



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2024

by T Gethin BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z0116/W/23/3331983

2 Stillhouse Lane, Bedminster, Bristol City, Bristol BS3 4EB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Michele Oldfield against the decision of Bristol City Council.
 - The application Ref is 22/06098/F.
 - The development proposed is Change of use from Commercial Workshop to 5no. Residential Apartments.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Michele Oldfield against Bristol City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Planning Inspectorate's Procedural Guide (Planning Appeals – England) sets out that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that what is considered by the Inspector at appeal is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the Council and by interested parties at the application stage. However, in seeking to resolve the Council's concerns and refusal reasons, the appellant submitted amended plans with the appeal.
4. It has been put to me that, following a request from the Council, the revised plans were being prepared as the planning application was refused permission and would have been submitted to the Council had the opportunity not been withdrawn. Be that as it may, the amended plans would, amongst other aspects, result in a change to the external appearance of the proposed building and in the number, mix and size of residential apartments. These are not insignificant and would lead to the above description of development no longer being accurate in terms of the number of apartments that would be provided.
5. The proposed amendments therefore equate to a fundamental change to the original scheme and constitute a different proposal. In addition, accepting amendments at appeal stage could deprive those who were entitled to be consulted on the application of the opportunity to make any representations that, given the nature and extent of the changes proposed, they may have wanted to make on the amended scheme. Despite no comments having been submitted from neighbours in relation to the scheme proposed as part of the original planning application, taking the amended plans into account could therefore also prejudice other parties' interests. Consequently, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the proposal determined by the Council,

as per the plans listed on the Decision Notice, and have not taken the amended plans into account.

6. As the proposal is in a conservation area (CA), I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, as set out in section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) also sets out that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:

- whether the proposed development would be suitably located in relation to flood risk;
- whether the living conditions of future occupiers of the proposed development would be sufficient, with particular regard to internal space, natural light, outlook and ventilation;
- whether satisfactory waste (refuse and recycling) and bicycle storage would be provided;
- the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Bedminster CA;
- whether the proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of employment land;
- whether the proposed housing mix would be suitable; and
- whether the energy requirements of the proposed development would be acceptable.

Reasons

Flood Risk

8. Situated in Flood Zone 2, the appeal site is at medium risk of fluvial flooding. Being entirely covered by built form, the site is also, as identified in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), completely impermeable. However, the FRA identifies that the site is, as per the Environment Agency surface water flooding map, at very low risk of surface water flooding.
9. Policy BCS16 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (CS) sets out that development in Bristol will follow a sequential approach to flood risk management. This is consistent with the Framework, which includes a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development, with the aim to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding.
10. The Framework indicates that some minor development and changes of use should not be subject to the sequential test. As per footnote 60, this includes householder development, small non-residential extensions and, with some exceptions, changes of use. Taking a similar approach, the Council's Practice Note, Flood Risk Sequential Test (Flood Risk PN) identifies that this only applies to change of use proposals involving no extension to the building above and

beyond that considered to be a “minor extension or alteration”. It also includes a further exception from the sequential test for proposals for replacement buildings where there would be no increase in the intensity of use of the site.

