Exmouth Town Council

Town Hall, St Andrews Road
Exmouth, Devon, EX8 1AW

tel: 01395 276167
email: reception@exmouth.gov.uk
www.exmouth.gov.uk

This meeting is open to the Public and Press

26 March 2025

To: Members of the Exmouth Town Council Planning Committee, other members of Exmouth Town Council for information & The Press

Dear Councillors

A Meeting of the Exmouth Town Council Planning Committee, to which you are summoned, will be held in the Chamber at Exmouth Town Hall, St Andrews Road, EX8 1AW on **Monday 31 March 2025 at 6.15pm** to consider the matters detailed on the agenda below.

Yours faithfully

Lisa Bowman
TOWN CLERK

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence

PUBLIC SPEAKING

- Representations will be taken ahead of each discussion by Councillors on each application.
- **Members of the public wishing to speak on an application are required to pre-register in advance of the meeting.**
  To register you must email reception@exmouth.gov.uk or telephone 01395 276167 by 12 noon.
  The number of people that can speak on each application is limited to:
  - Major applications – parish/town council representative, 5 supporters, 5 objectors and the applicant or agent
  - Minor/Other applications – parish/town council representative, 2 supporters, 2 objectors and the applicant or agent.
- Representations may be up to 3 minutes.
- Speakers must begin, within their representation, by stating their name and interest in the application, and whether they are supporting or objecting to the application.
- Speakers must endeavour to avoid repeating themselves or earlier comments by others.
- The Chairman, at their absolute discretion, may ask for members of the public wishing to make similar points to choose one speaker to represent them all. This is to enable the business of the meeting to be carried out in a timely way and allow representations on other applications to be heard.

2. **Minutes of meeting held on 17 March 2025:**
   To confirm the minutes (copies attached)

3. **To receive any declarations of interest from members:**
   Members to declare any interests they may have on the agenda and agree any dispensations to stay.

4. **Urgent Business:**
   To consider any items which, in the opinion of the Chairman should be dealt with as a matter of urgency.

5. **Tree and advertising consent applications**

BRIXINGTON

Planning Application No: 25/0348/TRE

Location: 2 Withycombe House, Hillcrest Gardens, EX8 4FF
Applicant: RSK Hi-Line Ltd
Proposal: Oak (656) – prune back eastern lateral branches by 3m to reduce loading over neighbouring property.

Target date: 14.04.25

Tree Officer's report attached for information.

TOWN

Planning Application No: 25/0105/ADV

Location: Premier Inn Esplanade, EX8 2AZ
Applicant: Agent: Walsingham Planning
Proposal: A Scheme of Signage Including 2No. Internally Illuminated Wall Mounted Flex Face Sign, 1No. Externally Illuminated Wall Mounted Flex Face Sign, 1No. Internally Illuminated Post Sign, and 2No. Internally Illuminated Entrance Signs.

Target date: 24.03.25

6. **Planning applications.**

BRIXINGTON

Planning Application No: 25/0601/FUL

Location: 153 St Johns Road, EX8 4EW
Applicant: Mr G Moyle
Proposal: Proposed detached garage

Date limit for comments: 10.04.25

Planning Application No: 25/0541/FUL

Location: 30 The Marles, EX8 4NS
Applicant: Mr Ian Sadler
Proposal: Construction of a raised deck to the front elevation with associated piers and guard railing.

Date limit for comments: 07.04.25

HALSDON

Planning Application No: 25/0558/FUL

Location: 123 The Marles, EX8 4NX
Applicant: Mr Jez Applegate
Proposal: Raising and alterations to the roof of the existing bungalow for the addition of the first floor.

Date limit for comments: 10.04.25

Planning Application No: 25/0510/FUL

Location: 2 Thornfield Close, EX8 3PA
Applicant: Ms Kay Sharman-Davies
Proposal: Front and rear dormers and a front roof light.

Date limit for comments: 02.04.25

LITTLEHAM

Planning Application No: 25/0176/FUL

Location: Winch House, Queens Drive, EX8 2AY
Applicant: Mr J Stuart (Stuart Line Cruises)
Proposal: Proposed replacement winch house.

