



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2025

by Laura Cuthbert BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/W/24/3350004

Long Close Rest Home, 23 Forest Road, Poole BH13 6DQ

- 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 Mr Keith London-Webb against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is APP/23/00240/F.
 - The development proposed is Demolition of existing block of care home units and construction of replacement block of care home units.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the appeal was made, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. I have taken the revised Framework into account as part of the determination of this appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the effect on the significance of the designated heritage asset of Chester Road Conservation Area, by virtue of development within its setting;
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the existing occupants of 1 and 2 The Rydal, and 1 The Grove, with regard to outlook and privacy;
 - whether the proposal provides satisfactory living conditions for future occupants of the care home, in regard to external amenity space and outlook;
 - the effect of the proposed development on protected species, most notably bats; and
 - the effect of the proposal on highway safety, with specific regard to parking provision.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site consists of an existing care home building situated along Forest Road, which is a predominantly residential area. It consists of the original 2 storey Edwardian residential villa, which has been significantly extended and altered over time to facilitate its care home use. It is enclosed to the front with established vegetation, including a number of mature trees. To the rear is a bungalow which is understood to be owned and occupied by the appellant, which would be retained under the proposed development. The appeal site lies outside of, but adjacent to, the Chester Road Conservation Area (CA), the boundary of which runs along Forest Road.
5. As recognised by the main parties, ‘the character along the east side of Forest Road opposite the CA has evolved over the last decade where there are examples of higher density development in the vicinity’. Consequently, there is a mixture of building footprint, scale and massing in the area, as well as architectural form and materials, as the appellant submits, including a 3 storey care home and a 4 storey block of flats. The Rydal development of four detached houses lies to the north of the application site, with a nursery and The Grove development of three detached houses positioned to the south. However, the prevailing scale and character of the buildings are of a domestic scale, with mature trees and landscaping incorporated.
6. As set out in the Chester Road Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan (2010) (the CA Appraisal), the significance of the Chester Road CA, for the purposes of this appeal, derives from its cohesive urban structure, as well as its spacious, sylvan character. The CA is characterised by large, detached Edwardian Villas on reasonably sized plots. Buildings are of a domestic scale and have a similar mass. The detached layout has created regular gaps in built form. These allow views through to buildings, trees and landscaping behind. Houses are generally viewed against a strong tree backdrop, and this gives the CA a rural character.
7. Paragraph 213 of the Framework states that significance of heritage assets can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets or from development within their setting and that this should have a clear and convincing justification. The appeal site, by virtue of its proximity and relationship, forms part of the setting in which the heritage asset is experienced. It also reinforces some of the characteristics identified above that contribute towards the significance of the CA, with the existing building and the plot within which it stands preserving its sylvan character, retaining the gaps between buildings and the ‘rural feel’ of the wider area. Consequently, it contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. It thus also contributes positively towards the setting, and therefore the significance, of the CA.
8. The proposed development, by virtue of its design, height, scale, bulk, massing and depth, would result in an uncharacteristically large building, and an overdevelopment of the site. Whilst the proposal would be sited in the same location as the existing care home building, the footprint would be larger, and the overall bulk, height and massing would be greater. Due to the scale and massing proposed, the proposal would not appear as a large, detached dwelling as submitted by the appellant. It would be a dominant and incongruous development, which would fail to reflect or enhance local patterns of development and neighbouring buildings. Consequently, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would undermine the contribution that the appeal site makes towards the significance of the CA as development within its setting.