11. The appeal proposal is described in the application form as change of use from commercial workshop to 5no. residential apartments. If this were the case, then the sequential test would not be required. However, the submitted evidence indicates that the development would involve more than just a change of use. For example, the FRA refers to ‘new residential apartments to replace the existing workshop building’ and to the proposal being for a three-storey apartment block. The submitted Design & Access Statement and Heritage Statement (DAS) includes similar references, with the proposed development providing, as reflected in the submitted plans, ‘new residential apartments to replace existing workshop building’ and involving ‘redevelopment of the site’, a ‘new build’ and ‘construction of a new three storey building’. Whilst some walls and structural elements would remain and be utilised, the DAS also identifies that the ‘remaining walls will be demolished and replaced’.
12. On this basis, the proposal cannot reasonably be regarded as involving only a change of use. Given the extent of the proposed works and size of the resulting building, as shown in the proposed plans, nor would it equate to a change of use with only a minor extension or alteration. With the change from a relatively small workshop building to a block with five apartments, the development, even if it could be described as providing a replacement building more resilient to flooding, would also clearly involve an increase in the intensity of use on the site. Accordingly, irrespective of what was required for the adjoining development, both the Framework and the Council’s Flood Risk PN indicate that a sequential test is necessary in this case. However, with none provided, it has not been demonstrated that there are no reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding.
13. With the likely source of flooding coming from the river to the south, the FRA indicates that occupiers, who would be provided with a specific flood management plan and could sign up for flood warnings, could head north. Flooding in the area is also said to be predictable and slow-moving, and a flood evacuation plan could be secured by condition. Nevertheless, if flood waters were to reach the site without the occupier of flat 1 having already left, no safe escape route would be available to them. In addition, with that flat being located on the ground floor and having a private entrance, the most vulnerable development would not be in areas of lowest flood risk.
14. In relation to being resistant and resilient to flooding, the FRA sets out the floor of the proposed apartment block would be no lower than the existing, non-return valves would be fitted to drainage systems, and electrical works would be top down and sockets placed as high as practicable. In addition, with the site already being fully developed, the proposed development would neither change the existing extent of surface water run-off nor increase flood risk elsewhere, irrespective of the use of sustainable urban drainage systems.
15. Nevertheless, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not be suitably located in relation to flood risk, contrary to CS Policy BCS 16. The proposal would also be inconsistent with the provisions in the Framework in relation to flood risk and the Council’s Flood Risk PN.

Living conditions

16. The Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard (2015) sets out requirements for, amongst other aspects, the minimum gross internal area (GIA) of new dwellings at a defined level of occupancy. The submitted evidence indicates that four of the flats would not meet the minimum GIA standards. This includes flats 1 and 3 being, respectively, 3.7 and 0.8 square metres smaller than the 39 square metres required for a single-storey one-person flat with bathroom; and flats 2 and 4 being two square metres smaller than the minimum 58 square metres for a two-person flat over two storeys. Whilst the shortfalls, with the exception of flat 1, may not be significant, the failure to provide flats with GIAs that meet national minimum standards indicates that future occupiers in four of the five flats would have insufficient internal space. Whilst not a reason for refusal, the limited provision of outdoor space in the proposed development also weighs against finding that the appeal proposal would provide suitable living conditions for future occupiers.
17. The main parties agree that flats 1 and 4 would be single-aspect. Despite its orientation, flat 4 would receive reasonable levels of daylight and outlook given the limited height of the adjoining building it would face and that it would be situated on the upper floors of the proposed development. However, flat 1 would be on the ground floor, fronting Stillhouse Lane.
18. Whilst it would have two windows, they would not be particularly large and would face towards the relatively big, blank building on the opposite side of the narrow lane. There would therefore be limited outlook and natural light in flat 1, with daylight particularly limited towards the back of the studio flat due to its depth. In addition, given the windows would abut the footway, it is likely that future occupiers of the flat would desire some privacy from passersby. Whilst such privacy could be provided by blinds or net curtains for example, such measures would clearly further restrict the outlook and the amount of natural light in the flat. Whether the same situation occurs in other nearby properties does not lead me to a different conclusion.
19. Being single-aspect, and without rooflights like flat 4, natural ventilation in flat 1 would also be insufficient. The ability to provide mechanical ventilation, which the submitted Thermal Model Assessment identifies is necessary for the flat to provide a comfortable thermal environment, does not change this.
20. A significant factor in my finding that flat 4 would have sufficient daylight and outlook is the limited height of the existing building on the opposite side of the unnamed lane. On this basis, were that site to be developed in future, the appeal proposal would, given the limited degree of separation, likely prejudice its development potential.
21. For the above reasons, I conclude that the living conditions of future occupiers of the proposed development would be insufficient, with particular regard to internal space, natural light, outlook and ventilation. I therefore find that it conflicts with CS Policies BCS18 and BCS21, and Policies DM27 and DM29 of the Bristol Local Plan – Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (LP). Amongst other aspects, these set out that residential developments should provide sufficient space for everyday activities and meet appropriate space standards; and expect development to create a high-quality environment for future occupiers, achieve appropriate levels of outlook and daylight, and not prejudice the development potential of adjoining sites. The proposal would also

be inconsistent with the provisions in the Framework in relation to providing a high standard of amenity for future users.

