
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2021

by Robin Buchanan BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/W/20/3260478

Dodnor Farm, Dodnor Lane, Newport PO30 5TE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs A Hocknull against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01630/OUT, dated 17 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as residential development.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Outline planning permission is sought with all matters¹ reserved for future approval. Notwithstanding the description of development in the banner above, which is taken from the application form and appears in the Council's decision notice, section 7 of the form refers to 9 dwellings. The Council considered the application on the basis that it was for 'up to' 9 dwellings and made its decision on the original illustrative site layout and site section (including dwelling elevation) plans which show 9 detached and semi-detached two-storey houses. With the appeal the appellant submitted amended versions of these plans which show 7 detached bungalows. The appellant intends all of these plans to show how the proposed residential development could be undertaken within the appeal site and is not seeking 'to dictate any fixed quantum of development', rather to establish the principle of residential development on the appeal site.
3. Having regard to the 'Wheatcroft Principles'² I consider that the amended plans do not materially alter the proposed development and would not therefore prejudice interested parties. I have dealt with the appeal on the basis that the original and amended plans are illustrative for up to 9 dwellings.
4. With the appeal the appellant also submitted a planning obligation³ in the form of an executed unilateral undertaking. It relates to the Council's reasons for refusal No 3 regarding the Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area (SPA) and No 4 regarding affordable housing. I deal with these considerations in 'other matters' below.

¹ Details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale

² *Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v SSE* [JPL 1982 P37]

³ Section 106, Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Main Issues

5. The main issues are whether the appeal proposal would provide a suitable site for residential development, having particular regard to its location and accessibility to services and facilities for future occupiers, and its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The Island Plan, the Isle of Wight Council Core strategy (including Minerals & Waste) and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document, March 2012 (the CS) was adopted more than 5 years ago⁴ and prepared under a previous National Planning Policy Statement regime. Nonetheless, it is the statutory adopted development plan and CS policies SP1, SP7, DM2, DM4, DM12 and DM17 are the most important for determining this appeal. I consider that the aims of these policies are broadly consistent⁵ with the relevant National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) objectives for achieving sustainable development (section 2), plan-making (section 3), delivering a sufficient supply of homes (section 5), promoting sustainable transport (section 9), making effective use of land (section 11), achieving well-designed places (section 12) and conserving and enhancing the natural environment (section 15). In this regard, I therefore give significant weight to these CS policies.

Location and accessibility

7. CS Policy SP1 sets out the Council's spatial strategy and confirms that Newport is within the Medina Valley Key Regeneration Area. This policy supports development, inter alia, on appropriate land within or immediately adjacent the defined settlement boundary of Newport (the settlement boundary), but not on land that is not within or immediately adjacent the settlement boundary unless a specific local need is identified. The main parties agree that the appeal site is not within the settlement boundary of Newport. On the evidence before me, I have no reason to reach a different view in this respect.
8. The appellant suggests that the proposed residential development would be 'close' to the settlement boundary. Indeed, most of the dwellings along part of Dodnor Lane are within the settlement boundary, except those nearest to the appeal site including the closest at Bank Cottage. This dwelling is next to a site where the Council has granted planning permission⁶ for two dwellings, having found that this site was immediately adjacent the settlement boundary and accorded with CS Policy SP1.
9. However, the site next to Bank Cottage is nonetheless a significant distance (60m according to the appellant) away from the appeal site and as a result that site is materially closer to the settlement boundary. These proposed and existing dwellings are also at, or near, an almost right angle bend in Dodnor Lane on the approach to the appeal site, at the bottom of a valley and in, or behind, a belt of mature trees and hedgerows. Whereas, the appeal site is clearly located beyond this development and on the other (far) side of these landscape and topographic features.