9. The design of the proposal, incorporating hipped and gable roofs and staggering of elevations, with various setbacks and projections, whilst trying to mitigate the bulk and visual impact of the development, would actually overcomplicate the built form of the proposal. It would introduce a 3 storey, flat roofed central link, to join together 2 slightly higher elements of the proposal at the front and back, resulting in a long building of 3 storeys, the bulk and massing of which would be out of character to the more prevailing domestic scale of built form in this part of Forest Road. The indicative street scene drawing provided by the appellant¹ would not convince me otherwise, with the buildings either side of the appeal site being a more appropriate domestic scale and simple built form. The use of materials, alongside the size, siting and design of fenestration would not be sufficient to mitigate the harm caused by the overall scale and massing of the proposed building.
10. The rear part of the proposal would replace a large part of the existing rear garden area associated with the existing care home, which contributes towards the sylvan character of the area. The resultant plot coverage of the proposal, due to the larger built form and introduction of a patio area, losing the existing areas of soft landscaping, would highlight the overdevelopment of the scheme, eroding the spacious character of the area. The dominance of built form and hardstanding would also restrict any opportunities for additional landscaping as part of the scheme.
11. Glimpsed views through to the existing building are currently possible from both directions along Forest Road, through the neighbouring accesses and the access to the site itself, albeit the presence of mature trees to the north along The Rydal are noted as well as those directly to the front of the appeal site. Nevertheless, whilst the appellant alleges that views through to the trees and vegetation behind would remain, I consider that due to the height and depth of the proposal, in particular the rear part of the replacement care home, and the higher central link, the development would be seen from approaching viewpoints along Forest Road, which would emphasise the unsuitable design of the proposal.
12. The retention of the trees is acknowledged, and tree protection and construction methods could be secured by a suitably worded condition to ensure the long term health of the trees. However, even with the trees in place, due to the visibility of the proposal from viewpoints, the proposal would fail to preserve the open and verdant character, and rural feel of the area.
13. It is noted that the CA appraisal identifies that some recent development has exceeded the typical scale of development in the area. However, I do not consider that these dominate, nor have they impacted adversely on, the prevailing character or scale of built form in the area. I also note the presence of the three storey care home building at Canford Chase as well as the blocks of flats in the area. Nevertheless, the fact that apparently similar development exists is not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development. The circumstances in each proposal are also likely to be different. I have determined this appeal on its own merits and have found harm for the reasons set out above.
14. The proposal would also involve a larger bin store structure to the front of the site, alongside a wider access to facilitate access to the bin store, as well as the hardstanding proposed to the front to accommodate the parking area.

¹ Pages 10 and 17 of the Planning Appeal Statement (v2) prepared by Darryl Howells Planning Consultancy Limited

Cumulatively, whilst they would be minor, they would result in harmful alterations to the important roadside frontage, detracting from the sylvan character of Forest Road and the adjacent CA. This would further harm the contribution that the appeal site makes towards the significance of the CA as development within its setting.

15. Consequently, by virtue of its design, height, scale, bulk, massing and depth the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, including harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset of Chester Road CA, through development within its setting. It would be contrary to Policies PP27, PP28 and PP30 of the Poole Local Plan (Local Plan) (2018). Together these policies seek to ensure that developments for care homes reflect or enhance local patterns of development in terms of layout and siting, including building line and built site coverage, height and scale, bulk and massing, landscaping and visual impact. The resultant plot coverage should respect that which prevails in the street. Proposals should also preserve or enhance the historic, architectural and archaeological significance of heritage assets, and their settings.

Living Conditions of Existing Occupants

1 The Grove

16. Directly to the south of the proposed new building to the rear lies 1 The Grove, a detached property, with a 1.8m fence and sporadic vegetation along the shared boundary with the appeal site. No 1 has a small rear garden area directly alongside the shared boundary and 3 ground floor windows on the rear elevation facing the proposal.
17. The introduction of a substantial 3 storey building, approximately 8.5m from the rear elevation of No 1, in particular the rear section of the proposal, by virtue of its size, massing and proximity, would have an unacceptable overbearing effect upon the outlook from the external amenity space to the rear of No 1 and its rear facing windows.
18. The appellant suggests that a gap of approximately 8.5m between the proposal and No 1 'is appropriate within a built up residential area' and that the proposed hipped roof, with staggered setbacks and projections would 'minimise the overall visual impact'. However, I am not satisfied that a gap of 8.5m, alongside these design features, would be sufficient to reduce the impact of a 3 storey building down to an acceptable level. The presence of the access drive which serves the bungalow to the rear, as well as the presence of any soft landscaping, would do little to alleviate this harm, given the substantial scale of the proposal.
19. Furthermore, No 1 would be overlooked by the first and second floor bedroom windows, notably those serving units 15 and 27, as well as the communal living area and dining rooms situated on both the first and second floors. Whilst the windows serving the communal areas would be obscured glazed, due to the proximity of the windows serving units 15 and 27, this would allow for direct overlooking to No 1's private rear garden, harming the privacy that this area currently enjoys. Although these windows serve bedrooms, these rooms would also be the primary private living/sleeping room for the future occupants so the level of overlooking would still be materially harmful. The presence of soft landscaping along the shared boundary would do little to alleviate harm from this overlooking due to the position and height of the first and second floor windows.

