

SHOREWOOD

HOMES

Benjamin Hindle
Development Management and Compliance
Wokingham Borough Council

By email only

9 February 2026

Dear Mr Hindle

PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE APPLICATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A MAXIMUM OF 7 HOMES (AND A MINIMUM OF 5), INCLUDING FORMATION OF ACCESS FROM BROADWATER LANE ON LAND NORTH OF BROADWATER LAND AND WEST OF HOGMOOR LANE, HURST.

I enclose for your consideration a Permission in Principle (PiP) application comprising the following:

- Application form and fee
- Cover letter which comprises the planning assessment
- Proposed Site Plan (8543 F02) – Radley House Partnership *illustrative plan showing 7 homes*
- Heritage Statement (January 2026) – Asset Heritage
- Arboricultural Implications Report incl. Tree Protection Plan (February 2026) – SJA Trees
- Supplementary Statement on Flood Risk (July 2025) - Simpson TWS

The Permission in Principle (PIP) Application Site

The Application Site bounds Broadwater Lane to the south, and Hogmoor Lane to the east beyond which is established residential properties. To the west and north is retained agricultural land. North-east of the Site is existing housing along Hogmoor Lane. The configuration of the site boundary abuts the boundary of two properties located generally south of the Application Site (between proposed Plots 3 & 4).

For the avoidance of doubt the Application Site is different to the red line boundary of the refused outline application (WBC Reference: 240583, and Planning Inspectorate (PINs) Reference: APP/X0360/W/25/3359898) although the western part of the Application Site falls within the boundary of that previous application site location.

The Scheme Proposal

This is a Permission in Principle (PIP) application that seeks to secure the principle of residential development for a minimum of 5 homes and a maximum of 7 homes.

The PIP consent route has two stages, the first stage being this permission in principle stage, and the second stage being technical details consent when the detailed proposals are assessed. Having regard to the recent planning appeal, to address the reasons for refusal, detailed supporting information in respect of heritage and trees is submitted with this application (as is a supplementary statement on flood risk).

Tel 01962 678528 | Email info@shorewoodhomes.co.uk
shorewoodhomes.co.uk

8a Upper High Street, Winchester, Hampshire, SO23 8UT

Shorewood Homes Ltd is registered in England under company no. 10670389

Relevant Planning History

Of relevance to this PIP application are the following:

- October 2025 – appeal dismissed for an outline application for the erection of 9no. dwellings and associated access on land north of Broadwater Lane, Hurst (WBC Reference: 240583, and PINs Reference: APP/X0360/W/25/3359898).
- January 1999 – appeal dismissed for 5 detached dwellings and garages at Hogmoor Lane, Hurst (PINs Reference: T/APP/X0360/A/98/298932/P9).

Planning Appeal Decision review and response

Further to the planning appeal dismissal on the 17 October 2025 for an Outline application for the proposed erection of 9 dwellings and associated access (APP/X0360/W/25/3359898 & 240583), to assist the determination of this PiP application: it is considered helpful to set out how this application responds to the main issues raised by the determining Inspector.

The following text presents the content of the Appeal Decision Letter in full, with text boxes following each relevant paragraph/section demonstrating how this PiP application scheme proposal positively responds and addresses the salient matters.

2025 Planning Appeal Decision Letter

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Additional plans were submitted by the appellant at the appeal stage. The proposed site plan has been amended to be titled an illustrative site layout plan. An increased buffer zone is shown for T16, the plot 2 double garage is removed, plot 3 and 4 garages are changed to single garages and the plot 5 single garage is removed. The street scene has been re-labelled as illustrative whilst the site access arrangements have been re-labelled as proposed rather than potential.
3. Whilst it is not the purpose of the appeal process to evolve a scheme, the amendments are effectively only minor changes in wording to clarify their intended purpose as well as effectively proposing reductions to the scheme. As such the acceptance of those plans would not represent procedural unfairness to those with an interest in the scheme and I have considered those plans as part of the appeal.
4. The application is made in outline with all matters reserved except for access. Therefore, only the site location plan and plan detailing the access arrangements would form the approved plans. The other plans are illustrative. However, I was advised at the Hearing that those plans should be afforded substantial weight and much of the appellants case is made on the basis of the details of the scheme that are referenced within the illustrative plans. I have therefore considered the proposal on the basis of the scheme shown within the illustrative plans. The site plan shows that each dwelling would be served by one of three shared access points from Broadwater Lane.

Response: The scheme proposed by this application utilises a single point of access.

5. The Council confirmed at the Hearing that it does not consider that the proposal would adversely affect the setting of nearby listed buildings. This is not the view taken by interested parties. The effect of the proposal on the setting of nearby listed buildings has been considered as a main issue.

Main Issues

6. The first main issue is whether Tree T14 can be considered veteran and the effect of the proposal on Trees T14 and T16. The second is the effect of the proposal on the setting of four nearby grade II listed buildings. These are known as Buttercups, Bower Cottage, Parkers Cottage and Elder Cottage. The third main issue is the effect of the proposal on the Village Centre (Hurst) Area of Special Character (AOSC).
7. The fourth main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area with regard to the landscape. The fifth main issue is the suitability of the site for residential development

having regard to the development strategy for the area including whether future occupants of the site would be reliant on private motor vehicles for access to day to day services and facilities.

Reasons

8. The site is located adjacent to Broadwater Lane from where Whistley Green can be located in one direction and Hurst in the other, the site being located outside of the Hurst/Whistley Green settlement boundary. The site is in agricultural use for the grazing of livestock. Two Oak Trees (T14 and T16) amongst other forms of planting are located close to the boundary of the site with Broadwater Lane. Residential properties are located opposite the site including the four listed buildings. Fields forming countryside interspersed with field boundary planting extend beyond the site to the rear.

Trees

9. The Council considers that the proposed northern and central accesses would significantly harm and lead to the degradation of trees T14 and T16. These are both English Oak Trees located between the appeal site and Broadwater Lane. It is common ground that the concerns of the Council with regard to trees relate to these trees only and that both trees are identified in the Wokingham District Veteran Tree Association Survey Map and the Woodland Trust Ancient Tree Inventory as veteran trees. The appellant considers only T16 as veteran.

Response: The red line is amended, so T14/T16 (as referenced in the 2015 Appeal) and their respective buffer zones are no longer affected. The Ancient Tree Inventory shows 4 veteran trees (T1, T9, T10, T11) near the red line (though as demonstrated in our advising tree consultants (SJA) Arboricultural Implications Report (February 2026) which forms part of this PIP application's supporting document it is not accepted these trees are all veteran trees). The SJA Tree Constraint Plan shows these trees. They have been surveyed and buffer zones shown.