Date limit for comments: 03.04.25

Amended plans for consultation.
Revised and simplified roof form.

Planning Application No: 24/2057/VAR

Location Chestnuts, 65 Salterton Road, EX8 2EJ
Applicant: Mr David Crocker
Proposal: Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission 23/0538/FUL (Construction of ground floor and first floor extensions to create an additional 10 additional HMO bedrooms, creation of new vehicular access onto Salterton Road and provision of parking to the front of the site) and condition 10 (parking layout) to allow the removal of east elevation chimney and alteration to approved windows on eastern elevation, the addition of ensuites at 1st floor, change

to material finishes, re-positioning of bike and bin store, change to parking layout and retention of disability ramp, retention of front West wing rood and inclusion of 2no roof lights.

Amended plans for consultation.
Revised first floor window to eastern elevation and additional data sheet for the heat exchange unit that has been installed.

Date limit for comments: 07.04.25

Planning Application No: 25/0454/FUL

Location: 4 Trefusis Place, EX8 2AR
Applicant: Mrs Susan Lagus
Proposal: Proposed garage conversion to annexe, including roof replacement, Ancillary to the dwelling

Date limit for comments: 01.04.25

Planning Application No: 25/0484/VAR

Location: 16 Raddenstile Lane, EX8 2JH
Applicant: Mr W Grounsell and Mrs J Payne
Proposal: Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) on planning permission 23/1359/FUL (Proposed internal and external renovations with two storey rear extension.) Revised design to patio to be level with the ground floor of the dwelling, extending 4 metres into the garden as opposed to 3 metres.
Date limit for comments: 03.04.25

Planning Application No: 25/0551/FUL

Location: 16 Raddenstile Lane, EX8 2JH
Applicant: Mr W Grounsell & Ms J Payne
Proposal: Proposed detached garage with ancillary accommodation to the loft space

Date limit for comments: 09.04.25

TOWN

Planning Application No: 25/0448/ PDM (Prior Notification Application)

Location: Rolle Clinic 6 Rolle Road, EX8 2AB
Applicant: Mr Anthony Smith
Proposal: Prior approval for a change of use of a ground-floor, two-bedroom flat in a Victorian semi-detached house from an Osteopathic Clinic (Class E) back to residential use (C3).

Date limit for comments: 02.04.25

The presumption is that this development can proceed without requiring planning permission unless we object on grounds of:

a) transport and highways impacts of the development,
b) contamination risks in relation to the building,
c) flooding risks in relation to the building,
d) whether it is undesirable for the building to change to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order because of the impact of the
change of use
i) on adequate provision of services of the sort that may be provided by a building falling
within Class A1 (shops), Class A2 (financial and professional services) or Class A5 (hot
food takeaways) of that Schedule or, as the case may be, a building used as a launderette,
but only where there is a reasonable prospect of the building being used to provide such
services, or
ii) where the building is located in a key shopping area, on the sustainability of that shopping
area,
e) the design or external appearance of the building, and
f) the provision of adequate natural light in all habitable rooms of the dwellinghouses.

Planning Application No: 25/0563/FUL

Location: The Octagon Esplanade, EX8 2AZ
Applicant: Mr David Freer
Proposal: Retrospective bin store located adjacent to The Octagon

Date limit for comments: 09.04.25

WITHYCOMBE RALEIGH

Planning Application No: 25/0581/FUL

Location: Exmouth Archery Club, The Common, EX8 5EE
Applicant: Mr Tim Pratt
Proposal: Proposed external weather canopy to southeast elevation of indoor shooting centre.

Date limit for comments: 14.04.25

---

7. Other items

i. Certificate of existing lawfulness planning permission
Planning Application No: 25/0487/CPE
Location: Flat 3, 92 St Andrews Road, EX8 1AT
Applicant: Mr James Pearce
Certificate of existing lawfulness for loft extension of flat to form bedroom carried out by previous owners in 2011.

Give consideration if there is any evidence to support or falsify the assertions made within the application.

