

Minutes of the meeting of Planning and regulatory committee held at The Council Chamber - The Shire Hall, St. Peter's Square, Hereford, HR1 2HX on Wednesday 2 August 2017 at 10.00 am

Present: Councillor PGH Cutter (Chairman)
Councillor J Hardwick (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors: BA Baker, WLS Bowen, DW Greenow, KS Guthrie, EPJ Harvey, TM James, FM Norman, AJW Powers, A Seldon, EJ Swinglehurst and SD Williams

In attendance: Councillors PE Crockett, BA Durkin, PM Morgan and D Summers

30. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors CR Butler, PJ Edwards, EL Holton, JLV Kenyon, and WC Skelton.

31. NAMED SUBSTITUTES

Councillor WLS Bowen substituted for Councillor PJ Edwards, Councillor EPJ Harvey for Councillor JLV Kenyon and Councillor SD Williams for Councillor WC Skelton.

32. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Agenda item 9: 170984 – Land at Four Winds, Phocle Green, Ross-on-Wye

Councillor DW Greenow declared a non-pecuniary interest because he knew the applicant.

Agenda item 10: 170465 – Land Adjacent to Holly Brook Cottage, Lyde.

Councillor J Hardwick declared a non-pecuniary interest because he knew the applicant.

33. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

34. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman reported that this was Leenamari Aantaa-Collier's last meeting as legal adviser to the Committee and thanked her for her contribution to the Committee's work.

35. APPEALS

The Planning Committee noted the report.

36. 162261 - LAND OFF ASHFIELD WAY, BROMYARD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR7 4BF

(Proposed site for up to 80 dwellings, garages, parking, open space and indicative road layout.)

The Principal Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application, and updates/additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet, as appended to these Minutes. He added that although no formal written response had been received from the Herefordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) they had confirmed, at a meeting on 31 July 2017, that Nunwell Surgery was at capacity.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr R Page, of Bromyard and Winslow Town Council, spoke in opposition to the Scheme. Mrs C Hughes, a local resident, speaking on behalf of residents of Ashdown Way spoke in objection.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor A Seldon, spoke on the application.

He made the following principal comments:

- The site was a windfall development. No local authority plan had designated the site for housing.
- Core Strategy Policy BY1 stated that Bromyard would accommodate a minimum of 500 new homes together with around 5 hectares of new employment land during the plan period. Bromyard and Winslow Town Council had decided not to pursue a Neighbourhood Development Plan having been unable to identify employment land. It was now seeking to participate in the production of the Bromyard Area Development Plan.
- The Parish Council's preference and that of the local population was for development to take place at the strategic housing location Hardwick Bank as provided for in Core Strategy policy BY2.
- He questioned whether the proposal was premature and contrary to the provision of policy SS5 requiring the provision of employment land.
- He highlighted and supported the concerns expressed by Nunwell Surgery that the current capacity was insufficient to meet the additional need that the development would generate.
- St Peters Bromyard Primary School was at or over capacity.
- He questioned whether the development was necessary and whether it would jeopardise infrastructure and the delivery of the strategic housing site at Hardwick Bank.
- In relation to the impact on the landscape and conformity with policy LD1, whilst the planning officer had commented that the planning application was for outline permission applications for planning permission on adjacent sites had been refused and dismissed on appeal on landscape grounds. Recent legal judgements meant that the authority could give weight to this aspect notwithstanding the absence of a five year housing land supply. Development proposals should conserve and enhance the landscape.
- In summary he asked the Committee to consider whether the proposal jeopardised the development of the Hardwick Bank site because of the pressure on infrastructure, whether it was contrary to policy SS5 given the absence of employment land in the Parish and contrary to policy LD1 because of its adverse impact on the landscape.

