



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 28 May 2025

Site visit made on 28 May 2025

by T Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A2470/W/23/3323746

Land on North Side of Brooke Road, Brooke Road, Braunston-in-Rutland, Oakham Easting (x) 483686 Northing (y) 306727

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Brand against Rutland County Council.
 - The application Ref is 2022/1286/MAO.
 - The development proposed is up to 30 dwellings and associated infrastructure.
 - This decision supersedes that issued on 13th May 2024. That decision on the appeal was quashed by order of the High Court.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for up to 30 dwellings and associated infrastructure at Land on North Side of Brooke Road, Brooke Road, Braunston-in-Rutland, Oakham Easting (x) 483686 Northing (y) 306727 in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2022/1286/MAO, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr and Mrs Brand against Braunston-in-Rutland Parish Council (the Parish Council). This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The planning application was submitted in outline with all matters reserved except for access. It was confirmed at the Hearing that plan Ref 221088_002_Proposed Site Plan - Revision B, which shows a site layout and house types should be considered on an illustrative basis only.
4. This decision supersedes that issued on 13th May 2024 which was preceded by a Hearing held on 17th April 2024. That decision was challenged and the decision was quashed by order of the High Court. The Parish Council played a significant role in that process and was kept informed of the main parties evidence and afforded relevant opportunities to comment and outline its own position in the lead up to and at the re-opened Hearing.
5. The appeal was originally submitted due to the failure of Rutland County Council (the Council) to determine the planning application within the prescribed period. The Council had previously submitted an appeal statement which included putative

reasons for refusal in November 2023. However, it altered its position on the appeal proposal in advance of the re-opened Hearing, and confirmed that it did not wish to object to the proposal. That revised position was that on the basis of an increase in the annual housing requirement of Rutland by reason of the publication of the revised Framework¹ in December 2024, which introduced changes meaning that the Council could no longer demonstrate a five year housing land supply (5YRHLS).

6. I note that the site was not taken forward from the call for sites to support the emerging Local Plan for Rutland. The Council stated at the Hearing that the emerging plan was submitted for examination in February 2025 and was scheduled to be heard in September 2025. I afford limited weight to that plan and its policies given its stage of production.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are informed by the Council's original putative reasons for refusal along with matters raised by interested parties. The main issues were set out at the Hearing and accepted by the Appellant, County Council and Parish Council.
8. The first main issue is the suitability of the appeal site for the proposed development having regard to the development strategy for the area and having regard to access to services and facilities. The second is the effect of the proposal on the setting of Braunston Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).

Reasons

Planning policy context

9. The most important policies are CS2 (The Spatial Strategy), CS3 (The Settlement Hierarchy), CS4 (The Location of Development), CS9 (Provision and distribution of New Housing) and CS22 (The Historic and Cultural Environment) of the Rutland Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011) (CS) and policies SP6 (Housing in the Countryside) and SP20 (The Historic Environment) of the Rutland Local Plan Site Allocations & Policies Development Plan Document (2014) (SP).
10. My position on some CS and SP policies contrasts with the previous Inspector and with previous appeal decisions² with regard to the datedness of policies. However, the aims of policies CS2, CS3 and CS4 of the CS in directing development to the most sustainable locations align with the Framework which supports such objectives. Policy SP6 of the SP seeks to limit housing within the Countryside, an approach which is not out of line with the approach of the Framework. I do not therefore consider those policies to be out of date. The same is the case for policies CS22 of the CS and SP20 of the SP, which amongst other things seek to protect heritage assets, as does the Framework.
11. The approach of Policy CS9 of the CS insofar as it sets out a settlement hierarchy approach which would direct development to the most sustainable locations has consistency with the Framework. However, I am unable to rely on the precise housing figures and their distribution across the plan area given those requirements

¹ National Planning Policy Framework 2024.

² APP/A2470/W/22/3301737 Land North Braunston Road & APP/A2470/W/23/3323586 Normanton Road (decision later quashed by order of the High Court).

do not appear to be reflective of those under the current Framework. I therefore consider that policy to be out of date.

12. In summary I therefore find only Policy CS9 of the CS is out of date which is just one of the seven most important policies that I have identified. I find the other policies of equal relevance and I do not consider them to be out of date. Therefore, it is the case that overall, the most important policies in relation to determining the appeal are not out of date.

