PLANNING STATEMENT IN RESPECT OF PROPOSED HOUSING

DEVELOPMENT (PIP)

AT

LAND AT FOREST ROAD, WOKINGHAM RG40 5SA

MLP REF: FR/25/188

MAY 2026

Mark Leedale Planning

Chartered Town Planning Consultant

20 Hurlands Place,
Farnham,
Surrey GU9 9HX
01252 718855
markleedale4@gmail.com

Principal – Mark Leedale M.Sc; Dip TP; B.Ed (Hons) MRTPI

Contents

1.0 Introduction
2.0 Planning history & pre-application response
3.0 Relevant planning policy
4.0 Applying planning policy
5.0 The assessment of PIP

1.0 Introduction

1.1. This statement sets out relevant planning policies and the application of those policies in seeking to establish Planning in Principle (PIP). In so doing, the following conclusions are reached:

- The proposal would ordinarily be considered in the context of the relevant development plan policies and all other material planning considerations, in so far as they relate to the principle of development and housing delivery.
- It has been conceded by the local authority that they cannot at this time demonstrate a deliverable 5-year housing land supply and in fact the shortall is significant. In such circumstances, policies of the development plan in so far as they relate to housing provision will be considered to be out of date and the 'tilted balance' takes effect where a positive approach to housing delivery will be taken.
- The issue for consideration is whether when assessed against the policies in the Framework, the adverse impacts associated with the proposal, would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits arising from housing provision.
- It is demonstrated that no such significant or demonstrable adverse impact can be identified or would be resolvable at TDC stage. In consequence, the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied
- In the Annual Monitoring Report, it is set out that windfall development continues to make a valuable contribution to housing land supply, and this proposal is a case in point.
- The application is accompanied by a PEA which identifies that there are no major constraints on development, notwithstanding the needs for further survey work at Technical Details Consent (TDC) stage. This also includes reference to BNG matters which are excluded from the PIP stage requirements.

- On the locational characteristics of the site, it si conceded that it is not linked by public transport. Nevertheless, it is a point of agreement between the parties that it is not remote and can readily be accessed to day-to-day needs and other infrastructure facilities. It is not an unsustainable location.
- The provision of affordable housing is one which relies on the correct application of national and development plan policy. It is concluded that the policies to which the local authority refers are not relevant and this is nota rural exception site or a major development. As such the matter of affordable housing is not relevant to the consideration.
- Matters of siting, design, external appearance, access arrangements and landscaping are reserved for future consideration as an application for TDC. At this time the effect on residential amenity in so far as it relates to neighbours and future occupiers will be considered, although the separation distances are shown to provide a satisfactory relationship.
- The application is accompanied by indicative plans so as to demonstrate to the decision maker the general form of development which could be readily accommodated on the site. It is an extension of the linear form of development and when seen in this context, it is acceptable.

2.1. In light of the foregoing, the proposal represents sustainable development which accords with the relevant development plan policies and PIP should be granted.

2.0 Planning history & pre-application response

2.1. The identified land B was the subject of an application for an agricultural barn which was refused under reference 213237. The basis of the refusal was:

1. The perceived lack of agricultural justification
2. The perception of harm as a result of the scale and effect of built development.

2.2. Plainly, the proposals placed before the local authority now, are materially different to the 2021 proposal and require fresh consideration.

2.3. As is encouraged in the Framework, the applicant has undertaken pre-application discussions which usefully frame the key considerations and the response is implicit in this application. Details of the response are set out below.

3.0 Planning policy

3.1. The relevant development plan policies are set out in the adopted Local Plan, as follows:

- CP1 – the generic policy of, inter alia, seeking to provide sustainable development.
- CP3 – General principles for development
- CP5 - Housing mix
- CP7 – The safeguarding of biodiversity interests
- CP9 – Affordable housing
- CP11 – Development outside of the development limits

3.2. The adopted MDD DPD also forms part of the development plan, and the relevant policies are as follows:

- CC01 - The presumption in favour of sustainable development
- CC03 – Trees and landscaping
- CC04 - Sustainable design and construction
- CC05 – Housing mix
- CC07 – Parking
- CC09 – Development and flood risk
- CC10 – Sustainable drainage
- TB07 – Internal space standards
- TB21 – Landscape character
- TB23 – Safeguarding biodiversity interest in accordance with CP7

3.3. In terms of national guidance, the 2024 Framework is relevant, and the key sections are as follows:

11 Sustainable development
65 The provision of affordable housing
170 Safeguarding and enhancing biodiversity interests.
188 Distinguishing between local and national landscape designations and the weight to be afforded to them.