- If the application were to be approved he requested that the Town Council and local community be involved in consideration of the reserved matters.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- In response to questions the Principal Planning Officer showed a plan indicating the proposed housing development in the Town. He confirmed that paragraph 4 of the Heads of Terms document was intended to refer to a contribution per dwelling.
- Current plans provided for sustainable development in Bromyard. Consideration should be given to the potentially adverse effect of unplanned development.
- The development was contrary to the wishes of the Town Council and the local community. There were other sites identified for development for which there was local support.
- Regard needed to be had to the concerns about whether there was sufficient infrastructure provision to support the proposed development.
- The absence of employment land was a concern.
- Particular consideration needed to be given to the impact on the landscape of a development on the approach to the Town. There appeared to be a lack of information about the provision of green infrastructure as part of the development. A member added that if the development were to be approved it would be important to ensure that any mitigation provided was sufficient. If this was carried out well it might even soften the edge of the approach to the Town.
- It was asked whether there was scope for sustainable transport measures. However, in view of the concerns about the impact on the landscape a majority of members supported a proposal that a site inspection be held.

The legal adviser commented on the effect of the "Richborough case" on the application of the NPPF and the weight the Committee could give to core strategy policies. If the Committee was minded to refuse the application it would have to be satisfied that the proposal would cause significant and demonstrable harm.

The Lead Development Manager commented in response to a question that the Rural Areas Development Plan was to be progressed first ahead of the Bromyard Area Development Plan. No decision had yet been taken as to what areas, including the application site, would be included within the Rural Areas Development Plan. A site visit would allow members to consider the concerns that had been expressed about the proposal's landscape impact.

RESOLVED: That consideration of the application be deferred pending a site visit.

(The meeting adjourned between 11.17 am and 11.28 am.)

37. 162809 - TOM'S PATCH, STANFORD BISHOP, BRINGSTY

(Proposed holiday park for 40 holiday caravans, associated infrastructure and managerial lodge.)

The Principal Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application, and updates/additional representations received following the publication of the agenda were provided in the update sheet, as appended to these Minutes.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr A Elliot, of Acton Beauchamp Parish Council, spoke in opposition to the Scheme. Mr M Venables, a local resident, spoke in objection. Mr J Lambe, the applicant's agent, spoke in support.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor PM Morgan, spoke on the application.

She made the following principal comments:

- She questioned whether the development was sustainable. Any other form of development would have been refused planning permission on the grounds that it represented development in the open countryside.
- A recent application for the construction of 5 dwellings next door to the application site had been refused at appeal on the grounds that it was not a sustainable location and another application for a house in Acton Beauchamp had been refused on the grounds that it represented development in the open countryside.
- In this case weight was being given to the economic benefits of the development associated with tourism. She highlighted paragraph 6.2 of the report which referred to policy E4 – tourism. She noted that having regard to paragraph 2 of policy E4 the policy supported the development of sustainable tourism opportunities “where there is not detrimental impact”. It was questionable whether the landscaping plans would be capable of mitigating the impact of the proposed development. It was also the case that there were a number of caravan developments in the area (the adjoining Malvern view (permission for 323 caravans and lodges), and, on the other side of Bromyard, Saltmarsh Castle (approx. 100 caravans) and Rock Farm (approximately 40 caravans). The application site did not support the type of developments referred to in paragraph 4 of policy E4. There would be some economic benefit but this had to be weighed against the other impacts of the proposal.
- The area was very rural; the parishes of Stanford Bishop, Acton Beauchamp and Evesbatch had small populations and the cumulative impact of the development on the locality had to be viewed in that context. There had been 31 letters of objection, a large number given the population.
- The access road was very narrow. The Transportation Manager had originally recommended refusal of the application. Some mitigation in the form of new white lines had now been proposed but there was a question as to whether this was sufficient, noting also that their condition would deteriorate over time. Visibility splays were also a concern and the right turn travelling to Bromyard was difficult.
- In summary the application site was not in a sustainable location; the economic benefit was not sufficient to outweigh this and there was already a significant number of such developments in the area. There were significant highways concerns and landscape issues.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- Some concern was expressed about the arrangements in place to ensure that the caravans were not permanently occupied. The legal adviser commented that council's enforcement team's ability to enforce was not a material planning consideration. The Lead Development Manager undertook to discuss the concerns raised with the Development Manager (enforcement).
- There were concerns about highway safety.
- There would be some limited economic benefit but this did not outweigh the significant impact on local amenity. The development was not sustainable.
- It was questioned when the cumulative impact of such developments in a locality could be considered detrimental and therefore inconsistent with policy E4.