Development strategy / accessibility to services and facilities

13. Set within a rural location, the village of Braunston-in-Rutland (Braunston) has some services and facilities, although these are limited to a church, a village hall and a public house. It is categorised under Policy CS3 of the CS as a Restraint Village. A substantially increased range of services and facilities are available within the much larger settlement of Oakham. This is identified within Policy CS3 as the main town within Rutland, hosting a range of job opportunities and higher order services including retail, leisure and health facilities.
14. There is some scope to access those services and facilities by bus, although such ability rests on being able to secure a spare seat on the early morning school bus to Catmose College and then walk the short remaining distance into Oakham town centre. There are journeys via the bus from Oakham to Braunston departing at 14:40 and 15:40 subject to the same restrictions. The opportunities to access Oakham via bus are therefore somewhat constrained.
15. The same is the case with accessing services and facilities within Oakham via bicycle. Although the distance is not great and the Brooke Road route was quiet when I cycled from Oakham to Braunston and back to carry out my site visit, the steep inclines in both directions would be likely to dissuade many from travelling between the two settlements by bicycle.
16. It is therefore likely that many journeys to access services and facilities would be made by car. However, it is the case that given the limited distance between Braunston and Oakham, those journeys would be short in both distance and duration.
17. It is also the case that Oakham benefits from a railway station providing direct services to places including Leicester and Birmingham with straightforward routes to London also available via a change at Peterborough. On balance, those residing on the appeal site would have acceptable access to services and facilities.
18. Nonetheless, there would be conflict with the development strategy for the area and with policies CS4 and CS9 of the CS and Policy SP6 of the SP. Amongst other things these policies state that the Restraint Villages are not considered sustainable locations to accommodate further development unless it is development normally acceptable in the countryside. The proposal is not a type of development that is supported under Policy SP6 of the SP.
19. Given that many journeys to access services and facilities would be made by car there would also be some conflict with paragraph 115 of the Framework which indicates that sustainable transport modes should be prioritised.

Conservation Area

20. The appeal site is located outside of the Braunston limits of development set to the north of properties on the adjacent section of Brooke Road and to the east of properties on Lammas Close. The site sits outside of, but immediately adjacent to the Conservation Area. There is no Conservation Area Appraisal for the village.
21. The heritage significance of the Conservation Area includes its form, scale, materials and detailing of buildings which are often of substantial age within the historic core of the village. The properties on Lammas Close and nearby on Brooke Road are generally of modern appearance and represent a notable intervention and barrier between the site and the core of the village.
22. The site, which is severed from the historic core of the village currently makes a neutral contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area. That would remain the case were the site to be developed at the level proposed. This is given that whilst in outline form, the scheme would be likely to deliver modern housing which would be likely to share some characteristics with the existing modern properties that are in place on two sides of the site.
23. There would therefore be no adverse impact on the setting of the Conservation Area as its significance would not be harmed. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy CS22 of the CS nor Policy SP20 of the SP. Amongst other things these require that all developments will be expected to protect, and where possible enhance historic assets and their settings.

Other Matters

24. A Transport Statement is included within the evidence³. The report concludes that there are no overriding traffic and transportation reasons why planning permission could not be granted. Given that the report states that the development proposals have the potential to generate 19 and 21 two-way trips during the AM and PM peak hour periods respectively, equating to approximately one additional vehicle on the local highway network every three minutes, I have no reason to disagree.
25. A condition is recommended requiring a scheme of off-site highway works for the construction of a 2m wide footway between the site access and the existing pedestrian infrastructure at Lammas Close and for the widening of Brooke Road between the site access and Church Street which would offer highways improvement in this part of the village.
26. There is nothing to indicate that services such as water, sewerage and electricity or indeed any other services and facilities within the wider area would be unable to appropriately serve the development. There is nothing compelling to indicate that there would be any significant issues regarding flooding and a drainage scheme is conditioned.
27. I have not identified any significant adverse impacts on the living conditions of nearby occupiers and many matters which could impact on this issue could be considered at the reserved matter stage or through matters to be agreed via condition following any approval. There is nothing compelling to indicate that there would be any significant adverse impact on activities at the nearby horse stud.

³ Transport Statement, Proposed Residential Development, Land at Brooke Road, Braunston-in-Rutland, Andrew Mosely Associates, November 2022.

28. I have taken into account the findings of the Site Allocations Assessment and the Rutland Settlement Landscape Sensitivity Assessment. I also noted on my site visit that some of the higher parts of the sloping site would be likely to be visible from outside of the site.
29. However, in many views, the development would be experienced in the context of the existing buildings within the village which would be closely adjacent. When approaching the site from the countryside there are already buildings to the south of the road which appear in advance of the site. Further, substantial hedgerows which border fields within the locality serve to restrict views towards the site. The proposal would therefore appear on the ground as a natural extension of the village and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area nor would it cause any significant adverse harm to landscape character.
30. There were extensive objections to the scheme from a wide range of local residents along with the Parish Council and I have taken all these comments into account.