10. The Framework defines a veteran tree as a tree which, because of its age, size and condition, is of exceptional biodiversity, cultural or heritage value. T14 has an estimated age of 290 years with an estimated planting date of 1735. It has a girth of 4.8m which when referenced against the extract from Lonsdale would see the tree fall within, albeit at the bottom of the light green shaded part of the chart labelled as veteran/notable. Therefore, T14 could be classed as veteran on account of its age and size.
11. The principal difference between the parties in terms of whether T14 should be classed as veteran is with regard to its condition. The appellants statement references that it is highly likely that there will be some decay at the base of the trunk albeit that this is not extensive or significant. It is further noted that T14 has vertical fluting of the trunk, one instance of delamination of wood high in the canopy and some minor deadwood. The deadwood was however at the time of the Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement considered to be such an issue that the removal of deadwood over the road was considered a management recommendation.
12. My attention is further drawn to the Lonsdale Book and in particular p. 26/27 which is concerned with recognising ancient and veteran trees. Whilst it is clear that T14 does not have all the attributes listed, when I account for the above, I consider that there is nothing compelling within the evidence that excludes T14 from being considered veteran. I consider that a precautionary approach should be taken, and I consider that T14 should be considered veteran.
13. Regardless, the appellant indicates that a precautionary approach has been undertaken with veteran tree 'buffer zones' applied to both trees in any event and this is perhaps a reflection of the fine nature

of the judgement with regard to the tree, a matter on which different experts in that field have not been able to agree.

14. The appellant maintained at the Hearing that the buffer zones around T14 and T16 do not need to be off set to account for the presence of Broadwater Lane which has the potential to have caused the growth of roots in an offset pattern.
15. However, the evidence indicates that a sewer was installed beneath it in 1975 and suggests that at least a 3m deep trench is likely to have been laid to accommodate this. This, combined with the generally inhospitable environment to tree roots provided by a metalled road, leads me to conclude that the tree roots are likely to have preferred the appeal site over the years in spite of its agricultural use and as such an increased buffer zone including an off-set should be provided as a result of the particular local characteristics to account for the likely spread of roots fostered by the particular location of this site.

Response: Trees 1, 9, 10, and 11, as identified in the PIP's AIA, are not close to roads or sewers. Offset for the existing drainage ditch is provided for with T9, 10, 11 & the Illustrative layout indicates location for a swale and attenuation basin beyond any tree buffer. There is no further requirement to extend buffer zones.

16. Whilst I note the findings of the Tree Radar Root Investigations Report, it was acknowledged at the Hearing that this survey method was unlikely to pick up on for example fine feeder roots. It is the case that upper levels of the soil often contain important roots for the health of a tree, and that mature trees are more at risk of decline and failure than young trees as a result of root damage.
17. I note the appellants position that standing advice does not suggest that buffer zones seek to protect all the roots of a tree. However, I consider that a cautionary approach should be taken here with regard to the buffer zones and subsequent protection of potential fine feeder roots.

Response: The Arboricultural Implications Assessment discusses roots / fine feeder roots at 6.2.1 to 6.2.6, notably at 6.2.4 "...additional space has been afforded to the buffer zones as the development does not include any structures or buildings within 4.5m of the edge of the buffer zones, which effectively increases the buffer zones beyond the minimum requirement and allows for the retention and protection of the soil and roots, including feeder roots."

18. The appellants evidence shows that if the buffer zones were to be off set, the central and western access would fall within these areas. The works associated with the construction of the accesses would subsequently be likely to result in the loss of roots within that area subsequently risking the health of T14 and T16, potentially leading to their deterioration. This potential harm would outweigh all of the suggested benefits put forward for the trees, relating to removal of the site from agricultural use, alleviation of soil compaction, habitat connectivity, management and succession planting.
19. There would subsequently be conflict with Policy CC03 of the Wokingham Borough Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (2014) (MDLP) which states amongst other things that

Response: This revised proposal has no accesses or development within any buffer zone, therefore, there will be no deterioration of irreplaceable habitats and no conflict with policy or the NPPF. Accordingly, in regard to this scheme proposal tree impacts is a resolved matter.

Development proposals should protect and retain existing trees. There would also be conflict with the Framework which states at paragraph 193 amongst other things that development resulting in the deterioration of irreplaceable habitats such as veteran trees should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists. Those are not before me.

Listed buildings

20. Buttercups is a grade II listed C17 timber framed dwelling, later altered. I accept that a substantial degree of its significance can be attributed to its early date and survival of early fabric. It has a slight degree of visual separation from the appeal site by reason of its set back from Broadwater Lane and the tall timber fence which forms its front boundary treatment.

Response: The red line, and accordingly the positioning of the new homes are positioned away from Buttercups. Accordingly, the perceived change to its setting is no longer of the same magnitude – if arising at all in the first instance.

21. Bower Cottage is another grade II listed C17 timber framed house, later extended. A substantial degree of its significance can be attributed to its early date and fabric and the example it provides of a smaller vernacular box-framed cottage. As with Buttercups, it has a slight degree of visual separation from the appeal site by reason of a brick wall and hedging which forms its front boundary treatment.
22. Parkers cottage is a C18 property, later extended. A substantial degree of its significance can be attributed to the earlier part of the building and its fabric including a thatched roof. It only has very limited visual separation from the site as it is set forward close to Broadwater Lane. The boundary treatment appeared to have been formed of low brick wall and railing at the time of the Heritage Statement.
23. Elder Cottage has C16 Origins, C17 fabric with further extensions dating from later periods. A substantial degree of its significance can be attributed to its early date and surviving fabric. It has more separation from the appeal site by reason of its position on Broadwater Lane which does not fully front the site.

Response: The revised site area and the proposed development still requires consideration of the changes it will introduce in context of Bower Cottage, Parkers Cottage and Elder Cottage. Our supporting Heritage Statement considers these properties and the scheme proposals in detail with a summary table (pages 42-43) concluding the impact for each asset based on the PIP 2026 application and as compared to the previous outline application, and the conclusions for this PIP application being:

- Buttercups Grade II – No Harm
- Bower Cottage Grade II – Less Than Substantial Harm at lower end of scale
- Parkers Cottage Grade II - Less Than Substantial Harm at lower end of scale
- Elder Cottage Grade II – No Harm
- Ward's Cross House Grade II – No Harm
- Old Posting House – No Harm
- Area of Special Character NDHA – No Harm
- Grappenall/Munfin House NDHA – No Harm

24. I note that the site is separated from these properties by Broadwater Lane and accept that the evidence does not indicate associative links between the listed buildings and the appeal site. I also note that the setting of the listed buildings has suffered some erosion through the introduction of more modern infill development on this side of Broadwater Lane.
25. However, from Broadwater Lane, these buildings are currently experienced and perceived within a largely quiet, open and rural environment because of the character and appearance of the appeal site. There is nothing to indicate any history of development on the appeal site and it is likely that these buildings will have always been set against that backdrop. This relationship can be appreciated both from within the appeal site and from Broadwater Lane.

26. The attributes of the site contribute positively to the setting and therefore the significance of the four listed buildings. Historic England guidance on the setting of Heritage Assets advises that settings of heritage assets which closely resemble the setting at the time the asset was constructed are likely to contribute particularly strongly to significance.

Response: The Heritage Statement (section 3.2) discusses *Significance* (including the contribution of setting and para 1.10 states the assessment of setting is in guidance provided by Historic England in *The Setting of Heritage Assets*. Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 3 (GPA3) “...explains that setting is not itself a heritage asset; its importance lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset or to the ability to appreciate that significance.”

27. That positive contribution would be significantly undermined through increased noise and activity on the site as well as the physical presence of nine well sized houses. This would be the case even if some dwellings were to be set back from Broadwater Lane and even if a scheme of landscaping were to be implemented.

Response: This comment by the Inspector is considered questionable/unusual in suggesting setting is affected from the domestic activity of only 9 homes, despite it being separated by a busy A-road connecting Twyford with Wokingham; and where adjacent infill development on the south side of Broadwater Lane has an impact. This application proposes only 7 houses of which now only 3 front Broadwater Lane and are set even further back (40-47m) from listed buildings by significant planting. This is a material change from the previous application. In absence of any demonstrable harm impacting these properties it is not considered these heritage assets present a restriction to the suitability of the application site to deliver the proposed type and amount of development.

28. The proposal would cause harm to the setting of Buttercups, Bower Cottage, Parkers Cottage and Elder Cottage. The arising harm to the significance of the assets would be less than substantial.
29. The harm would be towards the higher end within the less than substantial category for Bower Cottage & Parkers Cottage given they are fully opposite the appeal site and have a close relationship with it and because of the forward positioning of plots 6 and 7. The harm would be at the lower end within the less than substantial category for Buttercups given the development would be set further back at this end of the site and this would also be the case for Elder Cottage given its positioning slightly further along on Broadwater Lane not fully fronting the site.

Response: The revised application now results in no harm to Buttercups and Elder Cottage (with 3 accesses reduced down to only 1). Bower Cottage & Parkers Cottage – there will now be increased separation, reduced direct relationship of new buildings to those homes (Plots 6 & 7 removed) resulting in 40-47m separation, and double screening from existing and proposed planting. These distances are like the previous application for Buttercups and the new houses where lower end of LTS was concluded by the Inspector. A reduction to the lower end of LTS (at worst) would apply here.

30. Overall, there would be conflict with Policy TB24 of the MDLP which amongst other things states that the Council will conserve and seek the enhancement of designated heritage assets in the Borough and their settings by requiring works to or affecting the setting of heritage assets to demonstrate that the proposals would at least conserve the important character and special architectural or historic interest of the building including its setting.
31. I must give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings. Harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme.

AOSC

32. The AOSC, a non-designated heritage asset, encompasses part of Whistley Green and Hurst. Its significance in part sits with its buildings which are of a variety of ages, designs and materials including buildings and features that are designated and non-designated heritage assets in their own rights.
33. However, the AOSC also includes the land immediately on the boundary of the site adjacent to Broadwater Lane. Whilst the appeal site is not referred to as a component of the AOSC setting, details within the Historic Environment Topic Paper, where referring to this particular AOSC summarise amongst other things that Broadwater Lane is heavily vegetated on the stretch of road between Hurst Village and Whistley Green, with many mature trees and open fields on the northern side of the street. It can therefore be reasonably concluded that the planting on the boundary of the site including T14 and T16 makes a positive contribution to the significance of the AOSC as a backdrop which frames the buildings within it.
34. Whilst I note that the proposal would likely see the provision of substantial landscaping to the boundary as part of any approval, given the risk of deterioration associated with the proposal to T14 and T16 on that boundary and the importance of those trees within the boundary planting, the proposal would subsequently cause moderate harm to the significance of the AOSC. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy TB26 of the MDLP which amongst other things states that planning permission will only be granted for proposals affecting Areas of Special Character where they demonstrate that they retain and enhance the traditional, historical, local and special character of the area.

Response: This application no longer affects T14/T16. There will no longer be “moderate harm” to the significance of the AOSC. Therefore, there is no conflict with policy and the trees represent no constraint to achieving suitable development on this site. Furthermore the landscaped buffer will supplement the existing and contribute to the AOSC.

Landscape impact

35. The appeal site and the wider countryside beyond make for a pleasant backdrop to Broadwater Lane. The residential development on the opposite side of Broadwater Lane is largely continuous, linking Hurst and Whistley Green. This makes it difficult to assess when on the ground on this part of Broadwater Lane where these respective settlements begin and end meaning that there is no obvious gap between the two settlements in this particular location.

Response: the issue of gap is not a relevant matter for further consideration as confirmed by the Inspector. In any event this PIP application retains an area of field west of Plot 1.

36. The Hurst River Terrace Landscape Character Area (HRTLCA) within which the site sits encompasses land from the A329 (M) to the south incorporating land a short distance to the north of Whistley Green.
37. Its key characteristics amongst other things include being a simple agricultural landscape of mainly arable farmland with pasture enclosed in relatively large straight-sided fields as well as being a rural and tranquil area. Its valuable landscape attributes amongst other things include the peaceful and open character of the undeveloped pastoral landscape. Amongst the key issues is demand for residential development increasing linear development along rural lanes and continuing to push towards the amalgamation of close settlements Whistley Green and Hurst impacting rural character.

38. The Landscape guidelines include amongst other things conserving the open and rural qualities of the landscape and maintaining the sparse settlement pattern of villages and dispersed farms through control of new development, avoiding further linear spread of development.
39. Considering the key characteristics, valuable attributes, key issues and guidelines of the HRTLCA against the characteristics of the site as described above, I consider that the proposals could be integrated into the landscape setting without any significant adverse landscape effects.
40. Whilst the appeal site is not currently within an area designated as a valued landscape, the Council has intentions to extend the Haines Hill valued landscape such that it would include the appeal site.
41. However, when referring to the Haines Hill Valued Landscape Narrative and a map which includes the appeal site, the Council's Valued Landscapes Assessment does not refer to the HRTLCA within which the appeal site sits despite referring to other landscape character areas. Whilst I note the site specific reassessment supplied by the Council, on that basis, I am not confident that the appeal site should be considered as part of a valued landscape based on current evidence.

Response: Like the previous Outline application, this proposal will have no adverse impact on the landscape. Furthermore, the evidence does not demonstrate the site as Valued Landscape (VL): and the draft NPPF currently undertaking consultation proposes to remove reference to VL in entirety. It is evident VL does not present a constraint to the proposed development.

42. Overall, in conclusion on this main issue there would be no significant adverse impact on the landscape. There would subsequently be no conflict with Policy TB21 of the MDLP which states that proposals must demonstrate how they have addressed the requirements of the landscape character assessment and shall at a minimum retain the condition, character and features that contribute to the landscape. Given my conclusions with regard to valued landscapes there would be no conflict with paragraph 187 which requires that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by amongst other things protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.

Development strategy

43. I noted that whilst the footpaths adjacent to the roads within Hurst are at some points narrow and require pedestrians to cross where only provided on one side it would nonetheless be entirely possible for future residents to access the primary school by walking to it. Further, I noted that the public house, the Elephant and Castle at Whistley Green was located close to the site. There is also a convenience store near to the site and although that is currently closed, confidence was expressed at the Hearing by various parties that this would be re-opening shortly.

Response: The shop reopened in 2025, trading as Baweja Superstore. In addition, The Green Man public house reopened at the end of 2025 too.

44. Whilst bus services are somewhat limited, it was clarified at the Hearing that it would be entirely possible to, for example, catch a bus to Twyford, board a train, and arrive within central London in time for a day of work.
45. Therefore, whilst services and public transport options are more limited than would be the case within a more urban area, the development would not be for a large number of houses and those limited number of residents would have access to some services and facilities, whilst also being afforded the option of using an alternative means of travel to the car to access services and facilities elsewhere.

46. Nonetheless, there would be conflict with the development strategy for the area and with Policy CP9 of the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (2010) (CS) along with Policy CCO2 of the MDLP which amongst other things seek to direct development to locations within settlement boundaries. The development is not of a type that is supported outside of development limits under Policy CP11 of the CS. The Council however could not articulate to me the harm that would arise from these policy conflicts at the Hearing and I afford limited weight to the conflict with these policies.

Response: There will be limited harm as per the 2025 appeal. This scheme proposals are for fewer homes than that appeal (max. 7 vs 9). There are no sound grounds to maintain an issue re: locational sustainability.

Other Matters

47. The proposal is accompanied by a planning obligation under S106 along with a unilateral undertaking. They include provision for an offsite affordable housing contribution of £250,000, Biodiversity net gain at 42.78% habitat units and 137.84% hedgerow units (minimum), pedestrian route, management company, SUDS and drainage. These address matters in the Councils (*sic*) refusal reasons 7-10 which related to the absence of a completed legal agreement to deal with these matters.

Response: A S106 agreement would follow at the Technical Details Consent (TDC) stage to cover relevant matters, including a revised offsite affordable housing contribution. BNG metric would be completed. Details on management company, SUDS and drainage and pedestrian crossing points will be agreed and secured via the S278 process. These are all matters of details for the 2nd stage of the PIP/TDC process.

48. The evidence indicates that the provisions within the planning obligations are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. They are directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. They therefore meet the relevant tests.
49. The Councils Five Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS) was originally agreed at 1.7 years as common ground. At the Hearing, the Council revised its 5YHLS supply position to 2.5 years. The 5YHLS therefore falls within a range of between 1.7 and 2.5 years. The Council cannot demonstrate a 5YHLS.

Response: WBC continues to have a serious and substantial lack of a 5YHLS. Tilted balance subject to Footnote 7 and there being no strong reasons for refusing. This application has no impact on irreplaceable habitat. Impact on designated heritage assets is removed or significantly reduced from the Inspector's conclusion limited to the lower end of LTS harm to two properties only.

50. I have considered the appeal decisions that have been brought to my attention where relevant to the main issues. However, I do not consider that any of those appeals relate to exactly the same circumstances as those which are very particular to this site before me which limits the weight that I afford to them.

Planning Balance

51. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
52. There would be public benefits to the scheme. These would include the provision of 9 houses within a location that would not be unsustainable for a limited housing scheme. There would be an affordable housing contribution of £250,000. There would be a boost to housing supply within the

context of a 5YHLS with a range between 1.7 and 2.5 years. This benefit is tempered given the limited number of houses proposed. Nonetheless, I afford these matters significant weight.

53. The properties could incorporate more sustainable methods of heating and power, with reduced water consumption and would offer support to a small and medium housebuilder. There would be direct and indirect economic benefits of the type which would normally always be associated with a development of this scale. There would be biodiversity net gain of 42.79% in habitat units and 137.84% for hedgerow units. The development would provide a contribution towards CIL at a rate of £551.02 per m2. These benefits are afforded moderate weight.
54. There would be the provision of a pedestrian route onto Hogmoor Lane to provide some increased accessibility in the area, although the real world benefits of this are likely to be limited given the simplicity of the existing route. I afford this matter limited weight.

Response: The pedestrian route is not shown/included in this PIP. There is scope to provide a connection via the internal access road, between plots 5/6 & onto Hogmoor Lane. However, the Inspector noted the “simplicity of the existing route”, i.e. it is not essential attracting only limited weight in the planning balance. Its provision can be picked up at the detailed TDC stage.

55. Set against the benefits, I have found that the construction of the accesses would risk the health of T14 and T16 which can be considered as veteran, potentially leading to their deterioration. Even were I to take a less cautious approach and only consider T16 as veteran as is common ground between the main parties, the offset buffer zone for that tree would include both accesses in any event. The conflict with Paragraph 193 of the Framework would remain.