Date limit for comments: 03.04.25

---

8. Items for information

i. Notification of exempt works for Kincraig, 11 Cranford Avenue
Copy letter attached for information.

ii. Appeal decisions
Appeal ref: APP/U1105/W/24/3349912
Appeal by: Mr Jake Huntley
Application Ref: 24/0913/PIP
Location: 2 Lime Grove
Proposal: Proposed permission in principle for 1 no dwelling

The above appeal was dismissed, the decision notice is attached for information.

---

9. East Devon District Council – Planning Decisions

Application	*Exmouth Town Council View*	*EDDC Decision*
25/0226/FUL 373 Exeter Road	No objection	Conditional Approval
24/2538/LBC Green Farm, Maer Lane	No objection	Conditional Approval
25/0280/FUL 1 Orchard Close	No objection	Conditional Approval
25/0208/FUL 4 Ivydale	No objection	Conditional Approval
25/0129/FUL Marley House, Higher Marley Road	No objection	Conditional Approval

DELEGATED REPORT

Application No: **25/0348/TRE**

Location: **2 Withycombe House**
Hillcrest Gardens
Exmouth
EX8 4FF

Proposal: **Oak (T1) - Prune back northern lateral branches by 3m to reduce loading over neighbouring properties.**
Oak (656) - Prune back eastern lateral branches by 3m to reduce loading over neighbouring property.

Development Type: **TPO**

Date of Site Visit: **13.03.2025**

Consultation Period End Date: 14.03.2025

CONSULTATIONS

None received.

CONTRIBUTORS

None received.

OFFICER REPORT

The application is for works to two oak trees growing on the northern boundary of the converted Hillcrest School, now called Withycombe House and to the south of the recent properties 28 and 46 Hillcrest Gardens.

Both trees form part of the site's characterful population of large mature visually significant trees. These two trees contribute to the overall amenity and character of the development.

The application is supported by a written arboricultural report, however this document was produced in 2019 and now has little relevance other than to document the condition of the trees 5 years ago.

T1 This is a healthy maturing oak growing to the south of 42 to 44 Hillcrest Gardens. The northern extent of the crown grows out over the adjacent gardens to a notable degree. The tree was not recorded within the 2019 tree condition assessment as an individual specimen, on the basis that no notable issues were observed. Whilst the proposed reduction of the trees northwestern aspect is not required, on any identifiable safety grounds, some pruning back of this crown aspect to allow reasonable enjoyment of the gardens beneath, can be considered acceptable. However, the extend of these works should be limited to avoid causing unnecessary harm to the tree and reduce unsightly dense regrowth.

T2 This is a late mature oak, with reduced vitality, growing to the east of 26 Hillcrest Gardens. The condition of the tree appears to have changed little since the condition assessment was undertaken in 2019. Within this report no works were identified as being required, however it did note several historic branch failures. There appears to be no current safety justification for the proposed works. However, given the tree overhangs the adjacent property and there has been several past branch failures. Given the trees low vitality and its

late mature life stage, any pruning works and the resulting removal of foliage should be kept to a minimum. Some light pruning back of the overhanging branches to allow reasonable management of the tree should be approved, however the extent of these works should be limited.

CONCLUSION

A split decision should be issued, refusing the proposed works to both trees but allowing lesser crown reduction works.

RECOMMENDATION

THIS IS A SPLIT DECISION (a part of the application has been refused and a part approved).

The Council hereby **grants** permission to carry out work described below subject to the following conditions:

Oak (T1) - Prune back northern lateral branches by up to 2.5m, with pruning cuts made up to 75mm in diameter.
Oak (656) - Prune back eastern lateral branches by up to 1.5m, with pruning cuts made up to 75mm in diameter.

1. The works, hereby consented to, shall be carried out within a period of 2 years from the date of this decision notice.
   (Reason - To ensure that the works are carried out within a reasonable period of time.)

2. The works hereby consented to shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998: 2010 (Tree Work - Recommendations).
   (Reason - In the interests of amenity and to ensure the works are carried out in a satisfactory manner.)

The Council hereby **refuses** permission to carry out work described below for the following reasons:

Oak (T1) - Prune back northern lateral branches by 3m to reduce loading over neighbouring properties.
Oak (656) - Prune back eastern lateral branches by 3m to reduce loading over neighbouring property.

