

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE CASE OFFICER REPORT

APPLICATION REFERENCE:	PL/2026/00219
APPLICATION TYPE:	Permission in Principle
SITE ADDRESS:	Land Adjacent Valentine House, Kingston Road, Shalbourne
DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION:	Permission in Principle for Residential Development of 1 No Dwelling (Use Class C3)
RECOMMENDATION:	The Planning Permission be REFUSED

SITE DESCRIPTION/CONTEXT

The application relates to land adjacent Valentine House, Kingston Road in Shalbourne.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks Permission in Principle under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

The development proposed is for 1 No. residential Dwelling.

No detailed matters of layout, scale, appearance, access, landscaping or drainage are submitted at this stage, as these are not required as part of a Permission in Principle application.

PLANNING HISTORY

K/80/1017 – Detached house and garage. Approved with conditions 6th April 1981.

K/81/0932 - Erection of house and garage. Approved with Conditions 26th November 1981.

K/86/1259 - Erection of detached house and garage. Approved with Conditions 7th June 1988.

K/20374 – Erect two storey dwelling and associated works. Approved with conditions 1st September 1993.

K/36191 - Erection of new dwelling. Renewal of approval K/20374. Approved with Conditions 21st September 1998.

K/46209 - Renewal of application K/36191 for erection of a new house. Refused 3rd November 2003.

PL/2023/08608 - Erection of 3 no. detached dwellings; with associated garaging, parking, turning, landscaping, private amenity space and access arrangements. Withdrawn by Applicant 1st December 2023.

PL/2025/00227 – Certificate of Lawfulness to establish that work has commenced within 5 years, in accordance with outline planning permission K/80/1017. Withdrawn by Applicant 6th March 2025.

RELEVANT LEGISLATION, POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

Statutory Legislation:

National Planning Policy:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- National Design Guide

Development Plan:

The development plan for Wiltshire comprises the *Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS)* (*adopted January 2015*) and any made neighbourhood plans, which remains the principal statutory planning document guiding development across the county. In line with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning decisions must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Though the development plan is considered as a whole, those parts deemed to be particularly relevant to this application are listed below:

The adopted *Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS)*, with particular regard to:

- Core Policy 1: Settlement Strategy
- Core Policy 2: Delivery Strategy
- Core Policy 18: Spatial Strategy: Pewsey Community Area
- Core Policy 45: Meeting Wiltshire's Housing Needs
- Core Policy 50: Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- Core Policy 51: Landscape
- Core Policy 57: Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping
- Core Policy 58: Ensuring the Conservation of the Historic Environment

Supplementary Planning Documents and other Guidance:

- Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026, adopted 2015 - including the Car Parking Strategy and Cycling Strategy, adopted 2015
- Shalbourne Conservation Area Statement January 2003

PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE – PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF ASSESSMENT

Permission in Principle (PiP) is an alternative route to obtaining planning permission, introduced by the Housing and Planning Act 2016. It is intended to provide an early and proportionate decision on whether a site is suitable for development, before detailed design work is undertaken.

The PiP process operates as a two-stage planning permission route for housing-led development:

- *Stage 1 – Permission in Principle:*
Establishes whether the principle of development on a site is acceptable.
- *Stage 2 – Technical Details Consent:*
If PiP is granted, a subsequent application is required to consider the detailed proposals, including layout, scale, appearance, access, landscaping, drainage and infrastructure.

At the Permission in Principle stage, the assessment is deliberately high-level and limited in scope. The purpose of a PiP is not to approve detailed plans, but to provide certainty at an early stage about whether development of a particular type is acceptable in principle at a given location. This approach is intended to help streamline the planning process by allowing developers and communities to understand development potential before significant time and expense is committed to detailed designs.

Importantly, the grant of Permission in Principle does not authorise development to commence. Development can only proceed once Technical Details Consent has been granted.