Response: The revised scheme proposed by this PIP will have no impact on T14/T16. There is no risk to their health. SJA report references T1, 9, 10, 11 – all with buffer zones provided as if they were veteran trees (notwithstanding they are not considered to be) and no development will affect roots.

56. I have found that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of four grade II listed buildings. For Bower Cottage & Parkers Cottage the harm would be at the higher end of the spectrum within the less than substantial category and in respect of Buttercups and Elder Cottage the harm would be at the lower end of the spectrum within the less than substantial category. The harm would not be outweighed by the arising public benefits and there would be conflict with the Framework.

Response: Buttercups and Elder Cottage – there is no harm resulting from the development proposed by this application. A previous appeal identified no harm to Ward’s Cross. Bower Cottage & Parker Cottage – impact revised to lower end of LTS (if that). The Inspector for the 2025 Appeal recognised benefits including the significant benefit of new housing which should outweigh the limited harm to the setting of two listed buildings that are now situated 40 - 47m distance away.

57. I have also found that the proposal would harm the significance of the AOSC and I have taken this into account.
58. The benefits would not outweigh the harms even on the basis that I was to agree with the appellant that the 5YHLS of the Council is 1.7 years and subsequently recognise the boost to housing supply within that context.

Response: The Inspector references “clear reasons”. The current NPPF 2024 changed this to “strong reasons”. In any instance, the revised proposals will not harm irreplaceable habitat and any impact to the setting (or their significance) of the listed buildings (designated heritage assets) reduces any impact to no harm, or at most, the lower end of LTS and this does not form a strong reason for refusal.

59. Given my findings with regard to irreplaceable habitats and designated heritage assets the application of Framework policies relating to those matters provide clear reasons for refusing the development proposed. The proposal does not therefore benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Response: As there is no impact to T14/T16 by the development proposed by this PIP application site, there is no harm to the significance of the AOSC (reduced from moderate harm in the appeal). Combined with the reduction in unit numbers (and fewer homes close to the AOSC boundary), with increased set back from the existing landscape boundary and with opportunities for further planting. For completeness, it is noted Grappenhall Cottage is a Non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) but this is not within scope of Footnote 7, nor does it present a strong reason for refusal. Its setting will change but this does not affect the building’s limited heritage significance.

60. The proposal would conflict with policies CC03, TB24 and TB26 of the MDLP. I afford the conflict with these policies substantial weight given their broad alignment with the Framework.
61. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations which indicate a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with it.

Conclusion

62. For the reasons given above the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

1999 Planning Appeal

There was an appeal dismissed in January 1999 for the construction of 5 houses fronting Hogmoor Lane (PINS Ref T/APP/X0360/A/98/298932/P9) (**Appendix 1**).

That decision was 27 years ago, and was made under a very different national and local planning policy context.

Para 5 of the 1999 Decision Letter (DL) notes the site frontage of 80-90m as a substantial gap in the streetscene, that makes a significant contribution to the semi-rural character of the Lane, and the site appeared as an integral part of the green gap between the village and Twyford. The inspector added that development would be widely visible as a significant incursion into the relatively narrow belt of open land.

The “green gap” designation no longer applies. Furthermore, the 2025 appeal considered there to be no adverse landscape effects. Whilst that related to development fronting Broadwater Lane, this is similar in spatial terms and suggests this is no longer a relevant consideration (and the same applies to the statement in para 7 of the DL regarding character).

Para 6 considered the proposed houses would be closely spaced with about 2-3m between most dwellings and stated the effect would be a relatively densely built-up frontage with few visual gaps. The indicative layout in this PIP application shows much greater spacing between the proposed houses and neighbouring homes, and the provision of only 4 houses along Hogmoor Lane is not dense. There are 4 existing houses immediately to the north occupying a similar frontage width. The effect of siting garages to the rear of plots enables spacing to be achieved between houses and those garages are recessed features and of reduced height being only single storey.

Para 7 discussed the Environment Agency’s suggestion of a condition for a 4m planting zone from the top of the banks. This can be achieved through the detailed TDC stage, and the proposals are capable of having no effect upon the drainage ditch.

Para’s 8 and 9 of the DL note the narrow width of Hogmoor Lane and risks of the junction onto Broadwater Lane. The PiP application does not propose to use Hogmoor Lane for vehicular access and the site can be adequately served by the new access from Broadwater Lane.

Planning Assessment – Permission in Principle Application

Application Summary

1. This Permission in Principle (PiP) application seeks permission for residential development of a maximum of 7 dwellings (minimum of 5).
2. The site is within the designated countryside but is immediately adjacent the Limited Development Location of Hurst to the site's southern and eastern boundaries and also adjoins other dwellings. Development would not undermine the primary purpose of policy CP11 and would not lead to a coalescence and merging of settlements due to its location.
3. Spatially, the proposal represents a logical limited expansion to the existing development on Broadwater Lane and Hogmoor Lane. There will be the loss of some undeveloped land, but this would have a limited degree of harm to the character of the area considering the spatial relationship to existing built form around it. Harm would be limited and very localised.
4. There are no technical grounds to withhold permission in principle when considering matters such as highways, flood risk, or environmental health for only 7 dwellings (maximum). Matters concerning layout, scale and appearance will be the subject for consideration at the Technical Details Consent (TDC) stage.
5. In recognising Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF, the tilted balance is engaged due to the Council's failure to meet its required housing land supply, and the proposal would perform a positive social, economic and environmental role.
6. Paragraph 11(d)(i) is satisfied because there are no strong reasons for refusing development (irreplaceable habitat is now resolved), and there would be only a limited impact to the significance of the setting of two listed buildings
7. In weighing up: the conflict with the Development Plan (and noting key policies are out-of-date): the lower end of LTS harm to the significance of the setting of two designated heritage assets only: there being no harm to the setting of Non-Designated Heritage Assets (NDHA): these limited harms are outweighed by the benefits, in particular much needed housing to address a serious and substantial housing land supply shortfall. On this matter alone the 2025 appeal DL paragraph 52 gave this matter significant weight, along with other benefits including economic benefits during and post construction, environmental benefits through biodiversity net gain, energy efficiency measures (being limited to moderate benefits), etc., when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole. The PiP should therefore be approved.

Constraints:

- Countryside (but adjacent the settlement boundary and adjacent residential to the north, east and south).
- Designated Heritage Assets (Grade II Listed Buildings) to the south and south-east.
- Non-Designated Heritage Assets (AoSC and a house) to the south and east.