- The landscape mitigation proposed would vary in its effectiveness according to the seasons.
- The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the proposed lodges fell within the legal definition of caravans and the application needed to be considered within that policy context, which was different to that in terms of housing sites when considering sustainability. It was inherently the case that caravan sites would be located in more rural locations.
- The Lead Development Manager commented, having regard to concerns expressed in the debate, that if the Committee was minded to refuse the application the two main issues were the impact on local infrastructure potentially making the application contrary to policy MT1 and the cumulative impact on the landscape of the number of caravans on sites in the locality potentially making the application contrary to policy LD1.

Members suggested that policy E4 was also relevant.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. She commented that the site was not small and discrete, as had been suggested, particularly when viewed in conjunction with the large, neighbouring caravan site.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be refused and officers named in the Scheme of Delegation to Officers be authorised to finalise the drafting of the reasons for refusal for publication based on the Committee's view that the proposal was contrary to policies LD1, E4 and MT1.

38. 170984 - LAND AT FOUR WINDS, PHOCLE GREEN, ROSS-ON-WYE.

(Erection of a 3 bed dwelling, amended access and bio-disc drainage.)

The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Mr J Long, the applicant, and Mr B Griffin, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor BA Durkin, spoke on the application.

He made the following principal comments:

- The site was in the open countryside but the application had to be put in perspective. There were some 10 properties close by including a gated estate of 4 bungalows next door. The application site was not isolated but would form part of a hamlet and intrude no further into the open countryside than the estate next door.
- The Parish Council supported the proposal. There were 29 letters in support and 2 objections.
- He noted the circumstances of the applicant, an agricultural worker, as at paragraph 6.12 of the report. He acknowledged that the application did not comply with policy RA3 but considered that it had merit.
- In summary the site was not an isolated development, but would form part of a viable hamlet in the open countryside on a brownfield site.

The Chairman commented that he was the local ward member for the applicant's current dwelling but not the ward member for the application site.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- The application for a small development on a brownfield site would not intrude any further into the open countryside than the existing development which formed a small hamlet. It was sustainable.
- There was local support for the application including the Parish Council.
- The applicant was a council tenant losing his tenancy and seeking to provide accommodation for himself on waste land.
- Weight could not be given to the personal circumstances of the applicant, however sympathetic to these Members may be. The application was contrary to policy RA2 and did not meet the exception criteria in policy RA3.
- Reference was made to the reasons for the refusal of an earlier application set out at paragraph 3.22 of the report and it was suggested that nothing had changed since that refusal.

The Lead Development Manager commented that the adjacent bungalows had been approved on appeal. The inspector had commented on the unique nature of the application and the significant harm presented by the poultry units then on that site. The application needed to be determined in accordance with the development plan. The application was contrary to policy. The site was in the open countryside. The applicant owned an adjoining property. The applicant had submitted no evidence, for example the requested additional information on transportation aspects, to counter the reasons for refusal of the previous application.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. He had no additional comments.

A motion that the application be approved on the basis that it represented a sustainable location for a single dwelling was lost.

A motion that the application was refused on the grounds recommended in the report was carried.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal is considered to represent an unsustainable form of development where residential development of this type is not supported unless it meets exceptional criteria. As such, the application is found to be contrary to Policies RA2 and RA3 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy.**
- 2. The proposal is considered to be out of keeping with the pattern of the surrounding development, introducing an uncharacteristic ‘backland’ development. As such, the character of the landscape has not positively influenced the site selection with the application therefore being contrary to Policy LD1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy.**
- 3. In the absence of sufficient information, the highways implications of the proposal cannot be adequately assessed in relation to visibility splays, connection to the highway and increased vehicle movements onto the highway. The proposal is therefore unable to be assessed favourably against Policy MT1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan – Core Strategy and paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

39. 170465 - LAND ADJACENT TO HOLLY BROOK COTTAGE, LYDE, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR4 8AD

(Proposed bungalow and garage with access.)

The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation on the application.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking Mr Stain, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. Mrs Hall, the applicant, spoke in support.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the local ward member, Councillor PE Crockett, spoke on the application.

She made the following principal comments:

- The Parish Council objected to the application for the reasons set out at paragraph 5.1 of the report.
- The gradient of the proposed driveway was severe. There was a concern that removal of soil to achieve the access would result in subsidence to the neighbouring boundary wall and garden.
- There was a concern that emergency vehicles would be unable to access the property.
- She noted concerns of the Conservation Manager (Ecology) about the clearance of the site by the applicant that had taken place.
- Policy RA2 identified Pipe and Lyde as an area where sustainable growth would be supported. She questioned the sustainability of the application for 1 dwelling against the three dimensions of sustainable development: economic, social and environmental.
- There was a dispute over land ownership.
- A previous application on the site had been refused.
- In summary she considered the proposal would have an adverse environmental impact. This outweighed any modest social and economic benefit and the development was not sustainable.

In the Committee's discussion of the application the following principal points were made:

- A general concern was expressed about the access and visibility. Clarification was requested on the suitability of the access given its gradient and the potential impact on the neighbouring property. The Area Engineer – Development Control commented that the gradient was within the range permitted by the relevant standards.
- Concern was also expressed about sewerage and foul water disposal.
- It was noted that the clearance of the site, however regrettable, was not a material consideration.
- Mindful of the comments of the Conservation Manager (Ecology) it was asked what conditions could be imposed to provide mitigation in response to the clearance of the site, with the additional aim of preventing intensification of development on the site having regard to concerns about the access.

The Lead Development Manager commented that the application site was compliant with policy RA2 and represented organic growth. It had been judged that the application was suitable for one dwelling. A further application would be required if additional

development of the site was proposed. The refusal of a previous application for 2 dwellings had happened prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy and the inclusion of Pipe and Lyde as a settlement listed in policy RA2 where proportionate growth would be accepted. The Strategy provided for minimum growth of 25 dwellings and to date only one had been built. He suggested that if the Committee was minded to approve the application an additional conditional be applied regarding landscaping. The proposal was sustainable development.

The local ward member was given the opportunity to close the debate. She reiterated concerns about the access and questioned whether the proposal represented appropriate proportionate growth and sustainable development.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1. **C01 - Time limit for commencement (full permission)**
2. **C06 - Development in accordance with the approved plans (Drawings received 7 February 2017)**
3. **CAH - Driveway gradient**
4. **CAL - Access, turning area and parking**
5. **CAZ - Parking for site operatives**
6. **C13 - Samples of external materials**
7. **C95 - Details of Boundary treatments (boundary treatment (in particular Wyloe);**
8. **CD5 - No drainage run-off to public system**
9. **CD6 - Comprehensive & Integrated draining of site**
10. **CE6 - Water Efficiency - Residential**
11. **CD2 - Habitat Enhancement Scheme**
12. **CBK - Restriction of hours during construction**
13. **Single storey building only.**
14. **Ecological working method and risk avoidance measures statement.**
15. **Boundary tree protection measures during construction.**
16. **C96 – Landscaping scheme**
17. **G11 – Landscaping implementation**

INFORMATIVES:

1. **The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against planning policy and any other material considerations, including any representations that have been received. It has subsequently determined to grant planning**

permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. I05 - HN10 No drainage to discharge to highway

3. I45 - HN05 Works within the highway

40. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Planning Committee noted the date of the next meeting.

Appendix - Schedule of Updates

The meeting ended at 1.45 pm

Chairman

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 2 August 2017

Schedule of Committee Updates/Additional Representations

Note: The following schedule represents a summary of the additional representations received following the publication of the agenda and received up to midday on the day before the Committee meeting where they raise new and relevant material planning considerations.

SCHEDULE OF COMMITTEE UPDATES

162261 - PROPOSED SITE FOR UP TO 80 DWELLINGS, GARAGES, PARKING, OPEN SPACE AND INDICATIVE ROAD LAYOUT AT LAND OFF ASHFIELD WAY, BROMYARD, HEREFORDSHIRE, HR7 4BF

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Further correspondence has been received from Nunwell Surgery. It reiterates their concerns about the amount of new housing development that may take place in Bromyard and the impact that this will have on their service delivery.

OFFICER COMMENTS

No further comment

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

162809 - PROPOSED HOLIDAY PARK FOR 40 HOLIDAY CARAVANS, ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AND MANAGERIAL LODGE AT TOM'S PATCH, STANFORD BISHOP, BRINGSTY

For: Mr & Mrs Powell-Bateson c/o Agent per Mr Jeremy Lambe, Galeri, Victoria Dock, Caernarfon, Gwynedd, LL55 1SQ

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Email received from Bromyard & District Chamber of Commerce & Industry.

They have advised that they wish to express their support for the following reasons.

1. Rural Business diversification (NPPF)
2. Favourable economic activity in the Bromyard and District area.
3. Opportunities for local employment (NPPF and Herefordshire LDF/Core Strategy).
4. Not aware that the B4220 is heavily used in terms of severity (NPPF)
5. Holiday Parks in the Bromyard & District area should be encouraged given their significant contribution to the local economy and their wider Tourism favourable impact in the County of Herefordshire (Policy E4 LDF/Core strategy).

OFFICER COMMENTS

Three additional letters of representation have been received. In summary the points raised are as follows:

- The officer's report does not properly apply the 'planning balance'. It automatically assumes in favour of sustainable development and does not sufficiently take account

of the need for the 'weighing' or balancing of all relevant factors before determining whether the proposal is sustainable in terms of paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

- The report downplays the relevance of the appeal decision at Rock Farm for an almost identical proposal.
- Reference to a recently dismissed appeal for 5 dwellings at Woods End, 500 metres north of the site which was dismissed for not meeting sustainability criteria and having a negative impact on the Herefordshire Wooded Plateau Landscape.
- Another appeal was dismissed on landscape grounds at Little Froome Farm, Bromyard for a solar PV farm, despite massive potential renewable energy benefits.
- The negative impacts on the AONB and North Herefordshire Wooded Plateau Landscape measures weigh heavily against the proposal.
- The roofs of the lodge style units will intrude significantly within the setting of Silkcroft when viewed from the west and north east, particularly during autumn and winter months.
- Visual and residential amenity from other properties, namely The Herefordshire House (467 metres), The Oaks (520 metres) and Chapel Cottage (475 metres) will all be substantially affected by the cumulative negative impacts of the development.
- The lack of a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) apparently discounts the strong feelings of the local community.
- The report uses the absence of a NDP for invoking the precedence of Policy E4 of the Core Strategy regarding the promotion of sustainable development.
- Questions paragraph 6.29 of the report which suggests that there is confusion about the ownership of Toms Patch and Malvern View Country Park.
- Agreement with paragraph 6.30 of the report that planning does not exist to stifle development and that over-development can only be assessed on planning-related issues, provided that competition is actually intended and that the real intention is not in fact to sell the site to the owners of Malvern View.
- Weight must be given to the cumulative negative impact of the site and Malvern View.
- The number of conditions proposed to be imposed and the amount of mitigation required are a clear indication that the proposal almost certainly represents over-development.
- The report over-exaggerates the benefits to be derived from tourism. There may be marginal benefits to local pubs and restaurants but these do not provide adequate justification for further permanent major encroachment into the rural environment.
- Continued concern about highway safety

OFFICER COMMENTS

The correspondence from the Chamber of Commerce does not raise any new issues but concurs with the view expressed in the Officer's Appraisal at paragraph 6.33 that the proposal will have benefits in terms of its economic impact. This is one of the three dimensions of sustainable development and is a material planning consideration in favour of the proposal to which officers have attributed weight.

