

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Expiry Date	Plan Ref.
H2Land Ltd	Permission in principle for the erection of between 6no. and 8no. dwellings Land at Littleheath Lane, Lickey End	24.06.2026	26/00608/PIP

Councillor R Hunter has requested that this application be considered by Planning Committee rather than being determined under delegated powers.

RECOMMENDATION: That the planning in principle stage be **GRANTED**

Consultations

Worcestershire Highways – Bromsgrove

- No objection
- WCCHA comment that all other matters, including access are considered as part of the Technical Details Consent application;
- It is further noted that where development comprises 7 or more dwellings, access would be required to be constructed to adoptable standards in accordance with the Worcestershire County Council Streetscape Design Guide, and would be addressed at the Technical Details Consent stage.

North Worcestershire Water Management

- I am aware that permission in principle application only considers location, land use and amount of development. I believe that due to the potential flood risk and potential issues with draining the site, further detail is required to confirm that the location and land use in particular are appropriate. I therefore suggest that this application for permission in principle is refused
- The site falls within flood zone 1 (low risk of fluvial flooding) but lies adjacent to an area of flood zone 3 associated with the Spadesbourne Brook. There is a low-risk and shallow surface water flow path passing through the site from North East to South West. We are aware of reports of flooding in the nearby vicinity, including water flowing off this parcel of land. We are aware of a boundary ditch to the North of the site which we believe drains part of Littleheath Lane. Immediately to the North of this site is a flood storage area, created during the construction of the M42.
- The site is undeveloped / greenfield; the proposals are likely to result in an overall increase in the amount of hardstanding on site which may lead to additional surface water runoff being generated; this must be retained on site to greenfield rates and volumes to ensure no increase in flood risk off site.
- According to Soilscales, the site is underlain with loamy and clayey soils with impeded drainage, therefore infiltration drainage is unlikely to be feasible; on-site investigations must be carried out to verify this and to inform the detailed drainage design of the site. It is my understanding that there is no storm water sewer present at this point, although the applicant would need to undertake their own investigations to confirm this. No storm water may discharge into the highway drainage system or a foul sewer.

Publicity

10 letters sent 02.06.2026 (expired 26.06.2026)

11 letters of objection have been received to date. The comments are available in full on Public Access and are summarised below:

- The area has a high number of applications in for housing development and without the infrastructure in place to support it;
- Disturbance of wildlife habitats destroyed;
- Planning statement does not address recurring flooding in the area;
- The site is within the Green Belt;
- Access onto Little Heath Lane would be on a blind bend and highways concerns;
- Concerns over overlooking and privacy;
- No footpaths for pedestrians;
- Change in character of the area;
- Construction impact;
- Reduction of the open buffer between Little Heath Lane and the M42 motorway

Councillor R Hunter

- Has called in the application as he believes it is contrary to the Green Belt protections that have historically been in place and the interpretation of the new Grey Belt policy is subjective.

Relevant Policies

Bromsgrove District Plan

BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles

BDP2 Settlement Hierarchy

BDP4 Green Belt

BDP12 Sustainable Communities

BDP16 Sustainable Transport

Others

National Planning Policy Framework (2024)

National Planning Practice Guidance

Relevant Planning History

No relevant planning history.

Assessment of Proposal

The Site

The site comprises an uncultivated agricultural field measuring approximately 0.48 hectares and is located within the Green Belt, outside of the Lickey End Village settlement as defined on the Bromsgrove District Plan Policies Map.

There is a run of development opposite the application site on Littleheath Lane, approximately 19 metres south. The defined settlement boundary of Lickey End is located 19 metres to the south and 50 metres west of the application site.

To the north of the application site lies open fields, with the M42 motorway beyond that. To the east lies a hedged row, with a garden centre beyond. Having regard to the modest scale and location of the existing development, the site has a predominately open and rural character.

Proposal

The application relates to a Permission in Principle for up to 8 no. dwellings.

Permission in Principle (PiP) is a specific planning consent route in England designed primarily for small-scale, housing-led developments. It separates the consideration of whether a site is suitable for development in principle from the technical details of the proposed buildings.

The (PiP) process is an alternative to the traditional outline planning application route and involves two stages:

1. **Permission in Principle (PiP) Stage:** The Local Planning Authority assesses the site's suitability based only on three core factors:
 - Location;
 - Land Use
 - Amount of development (e.g. number of dwellings)
2. **Technical Details Consent (TDC) Stage:** The second age where the detailed development proposals are assessed. The new process was introduced in June 2018 and was intended to speed up and simplify the planning process for small housing developments.

