



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 January 2024

by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/23/3326468

Land to the rear of 163-165 Hanworth Road, Hounslow TW3 3TT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Randeep Gill, JRG Developments Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01254/163-165/P11, dated 17 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is construction of three-storey building to provide 3 no. flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have altered the address in the banner heading above to reflect the address on the decision notice as it more accurately describes the location of the appeal site.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of future occupiers with specific reference to noise; air pollution; light; outlook; privacy and amenity space;
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with specific reference to outlook; privacy; noise; and amenity space.
 - The effect of the proposal on the long-term viability of the adjacent car mechanic premises;
 - Whether reasonable carbon reductions have been achieved on site and;
 - Whether the proposal makes adequate provision for carbon off-set contributions; demonstrates adherence to the Considerate Constructors Scheme; and restricts future occupiers from applying for parking permits.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a narrow, rectangular shaped piece of land situated to the rear of numbers 163-165 Hanworth Road which comprises a three-storey building with retail space on the ground floor. There is an 'L' shaped 3 storey extension to the rear comprising three flats and associated bin and cycle storage to the rear. The

adjacent site is a car repair garage and the site to the north-east is in use as retail units at ground floor and residential flats above. A public car park lies to the rear.

5. The surrounding area comprises mainly two and three storey buildings with four-storey buildings defining the corner of Hanworth Road and Bell Road. The traditional properties fronting Hanworth Road and Bell Road contrast with the modern design of more recent development comprising commercial development at ground floor and residential above. The predominant pattern of development in the surrounding area is frontage development, although there are notable exceptions where development has taken place to the rear such as Bellview Court. Overall, the area is characterised as a busy mixed-use area with mainly frontage development comprising of both traditional and modern designs.
6. The appeal site is comprised of a large section of hardstanding, with storage buildings situated towards the rear boundary which are in a poor state of repair. Consequently, the appeal site does not make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the area.
7. The proposed development would comprise the erection of a three-storey building consisting of three self-contained, two-bedroom three person flats with private terraces and a communal roof top amenity space. The remainder of the site would be retained and implemented as communal amenity space for occupiers of the existing flats and the proposed dwellings. Cycle storage, bin storage and access would be provided.
8. Back land development exists in this section of Hanworth Road notably the Bellview Court development and development to the rear of number 169 Hanworth Road in the form of a rear extension. There are also single storey workshop buildings situated to the rear of the car repair business/coach works adjacent. Whilst the proposal would sit towards the rear boundary, I acknowledge that the building line to the rear of Hanworth Road is varied.
9. The proposed development would comprise a separate building to the rear of the long rectangular appeal site. The building would be designed in a similar style and appearance as the frontage building. Nevertheless, the 3-storey dwelling would have an obscure balustrade and lift overrun above which would create the impression of a fourth storey and which would visually compete with the main three storey frontage building. This would be compounded by the proposal taking up a significant portion of the width of this narrow site. The resultant building would be bulky and fail to appear subservient to the main building.
10. There would be glimpsed views of the proposal from Hanworth Road through the enclosed walkway. However, the proposed development would be highly visible from the public car park and also Bell Road. I acknowledge that the building would be seen in the context of Bellview Court to the west; however, the appeal site occupies a more prominent position central to the car park and would, therefore, be more visible. In addition, the original frontage buildings at Bell View Court appear to have been demolished and the site fully redeveloped and hence the relationship with the original building has been lost. At no 169 the rear portion of the building reads as an extension to the main building as opposed to a free-standing building and is set back from the rear boundary. The workshop buildings are single-storey and, therefore, appear as ancillary buildings which would be expected to be found at the rear of plots.

11. Furthermore, Bellview Court and the extension to no 169 were approved in a different national, strategic and local planning policy context which limits the weight which I can attach to these cases in my decision.
12. In conclusion, the proposal would appear bulky and fail to appear subservient to the main frontage development and would, therefore, harm the character and appearance of the area. It would, therefore, conflict with Policies CC1 and CC2 of the Council's Local Plan 2015-2030 which together seek to ensure that development sensitively and creatively responds to an area's character and promote and support high quality urban design and architecture to create attractive, distinctive and liveable places.