1 and 2 The Rydal

20. 1 and 2 The Rydal are detached properties situated to the north, with the appeal site slightly elevated from The Rydal development. A 2m fence and established vegetation of varying height runs along the shared boundary.
21. In regard to the living conditions of the occupants of No 1, their outlook is already impacted by the existing 2 storey care home, which is situated directly to the south of No 1, as well as the mature vegetation along the shared boundary. Whilst the proposal would be of a slightly greater height, bulk and mass compared to the existing building, it would be positioned slightly further away from the shared boundary and the hipped roof would assist in minimising any impact. Therefore, on balance, compared to the existing situation, the proposal would not be materially harmful to the outlook currently enjoyed by the occupants of No.1. It would not be significantly overbearing and would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of No 1, in regard to outlook.
22. However, in regard to the outlook currently enjoyed by No 2 The Rydal, unlike the outlook of No 1, the existing occupants of No 2 currently look towards a single storey extension at the rear of the existing building and the open aspect of the rear garden. This relatively open outlook would be replaced with the rear part of the proposal, which projects an additional 10m and at a 3 storey height. This would run along the entire length of No 2's outlook from the front of their property, which include the windows to all the habitable rooms of the dwelling. Due to the height, scale and depth, bulk and massing, as well as the proximity of the replacement care home, the proposal would be significantly overbearing to the outlook currently enjoyed by the occupants of No 2, harming their existing living conditions. In the circumstances related to No 2, the use of a hipped roof, and variety of setbacks and projections would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm.
23. In regard to privacy, whilst there are some existing windows in the northern elevation of the existing care home building facing No 1 which are sited slightly closer to No 1, these are not as high or as numerous as the windows which are proposed in the northern elevation of the replacement care home. Notably, the sole outlook to the first floor units 11,12 and 13 and the second floor units 23, 24 and 25 would be towards Nos 1 and 2. Both of these floors also include a staff room window, the sole outlook again being towards Nos 1 and 2.
24. According to the site plan provided by the appellant, the distance of separation between the windows of units 11 and 23 and the house at 1 The Rydal would be approximately 10.5m and would look directly towards the first floor bedroom windows of No 1. The distance of separation between the staff rooms and No 2 would be approximately 12m and would result in direct views at first and second floor across towards No 2.
25. The appellant argues that this level of distance between windows would not 'be an unusual relationship between properties in a residential location, and as such it is not uncommon for there to be some degree of mutual overlooking between properties'. However, due to the number of windows proposed on the northern elevation, and at both first and second floor level, there would be increased opportunities for overlooking towards both No 1 and 2, over that which currently exists. This would be materially harmful to the existing levels of privacy enjoyed by the occupants of Nos 1 and 2.

26. Whilst the presence of the landscaping along the shared boundary would assist in mitigating the impact of the development, this would not be sufficient to preserve the living conditions currently enjoyed by Nos 1 and 2. Furthermore, I am not convinced that any additional planting along the northern boundary would alleviate any overlooking to an acceptable level, as suggested by the appellant, due to the height and the number of windows proposed. The position of the access drive serving The Rydal properties would also do little to alleviate the harm identified.
27. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, the proposal would harm the living conditions of the existing occupants of 1 The Grove and 2 The Rydal, in regard to privacy and outlook, and would harm the living conditions of the existing occupants of 1 The Rydal, in regard to privacy. It would be contrary to Policies PP27 and PP28 of the Local Plan, which, in combination, seek to ensure that proposed care home development is in keeping with neighbouring buildings and compatible with surrounding uses and would not result in a harmful impact upon amenity for both local residents and future occupiers considering levels of privacy and whether the development is overbearing or oppressive. It would also conflict with paragraph 135 (f) of the Framework which states that development should have a high standard of amenity for existing users.