⁴ Framework paragraph 33

⁵ Framework paragraph 213

⁶ Council's reference P/01410/17

10. The appeal site is therefore physically and visually detached from the settlement boundary to the west by a significant distance (74m at its closest point according to the appellant) and to the south by a wide swathe of open undeveloped countryside and a wide belt of trees and hedgerows on this edge of the settlement boundary. On the evidence before me, planned development on nearby CS site allocations would be within the settlement boundary and as a result even though the built-up area of Newport would be enlarged, the settlement boundary would be no closer to the appeal site than it is now.
11. Consequently, the appeal site would not be located 'immediately adjacent' the defined settlement boundary of Newport in any reasonable understanding of this phrase. Accordingly, it would not be 'appropriate land' for development under CS Policy SP1 in this regard.
12. I accept that the distance to some existing (and proposed) services, facilities and employment is such that these could be conveniently accessed by some occupiers of the proposed residential development by cycling. This would provide a degree of choice that could reduce reliance on the private car to that extent. Some of these travel requirements, including to some public transport, would also be within walking distance of the appeal site, including via the pedestrian/cycle way⁷ into Newport that can be accessed from part of Dodnor Lane.
13. I acknowledge that Dodnor Lane is subject to a 30mph speed limit and that the Council's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) describes it as 'a lightly trafficked lane (a rural Quietway)'. The Council seeks to undertake 'cycle and pedestrian priority treatment' works to the lane, including to reduce the speed limit to 20mph and the addition of street lighting. I also note that some site allocations for development within the settlement boundary include new pedestrian and cycle links to Dodnor Lane.
14. However, I saw at my site visit that it is a reasonably narrow rural lane with mostly slender grass verges either side tight against rows of tall hedgerow. There are no footways or street lighting and it is on a gradient as it passes the appeal site. I also saw a significant amount of development further along the lane in one direction. This includes Dodnor Farm, commercial and industrial uses, tourism, leisure, education and residential uses. These uses generate vehicular traffic including cars, but by their nature also likely some larger vans and lorries. This traffic must pass the appeal site using the lane. In the other direction, there is additional traffic generated by the residential development along part of Dodnor Lane which also has no footway or street lighting until its distant junction with Monks Brook road. There would also be further traffic generated onto the lane by residential development on the appeal site.
15. Some people who already live in Dodnor Lane, or elsewhere, may choose to walk along the lane in these circumstances, including for leisure or recreation purposes. I am also mindful that the appeal site is not in an urban location, so limits opportunities to 'maximise'⁸ sustainable transport solutions and I accept that the private car would likely meet travel requirements for some daily needs elsewhere in Newport. Nonetheless, given that there are some existing (and proposed) local services, facilities and employment, pedestrian occupiers of the proposed residential development would have no option but to walk for a

⁷ Public Right of Way 207 and National Cycle Route 23

⁸ Framework paragraph 103

- significant distance along the lane in either direction, including an uphill stretch, and would have to share the metalled carriageway with vehicles.
16. Vehicular traffic, even at reasonably low speeds and especially for passing two-way traffic or larger vans or lorries, would as a result be in unacceptable close proximity to pedestrians and there would be insufficient space for people to take refuge in the verges. Furthermore, while there is adequate forward visibility along most of the lane, it would be restricted in places for smaller vehicles and for pedestrians by the tall (about 1.8m to 2m high) hedgerows either side. In particular, at a curve in the lane next to the appeal site in one direction (if the hedgerow were retained or replaced to a similar height at this point) and, especially, at the tight 'blind bend' in the other direction which would be the shortest route into Newport and therefore ordinarily the most likely desire line for pedestrians.
 17. The walking environment of Dodnor Lane would therefore be an unduly dangerous experience for pedestrians, especially for elderly persons, people with disabilities (including wheelchair users), children and parents with buggies. Moreover, including people who may also be distracted from the hazard of passing traffic by these personal considerations and responsibilities. It would as a result put pedestrians (and drivers of vehicles) at an unacceptable risk of accident or injury and would not provide a safe or convenient route for pedestrians, especially during hours of darkness.
 18. The appellant considers that vehicle speeds 'are likely to be... slightly less than 30mph past the Appeal site... and at a lower speed (c. 20mph) around the bend to the west, or at any other point when road users are present'. Additionally, the Council considers that vehicle speeds 'are more reflective of a 25mph environment'. Nevertheless, there is no objective evidence before me to substantiate either claim, such as a traffic survey; or to suggest that the volume and/or speed of traffic in Dodnor Lane would not be 'great enough to deter people from using the road on foot', as the appellant otherwise suggests. Nor have the main parties taken into consideration the range of type of vehicles likely to be using Dodnor Lane and the possible effect of these on pedestrians.
 19. Notwithstanding that there is an absence of a formal record of accidents in this part of Dodnor Lane, this nevertheless does not in itself mean an absence of risk of accident or injury or that there is an acceptable risk to pedestrians. Nor is there any clarity regarding the anticipated timing for starting or finishing the Council's proposed improvements to Dodnor Lane or any details of the nature of the cycle and pedestrian 'priority treatment' envisaged. In addition, even if a pedestrian footway were provided along the appeal site frontage as part of the appeal proposal, as the appellant suggests, and it helped to deliver the Council's wider improvements to Dodnor Lane, pedestrians would nonetheless still have to initially walk a significant distance along the carriageway in one direction to the pedestrian/cycleway or in the other direction to the footway at the junction with Monks Brook road. Such a limited and isolated footway would not therefore alleviate the significant concerns meantime that I refer to above.
 20. Consequently, I consider that Dodnor Lane would not be a particularly attractive walking option to future occupiers of the residential development. It would likely deter anyone contemplating walking routinely and who may otherwise resort to access by the private car, especially if they are unable or