Principle of Development

8. The site is in close proximity to the Limited Development Location boundary of Hurst, is designated countryside and should be assessed against Core Strategy Policy CP11 (Proposals outside Development Limits). None of the criteria in CP11 apply and the application is contrary to the spatial strategy as a starting point.
9. However, the site is adjacent established residential development – on Hogmoor Lane: to its north, south and east; and on Broadwater Lane: to its east and south. Development would not result in coalescence of settlements.

Locational Sustainability

10. The 2025 appeal discussed this matter at paragraphs 43-46 and the Inspector afforded limited weight to conflict with development plan policies, noting that facilities such as the school, public house and a shop are close to the site. At para 52 it is clearly noted “...*the provision of 9 houses within a location that would not be unsustainable for a limited housing scheme.*”
11. We agree with this conclusion that the site location proposed by this PIP application continues to represent a sustainable location for the scale of development being proposed. There are no valid planning grounds to suggest this is an unsustainable site for the development of 7 new homes.

Housing Land Supply (HLS)

12. The 2025 appeal determining Inspector agreed the Council had only 1.7 years HLS (DL para 58). Even if the alternative position from the Council is accepted of 2.5 years HLS, this still represents a serious and substantial housing land supply shortfall which is not likely to be satisfied. Small sites such as these are capable of being delivered quickly (particularly within the relevant five-year period) and can collectively make a valuable and much needed contribution to meeting more of the Borough’s housing needs hereon. In consequence of the supply position, those policies relating specifically to the spatial strategy and housing delivery in the Borough’s Core Strategy and MDD LP are out of date.
13. Para 11 of the NPPF states plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking this means where policies which are most important for determination the application are out of date, permission should be granted unless:
 - i. Application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance (Footnote 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.
14. In considering footnote 7 – the two considerations from the previous appeal were irreplaceable habitat (veteran trees) and designated heritage assets (significance of the setting of four Grade II listed buildings to the south of the site).
15. The supporting documents with this application show the trees identified as T14/T16 at the time of the 2025 appeal are not affected by this application: nor any other veteran trees and buffers affected by the proposed development.
16. The changes to the development would now result, at worst, in the lower end of LTS harm to the significance of the setting of two designated heritage assets. This does not provide a strong reason for refusal.
17. In the alternative, under NPPF para 11(d)(ii) Officers must assess as part of an application whether there are any adverse impacts generated by the development that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole, etc. This is referred to as the ‘tilted balance’. whereby harms and benefits are not weighed equally but tilted according to 11(d)(ii). The limited harm to the significance of the setting of two listed buildings does not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Emerging Local Plan Update (LPU)

18. The LPU was submitted for examination in February 2025 and sets out the development strategy and proposed site allocations to meet housing needs to 2040. Part 1 Examination Hearings were held in November 2025 and Part 2 Hearings will take place in 2026,
19. The most recent Local Development Scheme (LDS), September 2024 stated Examination Hearings (Stage 1) were expected in April 2025 (Table 1), a 7-month delay to the programme. The LDS stated adoption was expected in May 2026. Reflecting the delay to date it is more likely any adoption would not be until at least December 2026.
20. Increased weight to the LPU can be applied (per NPPF para 49) but it is relevant to note that under the NPPF 2024, because WBC is proposing its housing requirement at 80% or less of the most up to date housing need figure, that NPPF para 78(c) applies whereby as of the 1 July 2026 the Borough must demonstrate a minimum 6 years HLS. This is a material planning consideration that irrespective of the LPU, the Council will continue to have a serious and substantial HLS shortfall until it finally addresses its housing needs through a subsequent Local Plan Review. That will take several more years, as a minimum, to conclude.
21. The current standard method requirement is for 1,136 dwellings per annum (dpa). The LPU sets out a housing requirement of 12,763 over 17 years, being 750 dwellings per annum (dpa), i.e. only approximately 66% of the standard method, which is well below the SM figure.
22. It should be noted this site was originally identified as a site allocation in the initial versions of the Local Plan Update. This allocation was removed at the Pre Submission stage. The LPU makes no provision for any allocations in the settlement of Hurst despite this being a time when the Council should be significantly increasing the number of site allocations.

Summary of the principle of development

23. The site is outside the defined settlement area. It is however immediately adjacent the defined settlement boundary and well related to existing built form to the north, south and east. Development would not result in settlement coalescence.
24. The recent appeal confirmed the site is not an unsustainable location for the level of housing proposed. The scale of development is appropriate in a Limited Development Location such as Hurst.
25. This application has positively responded to the Inspector's findings in the recent appeal and overcome issues to veteran tree buffers by adjusting the site location boundary omitting two access points and reducing the impact to the significance of the setting of two listed buildings to the lower end of LTS harm. The resulting change occasioned by the development is not a strong reason for refusing development.
26. The limited harm would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF when read as a whole.

Location, Land Use and Amount of development in relation to the impact on character and appearance of the area.

27. The 2025 Appeal Inspector concluded he was *"...not confident that the appeal site should be considered as part of a valued landscape based on current evidence"* (DL para 41) and noting the draft NPPF 2025 does not reference Valued Landscape (VL) this is no longer a material consideration.
28. The site has no landscape designations that preclude development, as stated by the Inspector *"...the proposals could be integrated into the landscape setting without any significant adverse landscape effects"* (DL para 39). These same conclusions apply to this PIP application site. The location is capable of satisfactorily accommodating limited residential development and this application

proposes fewer homes compared to the appeal proposal, a maximum of 7, as opposed to 9 previously.

29. There is no basis to suggest the limited scale of development would be harmful to the landscape character of the area. Any visual impacts would be highly localised from viewpoints close to the site on Broadwater Lane and Hogmoor Lane and read clearly in context with established built form adjacent the site boundaries.
30. The red line area is below 1ha (as required for a PIP application). With a maximum of 7 homes, this represents a density appropriate to the character of the area. The illustrative plan demonstrates a large part of the site area would be retained as grassland or landscaped.
31. The introduction of residential development would be appropriate in this location where existing housing is immediately adjacent to the north, south and east (and development exists on the north side of Broadwater Lane to the east and west).
32. The depth of built form would not be uncharacteristic with neighbouring development. As demonstrated by the submitted Proposed Site Plan there would be an access road linking from Broadwater Lane to serve the 4 properties facing Hogmoor Lane. The width of the road is shown to be kept to a minimum and maintain a semi-rural character and would have very limited (if any) visual impacts from wider public viewpoints.
33. Development would not prevent the continued use for agricultural purposes of the remainder of the agricultural field. Plots 4 to 7 on Hogmoor Lane represent a logical infill between existing built form on the west side of the road, whereby the new properties can be well set back from the road and capable of being screened by existing and proposed planting. The dwellings within Plots 1 to 3 on Broadwater Lane can be set back 30 metres from the road, screened by existing highway verge, new hedge and tree planting. The Proposed Site Plan demonstrates significant spacing can be provided between the new houses, varying from 4m between Plots 6 & 7, to 23m to the existing house to the north (as shown).

