

APPLICATION REPORT – 22/00198/PIP

Validation Date: 24 February 2022

Ward: Buckshaw And Whittle

Type of Application: Permission In Principle

Proposal: Permission in principle application for the erection of up to 2no. dwellings (resubmission of 20/01202/PIP)

Location: Vacant Land Off Hill Top Lane Whittle-Le-Woods

Case Officer: Mike Halsall

Applicant: Mr James Berry

Agent: De Pol Associates Limited

Consultation expiry: 15 March 2022

Decision due by: 27 May 2022 (Extension of time agreed)

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that permission in principle is granted subject to conditions.

SITE DESCRIPTION

2. The application site forms part of a much larger designation covered by policy BNE3 of the Chorley Local Plan, as land 'West of M61, Whittle-le-Woods' to be safeguarded for future development needs beyond the plan period, which runs to 2026. The site is located to the south east of Whittle Hill Quarry, Hill Top Lane, where the gradient of the site slopes down steeply towards Hill Top Lane. The site is open land with grasses, some well-established trees and other wild plants.
3. The northern part of the site is characterised by mature trees and steep slopes, together with post and wire fencing. The southern part of the site is more level and a stone wall extends along the southern and eastern boundaries, separating the site from the highway and adjacent domestic garden area to the east. There is agricultural land to the north, and an embankment is located along the western boundary, demarcating the site from the quarry land to the west.
4. There is an existing vehicular access to the site from Hill Top Lane, with a metal gate.
5. Planning permission was refused on 10 March 2021 for the same development as currently proposed for the following reason:

The proposed development would be located within an area of Safeguarded Land as defined by the Chorley Local Plan 2012 - 2026 and, therefore, conflicts with policy BNE3 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012 - 2026. It is not considered that any material considerations in favour of the development are sufficient to outweigh the presumption against it.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

6. The applicant seeks permission in principle for the erection of up to 2no. dwellings at the site.

REPRESENTATIONS

7. Three representations have been received citing the following grounds of objection:
 - Hill Top Lane is a single track road with no footpaths and is therefore not a suitable access
 - The land is not identified for building in the Local Plan
 - The proposal seeks to remove the current status of the site as Safeguarded Land
 - There are no main services and nowhere for any septic tank drainage waters to go
 - Three previous applications to build have been refused
 - The difficult topography of this site does not lend itself to this type of development
 - The traffic access to Hill Top Lane from either end is problematic and congested so more traffic would make that worse
 - The north west corner of the proposed site was known as the Companies Hole. This was a source of water to top up the Lancaster canal across the road. Some years ago a large tree was uprooted in front of the listed canal tunnel. This uncovered the stone water race which was used to convey the water from the Companies Hole to the canal. Consequently a listed building application is required.
 - Flooding would increase
 - There are several mature trees on this site which need protection
 - Although not strictly a planning matter, other land owners have stated that they will not give permission for the surface water and treated foul water to be discharged into the disused canal which is under their ownership.

CONSULTATIONS

8. United Utilities: Have responded to provide advice to the applicant to assist them should they gain permission in principle and wish to then apply for technical details consent.
9. Whittle-le-Woods Parish Council: Have responded to object to the proposal for the following reasons:
 - The route to the site is a narrow single-track road with no pedestrian footpath and is therefore not safe
 - Traffic access to Hill top Lane from either end is problematic and the proposal will make this worse
 - The land is not identified for building in the Local Plan and should therefore be refused until such time as the land is included in the Local Plan
 - Three previous applications to build have been refused
 - The difficult topography of this site does not lend itself to this type of development
 - The north west corner of the proposed site was known as the 'Companies Hole'. This was a source of water to top up the Lancaster canal across the road. Some years ago a large tree was uprooted in front of the Listed canal tunnel. This uncovered the stone water race which was used to convey the water from the 'Companies Hole' to the canal. This would therefore require a Listed building application.
 - There are approximately 20 mature trees on this site which need protection and should be the subject of TPO's

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

10. Paragraph 012 of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) on Permission in Principle, states that *“the scope of permission in principle is limited to location, land use and amount of development. Issues relevant to these ‘in principle’ matters should be considered at the permission in principle stage. Other matters should be considered at the technical*

details consent stage. In addition, local authorities cannot list the information they require for applications for permission in principle in the same way they can for applications for planning permission.”

11. The previous refusal of planning permission at this site is a material consideration in the determination of this application, but there has been a significant change in policy considerations since the refusal of the application, as explained below.