Living conditions of future occupiers

NOISE

13. The appeal site is situated within a vibrant mixed-use area with a range of commercial uses. Hanworth Road and Bell Road are busy roads which generate traffic noise at a constant level throughout the day. The adjacent car repair business also generates noise during working hours. Furthermore, the site falls within the 63dB noise contour of Heathrow Airport. The site is, therefore, a noise sensitive site.
14. A new Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) Report (KP Acoustics) (6 July 2023) has been submitted in support of the appeal in response to concerns raised regarding the original Technical Note on Noise which accompanied the application. This identifies that air traffic rather than commercial or road traffic is the main noise source. The existing ambient noise levels were measured at 54dB(A) daytime and 48dB(A) night time, although higher daytime levels up to 67dB(A) have been assumed in assessing the proposal to reflect air traffic exposure.
15. The assessment demonstrates that appropriate internal noise levels can be provided for the development commensurate with the design range set out in BS8233: 2004.
16. The noise from the car repair business is assessed as 5dB below the background noise level at 1m from the nearest façade of the proposed flats. This falls within the BS4142 'Amber' rating level of acceptability which means that noise is observed to have an adverse effect level. However, subject to the glazed and non-glazed elements of the building meeting the performance values as specified in the Section 5.1 and 5.2 of the NIA and that they are installed on all elevations, including the use of double glazing, internal noise levels would comply with BS8233:2014 standards. The predicted noise level at the proposed external amenity space arising from the car repair business is 47dB which meets the BS8233:2014 recommendation of 50-55dB maximum for external amenity.
17. The noise from the car park is assessed as 12dB below the background noise level at 1m from the nearest façade of the proposed residential flats falling within the 'green' rating level of acceptability according to BS4142. The predicted noise level at the proposed external amenity space arising from the car park is 35dB which meets the BS8233:2014 recommendation of 50-55dB maximum for external amenity space. The report concludes that the addition of lower level noise sources to the overall noise background has little or no effect on the overall noise levels because of the logarithmic effect of the combined noise. Overall, the report concludes that the significance of any impact would be low and complaints would be unlikely.

18. Section 6.1 of the Report sets out a ventilation strategy recommending appropriate ventilation systems in order to ensure that the internal noise environment is not compromised. The report clarifies that the internal noise level is based on windows being shut; however, purge ventilation would be provided by openable windows. Given other methods of ventilation recommended in section 6.1, it is anticipated that purge conditions would only occur occasionally. In addition, where the strategies recommended are not sufficient for controlling overheating, a number of strategies could be adhered to, including fixed shading devices such as shutters, glazing design etc. On this basis, I am satisfied that appropriate mechanisms could be secured by condition in order to prevent over-heating.
19. In terms of the external amenity areas, the assessment has been undertaken on the basis of the noise contour levels for air traffic noise which would be 64dB LA_{eq,T} which would not meet the BS8233:2014 target guidance for noise in external amenity areas. Attention is drawn to BS8233:2014 guidance which suggests that the guideline values may not be achievable in all circumstances where development might be desirable in higher noise areas such as city centres a compromise between elevated noise levels and other factors might be warranted. However, I consider that the noise levels would significantly detract from the enjoyment of the external amenity areas and in particular the roof terrace. Whilst external balconies could be enclosed this would detract from the purpose of the amenity area. Consequently, this harm could not be mitigated.
20. In conclusion, I am satisfied that internal noise levels would be met with mitigation which can be secured by condition. I am also satisfied that with mitigation measures secured by condition that the properties would not overheat. However, the external amenity areas would be subject to significant levels of noise to the detriment of the living conditions of future occupiers.