unwilling to cycle. The appeal proposal would as a result be over reliant on access to facilities and services by the private car and not by sustainable means of transport including walking. As such, the proposal would result in a pattern of development that would not promote alternative means of transport to the private car. Accordingly, it would not be 'appropriate land' for development under CS Policy SP1 in this regard.

21. The appellant refers to some other decisions made by the Council⁹ and by Inspectors on appeal.¹⁰ I do not have full details of these other sites or decisions before me. While I accept that some were evidently on roads with higher speed limits than Dodnor Lane, there is no objective evidence before me to substantiate some of the claims made by the appellant with regard to the Council's decisions and the alleged absence or unsuitability of pavements, street lighting or proximity to bus stops in those cases.
22. On the evidence that is before me, I note that one site was located in a defined settlement boundary, another was measured to be significantly closer to a defined settlement boundary than the current appeal site and one was immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary (land adjacent to Bank Cottage). Not only, as I have found above, is the appeal site located materially further away from the settlement boundary than the site adjacent to Bank Cottage, the increased distance of travel along Dodnor Lane, and the nature of this lane and traffic along it that would be endured by pedestrians, is a significant factor in the accessibility concerns that I have referred to above.
23. In the other cases (and in the appeal decisions) I am unable to determine how close the sites were to defined settlement boundaries, thus whether they are in fact comparable to the appeal proposal in this regard. I also note that the Inspectors reached their own planning judgements on the nature and degree of choice in means of travel and the weight given to those matters on the circumstances of each case and in the planning balance. All of these decisions can therefore be distinguished from the appeal proposal. I have, in any event, determined the current appeal on the evidence before me, it's planning merits and my own planning judgement.
24. Considering the above, I find that there is not sufficient scope for a scheme at reserved matters stage to overcome the fundamental concerns that I have identified. Accordingly, I would not expect the proposal to provide a suitable site for residential development in principle having regard to its location in relation to the defined settlement boundary of Newport or with regard to its likely accessibility to services and facilities for future occupiers by walking. It would likely cause significant harm to the integrity of the planning and housing settlement strategy set out by CS Policy SP1 and would likely cause significant harm to future occupiers. It would not accord the CS Policies SP1, SP7 and DM17.
25. These policies include a spatial strategy that seeks to ensure that residential development is in the most sustainable locations to reduce the need to travel, particularly by the private car, and where people have access to services, facilities and employment by increased travel choice, including a safe and convenient alternative means of travel to the car by walking and sustainable routes between urban and rural areas for pedestrians.

⁹ Appellant's Grounds of Appeal (GoA) - Appendix 10 and Appendix 11

¹⁰ Appellant's GoA - Appendix 12

26. The proposal would conflict with Framework paragraphs 8, 15, 20, 59 and 117 which include that the planning system should be plan-led, with an overall strategy for the pattern and scale of housing development to come forward where it is needed and make an effective use of land. It would also conflict with Framework paragraphs 8, 102, 103, 108, 109, 110 and 127 which seek to manage patterns of growth to support opportunities to promote walking and in development to ensure safe and suitable access for all users to accessible services, avoid an unacceptable impact on highway safety and minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles.