Living Conditions of future occupants

28. Unit 3 on the ground floor would have a northern outlook and would be within 2.7m of the northern boundary which would consist of a close boarded fence with hedging above. Unit 3 would also be adjacent to the boiler/plant room of the care home. Given the proximity and height of the fence, the northerly facing direction of this window and this being the sole outlook to this room, I am concerned that the internal living environment of unit 3 would be unduly oppressive and enclosed. Furthermore, the boiler/plant room could result in a noisy environment, which would add to the unsatisfactory living conditions for the future occupants of No 3.
29. I note that the appellant states 'the existing windows at the current care home will already have a similar outlook to those proposed. As such there will not be any significant difference in terms of resident's outlook to that which currently exists'. However, I have not been provided with any existing floor plans which confirms this. Nevertheless, the fact that the existing care home provides sub-standard living conditions does not justify the proposed development. Therefore, based on the evidence before me, future occupants of unit 3 of the proposal would not be provided with satisfactory living conditions in regard to outlook.
30. In regard to the external amenity space that would be provided for the future occupants, the proposed ground floor communal living and dining area would open out onto the external amenity space, which has been identified as a patio on the proposed site plan. This patio area measures approximately 60sqm. The Council have calculated this to be an 80% reduction in outdoor amenity space from the existing outdoor amenity area, which measures approximately 324sqm.
31. I acknowledge that there are no prescriptive policy standards for the size of external amenity areas which would be applicable to the appeal scheme. However, the Local Plan requires the provision of satisfactory external amenity space for future users. Furthermore, paragraph 135 of the Framework requires planning decisions to create places that are inclusive and accessible, and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for future users. The

proposal results in an additional 15 care home bed spaces but proposes a significant reduction in the outdoor amenity space. Whilst the existing area might be underused, it is not unreasonable for the Council to require future occupants to have access to an adequate level of outdoor amenity space.

32. I acknowledge that not all of the residents would use the external area at any one time. The appellant states that 'there is space for tables and chairs and planting will be provided around the edges to enhance the visual amenity'. However, currently, there is a lack of details regarding how the outdoor patio area could be used in order for me to be convinced that the proposed patio area would be large enough. It is currently unclear how many residents, alongside their visitors, could be accommodated, and how this could be achieved, at any one time
33. The areas to the front of the 3 double doors, serving the patio would also have to be left clear in order to allow access and adequate circulation space. Furthermore, the doors open outwards on to the patio which would restrict the size and usability of the patio area even more.
34. I consider that it is important to the well-being of the future occupants for them to have attractive and useable outdoor amenity space to look at, or relax in. Such spaces can also be comforting for visitors to use when seeing friends or relatives in care homes. On the scale proposed, the proposed patio would be unlikely to provide a high standard of amenity for future users.
35. I recognise that the internal living areas might in themselves be of an acceptable size and allow for the 'pleasing views of the outdoor space and surrounding trees and soft landscape', as submitted by the appellant. However, this would not be sufficient to outweigh the lack of external amenity space.
36. Therefore, in view of the above, the proposal would fail to provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupants of the care home, in regard to external amenity space and outlook. It would be contrary to Policies PP27 and PP28 of the Local Plan. Together, these policies seek to ensure that care home development provides satisfactory external and internal amenity space for any new occupiers and would not result in a harmful impact upon amenity for future occupiers considering levels of noise and whether the development is overbearing or oppressive. It would also conflict with paragraph 135 (f) of the Framework which states that development should have a high standard of amenity for future users.

Protected Species

37. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA)² was submitted with the application. The report is slightly conflicting in its findings regarding whether further bat surveys are required or not.
38. Paragraph 3.58 of the PEA states that whilst the care home has low potential for roosting bats 'due to the presence of a number of potential roosting features including lifted/missing tiles on the dormer window', further surveys have been recommended in Section 4 of the PEA. However, there is no specific mention of the requirement for further bat surveys in Section 4 of the PEA, and the appraisal states that 'given the size of the site, amount of foraging habitat available and the proposals, it is considered unnecessary to undertake further bat activity surveys'.