AIR QUALITY

21. The appeal site is situated in an area which has been identified as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) due to annual NO₂ concentrations. An Air Quality Assessment (AQA) (June 2023) has been submitted with the appeal which identifies that as the appeal site is situated 45m from Hanworth Road and 30m from Bell Road that the 'relevant receptors' of the proposed development will not be directly affected by emissions from the local roads and will be at the urban background concentration. In addition, emissions from vehicles using the car park and adjacent car repairs are assessed as having a negligible effect on air quality. Consequently, the pollutant concentration for the relevant receptors using the proposed development will be at the prevailing urban background concentration.
22. Section 3.5 of the report states that for the relevant urban background monitoring sites the average NO₂ concentration has reduced from 34.0 ug^{m-3} in 2016 to 19.1 ug^{m-3} in 2021 compared to the Government's Air Quality Strategy (AQS) objective of 40 ug^{m-3}. Consequently, the measured concentrations demonstrate that the concentration at the appeal site is significantly less than the AQS objective and not of concern to human health. Section 3.5 assesses that the DEFRA estimated background NO₂ concentration for 2023 is 22.6 ug^{m-3}, 17.0 ug^{m-3} for PM₁₀ and 11.3 ug^{m-3} for PM_{2.5} all of which are significantly less than the AQS objectives. Furthermore, the proposed development would be car free and hence an assessment is not required of the impacts of emissions from traffic associated with the additional flats.

23. During construction, site specific measures can be used to mitigate the impact of any dust emissions arising to ensure that construction does not have an adverse effect on the air quality of neighbouring occupiers.
24. Overall, the use of the development site is acceptable in terms of prevailing air quality for its proposed use. The proposal would not, therefore, have an adverse impact on the living conditions of future occupiers with regards to air quality.

DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT

25. The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment submitted with the planning application only assessed the potential impact of the proposed development on the daylight and sunlight of adjoining buildings. However, a revised Daylight and Sunlight Assessment (DSA) (T16 Design 10/10/23) was submitted with the appeal which now includes an assessment of the proposed development itself.
26. The DSA concludes that all windows in neighbouring properties would retain in excess of 80% their current vertical sky component values (Section 7). BRE Guidance - Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (3rd Addition, 2022) states that only windows which face within 90° of due south need to be assessed for sunlight provision. 13 windows in the neighbouring properties fall into this category. The results of the assessment (section 8) show that all of the assessed windows would retain 100% of their existing values, both annually and over the winter months should the scheme go ahead. The proposal would not, therefore, have an adverse impact on the daylight or sunlight of neighbouring properties.
27. In terms of the proposed development, the DSA utilises the Target Daylight Factor (DF_t) methodology. Section 9 demonstrates that the minimum DF_t would be met in all habitable rooms within the proposed development and would meet and exceed the minimum levels of internal daylight.
28. The DSA has not undertaken an assessment of sunlight to the proposed development. However, BRE report (Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice (3rd Addition, 2022) states that a south facing window will in general receive most sunlight, while a north-facing one will only receive it on a handful of occasions. A dwelling with no main window wall within 90 degrees of due south is likely to be perceived as insufficiently sunlit. Sensitive layout design of flats will attempt to ensure that each individual dwelling has at least one main living room which can receive a reasonable amount of sunlight. Where possible living rooms should face the southern or western parts of the sky and kitchens towards the north or east. Each of the proposed flats are dual aspect. Furthermore, the living areas are south-east facing, and the kitchen is north west facing. BRE Guidance states that a habitable room, preferably a main living room should receive at least 1.5 hours of sunlight on 21 March and this has not been specifically assessed. However, given the orientation of the proposed living rooms and the full length glazed doors to the living room, I consider that this would be met. Consequently, I am satisfied that the proposal would receive sufficient sunlight. Overall, on the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the proposal would receive sufficient daylight and sunlight.

OUTLOOK

29. Occupiers of the first and second floor flats would have an open outlook over the car park from their bedroom and kitchen windows. The ground floor, rear facing rooms including a kitchen and single bedroom would face onto a narrow passageway and the boundary wall would be less than 2 metres away from the

window. The kitchen/living area is dual aspect; however, the bedroom only has one window. Whilst limited details are before me of boundary treatment attention is drawn to a plan/section which shows a relatively low boundary wall positioned on the rear boundary. This indicates that outlook over the car park would be available above the eye level of 1.7m. However, as more people are working from home, the single bedroom may be utilised as an office. Occupiers working from this room would be faced with a solid boundary wall in close proximity to the window. Furthermore, if future occupiers could see out across the car park, users of the car park would be able to see into the property raising privacy issues. Consequently, the proposal would result in harmful living conditions for occupiers of the ground floor flat in terms of outlook and privacy.