3.4. In respect of 11(d) it is important that where a local plan is out of date, the 'tilted balance' should be engaged as follows:

d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date[8], granting permission unless:

i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance[7] provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or

ii. 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, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination[9].

3.5. In this case, the 5-year land supply position renders the local plan as being out of date and what is known as the 'tilted balance' is engaged.

3.6. The applicant undertook a pre-application submission as is encouraged by Framework24 (40 onwards). This set out a useful response which identified the following issues:

- The lpa has a significant shortfall of housing land provision and deliverable sites.
- The local authority has a shortfall of affordable housing
- The site is not isolated from other housing.
- Whilst landscape impact is material, the proposals represent a logical extension of the linear pattern of development.
- There is a preference for shared vehicular access points and adopted standards for parking provision would need to be met.
- The effect on ecology and the ancient woodland will need to be assessed.
- The site lies within the 7km distance of the TBHSPA for major development.
- The thresholds for affordable housing need to be considered.
- There needs to be an assessment for SUDS suitability.
- Sustainable construction is material and needs to be submitted.

3.7. Whilst of positive intent the response also states that whilst development "could" be acceptable, it is noted that the occupiers of the houses would be reliant on the private car in light of the dearth of public transport links. This is a matter to which reference is set out below.

3.8. The following section applies these policies to consideration of this development proposal.

4.0. Applying planning policy

4.1. In considering the relevant planning policies, we refer to the following:

1. Is the development acceptable in principle?
2. What are the material effects on ecology and the landscape?
3. Is the development site remote in the terms of the Framework?
4. Is the affordable housing policy relevant and applicable?
5. Would the development significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits of housing provision?
6. Are there any other material planning considerations?

The principle of development

4.2. In considering the principle of development both the lpa in pre-application discussions and the applicant, recognise that the site is situated outside of a settlement as defined policies of the development plan.

4.3. The lpa response refers to the 'titled balance' and the concept of isolation in the terms of *Braintree* (*Braintree DC v SSCLG [2018] Civ 610*) and concludes that the site is not *'far away from other places, buildings and people'* although there are issues pertaining to reliance on the private car to which we return below.

4.4. In regard to the matter of physical cohesion, it is noted that there is a group of dwellings and other buildings in a linear fashion along Forest Road and this proposal is a 'tail end' of this pattern, subject to matters of design and visual effect on the wider landscape. This is shown on the indicative layout proposals and we return to this matter below in the context of visual effect.

4.5. Thus, the planning policy test in terms of principle is whether any adverse impacts of granting permission for much needed housing would result in adverse impacts which would significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits of housing provision when assessed against the policies of the Framework when taken as a whole.

4.6. The effects, ("harm") are ones to be considered against:

1. The landscape impact
2. The effects on protected ecology
3. The perceived remoteness and reliance on the private car

The effects on ecology and the landscape

4.7. It is acknowledged and accepted that all development will have some impact on landscape and the undeveloped character of that landscape. The degree of harm is a matter of the form of built development and the status of the landscape.

4.8. The landscape which is impacted is not of national importance and Framework24 at paragraph 188 draws the distinction along with the consequential weight to be afforded in decision making.

4.9. At the present time the landscape is designated as a Green Route in the development plan (CC03) and the landscape has no development plan designation beyond the countryside (CP11). The Landscape Character Appraisal identifies the site as falling within the Ashridge Clay Farmed Lowland and the key matter is set out as being:

'A simple farmed landscape dominated by open arable fields and some pasture, with mature hedgerow trees marking former hedge lines. Wooded horizons created by large deciduous blocks line a subtle ridgeline, cut by a network of small tributary streams. Settlement is focused on ribbon development along the local roads, scattered farmsteads and manor houses. The strong rural character is only affected by the M4 and A329 (M) which cut through the area'

4.10. It is further acknowledged in the pre-application response, that the emerging Local Plan (LPU) is at an early stage of preparation and is afforded limited weight. It is helpfully conceded by Officer's:

As a whole, the LPU is still given limited weight despite its advance stage of preparation. This is owing to unresolved objections to a great number of the policies contained within it.