1. The trees contribute to the amenity and character of the local area. The proposed works are considered excessive, causing unnecessary harm to the amenity and physiological condition of the trees. Lesser works have been approved to allow reasonable management of the trees.

NOTE FOR APPLICANT

1. **Wildlife** - Bats and birds are protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2001, it is an offence to deliberately or recklessly disturb them or damage their roosts or habitat. Therefore, close inspection of the tree(s) should be undertaken prior to the commencement of works to determine if any bats or birds reside in the tree(s). No works should occur while birds are nesting

which may be at any time between the month of March to September inclusive; if bats are present works should cease until the applicant has obtained further advice from Natural England on 0845 601 4523 or email wildlife@naturalengland.org.uk. Further advice on bats is available from The Bat Conservation Trust (0845 1300 228).

2. **Tree Ownership** - Ownership of the trees appears to be uncertain. Permission of the owners of the trees should be obtained before any works are carried out. Any parts of the trees which are removed or fall remain the property of the owner of the tree and should be offered back to them.

T1, Oak: Proposed crown reduction marked with the yellow line.



T656, Oak: Proposed crown reduction marked with red line.



DELEGATED REPORT

Statement on Human Rights and Equality Issues

Human Rights Act:
The development has been assessed against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998, and in particular Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 of the Act itself. This Act gives further effect to the rights included in the European Convention on Human Rights. In arriving at this recommendation, due regard has been given to the applicant's reasonable development rights and expectations which have been balanced and weighed against the wider community interests, as expressed through third party interests / the Development Plan and Central Government Guidance.

Equality Act:
In arriving at this recommendation, due regard has been given to the provisions of the Equality Act 2010, particularly the Public Sector Equality Duty and Section 149. The Equality Act 2010 requires public bodies to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between different people when carrying out their activities. Protected characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race/ethnicity, religion or belief (or lack of), sex and sexual orientation.

Date: 25 March 2025
Contact number: 01404 515616
Extension number:
E-mail: trees@eastdevon.gov.uk
Our Reference: **25/0699/PRETDD**

East Devon District Council
Blackdown House
Border Road
Heathpark Industrial Estate
Honiton
Devon
EX14 1EJ

DX48808 Honiton

Tel: 01395 516551

www.eastdevon.gov.uk

Kincraig
11 Cranford Avenue
Exmouth
EX8 2HT

Dear Mr Arrow

Notification of Tree works considered an exemption to 95/0004/TPO

Thank you for advising the Council that you would like to carry out works to which you consider to be an exemption to the usual requirements of the tree protection legislation.

The works are:

T484, Deodar Cedar, T485 and T486, Hollies - removal of dead and dysfunctional wood

The works in question are considered to be an exception from the normal requirement to seek the consent of this Council under Regulation 14 of the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation)(England) Regulations 2012. This regulation of the Act provides for works to be carried out on dead and dangerous trees (or parts of trees) in the interests of safety.

Yours sincerely

Arboricultural Team
Countryside Service

Copy to: The Clerk to Exmouth Town Council
Councillor Nick Hookway
Councillor Brian Bailey
Councillor Anne Hall
Tree Warden – Helen Bennett
Land Charges (if TPO)

Informatives:

1. **Wildlife :** Bats and birds are protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2001, it is an offence to deliberately or recklessly disturb them or damage their roosts or habitat. Therefore, close inspection of the tree(s) should be undertaken prior to the commencement of works to determine if any bats or birds reside in the tree(s). No works should occur while birds are nesting which may be

at any time between the month of March to September inclusive; if bats are present works should cease until the applicant has obtained further advice from Natural England on 0845 6003078 or 0300 0601110 (Exeter Office). Further advice on bats is available from The Bat Conservation Trust (0845 1300228).

2. **British Standard BS 3998:2010 Tree Work - Recommendations** came into effect on 31 December 2010 and supersedes BS 3998:1989 which is withdrawn. Before carrying out the works to which this notice applies, any person involved with the works should ensure they are fully aware of the contents of the new standard. A copy of the standard is available for inspection at the Council Offices, Blackdown House, Border Rd, Heathpark Ind Estate, Honiton EX14 1EJ or can be purchased from the BSI Shop on the website www.bsigroup.com/shop.

Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2025

by J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U1105/W/24/3349912
2 Lime Grove, Exmouth EX8 5NN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant permission in principle.
- The appeal is made by Mr Jake Huntley against the decision of East Devon District Council.
- The application Ref is 24/0913/PIP.
- The development proposed is a permission in principle for 1 no. dwelling.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The proposal is for permission in principle. The Planning Practice Guidance advises that this is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development. The permission in principle consent route has two stages: the first stage (or permission in principle stage) establishes whether a site is suitable in principle, and the second stage ('technical details consent') is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. This appeal relates to the first of these two stages.

3. The scope of the considerations for permission in principle is limited to location, land use, and the amount of development permitted. All other matters are considered as part of a subsequent Technical Details Consent application if permission in principle is granted. The appeal has been considered on that basis.

4. Article 5B(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017 provides that permission in principle cannot be given for habitats development. This is defined as development that would likely have a significant effect on a European site or an offshore marine site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. The scheme would impact upon the Exe Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) and the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SPA and Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Accompanying the appeal was a Section 111 agreement and evidence of a contribution payment having been made to the Council which had been provided to address the second reason for refusal. This matter will be returned to below.

5. Two block plan drawings have been submitted with the appeal, both of which have been described as indicative (dwg Nos 2324.005.HUNTLEY.02SV and 2324.005.HUNTLEY.03SV), with the former having been submitted for the original application. The appeal has been considered on the basis of both these plans showing indicative layouts.

6. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024, and the comments of the main parties have been sought. Consideration has been given to those received in reaching the appeal decision.

Main Issue

7. The main issue in this case is whether the site is suitable for residential development, having regard to its location, the proposed land use, and the amount of development.

Reasons

Location, Land Use, and Amount of Development

8. The appeal site comprises the side garden and garage of 2 Lime Grove (No 2). This property is positioned upon a steeply sloping hillside and occupies a corner plot formed by the junction of Lime Grove with Spider's Lane. It is part of a large residential estate that has a distinctive appearance, due to the repeated heights, sizes and styles of houses, their construction from a limited palette of materials, and the concentrated grouping of similar house types together. Most of the houses along Lime Grove are semi-detached, and they are set back from the public highway behind similar sized, regularly shaped front gardens, and they form long, harmonious frames to either side of the road.

9. No 2 is at one end of the long row of houses to the southern side of Lime Grove. Despite being detached, this house maintains the planned cohesion of the estate. It continues the building line that exists along the road, and is constructed of similar materials to those nearby, as well as being of a similar size and height. In addition, the side garden to this property creates an open setting to the road junction, which is another repeated and distinct characteristic found throughout the estate.

10. There is no disagreement between the parties that the site is within the built-up area of Exmouth, and that future occupiers would be near to a variety of services, facilities and employment opportunities. The provision of an additional single dwelling within an existing residential area would be acceptable in this respect.

11. However, as with the other houses within corner plots in the estate, No 2 is set back away from the public highway. These side gardens create a deliberate planned openness to either side of the road junctions that enhances their visual and functional importance within the estate. Whatever the size of the dwelling, the presence of an additional building in such a location would appear conspicuously intrusive and incongruous as it would erode the open spacious nature of the road junction. A dwelling within the small side garden would result in a buiding being very close to the public highway with little open garden remaining, as evidenced by the indicative plans provided by the appellant.

12. Furthermore, the side garden of No 2 has been levelled, and any proposed dwelling would be elevated high above the level of Spider's Lane. Having regard to this and the loss of the openness to the road junction, a dwelling in this location would be an overbearing and dominating addition within the area. Given the prominence of the site and the slope of the hillside the loss of the open setting to the junction would be visible from long distances away. In an estate with a

distinctive, planned cohesion where the junctions have a deliberate spacious openness, a single dwelling in this position would disruptively erode this character and appearance.

13. Whether a detached dwelling or attached to No 2, in this particular location it would appear disruptively intrusive. Indicative drawings show a dwelling could be provided, but they also demonstrate that the narrow breadth of the side garden is such that whatever the form of dwelling, it would be noticeably very close to Spider's Lane. It might be the case that a two storey house could be provided along with external space to serve future and existing occupiers. However, a dwelling would dominate such a small plot, contrary to the grain of the estate, appearing conspicuously cramped and constrained, and prominently and unacceptably disrupting the planned cohesion of the estate.