Planning conditions cannot be imposed on the grant of PiP however conditions can be applied in the usual way at the technical details consent stage. Any PiP approved for residential development must be expressed indicating the minimum and maximum net number of dwellings which are, in principle, permitted. For a valid PiP application only a plan to identify the land to which the application relates is required.

Matters that Can Be Considered at the PiP Stage

Legislation restricts the assessment of a PiP application to the following matters only:

- The location of the development
- The proposed land use(s)
- The amount of development proposed

These are the only issues that can lawfully be taken into account when determining whether Permission in Principle should be granted or refused.

Matters Excluded from Consideration at the PiP Stage

Detailed matters, including (but not limited to) the following, are not considered as part of a PiP application:

- Detailed design and appearance
- Site layout and internal arrangements
- Access arrangements and parking
- Landscaping and boundary treatments
- Drainage and flood mitigation measures
- Utilities and other technical infrastructure

Such matters are reserved entirely for consideration at the Technical Details Consent stage, should Permission in Principle be granted.

KEY ISSUES FOR ASSESSMENT

In determining this application for Permission in Principle, the Local Planning Authority must consider the following key issues:

1. **Whether the location of the site is suitable** for the proposed form of development, having regard to the spatial strategy set out in the development plan and relevant national policy.
2. **Whether the proposed land use is acceptable in principle** at this location, taking into account the character and role of the settlement and surrounding area.
3. **Whether the amount of development proposed is appropriate**, assessed at a high-level and in broad terms only.
4. **Whether there are any overriding constraints** which would clearly and demonstrably prevent the site from being developed in principle, even allowing for detailed matters to be addressed at the Technical Details Consent stage.

A Permission in Principle application should therefore only be refused where it is clearly demonstrated that the principle of the proposed development is unacceptable, and that such concerns could not reasonably be addressed through a subsequent Technical Details Consent application.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

WC Highways: Request further information.

WC Conservation: Object.

WC Archaeology: No objection subject to condition.

Shalbourne Parish Council: Object.

- The application covers only part of the applicant's land, making it impossible to assess suitability without clarity on intentions for the remaining area.
- The site lies outside the village boundary and within the National Landscape, with no justification provided for development in this location.
- No explanation is given as to why the proposal would not set an unacceptable precedent for further development in the National Landscape.
- The site is within the Shalbourne Conservation Area, but the application does not demonstrate how the proposal reflects or respects the village's linear character.

REPRESENTATIONS

In accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), the application was publicised by way of:

- Neighbour notification letters sent to adjoining and nearby properties;

- A site notice displayed near the site;

These methods were used to inform interested parties and provide a period of 21 days for comments to be submitted.

Below is a summary of the representations received during the consultation period. Only material planning considerations have been taken into account in the assessment of this application. Non-material issues, such as property values or private legal disputes, cannot be considered in the determination process.

- The site lies outside the defined village settlement boundary, in open countryside, within the Shalbourne Conservation Area and the North Wessex National Landscape, with insufficient justification for development in policy terms.
- Strong objection to the proposal setting an undesirable precedent for further speculative or incremental development within the AONB, Conservation Area and countryside.
- The application relates to only part of the overall landholding, with a retained area shown separately, and no clarity provided on future intentions for that land.
- Widespread concern that the partial red-line boundary represents a means of facilitating future applications for additional dwelling/s in the future.
- Requests that any permission granted be explicitly conditioned to prevent further development on the retained land.
- Adverse impact on the setting and amenity of the adjacent Grade II listed Bee Keepers Cottage, including concerns relating to noise, privacy, lighting and general residential amenity.
- Insufficient assessment of ecological and environmental impacts, with concern that the site supports wildlife and that past site activities (including removal of fuel tanks) have not been adequately addressed.
- Highway safety concerns relating to access onto Kingston Road, including substandard visibility splays, pedestrian safety, proximity to village facilities and on-street parking pressures.
- Reliance on historic planning permissions is considered misleading, as earlier approvals related to a single dwelling on the whole site and later renewals were refused due to harm to character and appearance.
- Alleged inaccuracies and inconsistencies within the application documents regarding land use, planning history, affordable housing claims and the surrounding context.
- Ongoing uncertainty regarding land ownership and first registration with HM Land Registry, with concerns that determination would be premature while legal boundaries remain unresolved.
- Lack of meaningful engagement by the applicant with neighbouring residents and the wider community.