5 year supply of housing land

31. It was agreed as common ground between the Council, appellant and Parish Council at the Hearing that the five year supply of housing land (5YRHLS) calculation should be based on an annual housing need figure of 266, which should be increased to 319 to include a buffer of 20% because delivery of housing taken as a whole over the previous 3 years has fallen below 85% of the requirement as set out in the last published Housing Delivery Test results.
32. The Council had previously identified a shortfall with regard to the 5YRHLS in January 2025. It then supplied a summary note⁴ for the benefit of the Hearing shortly before it re-opened which stated the 5YRHLS to be 3.1 years.
33. The appellant considers the 5YRHLS to be 2.96 years. Despite being offered the opportunity to outline their up to date position, the Parish Council declined to provide a 5YRHLS figure at the Hearing despite my request for clarification having previously identified various figures reflective of alternative scenarios, including 7.2 years and 9.5 years but based on an annual housing need of 266.
34. The issue of which sites within Rutland should be included within the 5YRHLS figure along with issues of deliverability was discussed at the Hearing. In order to include sites within the 5YRHLS, the Framework requires them to be deliverable.
35. The Council advise within its note that they have an Officer in post who conducts regular visits to ascertain the delivery status of housing sites. I accept that the detail within the recently submitted document is at some points limited, including the omission of analysis of sites to be included within the supply. However, the Council is likely to have taken account of its 5YRHLS report from 2024⁵ during its preparation, which does include those details.
36. In terms of determining what are deliverable sites, the Parish Council's position that there is no reason to exclude sites that are not specifically mentioned within categories a) and b) Paragraph 72 of the Framework as a matter of course is not unreasonable and I note their reference to St Mowden⁶.

⁴ Rutland County Council Five Year Housing Land Supply Summary Note 2025/26-2029/30 – May 2025

⁵ Rutland County Council Five Year Land Supply & Developable Housing Land Supply Report 2024/25 – 2028/29 dated June 2024.

⁶ St Mowden Developments Ltd v SSCLG [2017] EWCA Civ 1643.

37. The Parish Council has drawn my attention to a large number of housing sites within Rutland. Amongst those there is one very large housing scheme that has the potential to significantly alter the 5YRHLS position of Rutland. That site is Quarry Farm, for 650 dwellings. However, it was explained at the Hearing that this site does not have planning permission, benefiting only from a committee resolution to grant permission subject to the completion of a planning obligation under S106. Many other housing sites which may face impediments to delivery for other reasons as well as further sites that do not benefit from any planning permission were also drawn to my attention.
38. Overall, even in the event that it were appropriate to incorporate some or all of those sites into the future supply calculation there is no clear evidence about the deliverability of those sites nor evidence that there is a realistic prospect that completions will occur within 5 years. I am therefore not persuaded that they should be considered as part of the 5YRHLS.
39. On the basis of the evidence before me, I afford much greater weight to the positions of both the Council and the appellant. I therefore consider that the 5YRHLS position for Rutland falls within the limited range of 2.96-3.1 years.

Planning obligation

40. A completed planning obligation under S106 has been submitted. The obligation includes the provision of open space including its management and maintenance, a biodiversity net gain of 10%, not less than 40% of dwellings at the site provided as affordable housing and the provision of not less than two of the dwellings as self-build or custom build dwellings
41. The evidence indicates that the provisions within the planning obligation under S106 are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. They are directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. They therefore meet the relevant tests⁷.

Planning Balance

42. Although those residing on the appeal site would have acceptable access to services and facilities, the proposal would conflict in principle with the settlement strategy for the area conflicting with policies CS4 and CS9 of the CS and Policy SP6 of the SP. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole.
43. However, the Council does not have a 5YRHLS with this being between 2.96 and 3.1 years. Paragraph 11d) of the Framework is therefore of relevance. Paragraph 11d) i) is not relevant in this case.
44. In the context of a considerable shortfall of 5YRHLS, the provision of 40% or up to 12 affordable houses within an area of the country where the evidence suggests there have been problems with delivery⁸ is afforded significant weight. Additionally delivering up to 30 dwellings would make a notable contribution to the housing supply and is of significant weight. There would also be the provision of maintained open space, the provision of 10% biodiversity net gain and provision of a minimum of two self-build/custom build properties. These matters are afforded limited weight. Overall, I afford the combined benefits of the scheme significant weight.