4.11. Whilst the form of development is not detailed at PIP stage, the indicative plans show an extension of the linear form which would retain and supplement the Green Route whilst allowing for some removal to satisfy highway visibility and access to the dwellings. As is pointed out in the pre-application response, joint/communal access is preferred and this is shown in a different manner to the pre-application proposals, where individual access points were envisaged.

4.12. At TDC stage the effect on the Green Route can be assessed in detail. Suffice to say that the straight configuration of Forest Road will allow for good visibility when egress from the site is taken and turning into the dwellings will be safeguarded by this visibility.

4.13. In respect of the wider landscape, we have regard to the Character Assessment and the pre-application response. The latter recognises that the development proposals are a 'tailend' to the existing built form and will materially impact on the open countryside and undeveloped character of the open fields. Nevertheless, it states:

The indicative layout broadly respects the character and rhythm of the linear development which primarily sit on a staggered building line within relatively narrow plots.

4.14. We concur with this approach and the photographs below demonstrate the nature of the surroundings in which context the development will be seen.

1

Views along Forest Road from the west show the linear frontage housing development to which the proposals will relate and replicate

2

The linear housing on the south side of Forest Road is also a reference point of built development which the proposals will relate

3

From within the land there is a clear physical link to the housing on the north side of Forest Road as a cluster of development

4

The retention of the Green Route is a planning policy of relevance and will further serve to contain the proposed housing

4.15. This is a circumstance of planning balance where the provision of required housing land supply, must properly be set against the inevitable impact on the landscape character. The status of the landscape is material and the degree of harm is one which can be reconciled with this matter and the Green Route designation.

4.16. On this basis, we say that the impact would not significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework when taken as a whole.

4.17. The other aspect of landscape and ecological value is the proximity of the designated ancient woodland which sits to the north of the site. It is shown that the 15m buffer is achievable and the development proposal is deliverable whilst retaining this safeguarding zone – cf. Framework24 193(c).

4.18. Turning to Ecology, it is likely that the proposed changes in the legislation relating to BNG will result in an exemption for sites of this size. At PIP stage the BNG Metric is not required and this matter will be considered as part of the TDC approach with landscaping forming a consideration.

4.19. This aside, the PEA which is submitted with this application draws the following conclusions:

The survey methodology included a desk study (comprising a TVERC 1km data search) and a field survey (using UKHab Classification). The desk study revealed that whilst the application site is not statutorily designated for its wildlife interest and therefore is not currently recognised as being of international, national or county level conservation significance, the on-site ancient woodland along the northern boundary forms the edge of the Tippens Wood Local Wildlife Site (LWS). The site falls within the Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) for the Wykery Copse SSSI, but the planning proposals do not fall into any categories specified in the IRZ for the site and therefore no impacts are likely. No adverse effects are anticipated on the other nearby locally designated sites.

4.20. In summary, whilst there will be an impact on landscape character, the position within the hierarchy (Framework 188) is material and the acceptance of the replication of the linear pattern of built development is helpful. There is no ecological constraint which would fundamentally restrict development and this includes the buffer zone to ancient woodland which is shown to be achievable. There will likely be a requirement for further surveys at TDC stage and, at this time, a BNG appraisal and Metric.

4.21. On the planning balance and whilst details will follow at TDC stage, there is no significant or demonstrable harm to landscape or ecology which would render the harm as unacceptable when set against the advantages of housing provision.

<u>Remoteness in the terms of Framework24</u>

4.22. As is set out above, the pre-application response refers to the concept of remoteness and relevant case law – *Braintree*. In the terms of Framework24 the proposals do not fulfil any of the criteria set out at paragraph 84, although the proximity of other housing is material in light of the housing land supply position.

4.23. It is a matter of fact that as it stands, the site is not served by public transport and reliance on the private car is one which will pervade. In light of this, the proximity of service provision is relevant to the approach in so far as the respective distances to this are such that the site is not remote and accessibility, which is relative, may reasonably be described as being good. As is detailed below, it is commensurate with that of other housing development in the Borough and the SDL's.

4.24. In making this assessment we have regard to the day-to-day requirements of the prospective residents and how they can be met. These include trips to work, schools, retailing, health and recreational facilities. Additionally, the proximity to restaurants/public houses and railway stations are considered.

4.25. Work related trips are difficult to measure and it is widely acknowledged that the propensity to work from home has increased following the Pandemic. There is also commuting out with the Borough which includes Reading and London. For this reason, the proximity to railway stations is material.

4.26. The table below shows the relative distance to various infrastructure which would reasonably be considered to be important to meeting day-to-day needs for the residents of the proposed dwellings.

Facility	Distance (miles)	Journey time (car)	Journey time (cycle)
Railway Stations			
Bracknell	3.6	11 minutes	20 minutes
Wokingham	2.8	8 minutes	16 minutes
Twyford	4.9	10 minutes	26 minutes
Retail centre			
Binfield	0.9	2 minutes	4 minutes
Bracknell	3.2	10 minutes	17 minutes
Wokingham	3.1	8 minutes	18 minutes
Food supermarket Wokingham	2.5	7 minutes	14 minutes
GP Surgery			
Binfield	1.6	6 minutes	10 minutes
Kings Academy (hub)	1.6	7 minutes	10 minutes
Primary school			
Binfield	0.9	4 minutes	4 minutes
All Saints	1.8	4 minutes	10 minutes
Keephatch	1.8	5 minutes	11 minutes
Secondary School			
Emmbrook	2.7	6 minutes	14 minutes
St Crispin's	2.0	6 minutes	12 minutes
King's Academy	1.6	7 minutes	10 minutes
Public houses			
The Warren	0.6	1 minute	3 minutes
Restaurants – town centre			
Wokingham	2.5	7 minutes	14 minutes
Bracknell	3.5	11 minutes	17 minutes
Recreational facilities			
Parks/formal open space (Cantley)	2.2	5 minutes	13 minutes
Recreation centres/swimming pool Wokingham/Bracknell	3.2/3.8	10/14 minutes	18/21 minutes
Binfield Foxley Fields, tennis and cricket club	1.0	2.0 minutes	4 minutes

4.27. As a starting point, the servicing of dwellings by delivery, postal and aspects such as refuse disposal will not be significantly altered by the additional housing. That is to say, these services are already in place and aspects such as supermarket or mail order delivery will likely rely on joint trips so as to benefit from economies of scale and cost efficiency. This would not be the case for a limited development which was distanced from the cluster of housing.

4.28. Where trips to food supermarkets are preferred, the table shows that the residents may visit central Wokingham where there is a choice of suppliers. In reality those with younger children would usually undertake irregular trips to food supermarkets so that they benefit from bulk purchase and time saving. It is preferential to make such trips by car and transporting heavy shopping on public transport is impractical. Thus, the existence of a public transport link is largely irrelevant for this activity although residents working in a town centre such as Wokingham or Bracknell may benefit from joint trips for food shopping.

4.29. Binfield centre is a short distance from the application site and has a Post Office, chemist, co-operative grocery store and bakers as well as coffee shops. There is a library in this location and each would readily serve day-to-day grocery and other needs.

4.30. The proximity of railway stations is shown and there is a choice of relatively proximate provision to Reading, Waterloo and Paddington (Twyford) should this be required for commuting. It is perfectly possible to access railway stations by cycle and the time implications are shown. There is secure provision at Wokingham, Bracknell and Twyford and South-West Trains have a programme of improvement and the provision of Cycle Hubs. Moreover, the cost saving on parking fees influences modal choice.

4.31. The increasing propensity for Cargo Bikes and electric cycles which can accommodate small children and light shopping transportation. These are increasingly used by young families for primary school purposes and as is shown, are proximate to the proposed housing site.

4.32. Access to secondary school provision is dictated by catchment areas and the allocation of places. It is shown that the schools in Wokingham (St Crispin's and Emmbrook) are accessible and unlike a very high-density urban area there will be some degree of travel as a result. It is therefore inevitable that there will be cycle and/or car-based journeys to and from these schools. It is clear that King's Academy is oversubscribed and at present the catchment area does not cover the proposed housing site.

4.33. GP and health services are located in Binfield and are readily available to residents of the proposed housing. There is a park in Binfield as well as identified formal recreation facilities which are accessible by cycling.

4.34. In setting out this case we have regard to the close proximity of Binfield as a local centre which is described in the development plan (BFBC) as follows:

> **5.16** Binfield provides a range of basic facilities such as convenience stores and services within a Local Centre that meet the everyday needs of local residents and people living in hamlets and scattered development in the surrounding rural area. Whilst a number of sites were allocated through the SALP in the Parish of Binfield, the largest form urban extensions to the wider built-up area of Bracknell. However, due to their proximity to the settlement of Binfield, supporting infrastructure being provided as part of these developments is likely to be accessed by residents of Binfield. One example is the new community and health hub adjacent to Kings Academy School. One smaller site (south of Forest Road/east of Cheney Close) is being allocated through this Plan which will form a small extension to the settlement of Binfield. This will add choice and variety in the housing market in this part of the Borough and help maintain the vitality of the community.

4.35. It follows that whilst outside of a settlement boundary and lacking public transport facilities, the proposed site will allow ready access to facilities which may reasonably be accessed. In practice, there is a propensity to use the private car for some of these needs whilst there is an ongoing growth in cycling which can and is being used by many residents. It is fair to say that this use is less likely in winter periods when inclement weather discourages everyday use. Nevertheless, there are alternatives to the private car.

4.36. In setting out this appraisal, it is considered that residents occupying houses in the SDL's of North and South Wokingham and Arborfield would likely have very similar experiences to those living in the proposed housing on this site. That is to say, they would use a car for certain activities and cycle for others. Whilst there are some bus services to the town centres this is a factor of convenience and practicality as to modal choice. We say that the housing is not remote or isolated from day-to-day needs and this is to be weighed in the planning balance.

Affordable housing

4.37. In the pre-application response, the local authority refers to policy CP9 and concedes that this is not complaint with subsequent Framework policy. In such circumstances the Framework should take precedence and the applicant is of the view that since this is not a major development the policy is no longer applicable or relevant to the consideration. For ease of reference paragraph 65 of Framework24 states:

Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer). To support the re-use of affordable housing contribution due should be reduced by a proportionate amount

4.38. CP9, CP5 and TB05 variously refer to housing mix and affordable housing provision. The Core Strategy (January 2010) and MDDDPD (February 2014) are both superseded by policy in Framework24 and plainly the development is not a "major" category.

4.39. In setting out that this is a rural area the local authority refers to the policy of 5 or more dwellings *or* sites of 0.16 hectares. They say that the land in within a rural area and CP9 is relevant.

4.40. Policy CP states, inter alia:

Affordable housing on rural exception sites will be permitted adjoining the Development Limits of Modest or Limited Development Locations, if a need is demonstrated for residents, workers or other people with family connections within the Parish Council's area

4.41. The fact is that the application site does not adjoin a "development limit" and the policy is not applicable as a rural exception site. As such and whilst recognising affordable need in the Borough, the policy is not relevant to consideration of this application. It is a straightforward case of a lack of housing land supply and consideration of the 'tilted balance', as opposed to a rural exception development solely for affordable housing as an exception to rural area policy.

The tilted balance – significant or demonstrable harm?

4.42. There is plainly a gain in housing and this meets national policy objectives which are widely acknowledged, as is the significant shortfall. Whilst separate applications, the gain of 7 dwellings may reasonably be considered together and in sustainability terms there is a positive economic and social impact in constriction and the provision of housing, respectively.

4.43. In considering the 'tilted balance' there has to be significant or demonstrable harm to resist the housing supply argument. It is shown that there would be no overt material harm to the landscape and it is a material consideration of some weight that this is not of national designation. The local designation which is not part of the development plan or the limited weight attached to the emerging Plan, is one which refers to linear housing development and motorways in farmed character. All development will impact on the landscape and the ameliorative effects can be accentuated through the TDC submission.

4.44. It is further shown that the Green Route whilst disturbed by access points – which are proposed to be shared and limited – will remain largely intact. This is a planning policy objective which can be met and indeed this would further contain development in the wider landscape.

