

Reasons for refusal

01. The proposal is considered to represent unsustainable development in the countryside owing to its location outside a settlement boundary where new residential development is restricted by local and national policy and would therefore be contrary to policies CSP.1, CSP.4 and CSP.5 of the Core Strategy and policy API of the Allocations Plan, policy H2 of the Mitcheldean Neighbourhood Development Plan and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework.

02. The proposal would be contrary to policies CSP.1, CSP.4 and CSP.5 of the Core Strategy, policy API of the Allocations Plan and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework in that it would create a suburban form of development in this rural location on the best and most versatile agricultural land and this would mitigate against the food security of the nation as advised by the government in the Government Food Strategy for England, considering the wider UK Food System (2025) which would be out of character with the surroundings and would therefore represent an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.

03. The proposed development fails to take proper account of and, causes unacceptable harm to the significance of the affected designated heritage asset the Grade I Listed St Michael and All Angels Church which on balance is considered to be greater than the benefits of allowing the application. As a consequence it fails to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the affected listed building and its setting, as required under Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the national guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

04. The proposal fails to make provision for affordable housing, serviced plots for sale to self and custom builders, provision, laying out, management and maintenance of all open space on the site outside private gardens and including the attenuation pond should it not be adopted by a statutory body e.g. Severn Trent, the laying out, equipping of the trim trail and combined LEAP and LAP and contributions to deliver additional capacity at Mitcheldean surgery, primary education, libraries, travel plan, home to school transport, bus stop improvements, monitoring Biodiversity Net Gain via a Section 106 Legal Agreement where there are recognised shortfalls which would place an unacceptable burden on existing local services and infrastructure. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies CSP.1, CSP.4, CSP.5 and CSP.9 of the Core Strategy, policies API and AP7 of the Allocations Plan and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework.