provide opportunities for social interaction and support a healthy lifestyle(see Appendix EM1), and is of an appropriate density.

8.9.4 'Design' is about how places work, fit together and the quality of life they support. The proposals will not result in a satisfactory environment, do not show that all aspects of the development will function, be attractive, or are responsive to the character of the area. New development should create environments that local communities can be proud of. Para 134 of the NPPF states that 'Development which is not well designed should be refused'. Allowing this appeal would undermine policy on securing good design.

Appendices

Appendix EM1 - Note on Landscape Strategy

Appendix EM2 - Chapter 3 and Conclusion, HAPPI Report (2009)