30. The Council are concerned that the narrow passageway to the rear of the proposed development would lead to antisocial behaviour; however, the safety and security measures provided by the proposed gated access would mitigate against this.
31. In conclusion, the proposal would have harmful effect on the living conditions of future occupiers with regards to outlook and potentially privacy.

AMENITY SPACE

32. Policy SC5 of the Local Plan requires that proposed development should have 75m² of communal space for the three new flats, less the 18m² for the private balconies. These standards apply specifically to flatted development often found in more urban as opposed to suburban locations. The Council draw attention to the fact that the 435 m² of communal amenity space proposed in relation to the planning permission for the rear extension to the existing building to provide three flats has not been implemented in accordance with the approved plans. Whilst occupiers have private balconies the communal space was never provided.
33. The proposed site plan indicates that 159m² of communal outside space would be provided to the front of the proposed building, to be shared with the existing flats at the building. An additional 40m² of amenity space would be provided at roof level for the proposed units, alongside the 6m² of private amenity space provided for each individual unit. As such the proposal would meet the policy requirements set out by Policy SC5 in quantitative terms with at least 25m² of amenity space being provided for each of the proposed units and the existing flats at the site also being afforded a sufficient quantity of amenity space.
34. The ground floor amenity area is a good shape and would provide a useable amenity space for sitting out, hanging out washing, children playing out etc. However, as set out above, the external amenity areas would be subject to noise from the road and air traffic which could not be attenuated. I noted on my site visit that aircraft flew at low levels close to the site. In particular, users of the roof terrace would be subject to high levels of noise, in addition to being exposed to wind. Consequently, I do not consider that the roof top terrace would provide suitable amenity space in this location. It is, therefore, likely that future occupiers would rely on the ground floor amenity space which would be shared with the existing units at the site, intensifying the use of this space.
35. Although the proposed amenity space would meet the amenity space requirement for both the existing and proposed development; the calculation takes account of the roof top amenity area which I do not consider would provide suitable amenity space. As the roof top amenity area would not be useable amenity space it should be discounted from the calculation. The ground floor amenity space would be utilised by both existing and future occupiers resulting in an over-intensive use of

the space. Consequently, overall, the proposal would not provide sufficient amenity space of an appropriate quality to meet the needs of existing and future occupiers.

36. The appellant draws attention to the presence of two public parks situated around a 10 minute walk away (Lampton Park, Inwood Park). However, visiting both parks would entail crossing busy roads and would not, therefore, be a suitable alternative. It is suggested that the proposed accommodation would not necessarily attract families with children; however, all future occupiers should expect to enjoy suitable amenity space.
37. Consequently, the proposed development would not provide amenity space of a sufficient quantity or quality to the detriment of the living conditions of future occupiers.

LIVING CONDITIONS – FUTURE OCCUPIERS – OVERALL CONCLUSION

38. I have concluded that there would not be a harmful effect on the living conditions for future occupiers with regards to internal noise and air pollution or daylight/sunlight and that conflict would not arise with Policy EQ4 of the Local Plan which seeks to reduce the potential air quality impacts of developments. However, these are neutral factors in this case.
39. The proposed development would result in harmful living conditions for future occupiers with regards to the noise levels which would be experienced at external amenity areas, outlook and also in terms of external amenity space. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to Policies EQ5, CC2 and SC5 of the Local Plan which collectively seek to ensure that new developments: achieve a high quality of design; reduce the impact of noise from aviation, transport and noise-generating uses; provide a high quality external space that is useable; has a positive impact on the amenity of current and future occupiers; and provide adequate outlook.