Location, Land Use and Amount of development in relation to the impact on neighbouring amenity

34. There are residential properties close to the application site – the south side of Broadwater Lane; Wards Cross / Long Barn; to the north on Hogmoor Lane and the opposite side of Hogmoor Lane. Separation distances from the proposed houses and existing buildings are significant and would not give rise to any harmful effects such as overlooking, daylight/sunlight, outlook, etc. There were no identified harmful impacts to existing residential properties in the previous application. This remains the case.
35. The proposed development would have potential for increased noise and disturbance although its existing use is cattle and sheep grazing meaning there is a level of activity already. But the limited amount of development could not be considered to result in substantial harm – there is no evidence to suggest it would as this will obviously be a low intensity domestic use. In addition the existing context exhibits residential uses already surround the site, where there is existing noise and activity and Broadwater Lane is a main road through the Village. Further details would follow at the Technical Details Consent and capable of being mitigated through sensitive positioning of buildings, habitable room windows, landscaping, and so on.
36. The principle for development is acceptable in respect to impact to neighbours.

Location, Land Use and Amount of development in relation to the highway network

37. The PiP application proposes to use the same eastern access from the previous planning application. That access did not attract any highway objections with adequate visibility splays and swept path provided. The previous application proposed an access for 4 houses. This application proposes its

use for a maximum of 7. There is no material difference as the highways access is acceptable in either respect.

38. The pedestrian route along the south side of the site from the previous application has been removed because this is a much-reduced site area along Broadwater Lane and its provision is non-essential as identified in the Inspector's 2025 Decision Letter. There remains scope for a pedestrian crossing point across Broadwater Lane (via S278 approval). A pedestrian crossing onto Hogmoor Lane could be considered subject to a satisfactory crossing over the highway ditch. Proposed residents can easily use the proposed internal access road to access the footpath network on Broadwater Lane.
39. Refuse collection vehicles (and other service vehicles) can enter/exit the site via the proposed Broadwater Lane access. This includes adequate swept paths where Plots 4-7 are indicated.
40. Full details for highway considerations would follow at the Technical Details Consent stage and the previous appeal demonstrated there were no unacceptable highway impacts in respect of access and related matters.

Location, Land Use and Amount of development in relation to flood risk

41. No part of the red line area is within any areas at risk of flooding. This was not a matter for the refusal of the 2025 appeal. The EA flood maps show the site to be largely unaffected by surface water flooding apart from a small area along the northern boundary. This was responded to by Simpson's in their Supplementary Statement on Flood Risk to the planning appeal. At para 2.2.1 of the 2025 appeal the Inspector did not disagree. The same explanation applies here.
42. In any event even if this did present a constraint it would be possible to reposition plots to avoid any affected areas – the plan is illustrative and the housing numbers are expressed as a maximum of 7 and can be reduced.
43. There is an open ditch in the highways land on Hogmoor Lane. The application red line area (and blue line) does not encroach on that land.
44. As with the previous 2025 appeal, separate drainage details such as swales and basin would follow at the detailed stage (and are indicated on the illustrative layout and the swale is shown beyond any tree buffer). This was not a matter disagreed by the Council or the Planning Inspector.

Location, Land Use and Amount of development in relation to the impact on the natural environment (trees and ecology)

45. The Council is aware that a full suite of ecological surveys have been undertaken for the 2025 appeal site. These, and site specific surveys for this PIP application site are not required to be submitted at the PiP stage. They would be at TDC stage. The entire field (including the Hogmoor Lane area) has been subject to surveys by LUS Ecology.
46. Trees were a matter of disagreement with the previous application. This has necessitated the amended site location and accesses to avoid trees T14 and T16.
47. All trees within and adjacent the site have been resurveyed by SJA Trees and plotted on their Tree Constraints Plan (SJA TCP 25633-011). There are TPO trees along the Broadwater Lane frontage and the approach to them was satisfactorily addressed in the previous appeal. There is no adverse impact on those trees by the proposals.
48. Three trees are on the Ancient Tree Inventory and are plotted on the SJA plan as T1 English Oak – in the rear garden of Long Barn; T10 English Oak; and T11 English Oak – which are to the north of the site (also T9 English Oak further on the northern boundary is considered by SJA). On a precautionary basis these trees are treated as veterans with buffer zones applied, though SJA Trees do not consider them to be all veterans.

49. To avoid confusion, it should be noted that as this is a new tree survey, the tree numbering is different from the previous application.
50. An appropriate buffer and offset is provided for all trees, including Trees 1, 9, 10 and 11 and this is explained in the SJA Report. There is approximately 27m between the outer edges of the buffers for T1 and T10 and within this 'gap' is the proposed internal access road. This is capable of being sited well beyond those buffers and would have no adverse impact on those trees or their roots. Adequate protection measures can be ensured to protect trees. There would be no adverse impact on irreplaceable habitats.

Location, Land Use and Amount of development in relation to the impact on the historic environment (designated heritage assets and non-designated heritage assets)

51. A detailed Heritage Statement by Asset Heritage accompanies this application and should be referred in parallel with this letter.
52. The Inspector stated there was a high level of *Less Than Substantial* (LTS) harm to the Grade II listed Parkers Cottage and Bower Cottage – although that was never the Council's position in the previous application (or appeal itself).
53. The previous application showed Plot 6 to be approximately 27 metres from Bower Cottage; and Plot 7 approximately 19 metres from Parker Cottage (and 38m from Elder Cottage). For completeness, Plot 1 was shown to be approximately 44m from Buttercups – where the Inspector said the impact was at the lower end of LTS.
54. This PiP application (see Table below) shows the approximate separation distances between the proposed buildings and listed buildings can be significantly increased from the previous application.