The representations raise a number of points that require further comment. They are addressed in the same order:

With regard to the 'planning balance' the officer's view is that the process for considering the application is set out quite clearly in paragraphs 6.3 and 6.4 in that it sets out the need to apply the planning balance before coming to the conclusion as to whether the proposal is representative of sustainable development.

The references to appeal decisions are noted but Members are reminded that applications must be treated on their own merits. However, it is considered necessary to provide some commentary to address the points raised.

With reference to the appeal at Rock Farm, paragraph 6.31 of the Officer's Appraisal identifies a crucial difference between the two sites; the topography of the site. In that case the Inspector concluded that the site would be clearly visible in the near and middle distance as the site is quite steeply sloped and is not afforded the same degree of existing mature vegetation. In this case the site is flat and is surrounded by mature vegetation. As a result its visual impact is considered to be limited by comparison.

Contrary to the suggestion of one of the authors, the appeal for residential development at Woods End does not refer specifically to the negative impact of that appeal proposal would have on the North Herefordshire Wooded Plateau Landscape. It does consider settlement pattern and the impact of the site. Paragraph 18 of the appeal decision specifically says:

"...the visual impact of the site in the wider countryside is minimal. The impact of the site is essentially limited to passers-by on the road and has little effect on the setting of the listed building to the north..." and continues: *"the site has no material impact on the large Malvern View Leisure Park..."*

The visual impacts of a solar PV farm are inherently different to those of this proposal. They do not afford the same potential to introduce new planting to mitigate the impacts of development. The site in question is quite open and is clearly visible from a number of public vantage points. The same cannot be said of this site; whose characteristics and visual prominence have been examined in detail by the applicant's landscape appraisal and the Council's Landscape Officer, both of which concur that the site has a limited impact in the wider landscape.

The comments concerning the impact on heritage assets and residential amenity are a matter of judgement on behalf of the author of the correspondence. In the case of impact upon Silkcroft the comments do not apply the same test of significance of impact as outlined in the Officer's Appraisal. In terms of amenity, the correspondence fails to specify what the cumulative impacts are. The properties are distant from the site and it is not considered that they will suffer any demonstrable detrimental impact to their amenity.

The fact that the report highlights the lack of a NDP is not intended to dilute the significance of the comments received from the local community, but simply makes clear the policy basis under which the application should be considered.

While the author of the further correspondence may be clear about the ownership of the application site a number of objection letters do make reference to Malvern View and appear to conclude that this proposal is linked to it.

Correspondence suggests that the site may be sold to the owners of Malvern View and that consequently will not result in competition. In the same way that the planning system should not seek to stifle competition it cannot seek to restrict future ownership.

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) provides advice about the use of planning conditions. It says:

"When used properly, conditions can enhance the quality of development and enable development proposals to proceed where it would otherwise have been necessary to refuse planning permission, by mitigating the adverse effects of the development."

It does not suggest that the number of conditions to be imposed is an indication that the cumulative impacts of a proposal render it as unacceptable – the conditions are there to mitigate identified impacts.

Finally, the economic benefits have been given weight in the planning balance. It appears that the benefits are also given weight by local Chamber of Commerce. The precise impacts

are impossible to determine but the very fact that the proposal will bring tourists into the local area who will spend some of their income in Herefordshire has to be beneficial to the local economy.

The correspondence does not raise any new issues but concurs with the view expressed in the Officer's Appraisal at paragraph 6.33 that the proposal will have benefits in terms of its economic impact. This is one of the three dimensions of sustainable development and is a material planning consideration in favour of the proposal to which officers have attributed significant weight.

NO CHANGE TO RECOMMENDATION