14. The appellant has referred to 1A Lime Grove being an example of an infill plot. This house is on the opposite side of the road to the appeal site and has a generous side garden that has retained the open setting to the road junction that is such a distinctive feature of the estate. Furthermore, although it extends a pair of semi-detached houses into a terrace, in doing so it has replicated their size, form, materials and mass. Unlike the appeal scheme, this dwelling responds to its context, respecting the planned cohesion of the host buildings and that of the estate, and for these reasons it does not form a binding precedent for allowing the appeal.

15. Given these findings a single dwelling in such a location would have a significantly harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the area. This harm would conflict with Strategy 6 and Policy D1 of the East Devon Local Plan (2016) (LP), and also with Policy EB2 of the Exmouth Neighbourhood Plan (2019) (NP). As these seek, amongst other things development that would be compatible with the character of the site and its surroundings, that which respects the key characteristics and special qualities of the area in which the development is proposed, and that which would be mindful of surrounding building styles, the scheme would fail to accord with such objectives.

Other Matters

16. The site is within 10 kilometres of the Exe Estuary SPA and Pebblebed Heaths SAC and SPA. These habitat sites are of international importance. The Exe Estuary SPA is designated for its internationally important populations of birds, whilst the Pebblebed Heaths designations recognise the wet and dry heathland vegetation that supports a diversity of species and associated communities that include rare insects and birds. Natural England has advised that the estuary and the heaths are under significant pressure from increased public access and use, and that a net increase in the number of dwellings and occupiers in the area would have an adverse effect upon these important habitat sites and species.

17. LP Strategies 47 and 50 and the supporting South-East Devon European Site Mitigation Strategy (2014) (MT) seek to protect the habitat sites through requiring prevention, mitigation and compensation measures to maintain their integrity. All residential development within 10 kilometres of any part of the SAC and SPAs will be required to provide mitigation, and this can include through unilateral undertakings and Section 111 agreements.

18. Given the location of the scheme, future occupiers would be likely to visit the habitat sites, and this use would have an adverse effect upon their integrity. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) require the decision maker to undertake an Appropriate Assessment (AA) where there are likely to be significant effects from the proposal, either alone or in combination with other schemes, and this duty falls to occur with the appeal.

19. A Section 111 agreement has been provided with the appeal, although it has not been signed, nor is it linked in any way to the proposed development by an application or appeal reference or red-edged plan. Although the Council has confirmed receipt of a payment for the required contribution to provide for mitigation, the absence of a completed Section 111 provides a degree of uncertainty that the necessary mitigation would be secured. However, as the appeal is being dismissed for other reasons, the matter has not been pursued with the main parties and it has not therefore been necessary to undertake AAs.

20. Local residents have raised other matters, including on-street parking and access issues, as well as a loss of privacy and sunlight. Following the findings on the main issues, there is no need to consider these matters further.

Planning Balance

21. The appellant has drawn attention to the Council's lack of a 5 year housing land supply, citing a figure of 3.24 years. The provision of an additional dwelling in a location near to services, facilities, and employment, would be a modest benefit of the scheme. The Framework attributes great weight to the development of windfall sites within an existing settlement.

22. Weighing against these benefits would be the significant harm arising from the location of an additional home within a residential estate that would erode the area's distinct character and appearance. These harms weigh heavily against the proposal, as LP Strategy 6, LP Policy D1, and NP Policy EB2 are broadly consistent with the Framework, as the Framework also requires the provision of development that is sympathetic to local character.

23. Whilst a key aim of the Framework is to significantly boost the supply of housing, when read as a whole the Framework does not suggest this should happen at the expense of other considerations. The adverse impacts in this case amount to cumulative harm that significantly and demonstrably outweighs the modest benefits that accrue from the scheme, even the great weight deriving from the provision of a home that would make an effective use of land in a sustainable location. It follows that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

24. There would be conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole, and there are no other considerations, including the requirements of the Framework, that outweigh this finding. Thus, for the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J J Evans

INSPECTOR