² Prepared by Cherry Tree Ecology, dated 7 July 2022

39. Nonetheless, paragraph 4.11 confirms that ‘the presence of bat roosts within the building had yet to be confirmed, therefore impacts cannot be judged at this stage’. Paragraph 4.16 also states that in regard to lighting, ‘a full assessment of the impacts on bats will be provided upon completion of the phase 2 bat surveys’
40. The Council advise that this area of Poole is known to support bats. Due to the unconfirmed presence of bat roosts, a bat roost assessment, undertaken by a suitably experienced ecologist in line with best-practice guidance, should be undertaken prior to determination. It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, in this case bats, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before any planning permission is granted. Therefore, given the uncertainty in the PEA as to whether further bat survey work would be required, it would not be suitable to condition any further survey work in these circumstances, as suggested by the appellant, nor would this be appropriate to be covered by a Construction Method Statement (CMS).
41. The appellant argues that no additional surveys were requested by the Council during the application process. However, I note that the consultation response from the Council’s biodiversity officer states that they had a ‘holding objection’ to the application, due to the lack of a bat survey. Therefore, the Council did recognise the lack of a bat survey during the application process and the appellant would have been aware of their concerns.
42. Consequently, for the reasons set out above, as a result of the deficient PEA, I cannot be satisfied that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on protected species, most notably bats. The proposal would be contrary to the provisions of Policy PP33 of the Local Plan, which states that proposals for development that affects biodiversity, and any sites containing species and habitats of local importance, including, amongst others, species and habitats of principal importance, must demonstrate how any features of nature conservation and biodiversity interest are to be protected and managed to prevent any adverse impact; incorporate measures to avoid, reduce or mitigate disturbance of sensitive wildlife habitats throughout the lifetime of the development; and seek opportunities to enhance biodiversity through the restoration, improvement or creation of habitats and/or ecological networks.

Highway Safety

43. Forest Road is a relatively wide road which, apart from the double yellow lines immediately outside the appeal site and on the opposite side of Forest Road, currently accommodates on-street parking on both sides. The on-street parking to the north is covered by a parking permit, but allows for 2 hours of parking, whilst the on-street parking to the south is unrestricted on both sides of the road.
44. The proposed development would be served by 4 parking spaces. The Council state that when the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) (2021) is applied, this would require the development to provide 6 parking spaces to serve the number of units in the care home. Based on a daily staffing number of 14 staff, which was confirmed by the appellant during the application process, an additional 3 parking spaces would be required for staff. The Council also advise that staff hand overs between shifts would further increase the parking requirement by 1. Therefore, in total, the Council recommends car parking for a minimum of 10 cars, which would equate to a shortfall of 6 parking spaces.

45. Forest Road is wide enough to accommodate parked cars on both sides and there are plenty of opportunities for considerate parking locations, including the surrounding residential streets of Motcombe Road, Ormonde Road and Eaton Road. The Council refer to snapshots from Google Streetview, which they state shows 'that the area around the appeal site can be congested and parking spaces limited'. However, at the time of my site visit, which is acknowledged to only be a snapshot in time, there was plenty of parking opportunities in the unrestricted parking to the south and I noted that the majority of the properties in the immediate area have driveways. Even with an increase in demand for on-street parking in this location, taking in to account the function of the street and the existing parking demands, there would remain to be sufficient space to allow for the passing of vehicles, including emergency and delivery vehicles, enabling the highway to continue to function safely and effectively. Furthermore, visitors to the care home could use the permit parking to the north, which offers further short stay parking options.
46. The Council are concerned that the lack of on-site car parking could also result in site cramming, with vehicles parking along the access drive or within the passing zone, which would create conflict within the site and increase safety risks for all users. However, any additional vehicle manoeuvring would be minor, and alongside the extent of the shortfall, it is not considered that this would be to such a level so as to cause a severe impact. Furthermore, whilst it is accepted that there might be circumstances when vehicles might enter the site to see if parking is available and if it isn't, then having to manoeuvre to exit the site to search for parking, there would be sufficient space to turn between the parking bay area and the access road without causing a severe risk of conflict with other highway users.
47. Therefore, in view of the above, I am not convinced that the shortfall in parking 'would result in drivers trawling the streets looking for parking', as alleged by the Council. I also acknowledge that the shortfall might be less than envisaged. This is because the SPD does not officially require additional car parking spaces for staff handovers. The appellant also sets out that whilst the daily staffing number is 14, this includes 4 staff that are only required during the night. Therefore, during daytime hours, only 10 full time staff are required, which would reduce the number of spaces required during the day.
48. Furthermore, the location of the development offers good access to a range of public transport links as well as walking and cycling routes. This would allow the proposal to be accessed via a variety of sustainable transport modes, rather than relying on the use of a private car.
49. I am also mindful that the Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios. I consider that any impact on highway safety would fall well short of what could be considered as severe.
50. A bike store is proposed to the rear of the site and a buggy park is also proposed to accommodate mobility scooters. However, the Council remain concerned that a single Sheffield stand has not been provided for visitors. The Parking Standards SPD states cycle parking should be considered at the commencement of the design, and not be treated as a secondary issue to be resolved by condition.