⁷ Contained within Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024.

⁸ Rutland County Council Local Plan Authority Monitoring Report 1st April 2023 – 31st March 2024.

45. The evidence indicates that the new local plan has only recently been submitted with hearings scheduled in September 2025. However, the housing requirement set out in the emerging plan at 123 per annum is substantially lower than the current requirement for Rutland. There is therefore no obvious remedy to the housing shortfall in the short or medium term.
46. The development plan is failing to meet its strategic challenges and the settlement strategy is not working effectively. It is very likely that some sites beyond the present settlement boundaries, such as the appeal site, will be required to deliver the required housing. In these circumstances, the conflict with policies relating to the strategy for the location of housing development across the plan area should therefore be afforded limited weight.
47. Consequently, the adverse impacts of granting permission would not significantly outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. This is having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, all of which the proposal would provide.
48. As such, the material considerations indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. I note the decisions that have been supplied by the Parish Council where this scenario has not been found to be the case⁹. I also note the findings in Gladman¹⁰ but these do not alter my conclusions on this matter.

Conditions

49. Conditions 1-4 are necessary to define the development. Condition 5 is necessary to ensure proper and sustainable drainage of the site. Condition 6 is necessary in the interests of biodiversity. Conditions 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 are necessary in the interests of highway safety. Condition 9 is necessary to ensure that any archaeological interest in the site is accounted for. Condition 10 is necessary in the interests of the living conditions of those in the area and in the interests of highway safety. Conditions 12 and 19 are necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

50. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be allowed.

T Burnham

INSPECTOR

⁹ APP/X0360/W/22/3309202 Land East of Lodge Road, Hurst, Reading & APP/J0405/W/24/3342894 Land north of Brandon Close, Aston Clinton.

¹⁰ Gladman Developments Limited v SSCLG & Corby Borough Council / Uttlesford District Council [2020] EWHC 518 (Admin).

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1)Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.

2)Application(s) for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.

3)The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

4)The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: 221088_001_Existing Site and Location Plan & AMA/21645/SK005.

5) The details to be submitted at reserved matters stage shall include the provision of a surface water drainage scheme for the site, detailing how surface water is to be managed sustainably as part of the development. The development shall proceed only in accordance with the agreed scheme.

6)The details to be submitted at reserved matters stage shall include an Ecological Constraints and Opportunities Plan. This Plan shall show key biodiversity constraints and opportunities associated with the development and identify the following, in accordance with BS 42020:2013 Clause 5.4:

- areas and features including appropriate buffer areas that, by virtue of their importance, should be retained and avoided by both construction activities and the overall footprint of the development;
- areas and features where opportunities exist to undertake necessary mitigation and compensation;
- areas and features with the potential for biodiversity enhancement;
- areas where ongoing ecological management is required to prevent deterioration in condition during construction/implementation;
- areas needing protection on site and/or in adjacent areas (e.g. from physical damage on site or pollution downstream) during the construction process; and,
- areas where biosecurity measures are necessary to manage the risk of spreading pathogens or non-native invasive species.

7) A scheme of off-site highway works for the relocation of the 30mph speed limit, subject to an approved Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), and associated new gateway feature approximately 160m east of the proposed site access shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The TRO must be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to the receipt of a reserved matters application. The scheme shall thereafter be implemented in full prior to the commencement of any construction including groundworks.

8) The developer must contact the Local Highway Authority to agree the extent of a precondition highway survey and carry out a joint inspection of the condition of the public highway before site traffic commences. The results of the inspection shall be provided by way of a photographic survey to the Local Highway Authority. A similar inspection will take place on completion of the development to identify any damage and determine any remedial work required which shall thereafter be carried out by the developer if required within 3 months of completion.

9) No development shall commence until the necessary programme of archaeological work has been completed. The programme will commence with an initial phase of trial trenching to inform a final archaeological mitigation scheme. Each stage will be completed in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI), which has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. For land that is included within the WSI, no development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed mitigation in the WSI, which shall include the statement of significance and research objectives, and:

- the programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works; and,
- the programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

10) No development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, which shall include the following:

- a scheme for monitoring, reporting and control of construction noise and vibration including hours of working and scope for remedial action;
- a scheme for the control of dust and scope for remedial action in the event that dust is identified as an issue or any complaints are received;
- a scheme of chassis and wheel cleaning for all construction vehicles to include the details of location and specification of a fully working jetted drive-thru bath type wheel wash system together with hard surfacing laid between the apparatus and public highway in either concrete or tarmac, to be maintained free of mud, slurry and any other form of contamination during the period of construction with all exiting vehicles passing through;