22. The Council also alleges a conflict with CS Policy BCS15 with regards to this topic. However, my attention has not been drawn to any words in it that are relevant to this matter. The policy has therefore not been determinative in my findings in relation to this main issue.

Waste and bicycle storage

23. The appeal proposal would provide a storage room for bins and bicycles. However, with the combined storage area being relatively small, there would be limited space to move bins and bicycles past one another even if all items were always to be positioned as per the proposed floor plan. If the store was utilised to the extent shown on the plan, it is therefore likely that there would be insufficient space for manoeuvring bins past bicycles.
24. This could result in bins being left on Stillhouse Lane or, it seems to me more likely, either being left in the storage room uncollected or in a position that would impede the room available for bicycles, to the detriment of occupiers' bicycle usage. The main parties agree that the storage room also provides one less bicycle parking space than required for the proposed development. The site's accessible location neither justifies this shortfall nor makes it acceptable.
25. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposed development would not provide satisfactory waste (refuse and recycling) and bicycle storage. I therefore find that it conflicts with CS Policy BCS10 and LP Policies DM23 and DM32. Amongst other aspects, these set out that recycling and refuse storage should be separate from cycle storage; that development will not be permitted if recycling and refuse provision cannot practicably be provided; and that proposals should maximise opportunities for cycling and provide adequate access for all sections of the community and for cyclists.
26. In addition to the above policies, which are cited in the relevant reason for refusal, the Council's delegated report alleges a further conflict with CS Policy BCS15 in relation to this matter. On the basis of my findings above and that the policy requires development to provide, amongst other aspects, satisfactory arrangements for the storage of refuse and recyclable materials, I find that the proposal is also contrary to this policy in relation to this matter. In addition, the proposal would be inconsistent with the provisions in the Framework in relation to promoting sustainable transport.

Bedminster CA

27. The site contains a vacant former industrial building in a relatively poor state of repair. Whilst not original, the front gabled elevation with its bricks and openings is a pleasing feature in the narrow alley. It also has a broadly industrial character and functional appearance, which reflects its surroundings and position behind Bedminster Parade. However, the presence of white UPVC windows, which read as more related to a residential than an industrial use, detract from its commercial nature. Its rather dilapidated state overall, combined with various poor-quality materials, such as breeze blocks and the side extension with different bricks and damaged corrugated roof, also means that the building appears as a significantly altered, rather run-down feature in the locality. The UPVC windows and steel doors are further negative elements.

Its visual contribution to the locality is therefore neutral. The surrounding area includes built form in a variety of forms, heights, designs and uses, including some elegant historic buildings finished in stone, modern metal-clad industrial structures, and residential buildings including some relatively modern two- and three-storey blocks of flats on the same side of Stillhouse Lane as the site.