4.45. The impact on the Ancient Woodland to the north is one which requires a buffer zone and this is shown to be achievable and indeed is exceeded so as to safeguard this asset.

4.46. In pre-application correspondence the single 'red flag' which was raised by the local authority is in respect of location and the fact that there are no direct public transport links outside of the application site. It follows that the prospective residents will be reliant on the private car.

4.47. In appraising this matter we have regard to the agreement that the proposed housing is not, in the terms of *Braintree* and the Framework, remote or isolated. This is material and it is shown that journey times to identified infrastructure are short in terms of distance and time. Moreover, it is shown that most of these facilities are within reasonable cycle distance and there is a growth in this mode of transport with electric and cargo cycles becoming increasingly popular. Thus, for example, primary school trips, GP and local shopping which is readily accessible in Binfield to meet day-to-day needs, can be accessed by non-car modes.

4.48. This aside, there is access to main line railway stations serving Reading London Waterloo and Paddington all of which can be accessed by cycling. The respective stations have secure cycle provision.

4.49. On a practical level bulk food retail purchases are either undertaken on a weekly basis by car or are delivered to the door. In this context and as with servicing – refuse, post, mail order deliveries – there is a cluster of housing and additional housing will not require new provision.

4.50. On the planning balance, the locational characteristic of the site is not one which should be declined permission on this basis. It is neither remote nor isolated from infrastructure and is readily accessible to these facilities.

4.51. The other aspect to be weighed in the balance is the environmental impact of development on ecology. The PEA shows that there is no significant constraint or Priority Habitat(s) which would restrict development although additional survey work will be required at TDC stage. The development is not within the 5km regulatory distance which would impact on the TBHSPA and it is not a major development (50 dwellings) where the 7km distance takes effect.

4.52. The site is not the subject of any flood designation and a search of the Environment Agency web site shows that it lies within flood zone 1 with a low risk of surface water or fluvial issues. This includes the climate change allowance.

4.53. On the balance of these matters granting planning permission would not "significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework when taken as a whole".

5.0 <u>The assessment of PIP</u>

5.1. By way of summary, the following matters are set out:

- The proposal falls to be considered in the context of the relevant development plan policies and national policy set out in Framework24. However, the development plan is out of date in so far as it relates to housing land supply and the 'tilted balance' is engaged.

- The local authority properly concede that they cannot demonstrate a deliverable 5-year housing land supply and in fact the shortall is severe. This is a significant matter to be weighed in the planning balance and the weight afforded to housing delivery is accentuated.
- The issue for consideration is whether when assessed against the policies in the Framework, the benefits of housing provision would be significant or demonstrably outweighed by any adverse impacts and against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole.
- It is demonstrated that no such significant or demonstrable adverse impact can be identified and the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied
- In the Annual Monitoring Report, it is set out that windfall development continues to make a valuable contribution to housing land supply, and this proposal is a case in point.
- The application is accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Assessment which identifies that there are no major constraints on development, notwithstanding the needs for further survey work at Technical Details Consent (TDC) stage. The site is not p[art of a national landscape and it has no specific merit in the development plan. The Character Assessment refers to liner residential development in the wider agricultural landscape intersected by motorways. The development proposal, whilst indicative, entirely reflects this character and must be judged in this context.
- The provision of affordable housing is one which relies on the correct application of national and development plan policy. It is concluded that the policies to which the local authority refers are not relevant and this is not a rural exception site or a major development. As such the matter of affordable housing is not relevant to the consideration.
- On the locational characteristics of the site, it si conceded that it is not linked by public transport. Nevertheless, it is a point of agreement between the parties that it is not remote and can readily be accessed to day-to-day needs and other infrastructure facilities. It is not an unsustainable location.

- Matters of siting, design, external appearance, access arrangements and landscaping are reserved for future consideration as an application for TDC. At this time the effect on residential amenity in so far as it relates to neighbours and future occupiers will be considered, although the separation distances are shown to provide a satisfactory relationship.
- The application is accompanied by indicative plans so as to demonstrate to the decision maker the general form of development which could be readily accommodated on the site. It is an extension of the linear form of development and when seen in this context, it is acceptable.

5.2. In light of the foregoing, the proposal represents sustainable development, and a positive PIP decision should be issued so as to enable the provision of required housing land supply.