

DELEGATED REPORT

Report by Claire Booth	Date of report: 14/11/2025	Ref: 72436/PIP
Registration: 10/10/2025	LDfC: 07/11/2025	Expiry Date: 14/11/2025
Site Visit: 24/10/2025	Site Notice: 24/10/2025	Press Date: N/A
Objections: 108	Con Area:	Adv Type: PI
Reason for Delay: N/A		EIA: NA
		Dec Level: DEL
		Stat Class: MIDW

Proposal: Application for permission in principle for erection of up to 9 no. dwellings

Location: Land at Gorse Hill Stables, 160 Starling Road, Bury, BL8 2HJ

Description

This application is a Permission in Principle proposal for the erection of 9 dwellings on land known as Gorse Hill Stables, 160 Starling Road.

The application site contains a single storey dwelling, a former stable block, associated yard area, with the remainder of the site laid over to garden. It is accessed from Starling Road via a vehicular entrance formed by a brick wall and high double gates.

The application site is located on land designated within the adopted Development Plan as being within the Green Belt, within a Mineral Safeguarding Area and within the Pennine Foothills Landscape Character Area.

The application seeks Permission in Principle (PiP) for the development of the site for up to 9 dwellings. In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017 (as amended), the matters which can be considered by the Local Planning Authority in determining whether or not to grant Permission in Principle are limited to the location of development, the land use proposed, and the amount of development proposed.

A PiP application is an alternative route for applying for planning permission for housing - led development.

The PiP consent has two stages. The first stage, the Permission in Principle establishes whether a site is suitable in principle and the second stage is the Technical Details Consent when detailed development proposals are assessed.

The submission of a valid PiP application requires a completed application form, plan which identifies the land to which the application relates and the correct fee. There are no other details or reports which are required for the submission of a PiP.

A decision must be made in accordance with relevant policies in the development plan and material considerations including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Local Planning Authorities consult anybody that would be required to be consulted in relation to an application for planning permission but matters relating to ecology, landscaping, contamination, design, transport/highways and heritage are considered in a Stage 2 Technical Details application. Any responses received can be included as informatives notes to advise the applicant of the requirements at a technical details stage.

To assess PiP applications, an Local Planning Authority's (LPAs) consideration is limited to location, land use and amount of development, with other matters considered at technical details stage.

Relevant Planning History

21998 - Conversion of existing farm buildings to one dwelling. Approved, 09/02/1989

33946 - Infilling of land and pond to form access road and hardstanding; construction of gateway. Refused, 19/03/1998

Publicity

The application has been advertised by Site Notice erected on the lamp post closest to the access to the existing dwelling on the site. Date posted: 24/10/2025.

29 nearby neighbours were sent letters on 10/10/2025 notifying them of this application.

As a result of the publicity, 109 representations have been received. 108 objections have been received who raise the following areas of concern:

Location

Site Outside Village Envelope: The land lies beyond Ainsworth's built village envelope and is not limited infill. This encroaches into open countryside, contrary to the Green Belt purpose of safeguarding countryside from encroachment [bury.gov.uk] (reflected in PFE Policy JP-G9 and Bury UDP Policies OL1/2 & OL1/3).

Green Belt

- Green Belt should be protected
- Homes should not be built on Green Belt land
- The proposal would harm the openness and rural character of the green belt
- The proposal contradicts green belt policy
- This site lies within designated greenbelt and is therefore intended to remain protected from development. The proposed scheme is not part of the "Places for Everyone" development plan, which was created to ensure that any new housing is delivered in appropriate and sustainable locations.

Countryside/ Visual Amenity

- Loss of countryside, harmful to visual amenity
- The density of the development would be inconsistent with the surrounding area

Loss of farmland

- Farmland should be protected

Highway Matters

- The site access to the land is very close to an extremely busy junction on a busy commuter road for Bolton, Radcliffe and Manchester. Site traffic and parking will severely compromise existing traffic flow - especially during construction, but subsequently with residents / visitor vehicles, deliveries and refuse collection.
- Additional traffic and parking on Starling Road would worsen congestion and safety concerns, while air and noise pollution would rise.
- Increased traffic on an already congested road, raises serious safety concerns.
- Parking of construction vehicles would make the road impassible and would cause dangerous driving conditions.
- Starling Road is a two lane road and was not built for the volume of traffic which currently uses it on a daily basis. I use the road regularly and rarely see a vehicle parked along it. This is because there isn't the room to park without holding up traffic from behind. Looking at the plans submitted it is almost certain that delivery vans and visitors to the dwellings would have to park along Starling Road. This would cause wide ranging problems.
- Currently at peak traffic periods queues form along this section of road. Addition of multiple new dwellings and associated vehicles will only exacerbate the congestion, further impacting road safety and increase in pollution.

- The existing infrastructure is not designed to handle the additional traffic, raising legitimate safety concerns for pedestrians, cyclists, and schoolchildren in the area.
- Crossing Starling Road opposite the Rose and Crown P.H to walk into Ainsworth is high risk. To cross on the way back from Ainsworth is suicidal.
- Living directly opposite this plot, I already have great trouble with traffic. Getting on and off my drive can be challenging and dangerous at times and this will be made significantly worse with another 20+ cars. The junction is already a chaotic one.

Flood Risk/ Drainage

- There is a serious possibility that the development will have an impact on the water table causing flooding locally. There is another pond in close proximity which naturally drains across to this site.
- The field currently serves as a natural soakaway; building on it would increase flood risk, particularly along Garstang Avenue
- There is a risk of flooding, as the area is low-lying and prone to surface water build-up.

Land Stability

Concerns about ground stability - the site includes a former mineshaft and pond area that has been infilled with spoil and waste material.

Safety of Site

- Concerned that the land is contaminated
- The site contains unlawful waste which poses a health risk to all local residents

Housing Needs

- There is no evidence that this development would provide the type of housing our community genuinely needs. The local housing market is currently stagnant, with many properties available for sale. The proposed dwellings are unlikely to be affordable and would therefore fail to meet local housing requirements.

Wildlife

- The proposed use would adversely affect wildlife habitat. The site should currently support a pond used by local wildlife, which provides essential drainage and ecological value for the field opposite Starling Road; the development would remove this habitat.
- The site would need surveying as locals believe it has been used as wasteland and local tip for the last 50 years
- The proposal would harm local biodiversity, with loss of habitats, ancient hedgerows and mature trees.
- The owner has already cut down a mature tree showing complete disregard for our greenbelt.
- There will be significant damage to fauna; habitat loss, fragmentation, pollution, and direct injury to birds and animals.
- Loss of Natural Habitat: The area currently supports local wildlife and provides valuable green space that contributes to biodiversity. Changing its designation would result in the destruction of natural habitats and harm to local ecosystems. The new owners have already cut down large nesting trees.

Heritage/ Archaeology

- There is evidence of a Roman road running through part of the site, indicating potential archaeological significance.
- The pond shown on the map of the site was marked on maps going as far back as the 1830s. If this pond was successfully 'filled in' there would almost certainly be drainage issues for nearby land and dwellings.

Other Matters

- The development would give no beneficial addition to the area, only negative impact.
- Insufficient separation between properties and neighbouring properties
- There's plenty of brown areas which can be redeveloped without harming the environment,

wildlife etc.

Whilst the representations received have been noted, in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017 (as amended), the matters which can be considered by the Local Planning Authority in determining whether or not to grant Permission in Principle are limited to the location of development, the land use proposed, and the amount of development proposed. It is therefore only the comments received relating to these matters that have been considered.

Statutory/Non-Statutory Consultations

Traffic Section - No comments received other than noting that highway safety, access parking and servicing matters are assessed at Technical Details stage (Stage 2 of the Permission in Principle process).

Waste Management - No comments or observations received.

Borough Engineer - Drainage Section - Recommends a planning condition securing a satisfactory surface water and foul water scheme.

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land - No objections in principle

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit - Advises that the applicant would need to assess the ecological value of the site and provide ecological reports with the stage 2 Technical Details stage.

United Utilities (Water and waste) - No objections, subject to conditions

Minerals and Waste Team - Advised that any Technical Details stage would need to provide a statement

Greater Manchester Archaeological Service - No objections, subject to conditions relating to the archeological value of the site, where the Roman Road is likely to run along the boundary of the site being recorded.

Whilst the comments received have been noted, in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017 (as amended), the matters which can be considered by the Local Planning Authority in determining whether or not to grant Permission in Principle are limited to: the location of development, the land use proposed, and the amount of development proposed.

Pre-start Conditions - Not applicable.