28. The site is within the Bedminster CA. Based on the submitted evidence, the significance of the designated heritage asset stems from, amongst other things, its surviving historic route structure, plot layout and industrial heritage, complemented by a rich architectural backdrop. This includes some fine industrial, commercial, civic and institutional buildings within an overall landscape of period terraces, whilst the strong urban townscape of its shopping thoroughfares contrasts with the gritty industrial nature of its back land areas. Within the Bedminster Parade character area (BPCA), the surviving historic plot pattern and route structure are identified in the Council's Bedminster CA Character Appraisal (Appraisal) as being of particular special interest. With the back land areas, which are rare survivors of a historic street pattern, still retaining their narrow alleys, Stillhouse Lane also gives a glimpse of the former industrial nature and layout that once characterised the locality. The Appraisal specifically identifies these aspects, along with the various surviving townscape features and unlisted buildings of merit, as the positive features of the BPCA.
29. The building on the site is defined by the Appraisal as a character building. The available evidence indicates that it represents the CA's special character because, as a back land building, it forms part of its historic layout. Whilst it also reads as a remnant of the area's industrial past due to its location and broadly industrial character, its current appearance and significantly altered, run-down state mean that it has little obvious architectural interest or surviving historic fabric of significance. Unlike those buildings defined by the Appraisal as unlisted buildings of merit, which are specifically identified as positive features of this part of the CA, its designation as a character building does not identify it as making a particularly noteworthy or significant contribution to the significance of the BCPA or the CA as a whole. It is also not identified by the Council as a non-designated heritage asset.
30. Accordingly, whilst its identification as a character building means the Appraisal considers it makes a positive contribution to the CA's overall character and sense of place, the building itself does not read as being of any particular significance or part of the area's surviving industrial heritage. The available evidence does not lead me to a different conclusion. Nor does it make a notably positive or special contribution to the area's character or appearance, particularly given its various poor-quality materials and overall sense of decline. Instead, the site's significance and contribution to the CA relates principally to its position within the area's historic layout and Stillhouse Lane's narrow, back land nature.
31. Whilst some elements would be retained and form part of the proposed three-storey building, the majority of the current structure would be demolished and replaced. On this basis, the appeal proposal would effectively result in the loss of much of the existing building. However, the Appraisal sets out that, whilst the demolition or significant alteration of unlisted buildings of merit will likely be resisted, it is the specific characteristics of character buildings that contribute to the overall sense of place that will be encouraged to be retained or emulated. On this basis, and given my findings above, its loss, subject to a

suitably located (and designed) replacement, would of itself therefore harm neither the significance of the CA as a whole nor the character or appearance of the BPCA. In coming to this view, I have taken into account Framework paragraph 213 and paragraph 019 of the Planning Practice Guidance.

32. With its similar footprint and position, the development proposed would preserve the area's surviving historic street pattern, route structure and back land plot layout. These significant aspects of the CA and the character area, along with the narrow nature of Stillhouse Lane, would therefore be retained. Although larger, the proposed development, by incorporating a gable frontage, carriage doors and red brick walls for example, would have a similar appearance to the existing building, embrace and reflect its industrial heritage context, and emulate the site's existing articulation and various positive architectural features. The quality of the external finish could be secured by condition. To the benefit of the streetscene, detracting elements such as the side extension and poor-quality materials would also be removed.
33. The mansard would be finished in different materials and extend to the edge of the building. However, it would not be particularly high and would be partially set behind the gable and not extend above it. Combined with the narrow form of Stillhouse Lane and the presence of the adjoining (partially built) development and other buildings with various heights and designs in the surrounding area, it would therefore be neither particularly visible or prominent in the locality nor read as an incongruous feature. The zinc cladding would also give the mansard a form that would reflect its industrial context.
34. Although visible in some views, the air source heat pumps and rail on the roof would be relatively small features. Combined with their set back on all sides, they would therefore not be unacceptably prominent or bulky. Full details of the final features to be installed, including for example the need for the rail, its height and materials, could also be secured by condition to ensure a suitably subtle finish and appearance.
35. It has been put to me that the leaving of bins on the street would harm the CA's character and appearance. Be that as it may, as I have found above, the inadequacy of the combined waste and bicycle store would not automatically lead to bins being left on the street. It seems to me that there would also be other mechanisms to ensure that bins associated with the proposed development were not left on the public highway.
36. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the Bedminster CA, whose significance – rather than being vitiated – would be preserved. I therefore find that it accords with CS Policies BCS21 and BCS22, and LP Policies DM26, DM30 and DM31. Amongst other aspects, these seek development of a high-quality design that contribute positively to local character and distinctiveness; respect the local and historic development pattern; retain existing buildings that contribute positively to the area; respect the design of the host building and reinstate distinctive features; safeguard heritage assets; and preserve or, where appropriate, enhance those elements of a CA which contribute to its special character or appearance. The proposal would also be consistent with the provisions in the Framework in relation to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Employment land