If a PiP is granted, a subsequent application for Technical Details Consent must be submitted and approved before any development can begin. This stage involves the detailed design aspects, such as appearance, layout, landscaping, and access, and requires full architectural plans and supporting technical documents. The TDC stage is similar to a Reserved Matters application or a full planning application.

Assessment of Proposal

The main issue is whether the site is suitable for residential development, having regard to its location, proposed land use and the amount of development as highlighted above.

5 Year Land Supply Position

5 Year Land Supply Position The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply (5YHLS) and therefore regard should be had to paragraph 11(d) and footnote 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which together state that for applications providing housing, where the Council cannot demonstrate a 5YHLS, the policies which are most important for determining the application are considered out-of-date and planning permission should be granted unless:

- (i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance 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.

Location

In respect of Green Belt policy, it has been established through case law that the list of exceptions for 'appropriate development' set out in Policy BDP4 of the Bromsgrove District Plan (BDP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) amounts to a closed list. Thereby, proposals not included on the list are regarded as 'prima facie' inappropriate development. The Framework states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

The site is located within the Green Belt, on the edge of Lickey End which is considered a village. The site lies within the Green Belt and the proposal does not comprise one of the closed lists of exceptions at paragraph 154 of the NPPF and Policy BDP4 of the Bromsgrove District Plan.

The applicant has submitted a Grey Belt Assessment as part of the application.

Paragraph 155 of the Framework states that: the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should also not be regarded as inappropriate where all of the following apply:

- 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 this Framework; and
- d. Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157.

Grey Belt is defined within Annex 2 of the NPPF as follows:

Grey Belt: For the purposes of plan-making and decision-making, 'grey belt' is defined 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.

Paragraph 143 of the NPPF sets out that the Green Belt serves five purposes which are listed below:

- a. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b. to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- c. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- d. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- e. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Other than types of development listed as exceptions within the Framework, development within the Green Belt is generally regarded as “inappropriate development”, which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Further exceptions to inappropriate development are set out in paragraph 155 of the Framework, where homes, commercial and other development should also not be regarded as inappropriate where it would utilise grey belt, subject to specific criteria.

Does Green Belt land on the site strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes a), b) or d)?

a) To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas; the proposal does not strongly contribute to the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, as Lickey End is a village, and not a LBUA, and the proposal site has some physical features in reasonable proximity that could restrict and contain development. This is due to the existing development to the west, Littleheath Lane to the south, as well as Bromsgrove Garden Centre to the east and the M42 motorway to the north of the site. These features mean the site only makes a moderate contribution to checking unrestricted sprawl as the site is partially enclosed by existing development, such that new development would not result in an incongruous pattern of development and there also being subject to other urbanising influences. Therefore, this site only makes a moderate contribution to checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area.

b) To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; the site does not strongly or moderately contribute to preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another because of the nearest town is Bromsgrove, which sits to the south-west of the application site. The A38 is a physical barrier preventing Lickey End from merging with Bromsgrove. This site is located to the opposite end of where the A38 is located, and would make no contribution to visual separation. Therefore, the site makes a weak contribution to this purpose.

d) To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; the nearby town of Bromsgrove is not considered to be a historic town, and as such the site makes no contribution to purpose d).

Would the application of non-Green Belt NPPF footnote 7 policies to the scheme proposed on the Green Belt part of the site provide a strong reason for refusing development? Footnote 7 states "*The policies referred to are those in this Framework (rather than those in development plans) relating to: habitats sites (and those sites listed in paragraph 194) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land*

designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, a National Landscape, a National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or defined as Heritage Coast; irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets (and other heritage assets of archaeological interest referred to in footnote 75); and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change."

On this basis, the Council has no reason to believe that the application of NPPF footnote 7 policies would provide a strong reason for refusing development.

Would the proposed development on grey belt fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan?

Purposes a, b and d have already been assessed above. Regard however must be made to purposes c) and e).

c) Safeguard the countryside from encroachment; there is a row of development opposite the application site on Little Heath Lane, and the settlement boundary of Lickey End beyond that. To the north of the application site lies an open field, with the M42 motorway beyond. To the east of the site lies Bromsgrove Garden Centre. In relation to the wider function of the Green Belt, the site does not fundamentally undermine the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.

e) Assisting in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land; the proposed development would not fundamentally undermine the purpose of this Green Belt criterion.