The Development Plan

12. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides that if regard is to be had to the development plan for any determination then that determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
13. The Development Plan comprises the adopted Central Lancashire Core Strategy (2012) and the adopted Chorley Local Plan 2012- 2026.
14. The Central Lancashire Core Strategy was adopted in July 2012 and covers the three neighbouring authorities of Chorley, South Ribble and Preston. The three authorities are a single Housing Market Area (HMA).
15. Core Strategy Policy 4 sets out the minimum housing requirements for the plan area and is assessed later within this report.
16. The site forms a very small section of a vastly larger area of safeguarded land, protected by policy BNE3 of the Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026, known as BNE3.10 'West of M61, Whittle-le-Woods' which covers land between Whittle-Le-Woods and the M61. Policy BNE3 indicates that development other than that permitted in the countryside whether Green Belt or Area of Other Open Countryside will not be permitted as shown on the policies map.

Other Material Considerations

17. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is a key material consideration. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. There are three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives). There are three objectives to sustainable development set out at paragraph 8 and it is fundamental that development strikes the correct balance between:
 - Environmental - the protection of our natural, built and historic environment
 - Economic - the contribution to building a strong and competitive economy
 - Social - supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities
18. Paragraph 10 of the Framework states that; so that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 11).
19. Paragraph 11 of the Framework states for decision-taking this means:
 - c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or
 - d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
 - a. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
 - b. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.
20. The Footnote (6) to paragraph 11 sets out examples of the type of policies that may indicate development should be refused. Footnote 7 makes clear that the tilted presumption

in favour of sustainable development will apply where a Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

21. Paragraph 59 of the Framework confirms the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes.
22. Paragraph 60 of the Framework reinforces that requirements represent the minimum number of homes needed.
23. Paragraph 73 of the Framework requires Local Planning Authorities to maintain a supply of deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirement set out in adopted strategies or against their local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old. Footnote 37 states in circumstances where strategic policies are more than five years old, five year housing land supply should be calculated against Local Housing Need calculated using the Government standard methodology, unless those strategic policies have been reviewed and found not to need updating.

Housing land supply

24. The following planning appeal decisions are of relevance.

Land adjacent to Blainscough Hall, Blainscough Lane, Coppull Decision APP/D2320/W/21/3275691

25. On the 3 February 2022 a decision was issued for the appeal for Land adjacent to Blainscough Hall, Blainscough Lane, Coppull. The appeal was allowed and outline planning permission was granted for the erection of up to 123 dwellings (including 30% affordable housing) with public open space provision, structural planting and landscaping and vehicular access points from Grange Drive.
26. The main issues in the appeal were:
 - Whether or not the Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land, having particular regard to the development plan, relevant national policy and guidance, the housing need or requirement in Chorley and the deliverability of the housing land supply;
 - Whether or not the most important policies of the development plan for determining the appeal are out of date, having particular regard to the 5 year housing land supply position and relevant national policy;
 - Whether this, or any other material consideration, would justify the proposed development on safeguarded land at this time.
 - Whether or not there are adequate secondary school places to serve the development.
27. In respect of the Housing Requirement in Chorley:
28. The Decision Letter includes an assessment of Core Strategy policy 4 (which sets out the minimum housing requirements for the plan area) in the context of Paragraph 74 of the Framework, and whether the policy has been reviewed and found not to require updating. It also considers whether the introduction of the standard method in itself represents a significant change in circumstances that renders Core Strategy policy 4 out of date with reference to the PPG (paragraph 062).
29. The Decision Letter concludes that it is appropriate to calculate the housing requirement against local housing need using the standard method due to the significant difference between the local housing need figure and the housing requirement in policy 4 amounting to a significant change in circumstances which renders Policy 4 out of date.
30. With regards to the appropriate housing requirement figure to use when calculating the housing land supply position of the authority, the Blainscough Hall Inspector, therefore, sets

out that the standard method should be used. Applying this to the Council's current supply results in a housing land supply position between 2.4 and 2.6 years.

31. The Inspector concluded that as such the Council can no longer demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land meaning that the tilted balance, and presumption in favour of sustainable development was, therefore, engaged under paragraph 11(d) of the Framework.

Land to the East of Tincklers Lane, Tincklers Lane, Ecclestone PR7 5QY Appeal A Ref: APP/D2320/W/21/3272310

Land to the North of Town Lane, Town Lane, Whittle-Le-Woods PR6 8AG Appeal B Ref: APP/D2320/W/21/3272314

32. On the 18 February 2022 decisions were issued for the above appeals. Appeal A was allowed and outline planning permission was granted for the construction of up to 80 dwellings with all matters reserved aside from vehicular access from Doctors Lane. Appeal B was dismissed on grounds of highway safety.

33. The main issues in the appeals were:

- Appeal A: Whether or not the proposal integrates satisfactorily with the surrounding area with particular regard to patterns of movement and connectivity Appeal B: The effect of the proposal on highway safety including accessibility of the appeal site.
- Whether or not the Council is able to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land;
- Whether or not the most important policies of the development plan are out of date; and,
- Whether any adverse effects, including conflict with the development plan as a whole, would be outweighed by other material considerations.

34. In respect of housing land supply:

35. The Inspector for the conjoined appeals assessed Core Strategy Policy 4 against Paragraph 74 of the Framework which requires the local planning authority to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of 5 years' worth of housing against their requirement as set out in adopted strategic policies, or against their local housing need when strategic policies are more than five years old. The Core Strategy is more than five years old.
36. The Inspector considered MOU1 to have constituted a review of Core Strategy Policy 4 and was an up-to-date assessment of need at that point in time but that the situation moved on considerably since it was signed.
37. Paragraph 44 of the Inspector's report notes that national guidance indicates local housing need will have considered to have changed significantly where a plan was adopted prior to the standard method being implemented based on a number that is significantly below the number generated by the standard method. The implications for Chorley would result in an annual requirement of 564 dwellings and the CS figure would be significantly below this. In this instance, Chorley's local housing need has changed significantly.
38. The Inspector noted that the standard method figure is particularly influenced by the level of development in the area between 2009 and 2014 but considers that this does not necessarily render the standard method itself as invalid. Any proposed redistribution of standard method figures for the Central Lancashire authorities, such as MOU2, would need to be considered at an examination.
39. The Inspector considered oversupply and the delivery rates of housing, which was weighted towards the early years of the plan period. However, the requirement in Policy 4 itself is not expressed as an overall amount to be met over the plan period. Policy 4 does not refer to any potential oversupply despite the known potential of Buckshaw Village contributing to

growth in Chorley and it clearly states that it is a minimum annual requirement. (paragraph 49)

40. Paragraph 50 of the Inspector's report states: *"the inclusion of oversupply against Policy 4 would reduce the requirement for Chorley to just over 100 dwellings per annum. This would be considerably below anything which has been permitted in previous years in the area and would even be below the redistributed standard method figures for Chorley in MOU2. I consider it would be artificially low and would in greater probability, lead to significantly reducing not only the supply of market housing but also affordable housing within the area. It would thus run counter to the objective of the Framework to boost the supply of housing and to paragraph 74 of the same, which seeks to maintain the supply and delivery of new homes."*
41. The Inspector concludes at paragraph 51 of the report that; *"in the circumstances before me having regard to both MOU1 and MOU2, I conclude that the situation has changed significantly for Chorley in respect of local housing need and that Policy 4 is out of date. The standard method is the appropriate method for calculating housing need in Chorley. It is agreed between the parties that a 5% buffer should be applied. In terms of sites which contribute to the housing land supply within Chorley, there is a very narrow area of dispute between the two main parties which relates to only 2 sites and amounts to 116 dwellings. This is a marginal number that has little effect on the result in respect of the requirement. Accordingly, against the application of the standard method there would be less than three years supply of housing land in Chorley, and I conclude that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites."*

**Land south of Parr Lane, Eccleston
Decision APP/D2320/W/21/3284702**

42. On the 17 March 2022 a decision was issued for the appeal for Land south of Parr Lane, Eccleston. The appeal was allowed and outline planning permission was granted for up to 34 dwellings and associated infrastructure on land south of Parr Lane, Eccleston, Lancashire in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01193/OUTMAJ, dated 4 November 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions.
43. Following the LPAs withdrawal of the reasons for refusal of the application, based upon the LPA not having a 5-year housing land supply as born out through recent appeal decisions, the main issue in the appeal was whether there were any material considerations that would justify dismissing the appeal.
44. The Inspector concluded the following with regards to housing land supply:

"Framework paragraph 11d indicates that where the most important policies for the determination of a proposal are out-of-date, (which includes applications for housing, where the LPA cannot show a 5-year HLS), permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework taken as a whole; the tilted balance.

The most important policies for determining this appeal are CS Policies 1 and 4 and LP Policy BNE3. Whilst the proposal would be consistent with CS Policy 1, it would conflict with LP Policy BNE3, safeguarding land for future development. The LPA accepts that it cannot show a 5-year HLS and as such CS Policy 4 and LP Policy BNE3 are out-of-date. Taking the development plan as a whole, the most important policies for determining this appeal are out-of-date and the tilted balance applies.

The proposal would provide for up to 34 dwellings of which 35%, would be affordable homes (CS Policy 7). Given the absence of a 5-year HLS, the proposal would make, albeit a modest one, a material contribution to meeting local housing needs. As a benefit this attracts significant weight. The development would secure economic benefits through construction investment and the contribution future occupants would make to the local economy. These benefits attract moderate weight. The site has limited biodiversity value

and the development has the potential to provide biodiversity net gain. This is a benefit of limited weight. Given my assessment above, the harm arising from the conflict with LP Policy BNE3 is significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole.”

**Land off Carrington Road, Adlington
Decision APP/D2320/W/21/3284692**

45. On the 17 March 2022 a decision was issued on the above referenced appeal. The appeal was allowed and outline planning permission was granted for residential development of up to 25 dwellings on land off Carrington Road, Adlington, Lancashire PR7 4JE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01200/OUTMAJ, dated 5 November 2020, and the plans submitted with it.
46. Following the LPAs withdrawal of the reasons for refusal of the application, based upon the LPA not having a 5-year housing land supply as born out through recent appeal decisions, the main issue in the appeal was whether there were any material considerations that would justify dismissing the appeal.
47. The Inspector concluded the following with regards to housing land supply:

“Framework paragraph 11d indicates that where the most important policies for the determination of a proposal are out-of-date, (which includes applications for housing, where the LPA cannot show a 5-year HLS), permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework taken as a whole, the tilted balance.

The most important policies for determining this appeal are CS Policies 1 and 4 and LP Policy BNE3. Whilst the proposal would be consistent with CS Policy 1, it would conflict with LP Policy BNE3, safeguarding land for future development. The LPA accepts that it cannot show a 5-year HLS and as such CS Policy 4 and LP Policy BNE3 are out-of-date. Taking the development plan as a whole, the most important policies for determining this appeal are out-of-date and the tilted balance applies.

The proposal would provide for up to 25 dwellings of which 30%, would be affordable homes (CS Policy 7). Given the absence of a 5-year HLS, the proposal would make, albeit a modest one, a material contribution to meeting local housing needs. As a benefit this attracts significant weight. The development would secure economic benefits through construction investment and the contribution future occupants would make to the local economy. These benefits attract moderate weight. The site has limited biodiversity value and the development has the potential to provide biodiversity net gain. This is a benefit of limited weight. Given my assessment above, the harm arising from the conflict with LP Policy BNE3 is significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole.”

Summary - the tilted balance

48. Paragraph 11 d (ii) of The Framework essentially comes into play whereby the most important policies for determining an application are out of date, then planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
49. Policy 4 of the Central Lancashire Core Strategy and policy BNE3 of the Chorley Council Local Plan are the most important policies for determining the planning application.
50. At 1 April 2021 there was a total supply of 1,504 (net) deliverable dwellings which is a 2.7 year deliverable housing supply over the period 2021 – 2026 based on the annual housing requirement of 547 dwellings which includes a 5% buffer. Chorley does not have a five-year deliverable supply of housing plus 5% buffer and the shortfall is significant. Significant

weight should therefore be attached to the delivery of housing provided by this proposal and that it is proposed to be a 100% affordable housing scheme.

51. The Borough cannot show a 5-year HLS and as such Core Strategy Policy 4 is out-of-date.
52. Paragraph 143(d) of the Framework sets out that when defining Green Belt boundaries, plans should make clear that safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following an update to a plan which proposes the development. Policy BNE3 is consistent with the Framework in this respect. However, the boundaries of the settlements and safeguarded land to which they relate were established based on meeting the housing requirement in Policy 4 of the CS, which is out of date. This means that Policy BNE3 is also out of date.
53. Taking the development plan as a whole, the most important policies for determining this appeal are out-of-date and the tilted balance applies.
54. In accordance with the Framework, planning permission should be granted for the proposal, unless:
 - c. the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or
 - d. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

Emerging Central Lancashire Local Plan

55. Once adopted, the Central Lancashire Local Plan (CLLP) will replace the existing joint Core Strategy and Chorley Local Plan. The CLLP is at an early stage of preparation and consultation on Issues and Options closed in February 2020.
56. The emerging CLLP will look at the distribution of new homes and the CLLP will be informed by an evidence base including a Housing Need and Demand Study, the results of which will also help to inform the future distribution of housing across the Plan area.