37. Being close to the Bedminster Principle Industrial and Warehousing Area (PIWA), the site is in an area with various functioning employment uses. The site's past commercial use means that it is also classed as employment land.
38. As per CS Policy BCS8, such land will be retained where it makes a valuable contribution to the economy and employment opportunities. However, with its limited floorspace, the workshop is relatively small. It has also been vacant for several years, is in a poor state of repair, lacks off-street parking and is near to various other employment uses. On this basis, and with little substantive evidence to the contrary, the site cannot be described as making a valuable contribution to the economy and employment opportunities.
39. LP Policy DM12 also provides protection to employment sites, seeking to retain such sites subject to certain exceptions. This includes where there is no demand for the use or where continued employment use would have an unacceptable impact on the environmental quality of the surrounding area. In this instance, the lack of marketing information for the workshop means that it is not possible to ascertain if there is – or would be – any demand for employment use of the site. However, with part of the approved development for two dwellings being attached to the existing workshop building, continued use of the site as a commercial workshop or similar employment use, with the activities and likely noises associated with such uses, would clearly harm the living conditions of occupiers on the adjoining site. On this basis, and despite there being other employment uses in the surrounding area, the continued unfettered employment use of the site would have an unacceptable impact on the environmental quality of the surrounding area.
40. The site is located close to various public transport options, the city centre and designated employment sites, including the adjacent Bedminster PIWA. As such, the proposed residential use would not result in a significant increase in the need to travel, including by car, to places of work.
41. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable loss of employment land. I therefore find that it accords with Policies DM12 of the LP and BCS8 of the CS. In addition, it would accord with CS Policy BCS10 which amongst other things expects development to be located where sustainable travel patterns can be achieved. The proposal would also be consistent with the provisions in the Framework in relation to promoting sustainable transport and making effective use of land.

Housing mix

42. The proposed development would be in the Bedminster East neighbourhood. Dominated by flats and one- and two-bed residential units, the submitted evidence shows that this area has a very limited number and supply of larger homes. Providing one-bed flats, the appeal proposal would therefore neither help to redress the in-balance in the neighbourhood's housing mix nor contribute to housing diversity and the supply of larger homes.
43. However, the submitted evidence indicates that at the ward (rather than smaller neighbourhood) level, the mix of residential properties is less dominated by one-bedroom units, whilst there is also a significant need in Bristol for units of the size proposed. In addition, the Strategic Housing Market

Assessment expects single-person households to represent 40% of overall household growth in the coming years and the available evidence indicates that development is not providing enough one-bedroom units. In this respect, although CS Policy BCS18 sets out that development should contribute to the diversity of housing in the local area and help to redress any existing housing imbalance, it also refers to, amongst other things, development aiming to address housing demand and responding to the requirements of a changing population. Furthermore, whilst the proposal would not help to support the creation of a mixed community, it would maintain a mix of housing sizes in the neighbourhood, which is another aspect sought by CS Policy BCS18.

44. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposed housing mix would be suitable and that the proposed development would accord with CS Policy BCS18. It would also be consistent with the provisions in the Framework in relation to delivering a sufficient supply of homes.

Energy

45. The two single-aspect flats would be likely to require more use of electric lighting relative to the other proposed flats. With flat 1 having limited natural ventilation, mechanical ventilation, as identified in the Thermal Model Assessment, would also be required. However, that flat's south-east orientation and flat 4's north-east orientation equate to a passive solar design. This would reduce the risk of those flats overheating and thus the likely need for significant use of mechanical ventilation in flat 1. Whilst a different design could reduce the energy demand from electric lighting and mechanical ventilation compared to the proposed scheme, it seems to me that the increased energy needed for artificial lighting and ventilation in flat 1 would be negligible.
46. In any event, the submitted Energy & Sustainability Statement shows that the development would exceed relevant Building Regulations requirements through energy efficiency measures. With the use of air source heat pumps, which the Council's Climate Change and Sustainability Practice Note (Climate Change PN) Addendum defines as a renewable technology, there would also be an estimated total reduction in residual carbon emissions of 42.86%.
47. The proposed apartment block would therefore utilise a renewable heat system and include sufficient renewable energy generation to reduce carbon emissions from residual energy use by at least 20%, as required by CS Policy BCS14. Whilst solar panels, which would further reduce residual emissions, have not been proposed, the available evidence indicates that this would not be necessary with regards to the appeal proposal meeting the energy-related requirements of the development plan. In any event, even if solar panels were required, the Council concedes that this could be secured by condition.
48. For the above reasons, I conclude that the energy requirements of the proposed development would be acceptable. I therefore find that it accords with CS Policies BCS13, BCS14 and BCS15. Amongst other aspects, these set out that development should include measures to reduce carbon emissions through minimising energy requirements, maximising energy efficiency, and incorporating renewable and low-carbon energy sources; and, as clarified in the Council's Climate Change PN and Addendum, provide renewable technologies to achieve a 20% reduction in regulated carbon emissions compared to residual emissions. The proposal would also be consistent with the provisions in the Framework in relation to planning for climate change.