Is there a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed?

The Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year land supply of housing having regards to the Government's targets.

Would the development in the Grey Belt be in a sustainable location?

The application site is located immediately (but outside) of the settlement boundary for Lickey End, as identified on the Council's Proposals Map. Lickey End is considered to be a 'village', and has a variety of services and amenities, including a school, convenience store and public house. Whilst the application site is just outside of the settlement boundary, there is housing along Little Heath Lane, and immediately to the west of the application site, and a bus stop approximately 400 metres south with regular services to Bromsgrove and Droitwich. There is street lighting and footpaths along Little Heath Lane towards Meadowvale Road.

Through established case law (*Wood v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*, *Gravesham Borough Council* [2015]), it is considered that the physical circumstances of a site and its relationship to a settlement are relevant in considering whether a site should be deemed infill for the purposes of Green Belt policy. Within the settlement boundary of Lickey End, there are footpaths with street lighting along Little Heath Lane and Meadowvale Road.

Whilst I note the application site is not within a defined settlement boundary, I take the above into account and the day to day services provided in Lickey End and further

beyond in Bromsgrove, the application site would be in a sustainable location, having regard to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF, as despite the semi-rural nature of the location, future occupiers would be able to access bus services on Little Heath Lane using footpaths to access Lickey End, Bromsgrove Town Centre and Birmingham. Those services would provide an alternative to using private vehicles to access a range of facilities for future occupiers day to day needs.

Does the proposal include major development involving housing?

The proposals would not need to meet the 'Golden Rules' requirements because the application would not be categorised as 'major' development having regard to the definition of 'major development' set out in Annex 2: Glossary on page 75 of the NPPF.

In conclusion, it is considered that the site is Grey Belt and would meet the paragraph 155 requirements and thus the proposal should not be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the Framework.

Conclusion on Green Belt Matters

In conclusion, it is considered that the site is Grey Belt and would meet the Paragraph 155 requirements and thus the proposal should not be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the Framework.

The proposals would not need to meet the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in criterion (d) of the NPPF because the application would not be categorised as 'major' development having regards to the definition of 'major development' set out in Annex 2: Glossary on page 75 of the NPPF.

Land Use

The application site is currently a undeveloped piece of land. There could be potential for conflict in terms of land use with its immediate surroundings. In principle the land use may be acceptable, subject to a landscape character assessment at the TDC stage.

Amount

The amount of development (up to 8 dwellings) is considered acceptable given the area of land shown within the red line boundary on the location plan.

Other Matters

North Worcestershire Water Management: recommend refusal of the application. The applicant has submitted a Water Management Statement for further review by NWWM.

I believe that whilst the application site could have an impact upon flooding in the locality, it would not be warranted at the PIP stage to recommend refusal, as the matters for consideration under a PIP are location, land use and amount. In the recent Appeal Ref: 6004489 (9 Bromsgrove Road, Romsley, B62 0ET), dated 15 June 2026, the Inspector noted that Worcestershire County Council Highway Authority recommended refusal for the site, and the Inspector raised the fact that the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) makes it clear that the only matters for consideration at the PIP stage are the location, land use and the amount of development, and all other matters are considered at the TDC stage (Decision at Appendix 1).

Worcestershire Highways have raised no objection to the scheme. At the 'in principle' stage, the scope of the considerations is limited to location, land use and the amount of development. All other matters including access, are considered as part of a subsequent technical details consent application, should permission in principle be granted.

It would be for the applicant to take the comments into account at a subsequent Technical Details Consent Stage.

Conclusion

The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing land supply (5YHLS) and therefore regard should be had to paragraph 11(d) and footnote 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which together state that for applications providing housing, where the Council cannot demonstrate a 5YHLS, the policies which are most important for determining the application are considered out-of-date and planning permission should be granted unless:

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

Limb i) does not apply.

In view of limb (ii), the proposal would make a contribution of up to 8 dwellings to the Council's housing supply, offering some employment opportunities during construction and post development spend. The site is located within a sustainable location and is of suitable land use and amount.

This is a two-stage approach, and the Technical Details Consent will consider the detailed development proposals. On this basis, there are some adverse impacts in regarding to flooding, however it would be for the applicant to demonstrate this during the TDC process. This impact would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits as set out in limb ii) and it is recommended that Permission in Principle is granted.

RECOMMENDATION: That the planning in principle stage be **GRANTED**

Conditions:

No conditions can be imposed.