Character and appearance

27. The appeal site is part of a larger field in use as grass pasture with a frontage to Dodnor Lane. It is detached from development in one direction along Dodnor Lane for the reasons explained in the first main issue above. In the other direction land levels along the lane and on the appeal site rise towards Dodnor Farm and a local high point. Most of the buildings at the farm and those further along the lane are at or beyond a crest, on level or lower ground, including behind an intervening short row of trees at right angles to the lane. Land levels on the appeal site also rise up from the front boundary hedgerow to the rear of the site towards a skyline, overlooking countryside on lower ground to the south of the lane and the built-up area of Newport beyond.
28. The open and undeveloped form of the appeal site and its spacious, undulating rural nature is locally distinctive. It also forms part of the pattern of fields along this part of Dodnor Lane and a gap that provides a clear separation with the edge of the built-up area of Newport and the more sporadic cluster of development at Dodnor Farm and further along the lane.
29. The appeal proposal would redevelop the appeal site for up to 9 dwellings. The illustrative plans suggest that these may be two-storey houses or bungalows and some may have detached garages. These dwellings could be sited in a linear frontage along and facing the lane and be reasonably well set back, with parts of the hedgerow removed to create means of vehicular access to pairs or groups of dwellings. Alternatively, the hedgerow could be removed and re-planted to provide a pedestrian footway along the frontage of the appeal site. There could also be new planting along the two side boundaries of the appeal site and a more substantial belt of planting to the rear, on land beyond the appeal site that is also owned by the appellant. It could eventually provide a verdant backdrop along the skyline to development on the appeal site.
30. However, any dwellings on the appeal site, even bungalows, would likely be sited in front of, or to one side of, any background or side boundary planting and I would not therefore expect dwellings to be screened by it. Furthermore, any dwellings sited further back or closer to the lane would likely nonetheless be on land that is appreciably higher than the lane and I would therefore expect dwellings to project significantly above a retained or re-planted hedgerow. In addition, sub-dividing the appeal site into a smaller plot or plots and a domestic garden(s) would likely be manifestly at odds with the integrity or size and openness of the appeal site and nearby fields.
31. Residential development on the appeal site would therefore likely be unduly prominent and conspicuous and a discordant feature in the countryside and this landscape in public views from Dodnor Lane — from lower ground in one direction looking up, and from higher ground in the other direction looking

down — and likely also in glimpsed views from Dodnor Mews, between gaps in the siting of these houses, and in more extensive views from roads, pavements and semi-public parking areas within the facing parts of the St Cross business park to the south.

32. I have found that the appeal site forms a gap between mostly discrete areas of development in either direction further along Dodnor Lane and there is therefore no 'transition' to be bridged by residential development on the appeal site and it would not therefore provide any meaningful link between one thing and another. Residential development would as a result likely unduly extend or connect the separate and distinct built-up area of Newport towards, or to, the more sporadic cluster of development at Dodnor Farm and further along the lane.
33. The proposal would likely therefore fundamentally erode openness and be an unwarranted consolidation of discordant built form and a more urban pattern and sequence of development at odds with the overwhelming rural character and appearance of the area and this predominantly rural part of the lane. Consequently, whilst the appeal site is not previously developed land¹¹ I would not expect the proposal to 'enhance the character and context of the local area'. Accordingly, it is not 'appropriate land' for development under CS Policy SP1 in this regard.
34. The appellant has referred me to another appeal decision.¹² I do not have full details of that appeal or development before me. However, on the evidence that is before me, I note that in paragraph 8 the Inspector found that the site 'adjoins the settlement boundary'. In other words, that for the purposes of CS Policy SP1 it was immediately adjacent the defined settlement boundary. As such, the Inspector considered that it 'would accord with the broad locational requirements of the spatial strategy which allows for development to take place outside settlements in certain circumstances' and accordingly, on this basis, that for the development 'to enhance simply because it was 'greenfield' land would be self-defeating' (paragraph 20).
35. In the first main issue above, I have found that the current appeal site and proposed development does not meet any of these same locational descriptions — 'adjoin', 'immediately adjacent to' or 'on the periphery of' a defined settlement boundary (as the other Inspector also put it in paragraph 20). This appeal decision, and that Inspector's approach to CS Policy SP1 in these regards, can therefore be distinguished from the current appeal.
36. Considering the above, I find that there is not sufficient scope for a scheme at reserved matters stage to overcome these fundamental concerns. By virtue of its location and position, residential development on the appeal site in principle would likely fail to protect and preserve the visual amenity of the site or the wider rural nature of the surrounding streetscape of Dodnor Lane. I would not expect the proposal to provide a suitable site for residential development having regard to its likely significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would not accord with CS SP1 or with CS Policies DM2 or DM12. These policies include that development should have regard to constraints such as topography, views or other features which significantly contribute to the character of the area and should conserve and promote the landscape.