ASSESSMENT

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purposes of any determination to be made under the planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

In accordance with this statutory requirement, this application has been assessed against the relevant policies of the Development Plan, including the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) and, where applicable, any made Neighbourhood Plans. Consideration has also been given to the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as a material consideration in the assessment.

Principle of Development – Location

Policy Context

The development plan establishes a spatial strategy which seeks to direct new development towards defined settlements where residents have reasonable access to services, facilities and sustainable transport options. Development beyond these locations is generally more restricted in order to protect the countryside and promote sustainable patterns of growth.

The National Planning Policy Framework supports the delivery of new homes in appropriate locations, whilst seeking to ensure development is well related to existing settlements and does not result in unsustainable patterns of development.

Assessment

The site is located outside the defined limits of development for Shalbourne which is classed as Large Village, so it is located in the open countryside for planning purposes. Core Policy 1 outlines that development at Large Villages will be limited to that needed to help meet the housing needs of settlements and to improve employment opportunities. Core Policy 2 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy outlines that other than in circumstances as permitted by other policies within this plan, development will not be permitted outside the limits of development. The proposed development is not considered to fall under any of the exception policies and as such is unacceptable in principle.

Conclusion

Having regard to the spatial strategy set out in the development plan and relevant national policy, it is considered that the location of the site is unacceptable in principle for the proposed development.

The site's location represents a fundamental conflict with the development plan's spatial strategy. This concern relates to the principle of development and could not reasonably be resolved through a subsequent Technical Details Consent application.

5 Year Housing Land Supply

The Wiltshire Housing Land Supply Statement (June 2025) provides the latest position on the Council's ability to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land, which is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in December 2024. This has reintroduced the requirement to meet five years' worth of deliverable sites and a buffer to be applied to the five-year housing requirement in all circumstances and has revised the Local Housing Need calculation to establish the five-year housing requirement. These factors have resulted in a substantial increase in the five-year housing requirement to be met from the previous calculation. When this is assessed against the housing land supply which can be delivered within five years, the recalculation shows a significant reduction in the number of years supply. The resulting position shows that the Council can currently demonstrate a 2.42 years housing land supply of housing at a unitary authority level. This is considered to be a substantial shortfall.

The absence of a five-year housing land supply is a material consideration in the determination of this application. In accordance with Paragraphs 78 and 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), for applications involving the provision of housing, where there is a shortfall in the supply of deliverable housing sites, the most important policies for determining the application should be considered out of date. The current housing land supply shortfall is a factor that must be considered in the planning balance and in this case, as a five-year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated, the weight that can be applied to the most important policies for determining this application should be assessed and altered in the light of the shortage in housing land supply. The proposal must be assessed against the national policy context of the need to boost housing supply and the benefits of delivering new homes whilst having particular regard to the key policies set out in paragraph 11(d)(ii) and Footnote 9 of the NPPF.

Principle of Development – Land Use

Policy Context

The development plan supports the provision of appropriate land uses in locations identified as suitable by the spatial strategy. In particular, policies seek to ensure that proposed uses are compatible with their surroundings and contribute positively to the function and character of settlements.

The National Planning Policy Framework promotes sustainable development and supports the delivery of housing in principle, subject to it being located in suitable areas and not giving rise to conflicts that would fundamentally undermine the objectives of the development plan.

Assessment

At the Permission in Principle stage, the key test is whether the type of development proposed is acceptable in principle at this location, not whether the finer details of how it would operate can be resolved.

The proposed land use is considered in the context of the site's location and its relationship to surrounding land uses. In broad terms, the surrounding area comprises a mix of residential and other compatible uses and open countryside.

Shalbourne offers a post office, primary school and pub and is served by limited bus services. The site is also located in an area dominated by existing residential dwellings. Given the site's context and proximity to services, the proposal can be considered to be compatible with its immediate area.

There is nothing inherent in the proposed land use that would, in principle, conflict with the character or function of the area. Matters such as the precise mix of uses, scale of buildings, detailed design, and operational impacts are not for consideration at this stage and would be assessed as part of a subsequent application for Technical Details Consent, should Permission in Principle be granted.

Conclusion

Having regard to the development plan and relevant national policy, it is considered that the proposed land use is acceptable in principle.

The use of the site for residential use would be consistent with the general pattern of development in the area and does not raise any in-principle land use conflicts that would justify refusal at the PiP stage.

Amount of Development

Policy Context

The development plan seeks to ensure that the scale of new development is appropriate to its location, having regard to the size, role and character of the settlement, and the capacity of the area to accommodate change in principle.

The National Planning Policy Framework supports a proportionate approach to the assessment of scale at an early stage in the planning process, recognising that detailed matters of layout, design and appearance are to be addressed through subsequent stages of decision-making where appropriate.

Assessment

At the PiP stage, the assessment of the amount of development is necessarily broad-brush. The key question is whether the quantum of development proposed is so excessive, or so limited, that it would be inappropriate in principle, having regard to the site's location and the settlement within which it sits.

The site is relatively large so it could comfortably accommodate a single dwellinghouse within the plot.

In this case, the proposed quantum of development would represent a modest level of growth relative to the size and character of Shalbourne. In high-level terms, the amount proposed is broadly consistent with the role and scale of the settlement as identified in the development plan.

No detailed conclusions are drawn at this stage regarding density, layout, or the precise form of development, as these matters fall to be considered through a subsequent Technical Details Consent application. The assessment at this stage is limited to whether the amount of development proposed could reasonably be accommodated in principle on the site.

Conclusion

Having regard to the development plan and relevant national policy, it is considered that the amount of development proposed is acceptable in principle.

The proposed quantum is not considered to be so excessive that it would result in an inherent conflict with the scale or role of the settlement. Subject to detailed matters being satisfactorily addressed at the Technical Details Consent stage, the amount of development proposed could be accommodated in principle on the site.

Constraints and Infrastructure Considerations (PiP Context)

Policy Context

The development plan and national planning policy recognise that sites may be subject to environmental, physical or policy constraints. At the Permission in Principle stage, the key consideration is whether any such constraints are of a nature or severity that they would clearly and demonstrably prevent development from coming forward in principle, even allowing for detailed matters to be addressed at the Technical Details Consent stage.

The National Planning Policy Framework confirms that planning decisions should be proportionate, and that early-stage permissions should not seek to resolve detailed technical matters prematurely.

Assessment

Consideration has been given to the presence of any known constraints affecting the application site that are capable of undermining the principle of development.

These include:

- Heritage assets or their settings
- Landscape or environmental designations

The existence of a constraint does not, in itself, justify refusal of a Permission in Principle application. The crucial question is whether the constraint is so severe that it could not reasonably be overcome or mitigated, even in principle, through the consideration of detailed proposals at the Technical Details Consent stage.

At the Permission in Principle stage, it would be inappropriate to speculate on detailed technical solutions. However, equally, where a constraint clearly prevents development in principle, it must be afforded decisive weight.

The site is located within the Shalbourne Conservation Area and is washed over by the North Wessex Downs National Landscape.

Heritage impact

Wiltshire Council's Conservation Department has been consulted on the application and have objected to the scheme. The village has a strong rural setting, and most modern development is concentrated on the fringes of the village and outside of the conservation area, although there are a few exceptions of this. The adopted CA statement concludes that there are limited opportunities for development within it, and that 'the character of the village can be adversely affected by changes to existing buildings especially buildings of historic interest. It is important to recognise, and work with, the form and grain of the village taking into account historic boundaries and overall density'. It is acknowledged that there is some later 20th century development set back from the main road, which is more urban in character, but the presence of such development does not set a precedent for additional development, and particularly when the starting point is a greenfield site highly visible on the main throughfare of the village. The increase of density of development between existing buildings, and/or behind the main road gradually erodes away the looser character of development and its more sporadic, organic evolution of the development of this rural village, which generally clings to the main thoroughfares through the area.

The change of use of the land from agricultural to residential would permanently change the character of the site and its relationship with buildings on either side, including the un designated heritage asset known as Valentine House, and the setting of the Grade II listed 'Bee Keepers'. This change in character by the residential use would cause less-than-substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and the setting of heritage assets.

The change in character and land use would have an impact on the designated heritage asset and would erode the rural character of the village street scene. The NPPF (219) states that *"local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably."*

The visual change is likely to have a negative impact on the rural character of the local area and therefore the change of use of the land to residential will not *'better reveal the significance'* of the conservation area. As such, the proposed development is contrary to paragraphs 212, 215 and 219 of the NPPF and Core Policies 57 & 58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

The less than substantial harm identified would not be outweighed by any public benefit.

The comments received from the Conservation Officer are agreed, whereby the site is affected by fundamental heritage harm and encroachment into the open countryside within the North Wessex Downs National Landscape, which fundamentally limits the ability of the site to accommodate development. This constraint relates to the suitability of the site itself, rather than to matters of detailed design or mitigation.

Impact upon the North Wessex Downs National Landscape

The site is located in the open countryside for planning purposes and is currently undeveloped land, such that the change of use to residential would result in an encroachment into the open

countryside within a protected landscape. The site is located within a built up area and is bounded on three sides by residential development, such that any long-distance views from the wider countryside would be experienced against the backdrop of the existing built form and the site would be closely associated with the settlement.

While the site is closely associated with the built form of Shalbourne, the change of use of undeveloped land within the North Wessex Downs National Landscape would nonetheless contribute to the erosion of the rural character of the village, which is a defining feature of the Conservation Area. The landscape harm is afforded limited weight in isolation but adds to the overall harm identified when considered cumulatively alongside the impacts on designated and non-designated heritage assets.

While detailed landscaping could be considered at the Technical Details Consent stage, such measures would not alter the fundamental change in character arising from the loss of undeveloped land. Accordingly, although landscape impact alone would not justify refusal, it reinforces the conclusion that the site is unsuitable for residential development in principle when assessed in combination with the identified heritage harm.

Conclusion

Having regard to the development plan and relevant national policy, it is considered that there are overriding constraints affecting the site which would clearly and demonstrably prevent the proposed development from coming forward in principle.

The harm to the heritage impact is such that the site is not suitable for the proposed development in principle. This objection goes to the heart of site suitability and could not reasonably be overcome through the submission of detailed proposals at a later stage.

Other Issues

Highways

Wiltshire Council's Highways department has been consulted on the application and have requested further information relating to the detailed design of the proposed access, including visibility splays, access geometry, surfacing, drainage, provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure and a bin storage/refuge area, as well as advising that a Section 184 licence would be required to implement any new vehicular access.

It is noted that highway comments on previous applications have raised no objection in principle, subject to the provision of detailed access arrangements meeting current highway standards. The comments raised in response to the current application relate to the technical design and specification of the access, rather than identifying an objection to the principle of residential development at this location on highway grounds.

At the Permission in Principle stage, legislation restricts consideration to the location of the site, the proposed land use and the amount of development. Detailed access arrangements, visibility splays, surfacing, drainage, parking layout, electric vehicle charging provision and

refuse storage are explicitly excluded from consideration at this stage and would fall to be assessed in full as part of a subsequent Technical Details Consent application, should Permission in Principle be granted.

On this basis, while the Highway Officer's comments are noted, they do not identify a fundamental or overriding constraint which would clearly and demonstrably prevent development from coming forward in principle. Any future application for Technical Details Consent would be required to fully address these matters to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority, and the need for a Section 184 vehicle crossing licence is noted as a separate matter under the relevant highways legislation which would be brought to the applicants attention at the technical details stage.