Case Officer: Emily Cox Tel: 01527 881699
Email: emily.cox@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk
Appendix 1: Appeal [6004489](#)

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2026

by **D R Kay BA Dip.Arch RIBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6004489

9 Bromsgrove Road, Romsley, Worcestershire B62 0ET

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant permission in principle.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Buckley against the decision of Bromsgrove District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01094/PIP.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of the existing house and the construction of up to 4no. bungalows (a minimum of 2 and a maximum of 4).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and permission in principle is granted for the demolition of the existing house and the construction of a minimum of 2 and a maximum of 4 bungalows at 9 Bromsgrove Road, Romsley, Worcestershire B62 0ET in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01094/PIP.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr M Buckley against Bromsgrove District Council. That application is the subject of a different decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposal is for permission in principle. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that this is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development. The permission in principle (PIP) consent route has two stages: the first establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle and the second (technical details consent - TDC) is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. This appeal relates to the first of these two stages.
4. The scope of the considerations for permission in principle is limited to location, land use and the amount of development permitted. All other matters are considered as part of a subsequent TDC application, if permission in principle is granted. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the site is suitable for residential development, having regard to its location, the proposed land use and the amount of development.

Reasons

6. The appeal site (the site) is a roughly oblong parcel of land, though its width narrows to its southern end, and is described as being around 0.35 hectares in area. It is located to the west side of the B4551 Bromsgrove Road, from which it

takes its vehicular access via two separate gated access positions. A substantial two-storey dwelling occupies the northern section of the site, which is noted as having planning permission for enlargement to an area of 767 sq.m.

7. The site's eastern boundary with the road has a dense belt of substantially evergreen trees running along much of its length, behind and above a high close boarded timber fence on the southern section of the site, and a high render and brick masonry wall for the remaining section of the boundary, with the exception of the two access points, where gate pillars and gates provide access from the highway to the site. This boundary wall and fence is set several metres back from the highway providing visibility for exiting vehicles, whilst the gates on the northern-most access position are set further back from the highway, to allow a vehicle to fully pull off the road whilst waiting for the gates to open.
8. The site's southern boundary has a timber fence with an evergreen tree and shrub belt behind it, whilst the site's northern boundary is defined by a fence which separates a former section of the site which received approval in 2018 for the erection of a large bungalow. The site's western boundary consists of a mix of lower hedge and fences, allowing views into open farmland beyond.
9. The appeal site is located to the south of the village of Romsley, though is not within the built-up area of the village identified on the Bromsgrove District Plan 2011-2030 (adopted 2017) (the District Plan) Policies Map. The appeal site and the village are located within the West Midlands Green Belt. As the site is not within the defined village boundary, its land use is therefore that of an existing residential dwelling within the Green Belt, with development subject to the controls of national Green Belt policy along with Policies BDP1, BDP2 and BDP4 of the District Plan.
10. The Council have examined the effect of the proposal on the Green Belt. They determined that the appeal proposal did not meet the exceptions to inappropriate development contained in paragraph 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, they determined the site constituted Grey Belt land and met criteria a) to d) of paragraph 155 of the Framework. Therefore, it met this exception to inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
11. Having examined the evidence before me, I have reached the same conclusion. The proposal would therefore not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and should therefore not be regarded as being harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. Therefore, in relation to its location and land use, I find the proposal would accord with National and development plan Green Belt policy.
12. Whilst the site is located outside the defined boundary of the village, it is located within a satellite area of development immediately to the south, around the junction of Bromsgrove Road with Farley Lane, where there are a significant number of residential properties. The site is bounded to the north and south by other such properties and contains a substantial sized existing residential dwelling. Its proposed land use would therefore be consistent with the established use and that of neighbouring properties and is therefore acceptable.
13. The site is located outside the defined Policies Map boundary for Romsley and would, therefore, not represent infilling which would have gained support from policy BDP2 of the District Plan. It therefore conflicts with policy BDP2 of the District Plan in this regard. However, the site is within existing residential use in an area with other such uses adjacent to it.