Living conditions – existing occupiers

40. Occupiers of the proposed development would need to pass through the narrow archway and pass the ground floor flat of the rear extension of the existing building. Up to nine residents could occupy the proposed development; however, given this low level of use, I do not consider that this would result in undue noise or disturbance to the occupiers of the ground floor flat or their external amenity space which is surrounded by a 1.9m high screen. I note that the window on the flank elevation of the phase 2 development is a kitchen window and is obscure so there would be no loss of privacy to the occupants of that flat.
41. The bin storage area is situated to the front of the proposed amenity space. The bins would need to be moved to the front of the site near the access on bin collection day; however, due to the low level of movements, I do not consider that this would have an adverse effect on existing occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance.
42. The Council acknowledge that numbers 63-67 Bell Road are not residential properties and so there would not be an adverse effect in terms of outlook from those properties.
43. As set out above, the proposed development would not provide sufficient amenity space for existing occupiers as the proposed central amenity space would be subject to intensive use from both existing and future occupiers of the proposed development due to the poor quality of the proposed roof top terrace.

44. Whilst the proposal would not harm the living conditions of existing occupiers with regards to noise/disturbance, privacy or outlook, the proposal would, however, not provide sufficient external amenity space for existing occupiers and would, therefore, be contrary to Policy SC5 of the Local Plan.

Viability of adjacent business

45. As set out above, the NIA concludes that the noise from the car repair shop is 5dB below the background noise at 1m from the façade of the proposed residential dwellings, thus falling under BS4142 'amber' rating level of acceptability which means that noise is observed to have an adverse effect level, but it may be considered acceptable when assessed in the context of other merits of the development. However, double-glazed windows are proposed for the façade overlooking the industrial units. The performance specification calculated for the window units and building fabric would ensure that a high degree of attenuation is provided from the nearby industrial sources, ensuring the interior noise limits of BS8233 are met.
46. The predicted noise levels at the proposed external amenities due to the existing car repair shop is 47dB which meet the BS8233 recommendation of 50-50dB at the external amenities. Consequently, the likelihood of complaints arising from future occupiers in relation to noise arising from the car repair business is low. Furthermore, as set out above, emissions from vehicles using the adjacent car repairs are assessed in the AQA as having a negligible effect on air quality.
47. As such, I do not consider that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the viability of the adjacent car repair business. The proposal would not, therefore, conflict with Policy EC5 of the Local Plan and Policy D13 of the London Plan which together

Carbon Reductions

48. The Council declared a climate emergency in 2019 and subsequently published a draft Climate Emergency Action Plan in which it sets a target of net zero carbon by 2020. To achieve this, all new developments are expected to meet the net zero carbon targets set out in Policy S1 2 of the London Plan. The policy sets out an energy hierarchy which is expected to inform the design, construction and operation of new buildings.
49. Part C of Policy SI 2 requires a minimum on-site reduction of CO₂ emissions of at least 35 per cent beyond Building Regulations for major development. It goes onto say that residential development should achieve 10 per cent through energy efficiency measures. Where it is demonstrated that this cannot be achieved any shortfall should be provided either as a cash in lieu contribution to the borough's carbon off-set fund or off-site.
50. The application has been accompanied by an Energy Statement (ES) which shows an on-site reduction in CO₂ emissions of 56.25% achieved through a variety of passive measures and sustainable energy technologies and commits to offset the remaining carbon emissions generated by the development through an in lieu offset payment of £3,942.30. A s106 obligation has been submitted which provides a mechanism to secure the contribution.
51. The Statement uses SAP10 carbon factors and specifies an appropriate amount of photovoltaics (PV) for the size of the development proposed. It also correctly calculates the onsite saving and offset fund contribution. In addition, a Be Lean carbon saving would be achieved for the development of 11.29%, bettering the

10% requirement. However, the Council is concerned that the document fails to ensure that energy savings at each step of the energy hierarchy are maximised before being off-set.