However, I consider that given that it is only the single Sheffield stand that is outstanding, this could be secured on site via a suitably worded condition in these circumstances, as there would be sufficient space on site to accommodate it.

51. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, the proposal would not harm highway safety, with specific regard to parking provision. The proposal would be in accordance with Policies PP27 and PP35 of the Local Plan. In combination, these policies seek to ensure that development provides convenient and practical parking arrangements to create safe and accessible places. It would also be in accordance with the SPD which recognises that relevant factors that might justify a reduction in parking provision can include the nature and location of the development, or where there is greater public transport accessibility or higher active travel usage. They may also include the function of the street and existing parking demands.

Other Matters

52. The appellant alleges that the case officer relied on their own assessment of the impacts upon the adjacent heritage asset, as opposed to seeking the formal advice of a qualified heritage professional and therefore they have not undertaken their duty as required under paragraph 208 of the Framework (formally paragraph 201). However, I note the planning officer's report uses the CA appraisal in order to identify and assess the impact of the proposal on the setting of the CA, taking in to account the evidence available to them. The lack of any formal heritage 'expertise' does not undermine the conclusions of the Council on this matter.

Planning and Heritage Balance

53. The harm that I have found would be caused to the significance of the heritage asset by virtue of development within its setting, would be localised. Accordingly, the harm would be less than substantial. Nonetheless, I am mindful that less than substantial harm does not equate to a less than substantial planning objection and that any such harm is to be given considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 215 of the Framework states that this harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
54. The Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing. The proposed 15 additional care home bedroom spaces would contribute towards the Council's housing delivery targets by 8 additional units³. This would attract significant weight.
55. The proposal would also deliver 15 additional care home bed spaces, which would go towards meeting an identified housing need, despite the Council submitting that 'there is currently a good supply of beds in residential care homes similar to those provided at this care home across BCP'. This would also attract significant weight.
56. There would also be economic benefits contributing to building a stronger, responsive, and competitive economy, supporting growth with construction and post-construction benefits. This would include investment of the site, job creation during construction and the support of facilities and services within the local area by new residents. There would be social benefits through the provision of improved care home facilities and an increase in care home bed spaces within the borough.
57. Environmental benefits would be provided by making the effective and optimum use of the land through the delivery of a higher density sustainable scheme close

³ As calculated using the ratio of 1.8 as set out in the Housing Delivery Test measurement rule book.

by to public transport networks and local services and facilities, reducing the use of the private car.

58. Taking all the above into consideration, I am of the view that taken together, the public benefits do not outweigh the harm I have found to the heritage asset. Given that I have found that the Framework paragraph 215 balance is not satisfactorily achieved, despite the lack of a five-year housing land supply and thus paragraph 11 (d) of the Framework being engaged, in accordance with paragraph 11 (d) (i), the application of policies in the Framework provides a clear reason to refuse permission.
59. Therefore, in conclusion, although acceptable in some regards, I have identified that there would be conflict with the development plan as a whole, as there would be less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset which is not outweighed by public benefits. The proposal would also be contrary to policies regarding the character and appearance of the area, the living conditions of existing and future occupants, and protected species. Considered in total, the material considerations referred to above do not outweigh the conflict with the development plan.
60. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Laura Cuthbert

INSPECTOR