Central Lancashire Local Plan: Site Assessment work

57. Three call for sites exercises have been completed to date for the CLLP. The results from Call for sites 1 and 2 were consulted on as part of the Issues and Options Consultation which ran between November 2019 and Feb 2020, during this time, a further window was opened for addition site suggestions (Call for sites 3).
58. Work to assess the sites commenced in February 2021 following completion of Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). This was undertaken in line with Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) methodology.
59. Officers in Chorley, South Ribble and Preston Councils finished their initial assessment of the sites in January 2021, and their findings were collated by the CLLP Team into the SHELAA database. This work will also include undertaking Integrated Assessment (IA) and Habitats Regulation assessment (HRA) and viability assessment of the sites, and will bring in findings of the SFRA as well as consultation responses on the specific sites from Statutory Consultees and local residents.
60. The direction of growth and development of a spatial strategy for the area is also in early development, with the Councils starting to look at the level of growth likely to be needed over the plan period and how the plan should look to direct this. There is still work to be done on this, including testing the emerging options in terms of transport and other infrastructure needs as they develop.
61. It is important to note that until all these stages of work have been completed, no decision on sites to be taken forward through the CLLP can be made.

Other issues

62. Issues such as heritage, tree loss, flood risk, site topography, highway safety and traffic congestion raised within the representations and by the Parish Council are technical matters that could only be assessed as part of any future detailed consent application. They fall outside of what the Council can assess as part of this current application, as set out in the above paragraph from the NPPG.

Applying the tilted balance

63. Paragraph 11. d) ii. of the Framework indicates that, where the most important development plan policies for determining the application are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole; the tilted balance.
64. As previously noted in this report, the scope of a permission in principle application is limited to location, land use and amount of development. Other matters such as highway safety, potential harm to amenity, heritage assets, trees etc. can only be considered at the technical details consent stage.
65. With regards to the amount of development, whilst some changes would be required to ground levels to form a development platform, it is considered that it is possible that two dwellings of relatively modest scale could be adequately located on the application site with space for vehicle manoeuvring / parking, gardens and landscaping. The scale and type of any such dwelling would however be constrained by the site levels, trees and landscape characteristics.
66. The adverse impacts of the development relate solely to its conflict with policy BNE3 in locational and land use terms. Whilst BNE3 is broadly consistent with the Framework it is also out of date as it safeguards land based on the housing requirement in Policy 4 which is also out of date. The conflict with policy BNE3 is therefore only afforded limited weight in the planning balance.
67. In terms of benefits, the applicant has identified economic benefits from the creation of work in the construction industry, estate agencies and furniture sales and increasing the local population which will increase the expenditure available to local businesses and tax income for the local authority from Council Tax.
68. Social benefits identified by the applicant cover aspects of contributing towards the shortfall in housing land supply in the Borough.
69. The applicant is of the view that the site is in a sustainable location between an allocated housing site to the east and existing dwellings to the west. They identify that the site is located approximately 100m to the east of the built up area of Whittle-Le-Woods, identified as an Urban Local Service Centre in the Central Lancashire Local Plan, containing a variety of services including food store, village hall, doctor surgery, pharmacy, primary school etc. Proximity to the M6 and M61 motorways is also noted, along with bus stops within 200m of the site providing access to Chorley Town Centre and other settlements. Reference is also made to Outline planning permission ref. 12/01134/OUTMAJ for 85 dwellings on adjacent land.
70. The proposal would boost the supply of housing, albeit on a small scale, in a situation where there is no five-year supply and, as a result, moderate weight can be given to the social benefits of the proposal. It is considered that the economic benefits for proposal would be minimal and so can be afforded limited weight.
71. It is not considered that the adverse impacts of the proposed development relating to the conflict with policy BNE3 of the Local Plan would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits of the proposal. As such, the proposal is recommended for approval.

Community Infrastructure Levy

72. The Chorley CIL Infrastructure Charging Schedule provides a specific amount for development. The CIL Charging Schedule was adopted on 16 July 2013 and charging commenced on 1 September 2013. CIL Liability is not calculated on applications for Permission in Principle but will be CIL Liable on approval of the technical details (if approved).

CONCLUSION

73. The proposal is recommended for approval as the adverse impacts of the proposal do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic and social benefits it would deliver.

RELEVANT HISTORY OF THE SITE

Ref: 20/01202/PIP **Decision:** REFPIP **Decision Date:** 9 March 2021
Description: Permission in principle application for the erection of up to 2no. dwellings

RELEVANT POLICIES: In accordance with s.38 (6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), the application is to be determined in accordance with the development plan (the Central Lancashire Core Strategy, the Adopted Chorley Local Plan 2012-2026 and adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance), unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Consideration of the proposal has had regard to guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the development plan. The specific policies/guidance considerations are contained within the body of the report.

Suggested conditions

1. The proposed development must be begun not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans below:

Title	Plan Ref	Received On
Site Location Plan	1000/HTW/LP	21 February 2022

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.