14. The site is within walking distance of the main section of the village via a continuous public footpath located opposite the site, on the eastern side of Bromsgrove Road. The village contains a primary school, a public house, a church, a village hall and several shops. The site would also have access to public transport, the Council confirming that a bus stop is located a short distance to the north of the site. Accordingly, the site would be in a sustainable location and would, therefore, be supported by policy BDP1 of the District Plan.
15. For the above reasons I find the proposal would conflict with Policy BDP2 of the District Plan but would accord with policy BDP1 of the District Plan. It would, therefore, be acceptable in terms of its location and land use.
16. With regards to the amount of development, in terms of the extent of development proposed relative to the size of the site, I find that it would provide sufficient space to accommodate the range of development proposed, though the final extent of development and its form would be for determination at the TDC stage, were the appeal allowed.
17. There is dispute between the parties in relation to the locational suitability of the site with regards to safe vehicular access to the site. Worcestershire County Council acting as the Highway Authority (WCCHA), raised objection to the proposal, recommending its refusal. Their concerns were related to the speed of vehicles within this section of road, the visibility from the existing access points and the width of the existing access points being insufficient to meet the intensified use that would result from the proposal. The Council has accepted the comments of the WCCHA, refusing the proposal by reason of its location and a lack of demonstration of safe access to the highway for future occupiers of the site, with consequent effects on highway safety.
18. The Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG) makes it clear that the only matters for consideration at the PIP stage are the location, the land use and the amount of development. All other matters are for consideration at the TDC stage. Whilst the accessibility of a site can be considered in relation to its location, this should relate to a high-level assessment as to whether safe access to the site could be achieved at the TDC stage. It should not be assessing the technical suitability of existing means of access to the site, as the detailed proposed means of access, including geometry and level of visibility are neither proposed within, nor for consideration at, the PIP application stage.
19. The WCCHA have raised concerns over the speed of traffic within this section of the road. At my visit, it was evident that the southern-most point of the application site was around 100 metres north of the point where the speed limit on Bromsgrove Road transitions from the National speed limit to a 30mph speed limit. If the WCCHA have concerns regarding persistent breaches of the speed limit within this section of the road, then this is a separate matter that should be addressed directly by WCCHA, as the relevant highway authority, in conjunction with the Police to enforce the defined speed limit.
20. Notwithstanding the 30mph speed limit of this section of road, the evidence before me indicates that the increased visibility of 2.4m x 79m recommended by WCCHA, for the increased speed that they suggest vehicles are regularly travelling within this section of the road, can be met by both of the existing access points on the site. This was also clearly evident at my site visit. It would, therefore, be possible

for a future access to be located at any point between the position of the two existing accesses, which would have a visibility much greater in either direction, than the increased distance recommended by the WCCHA. It is thus clearly demonstrated, at high level, that safe access from the site to the highway could be provided for occupiers of the proposed development, which would be fully detailed at the TDC stage.

21. For the above reasons, I therefore find the appeal proposal would accord with Policies BDP1 and BDP16 of the District Plan.

Planning Balance

22. The Council have identified that they cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply as required by the Framework. The position has been identified as being at 2.24 years housing land supply, which is a significant deficit. Accordingly, paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is engaged for decision making purposes. As the site is within the Green Belt, the policies within paragraph 11(d)(i) and Footnote 7 of the Framework are of relevance. However, the proposal would utilise grey belt land and would accord with the provision of paragraph 155 of the Framework. I have therefore found the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. As such, it would not provide a strong reason for refusing the proposed development.
23. Accordingly, paragraph 11(d)(ii) of the Framework is engaged, which indicates that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
24. The proposal would provide additional housing in a sustainable location which would support the government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. The proposal is for between two and four dwellings, which in the context of the Council's significant housing land supply deficit, would make an important contribution towards overall housing supply. I therefore attach significant weight to this matter.
25. The proposal would provide local economic benefit, both in the construction phase and in the longer term with future occupiers supporting local businesses and contributing to Local Authority rates for services within the area. The properties would also be CIL liable, providing further public benefit. The new dwellings would be bungalows, providing housing choice and would be energy efficient. Cumulatively, these are benefits that attract significant weight.
26. I have found that harm would arise from conflict with policy BDP2 of the spatial strategy in the development plan. However, owing to the Council's significant deficit of 5-year housing land supply, the weight I attribute to this conflict is substantially reduced.
27. Consequently, I conclude that the adverse impacts of the proposal, would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies, which is a material consideration that weighs heavily in favour of allowing the appeal.

Conditions

28. The PPG makes clear that conditions cannot be attached to a grant of permission in principle. Where permission in principle is granted by application, the default duration of that permission is 3 years. Applications for technical details consent must be determined within the duration of the permission granted. Therefore, no conditions have been imposed.

Conclusion

29. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan. However, material considerations indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Kay

INSPECTOR