Other matters

49. The submitted evidence indicates that housing supply in Bristol is on a downward trend and was, in the past year, equivalent to a supply of 2.2-2.45 years, equating to a shortfall of between 9,756 and 11,233 homes. The Council has not disputed this.
50. On the basis that the Council cannot demonstrate a sufficient supply of deliverable housing sites, the approach set out in paragraph 11d) of the Framework applies. However, despite the significant shortfall in supply and irrespective of whether the local plan is out of date, the Framework is clear that in such circumstances, permission should be granted unless the application of its policies that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; and this includes, as per footnote 7, areas at risk of flooding. Given my findings above in relation to flood risk, there is thus a clear reason for refusing the development proposed. The presumption in favour of sustainable development is therefore not applicable in this instance.

Planning Balance

51. I have found that the proposed development would be acceptable in relation to housing mix and energy requirements and would not harm the CA or result in an unacceptable loss of employment land. The Council has raised no objection in relation to various other issues, such as the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, pollution, highway safety and accessibility matters. The available evidence indicates that the site is also in an area identified by CS Policy BCS1 as a priority focus for development and regeneration. The appeal proposal would therefore accord with various development plan policies related to these aspects. Nevertheless, my findings in relation to flood risk, the living conditions of future occupiers and the storage of waste and bicycles, and the consequent conflict with development plan policies related to these matters, leads me to conclude that the appeal proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole.
52. The proposed windfall development would provide an additional five residential units in an accessible location well-served by public transport and other services and facilities. The provision of additional accommodation, supported by the Framework which seeks to significantly boost housing supply and delivery, would contribute towards the mix and supply of needed housing in the locality and city which, as set out above, has a very substantial shortfall in housing supply. Whilst the latest housing delivery data shows a small improvement in Bristol compared to the previous year, it still shows an under-delivery in an area with a history of under-delivery. Consequently, there is clearly a significant need for new housing of all types in the city, and this – along with the resulting real world affects, such as affordability rates and rising house prices – attracts significant weight.
53. In an area identified as a priority focus for development and regeneration, the energy efficient housing proposed would make use of previously developed land, which has been under-utilised for some time. Given the poor state of repair of the vacant building and its various poor-quality features, the appeal proposal would also help to reverse the sense of decline in the locality. In addition, the proposed development would support the local economy through construction employment for example.

54. The appeal proposal would therefore provide various social, economic and environmental benefits. These, and particularly the supply of new housing, attract significant weight in the planning balance. However, it has not been demonstrated that there are no reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The living conditions for future occupiers in four of the five flats would be insufficient, with the occupier in flat 1 also having no dry route to escape if flood waters reached the site without having already left. The inadequate storage area would likely lead to either a build-up of uncollected rubbish or the bicycle stands – already providing less parking than required – being obstructed and consequently underused. In addition, I have found that the appeal proposal would likely prejudice the development potential of the adjoining site.
55. Overall, this equates to significant and unacceptable harm. Accordingly, despite the substantial shortfall in housing supply and the need for more accommodation, I find that the scheme's benefits outweigh neither this nor the conflict with the development plan. My findings also mean that the development proposed cannot be described as making effective use of land.

Conclusion

56. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the benefits of the scheme, the limited supply of housing in the area and the provisions of the Framework, which carry sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

T Gethin

INSPECTOR