¹¹ Framework Annex 2: Glossary

¹² Appellant's GoA – Appendix 13, APP/P2114/W/14/3001191

37. It would also conflict with Framework paragraphs 8, 124, 127 and 170. These include that development should protect the natural environment, create high quality places, add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive as a result of good layout and be sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting and recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Other Matters

38. Some interested parties also objected to the proposal for reasons of alleged adverse effect on air pollution due to increased traffic and to the state of repair of Dodnor Lane. There is no objective evidence before me that increased traffic generated by the proposal would result in an adverse effect on air quality, or that there is any recognised existing air quality concern in the vicinity of the appeal site or its surroundings. I saw that the Dodnor Lane carriageway is generally in reasonable condition (up to its junction with the pedestrian/cycleway) with no apparent significant or material defects. I note that the Council did not object for either of these reasons.
39. The appellant has suggested a number of conditions were I minded to grant planning permission, including to secure the approval of the reserved matters. However, for the reasons explained in the main issues above, these conditions would not overcome the likely significant material harm that I have identified and would not therefore make unacceptable development acceptable in these regards.
40. The proposal would have a likely significant effect on the SPA, an internationally important wildlife designation for birds, due to disturbance by increased human recreational activity. However, by virtue of the unilateral undertaking the appellant would make a payment towards the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy. The main parties agree that the proposal would not therefore adversely affect the integrity of the SPA. I note that on this basis Natural England did not object and that the Council considers that the undertaking overcomes its reason for refusal No 3 and that the proposal would accord with CS Policy DM12. On the evidence before me I have no reason to reach a different view. It would also be consistent with Framework paragraphs 175, 176 and 177 which include that development should mitigate significant harm to biodiversity and not adversely affect the integrity of a SPA.
41. I note that a 'lack of delivery of affordable housing has become a significant issue for the island'¹³ and that there is a need to 'increase the amount of affordable housing'.¹⁴ The proposal is for less than 15 dwellings and the CS does not therefore require affordable housing to be provided on-site. By virtue of the unilateral undertaking the appellant would make a payment towards providing affordable housing off-site elsewhere. The main parties agree that the proposal would not therefore adversely affect the delivery of affordable housing. I also note that the Council considers that the unilateral undertaking overcomes its reason for refusal No 4 and that the proposal would accord with CS Policy DM4 and the SPD. On the evidence before me I have no reason to reach a different view. Providing affordable housing by this means would be aligned with the Government's objective to meet the needs of groups with

¹³ Council's Affordable Housing Contributions supplementary planning document (the SPD), March 2017 – paragraph 2.14

¹⁴ CS paragraph 7.64

specific housing requirements, including for affordable housing, in Framework paragraphs 59, 61 and 62.