52. The appellant confirms that the fabric elements of the build have been specified and assessed in the ES on the basis of the current Building Regulation (2010, 2021 edition incorporating 2023 amendments (Table 5 of the EA).
53. The Council is concerned that the proposal would use double glazing as opposed to triple. However, as set out in the EA whilst the U-values for triple glazing may be better, typically the g-values are worse. Incorporating triple glazing into the build has very little effect on the overall performance as it is likely to mean that more active heating is required due to the lower solar gain associated with triple glazing and there is potential for overheating.
54. Due to the relatively small size and low energy demand of the proposal a CHP or a dedicated heat network are considered inappropriate. However, the proposed wet central heating system could facilitate the connection to a future area heating network. Consequently, whilst there are no proposed energy/carbon savings that can be attributed to the connection of an area heating network or use of a CHP system, the option is not ruled out in the future.
55. The development proposes the use of photovoltaic array to be fitted to the flat facing roof. The proposed air source heat pumps external units could be sited on the flat roof. The heat pumps would also provide hot water heating via cylinders fed from each of the heat pumps. The use of heat pumps allows the minimum 35% emissions reduction to be achieved on this site. Other renewable technology was also explored including ground source heat pumps and biomass; however, there would be insufficient space to accommodate trenches and space needed for plant, fuel storage and deliveries. The proposal would comply with the water efficiency target of 105 litres per person per day.
56. Whilst it has not been possible to offset all of the carbon emissions, the ES demonstrates that the proposal achieves a minimum on site reduction of at least 35% beyond Building Regulations and that the 10% of those reductions would be achieved by energy efficiency measures. There is no district heating system in the vicinity and due to the size of the development it is not possible to have its own. Furthermore, other renewable energies have been explored; however, there would be insufficient space within the site of the required infrastructure.
57. A s106 Unilateral Undertaking (UU) has now been submitted to secure the Carbon Off-set payment contribution which has been calculated correctly. Consequently, taking account of the above, I consider that the proposal does not conflict with Policy SI 2 of the London Plan.

Infrastructure Requirements

58. As discussed above, the s106 Unilateral Undertaking secures the necessary Carbon off-set payment.
59. The site is situated in close proximity to public transport including rail and buses and has a PTAL score of 6a 'excellent'. The development would be car free, other than the provision of a disabled parking bay which is acceptable given its accessibility to sustainable methods of transport. The s106 UU has now been submitted and provides a mechanism for achieving the restriction of future occupiers' rights to obtain a parking permit and also to ensure that the parking space is reserved for the sole use of blue badge owners. Given the parking

restrictions in the busy commercial area and the high PTAL rating, I consider that car free development and the restriction of resident parking permits is necessary.

60. Schedule 1 of the s106 UU covenants the owner to implement and comply with the Schedule 2 which sets out details of the Considerate Contractor Scheme. On this basis, I am satisfied that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers during the construction phase.
61. Taking into account the above, I am satisfied that the proposal would not conflict with Policy IMP3 of the Local Plan which expects development proposals to mitigate the impacts of the development on the area through a section 106 agreement where necessary.

S106 Obligation

62. A s106 obligation has been submitted in the form of a Unilateral Undertaking (UU). The UU seeks to secure the carbon off-set contribution; the considerate contractor scheme; and the prohibition of residents parking permits.
63. I have found that the s106 UU has met concerns in relation to these matters; however, as I have decided to dismiss the appeal there is no need to consider the s106 UU in any further detail.

Planning Balance

64. The proposed development would make provision for 3 additional dwellings and would make a contribution, albeit limited, to housing land supply, meets the need for smaller units and payment of the New Homes Bonus. There would also be some economic benefits during the construction phase and longer term as future occupiers help to support local businesses. Furthermore, the proposed development would make use of previously developed land in an accessible location. However, due to the small scale of the development, these would be only moderate benefits.
65. I have determined that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers or the living conditions of future occupiers regarding internal noise, air pollution or daylight/sunlight. These are neutral factors in my Decision. However, I have found that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of future occupiers with regards to outlook, and the noise experienced in external amenity areas and for both existing and future occupiers, insufficient and poor quality of the amenity space. I have also found that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.
66. In conclusion, I find that the totality of the harm outweighs any moderate benefits of the scheme. There are no material considerations which would outweigh the harm which I have identified or the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

67. For the reasons stated and taking all other considerations into account the appeal should be dismissed.

Caroline Mulloy

Inspector