Approx. Distances	2025 Appeal	2026 PIP application
Bower Cottage to Plot 1	27m	47m
Parkers Cottage to Plots 2 & 3	19m	40m
Elder Cottage to Plots 2 & 3	38m	48m

55. These revised distances are comparable to the separation distance from the 2025 Appeal between Plot 1 and Buttercups. On that basis the logical and objective conclusion must be a lesser level of harm to the setting of those listed buildings is proposed by this application. The proposed dwellings are shown to be set back approximately 30m from the edge of Broadwater Lane, a significant set back from the public highway, which allows considerable opportunities for intervening landscaping, including new landscaping, post and rail fencing, etc.
56. There will no longer be development directly facing Bower Cottage, and there will be significant spacing between Plots 2 & 3 that disperse any impression of a direct relationship with Parkers Cottage. As stated, any impacts would now be limited, at the very most, to the lower end of LTS harm to the significance of the historical setting only of Bower Cottage and Parkers Cottage.
57. There will be no harm to Buttercups and Elder Cottage.
58. The Inspector did not cite harm to Ward's Cross (a Grade II listed building) in the previous appeal. There will similarly be no harm to Ward's Cross from this application.
59. There is a further Grade II listed building, the Old Posting House to the south-east of Plot 4 on Hogmoor Lane. This will be at least 42m from the new plot, is not directly adjacent the site and like Elder Cottage it can be concluded the proposals would result in no harm.
60. At the PiP stage, architectural details are not required to be provided. That is a matter for the TDC stage. It would be appropriate to design traditional vernacular homes to reflect local character, and this can be controlled via the TDC application. The maximum floorspace in a PiP application is

under 1,000sq.m meaning smaller homes would be provided here. The limited (& maximum) number of homes on the site area of less than 1ha will enable spacing between and around the homes, maintain separation to site boundaries and significant set back from the highways as clearly shown in the illustrative layout provided thereby mitigating the low level of harm.

61. The Area of Special Character (AoSC) runs along the southern boundary, wrapping around Ward's Cross and Long Barn before crossing east over Hogmoor Lane. It is a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA). The heritage assessment has not identified any harm to the setting of the AoSC.
62. To the east of Plot 7, is Grappenhall Cottage (now Munfin House), a NDHA. Plot 7 would be approximately 28 metres from the front of Munfin House. There was no functional or ownership association with the application site and Munfin House. That property has been much altered with a large garage and parking courtyard. The property was originally two houses. Development is set well back from Hogmoor Lane beyond an existing ditch and vegetated verge which is capable of being enhanced with further hedgerow and trees. Whilst there will be a change to the physical setting of the house, this will not affect the building's limited heritage significance.

Planning Balance and Summary

63. The statutory starting point for determination is the development plan.
64. The site is outside of the defined development limits and within the countryside. Ordinarily development on the site would conflict with the spatial strategy of the plan.
65. However, the site is not an unsustainable location for the limited amount of development proposed and would not undermine the purpose of CP11. The amount of development is appropriate in a Limited Development Location such as Hurst.
66. In addition, the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing, and even with an emerging Local Plan, the transitional arrangements in the NPPF means 6 years supply of housing will be required from the 1 July 2026. The Council has a serious and substantial housing land supply shortfall that will persist for the short to medium term at least. It is important that more sites are urgently brought forward for development. A small housebuilder is able to deliver developments more quickly than larger strategic sites.
67. The two matters that resulted in the 2025 appeal being dismissed have been thoroughly considered and addressed through this PiP application. In consequence there are no strong reasons for refusing the development proposed (para 11(d)(i)). Moreover, there are significant benefits from the proposals, particularly the provision of much needed housing that outweigh the low level of *less than substantial harm* to the historical setting of two listed buildings which will be situated some 40-47 metres from the nearest new houses: which would be well separated from one another, set beyond existing and proposed planting and retained grassland).
68. No other harms are identified to other designated heritage assets or non-designated heritage assets.
69. The tilted balance and presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged. The proposals will contribute to the three overarching objectives to achieving sustainable development as defined in the NPPF: being the economic, social and environmental aspects.

Economic

70. The site will perform a short-term economic role as a result of the construction period, and a longer-term economic role via consumer spend and CIL payments. The benefit in the provision of new homes from an economic perspective should be afforded at least moderate weight (see 2025 appeal DL para 53).

Social

71. The development would make a valuable and positive contribution to the Borough's housing stock in the creation of new homes at a time where the Council has a significant shortfall in housing land supply. This will persist for a considerable period of time. As with the 2025 Appeal, the delivery of 7-much needed new homes needs to be afforded significant weight (para 52 of the 2025 Appeal DL).
72. The proposals will contribute to the Government's key objective of significantly boosting the supply of new houses.
73. The new homes would be well connected to nearby services facilities within the Village as identified in the Appeal DL para's 43-46. The site is well related to existing built form in the Village. This would not represent an isolated countryside development.
74. The social benefits of the proposals are of significant weight considering the Borough's housing needs, which will include the need to provide more housing in villages such as Hurst, which will help sustain local services and facilities, such as the shop and public house.

Environmental

75. When assessing the impact on the character of the area, the layout and density is considered acceptable. The previous appeal decision recognised this is not a valued landscape and the proposals would not have any significant adverse landscape effects.
76. The illustrative layout demonstrates significant scope for open space, landscaping including new hedgerows and trees which would be secured at the TDC stage.
77. The site presents alternative options to the car to access services and facilities elsewhere and is in walking distance to the village's services and facilities. This is afforded significant weight in the planning balance.
78. The development would expect to achieve a 10% biodiversity net gain, retention of existing trees and new planting opportunities and ecological mitigation and enhancement measures. This would perform at the very least, a moderately positive environmental role. The 2025 appeal demonstrated significant biodiversity net gain via off-site land, providing a further benefit to the proposals. The same approach would be employed for this development – to be secured at the TDC stage via a planning obligation.

Conclusion

79. The most important policies for determination of this application are out of date by virtue of the absence of a 5-year housing land supply. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that permission should be granted unless any adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or there are specific policies in the Framework which indicate that development should be restricted.
80. As outlined above, the proposal would provide a range of material benefits that weigh either significantly or moderately in favour of the application. The detailed design would follow at the TDC stage and planning conditions can be imposed. That is not necessary at the PiP stage.
81. In light of the above, the limited extent of harmful impacts identified would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole. The PiP application should therefore be approved.

We would be grateful to receive confirmation of the validation of this application. Should there be any queries, please contact me at stuart@shorewoodhomes.co.uk and 07500 070299.

Yours sincerely



Stuart Garnett BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

Shorewood Homes

Encl.