Development Plan and Policies

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
H1/2	Further Housing Development
H2/1	The Form of New Residential Development
H2/2	The Layout of New Residential Development
EN1/2	Townscape and Built Design
EN6/3	Features of Ecological Value
EN7/5	Waste Water Management
OL1/2	New Buildings in the Green Belt
HT2/4	Car Parking and New Development
SPD6	Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations & Extensions
SPD8	DC Policy Guidance Note 8 - New Buildings in the Green Belt
SPD11	Parking Standards in Bury
JP-S2	Carbon and Energy
JP-S4	Flood Risk and the Water Environment
JP-S5	Clean Air

JP-H3	Type, Size and Design of New Housing
JP-H4	Density of New Housing
JP-G1	Landscape Character
JP-G8	A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
JP-G9	The Green Belt
JP-P1	Sustainable Places
JP-C2	Digital Connectivity
JP-C5	Streets For All
JP-C6	Walking and Cycling
JP-C8	Transport Requirements of New Development

Issues and Analysis

The following report includes analysis of the merits of the application against the relevant policies of both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the adopted Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (PfE) and the saved policies within the adopted Bury Unitary Development Plan (UDP), together with other relevant material planning considerations.

The policies of the UDP that have been used to assess this application are considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and as such are material planning considerations. For simplicity, just the UDP and PfE Policies will be referred to in the report, unless there is a particular matter to highlight arising from the NPPF where it would otherwise be specifically mentioned.

Equality Act 2010: All planning applications are considered in light of the Equality Act 2010 and associated Public Sector Equality Duty, where the Council is required to have due regard for:

- The elimination of discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
- The advancement of equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it;
- The fostering of good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it; which applies to people from the protected equality groups.

Human Rights: All planning applications are considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998.

Under Article 6 the applicants (and those third parties who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end full consideration will be given to their comments.

Article 8 and Protocol 1 of the First Article confer a right to respect private and family life and a right to the protection of property, ie peaceful enjoyment of one's possessions which could include a person's home, and other land and business assets.

In taking account of the Council policy as set out in the Bury Unitary Development Plan 1997 and all material planning considerations, it is concluded on balance that the rights conferred upon the applicant/ objectors/ residents/ other interested party by Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol may be interfered with, since such interference is in accordance with the law and is justified in the public interest. Any restriction of these rights posed by refusal/ approval of the application is legitimate since it is proportionate to the wider benefits of such a decision, is based upon the merits of the proposal, and falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town & Country Planning Acts.

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 imposes (without prejudice to any other obligation imposed on it) a duty upon the Council to exercise its functions and have due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of its functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can

to prevent crime and disorder in its area. In so doing and on making planning decisions under the Town and Country Planning Acts, the material Planning considerations shall have due regard to the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and its implications in the exercise of its functions.

Permission in Principle (PiP)

The Permission in Principle (PiP) application seeks to establish whether in principle, the site is suitable for a residential development for up to 9 no. dwellings.

The scope of permission in principle is limited to location, land use and amount of development. Other matters are considered at technical details stage.

Consultations on the planning application can be carried out but planning conditions cannot be attached to a PiP approval. These can be placed as informatives to advise on any technical details application that may follow.

The issues to establish acceptance of the proposed PiP development are analyzed below:

Location of Development

The application site is located on Starling Road, close to its junction with Ainsworth Road.

Green Belt

The application site falls within the Green Belt as designated by PfE Policy JP-G9 and as a result any development on the site is subject to NPPF Paragraphs 154 and 155.

Paragraph 153 states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness.

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF is clear that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt.

The submitted Planning Statement suggests that the proposed development meets the exception 154 e) limited infilling.

Whilst Unitary Development Plan policy OL1/3 names Ainsworth as a village in the Green Belt, the site itself is not considered to be located in or near Ainsworth Village and is clearly visually and physically separated from the village. The site is adjacent to Seddons Farm Estate and Lowercroft areas. As such, it is considered that the proposed development does not meet any exceptions listed within paragraph 154.

Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that the development of homes should also not be regarded as inappropriate where:

- a) The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;
- b) There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed;
- c) The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF; and
- d) Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157 below.

Grey Belt is defined by the NPPF as *"land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. 'Grey belt' excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development."*

The application site does not impact assets referred to in footnote 7. As such, the first test is to determine whether the land does or does not contribute strongly to the following purposes:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

Planning guidance published on 27th February 2025 for assessing a site against these purposes is relevant to determine whether the land constitutes grey belt for decision making. In particular, paragraph 005 of the guidance sets out the key considerations to inform judgements as to whether land is grey belt (Reference ID: 64-005-20250225). As such, the site's contribution to these purposes is considered below:

Purpose A - to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

The site is located off Starling Road on the edge of west Bury in an area known as Lowercroft and Seddons Farm Estate, so is near to a large built-up area. The site is also fully or partially enclosed by existing residential development on three sides. As such, the site is considered to play a weak role in inhibiting sprawl and would not represent an incongruous pattern of development.

Purpose B - to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

The guidance is clear that this relates to the merging of towns, not villages. The site does not contribute towards maintaining a gap between towns, nor does it contribute to visual separation of towns. As such, it is considered that this site makes no contribution toward preventing the merging of neighbouring towns.

Grey Belt Conclusion

As the site does not make a strong contribution to the Green Belt purposes (a) or (b), the site falls within the definition of Grey Belt land. However, for the proposal to be considered as not inappropriate development in the Green Belt it must satisfy all of the criterion, a to c, listed in NPPF paragraph 155. These criteria are therefore considered below:

Criterion A: Considering the impact on the remaining Green Belt in the plan area

This criterion requires that the development would not fundamentally undermine, the purposes, when taken together, of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.

The development of the site would not represent encroachment into the countryside given the surrounding development, so it is considered that the development of the site in principle would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.

Criterion B Demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed.

This criterion requires there to be a demonstrable unmet need, which in the case of applications involving the provision of housing, means:

- A lack of a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, including the relevant buffer where applicable; or
- Where the Housing Delivery Test is below 75% of the housing requirement over the previous three years.

Housing Provision

In December 2024 the revised Framework was published. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), along with revised National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), re-introduced the standard methodology as a mechanism to calculate local housing need. Paragraph 62 of the Framework states that strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment conducted using the standard method in the NPPG.

Paragraph 78 of the Framework states that Local Planning Authorities should identify a

supply of specific deliverable sites to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements set out in adopted strategic policies, such as Policy 4(a), or against local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old (unless the strategic policies have been reviewed and found not to require updating) with an additional buffer of 5% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.

The Framework states that local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing, with either a 5% buffer to ensure choice and competition in the market for land, or a 20% buffer where there has been significant under-delivery of housing over the previous three years. As set out in NPPF paragraph 78, the supply of housing must be assessed against the housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies where these are less than five years old.

The joint Places for Everyone Plan was adopted with effect from 21 March 2024 and sets the up-to-date housing requirement for Bury against which the deliverable supply of housing land must be assessed. PfE Policy JP-H1 sets the following stepped targets for Bury:

- 246 homes per year from 2022-2025;
- 452 homes per year from 2025-2030; then
- 520 homes per year from 2030-2039.

Bury's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment sets out the latest housing supply position, which is made up of sites that have an extant planning permission and sites that have potential to obtain planning permission in the future. This shows that there are a number of sites within the Borough with the potential to deliver a significant amount of housing. However, not all of these sites will contribute to the deliverable land supply calculations as many sites will take longer than five years to come forward and be fully developed. The joint Places for Everyone Plan allocates significant strategic sites for housing within Bury and will accelerate housing delivery within the Borough to meet housing needs.

Based on the 2024 5-year supply statement, the Council has demonstrated a deliverable 5-year supply of housing land with a 20% buffer (as currently required in Bury due to past under delivery) when assessed against the adopted PfE housing requirement.

Housing Delivery Test

The National Planning Policy Framework also sets out the Housing Delivery Test (HDT), which is an assessment of net additional dwellings provided over the previous three years against the homes required. Where the test indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75%) the housing requirement over the previous years, this needs to be taken into account in the decision-taking process. The latest results published by the Government (the 2023 measurement published on 12 December 2024) show that Bury has a HDT result of less than 75%, and therefore, this needs to be treated as a material factor when determining applications for residential development.

NPPF paragraph 80 requires the latest published HDT results to be used. However, the Government is currently operating to a delayed publication timetable for the HDT, and although the latest published results for 2023 are below 75%, based on the current HDT rulebook Bury's result for 2024 will be above 75% and the tilted balance will no longer be triggered by the housing delivery test result.

Paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless:

- i. The application of policies in the Framework that protect areas, or assets of particular importance, provide 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 the Framework, 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.

As a result of the latest published HDT result the 'tilted balance' applies and planning permission should be granted unless the above points Para 11(d) i or ii apply.

In this case, the site is located within the Green Belt the proposal needs to be assessed against Green Belt policies. The latest published HDT result for Bury also means that NPPF paragraph 155(b) is triggered, and there is a demonstrable unmet need for housing.

Criterion C: Sustainable Location

NPPF paragraph 155(c) requires consideration of whether the development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the Framework.