- a contingency plan including, if necessary, the temporary cessation of all construction operations and movements to be implemented and any affected public highway thoroughly cleaned immediately with mechanical sweepers in the event that the approved vehicle cleaning scheme fails to be effective for any reason;
- haul routes to the site and hours of delivery;
- details of temporary facilities to be provided clear of the public highway for the parking, turning, loading and unloading of all vehicles visiting the site;
 - measures to ensure that vehicles can access the site immediately upon arrival to ensure there is no parking, waiting, loading/unloading or queuing on the public highway;
 - details of site compounds, storage area and contractor/visitor parking/turning;
 - details of the site enclosure or part thereof and gated site security;
 - confirmation of any tree protection measures;
 - confirmation that any demolition will be carried out in accordance with the ecological assessment;
 - details of site notice with contact details and a scheme for dealing with complaints;
 - details of any temporary lighting which must not directly light the public highway;
 - phasing plans where necessary;
- a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from the demolition and construction works;
- the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate; and
- Measures to ensure safe and appropriate access to and from the site for construction purposes.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan.

11) No development shall commence until details of the estate roads and footways (including layout, levels, gradients, surfacing and means of surface water drainage) have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The estate roads and footways shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details.

12) No development shall commence until the existing trees on the site that have been agreed with the Local Planning Authority for inclusion in the scheme of landscaping or shown to be retained on the approved plan, have been protected by the erection of temporary protective fences in accordance with BS5837:2012 and of a height, size and in positions, which shall previously have been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The protective fences shall be retained throughout the duration of building and engineering works in the vicinity of the trees to be protected. Within the areas agreed to be protected, the existing ground level shall be neither raised nor lowered, and no materials or temporary building or surplus soil shall be placed or stored there. If any trenches for services are required in the protected areas, they shall be excavated and backfilled by hand and any tree roots encountered with a diameter of 5cm or more shall be left unsevered.

13) The access shall be provided in accordance with the details shown on the approved drawing Ref AMA/21645/SK005 prior to first occupation of the first dwelling in the development. It shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved drawing.

14) A scheme of off-site highway works for the construction of a 2m wide footway between the site access and the existing pedestrian infrastructure at Lammas Close and for the widening of Brooke Road between the site access and Church Street shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in full prior to the occupation of the first dwelling.

15) Prior to first occupation of the development, vehicle to vehicle visibility splays shall be provided in accordance with the details shown on the approved drawing Ref AMA/21645/SK005. They shall thereafter be kept free of any obstructions over 600mm in height above ground level.

16) Prior to first occupation of each dwelling, a space shall have been laid out within the site in accordance with the details approved under the appropriate reserved matters for the required number of cars to be parked at each dwelling.

17) The carriageways of the proposed estate roads shall be constructed up to and including at least road base level, prior to the commencement of the erection of any dwelling intended to take access from that road. The carriageways and footways shall be constructed up to and including base course surfacing to ensure that each dwelling prior to occupation has a properly consolidated and surfaced carriageway and footway between the dwelling and the existing highway. Until final surfacing is completed, the footway base course shall be provided in a manner to avoid any upstands to gullies, covers, kerbs or other such obstructions within or bordering the footway. The carriageways, footways and footpaths in front of each dwelling shall be completed with final surfacing within twelve months (or three months in the case of a shared surface road or a mews) from the occupation of such dwelling.

18) No unbound material shall be used in the surface treatment of the vehicular access within 10 metres of the highway boundary, but the construction material used must be porous.

19) All changes in ground levels, hard landscaping, planting, seeding or turfing shown on the landscaping details to be submitted as part of the reserved matters, shall be carried out during the first planting and seeding season (October - March inclusive) following the commencement of the development or in such other phased arrangement as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or shrubs which, within a period of 5 years of being planted die or are removed or seriously damaged or seriously diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Iain Downer – Agent

Tom Helliwell – Agent

Mr Brand – Site owner

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Nick Thrower – Principal Planning Officer

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Cllr Jane Ellis – Braunston in Rutland Parish Council

Cllr Jim Attack - Braunston in Rutland Parish Council

Cllr Chris Bichard - Braunston in Rutland Parish Council

Theresa Callaghan – Local Resident

Susan Bichard - Local Resident

Janet Taylor - Local Resident

DOCUMENT SUBMITTED AT HEARING

Rutland County Council Local Plan Authority Monitoring Report 1st April 2023 – 31st March 2024