Land ownership

Concerns have been raised by third parties regarding land ownership, first registration with HM Land Registry and the fact that the application site forms only part of a wider landholding, with uncertainty expressed regarding future intentions for the retained land.

Land ownership is not a material planning consideration when making a decision on this application, but the applicant has confirmed via email that they are the sole owner of the land within the red line.

The extent of the red line application boundary reflects the land for which Permission in Principle is sought. While concerns have been expressed regarding the potential for future development on adjoining land within the applicant's control, the planning system requires each application to be determined on its own merits. The existence of retained land does not justify refusal of a Permission in Principle application.

Precedence

A number of representations raise concern that the proposal would set an undesirable precedent for further development within the countryside, the Conservation Area and the North Wessex Downs National Landscape. The granting of Permission in Principle for a single dwelling would not establish a blanket precedent for further development. Each subsequent proposal would be required to be assessed on its own merits against the development plan and material considerations prevailing at the time.

Impact on Residential Amenity

Representations raise concerns regarding potential impacts on the amenity of neighbouring properties, including the Grade II listed Bee Keepers Cottage, in terms of noise, privacy, overlooking, lighting and general disturbance.

At the Permission in Principle stage, detailed matters relating to layout, separation distances, fenestration, lighting and noise generation cannot be assessed. These issues are not capable of being determinative at this stage and would be fully considered as part of any subsequent Technical Details Consent application if the application current application were approved. No conclusion is therefore reached on detailed residential amenity impacts at this stage.

Ecology and Environmental Matters

Concern has been raised regarding potential impacts on wildlife, biodiversity and the environment, including references to previous site activity and land management practices. There are no ecological constraints upon the site which would impact the principle of development whereby the current application could be refused on ecological grounds. Detailed ecological surveys, mitigation measures and any necessary enhancements would be matters for consideration at the Technical Details Consent stage, if required.

Accuracy of Submitted Information and Planning History

Some representations allege inaccuracies or inconsistencies within the submitted information, including references to planning history and previous permissions.

The planning history of the site has been set out within this report and has been taken into account as a material consideration. While historic permissions provide context, they do not create a presumption in favour of new development, and the current application has been assessed against the prevailing development plan and national policy framework.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

The application seeks Permission in Principle for the erection of a single dwellinghouse on the site.

In determining a Permission in Principle application, the Local Planning Authority is required to assess only the location of the development, the proposed land use, the amount of development, and whether there are any overriding constraints which would clearly and demonstrably prevent development from coming forward in principle.

Having considered the application against the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, it is concluded that the proposed development is not acceptable in principle. The concerns identified go to the fundamental suitability of the site for development, rather than to matters that could reasonably be resolved through the submission of detailed proposals at a later stage.

Five-Year Housing Land Supply

The Local Planning Authority is currently unable to demonstrate a deliverable five-year supply of housing land.

The National Planning Policy Framework confirms that in such circumstances, the delivery of new housing attracts significant weight as a material consideration in decision-making.

At the heart of the NPPF there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development requiring local planning authorities to approve development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; and where there are no relevant development plan policies,

or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless (taken from paragraph 11d of the NPPF):

- The application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing development proposed; or
- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole

Having regard to paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework and footnote 7, the Local Planning Authority does not consider that the presumption in favour of sustainable development ('tilted balance') is engaged, as harm to heritage assets has been found which are protected areas and assets of particular importance and thus provide a strong reason for refusing the development.

Even if the tilted balance were not be engaged, the less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets is considered not to tilt the balance in favour of approving the application.

In this particular case, the identified harm relates to the principle of development and to matters that could not reasonably be resolved or mitigated through a subsequent application for Technical Details Consent.

Conclusion

Overall, the proposal conflicts with the development plan when assessed against the statutory framework for Permission in Principle. There are no material considerations, including housing land supply, that indicate a decision other than refusal should be made.

RECOMMENDATION: That Permission in Principle be REFUSED