Paragraph 110 of the Framework states that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth to support the sustainable transport objectives in paragraph 109. Development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. Paragraph 115 states that development should ensure that sustainable transport modes are prioritised and safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users.

In this regard, PfE Policy JP-C1: An Integrated Network sets relevant advice, supporting:

- Patterns of development that minimises both the need to travel and the distance travelled by unsustainable modes to jobs, housing and other key services, including healthcare, education, retail, recreation and leisure facilities, green space and green infrastructure; and
- Locating and designing development, to deliver a significant increase in the proportion of trips that can be made by walking, cycling and public transport;

The site is located approximately half a mile from the closest neighbourhood centre at Mile Lane, where there is a convenience shop, a pharmacy, and a dentist. There are two primary schools within a 15 minute walk. There is also Ainsworth Delph and Ainsworth Park within a 15 and 20 minute walk respectively. Bus stops approximately 200m from the site offer hourly buses between Bury, Radcliffe and Farnworth (Bolton) on Ainsworth Road. As such, it is considered that the site is relatively sustainable, though it could benefit from improved active travel links or elements of design (bike storage, good quality footpaths, improvements to lighting) to promote increases in trips made by walking, cycling and public transport.

As such, the development is in a location that is, or can be made, sustainable and therefore the proposal meets criterion C.

To conclude, the site falls within the definition of Green Belt land and is considered to meet NPPF paragraph 155 criteria a-c. Therefore, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in Green Belt principles. The site is also considered to be in a sustainable location and therefore dwellings on this site are thus acceptable in principle.

Amount of development

PfE Policy JP-H4 requires new housing development to be delivered at a density appropriate to the location, reflecting the relative accessibility of the site by walking, cycling and public transport and the need to achieve efficient use of land and high-quality design.

Policy JP-H4 sets out minimum densities that should be considered.

Paragraph 124 of the Framework states that planning decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes whilst safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring, healthy living conditions. Paragraph 130 of the Framework states that where there is an existing shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs it is especially important that planning decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, failing to make optimal use of the potential of each site. Paragraph 130 further states that Local Planning Authorities should refuse applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land, taking into account the policies in the Framework.

The application site falls in an area where PfE Policy JP-H4 seeks a minimum density of 35 dwellings per hectare applies. Increasing the average density of new housing developments in the most accessible locations is an important part of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan overall strategy.

The total site area is circa 0.72 hectares, therefore this equates to 16 dwellings per hectare. As this application only proposes 9 dwellings would be provided, the proposal would fail to meet the PfE density standards set out in PfE Policy JP-H4.

PfE Policy JP-H4 states that lower densities may be acceptable where they can be clearly justified by:

1. Local housing market issues, such as a demonstrable need for a particular type of housing that cannot be delivered at higher density; or
2. Site-specific issues, such as the design context and any potential impact on the wider landscape or townscape including heritage assets and green infrastructure.

The site's Green Belt location would not automatically justify a lower density, and whilst a case has been put forward by the applicant advising that the applicant wishes to keep their house and part of their garden including the pond and some trees, and an area to provide a net gain to biodiversity, no Biodiversity information accompanies this application to prove the extent of land that would need to be set aside to achieve the mandatory required net gain to biodiversity, the application contains a red edge around the entirety of the site, as defined on the submitted Location Plan.

It is noted that another illustrative plan shows a reduced development area indicating the above. However, the number of houses shown on both illustrative Site Plans, even on the a smaller development area, fail to accord with the density requirements of PfE Policy JP-H4.

To conclude, developing the site for up to 9 dwellings would therefore be contrary to PfE Policy JP-H4: Density of New Housing, and NPPF paragraph 130 as 9 dwellings on this site would not result in an efficient and effective use of land. It is therefore recommended the proposed development is refused.

Statement in accordance with Article 35(2) Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2015

The proposal would not improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area nor does it comply with the development plan and therefore does not comprise sustainable development. There were no amendments to the scheme, or conditions which could reasonably have been imposed, which could have made the development acceptable and it was therefore not possible to approve the application. The Local Planning Authority has therefore implemented the requirement in Paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Recommendation: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons:

- 1 The proposed development for up to 9 No dwellings on a 0.72ha site would not make optimal use of the potential of the site and would fail to provide a satisfactory density of development. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy JP-H4 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan and Chapter 11, particularly paragraph 130, of the National Planning Policy Framework.

<u>Case Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Sign off Officer</u>	<u>Date</u>
CB	14/11/2025	HL -	14/11/2025