42. I have been provided with the Council's calculation methodology and written justification for its requirements for the unilateral undertaking in both of these regards.¹⁵ I am therefore satisfied that these obligations are necessary to mitigate the impact of otherwise unacceptable development and make it acceptable in planning terms in these regards,¹⁶ are related directly to the development and are fairly related in scale and kind. As such they would accord with the provisions of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and the tests for planning obligations set out in Framework paragraph 56. The absence of harm in respect of the SPA is a neutral factor in my decision and the provision of affordable housing would be an appreciable benefit, commensurate with the reasonably modest possible scale of residential development.
43. On the evidence before me, the proposal would not be at risk of flooding and foul waste disposed via the Sandown treatment plant would not have any adverse effect on nitrates in protected waters. Residential development on the appeal site would not affect any trees or other ecology interest, would not be in close proximity to any listed buildings or other heritage assets, would not adversely affect the living conditions of existing occupiers of dwellings and proposed dwellings could be high quality in design with gardens suitable for their intended use. It could provide satisfactory visibility splays for vehicular means of access into the site, turning areas and provide sufficient car parking and the traffic generated would not adversely affect the capacity of the highway network. I note that the Council did not object to the appeal proposal for any of these reasons. The absence of harm in these regards is also a neutral factor in my decision
44. The main parties agree that the Council has less than a 5-year housing land supply (5YHLS), though do not suggest what the quantum of shortfall is. The Council also accepts that against the Government's Housing Delivery Test (HDT) the delivery of housing was substantially below,¹⁷ ie less than 75%, the Council's housing requirement over the previous three years. On the evidence before me, I have no reason to reach a different view on these matters. The Council cannot therefore presently demonstrate a 5YHLS or meet the HDT.
45. For the purposes of CS Policy SP1 (which otherwise 'generally'¹⁸ expects development to be within or immediately adjacent the settlement boundaries unless there is a 'specific local need') a specific local need includes identified local requirements for housing,¹⁹ albeit that 'local' is not defined by the Council. I accept that this could ordinarily mean a particular part of the Isle of Wight. However, the Council's 5YHLS and HDT position applies across the entire island and suitable and appropriate residential development in any location would therefore help to restore a 5YHLS and help to meet the HDT. In these circumstances, the appeal proposal — which would otherwise not be immediately adjacent the defined settlement boundary of Newport but nonetheless within the Medina Valley Key Regeneration Area where smaller

¹⁵ CS Policy DM12 and the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy, December 2017; CS Policy DM4 and the SPD

¹⁶ Framework paragraph 54 and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) paragraph 23b-002-20190901

¹⁷ Framework paragraph 215(c)

¹⁸ CS paragraph 5.7

¹⁹ CS paragraph 5.31

scale residential development would assist in meeting housing delivery in accordance with CS Policies SP1 and SP2 — would therefore help to meet this specific local need.

46. Notwithstanding the above, by virtue of footnote 7, Framework paragraph 11(d) is engaged such that the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date. I note that the Council considers that in these circumstances there is no longer a requirement under CS Policy SP1 to demonstrate a specific local need for residential development on land that is not within or immediately adjacent the defined settlement boundaries.²⁰ The delivery of housing by the appeal proposal would be aligned with the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of homes²¹ and would therefore be an appreciable benefit of the proposal.
47. Accordingly, the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in Framework paragraph 11 requires planning permission to be granted unless either of two circumstances apply. The second of these is where any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the Framework taken as a whole, in which case in accordance with Framework 11(d)(ii) the presumption in favour of sustainable development would not apply.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

48. As explained in the main issues above, in principle the appeal proposal would likely cause significant harm to the Council's planning and housing settlement strategy and to future occupiers, having regard to its location and accessibility to services and facilities, and to the character and appearance of the area. I attach substantial weight to each of these harms. The appeal proposal would likely deliver up to 9 new homes on the appeal site and likely result in the provision of affordable housing. Mindful of the 5YHLS shortfall, and even if the Council's HDT is only 54% as the appellant suggests, I attach meaningful weight to these appreciable benefits. The proposed development would not therefore accord with the development plan overall.
49. Consequently, I find that the scale of the development proposed and the identified benefits would be limited, such that the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh those benefits. There are no material considerations which indicate that my decision should not be taken otherwise in accordance with the development plan.
50. For the reasons given, the appeal does not succeed.

Robin Buchanan

INSPECTOR

²⁰ Council's SoC – paragraph 5.9

²¹ Framework paragraph 59