

Planning, Design and Access Statement

4 Gouge Avenue Gravesend Kent
DA11 8DP

Outline application for the demolition of the existing detached two-storey dwelling and the erection of one pair of two-storey semi-detached dwellings and one pair of single-storey semi-detached dwellings sited to the rear with new site access, parking and associated works. Layout and Access to be determined.

By: Graham Simpkin Planning Ltd.

For: Mr N Bal and Mr A Bains

Project reference: PR4720

07 August 2026

office@gsplanning.uk



Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Site Context.....	3
3	Relevant History	4
4	Proposed Development	5
5	Planning Policy	5
6	Planning Assessment	7
7	Conclusions.....	11
	Appendix One: Appeal decision dated 10/04/2026	

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This Planning, Design and Access Statement has been submitted in support of an application for the following development at 4 Gouge Avenue Gravesend Kent DA11 8DP (hereafter referred to as 'the Site'):

Outline application for the demolition of the existing detached two-storey dwelling and the erection of one pair of two-storey semi-detached dwellings and one pair of single-storey semi-detached dwellings sited to the rear with new site access, parking and associated works. Layout and Access to be determined.

- 1.2 The proposed development affects the following Land Registry title(s):

Title Number	Description	Owner
TT4202	4 GOUGE AVENUE, NORTHFLEET, GRAVESEND DA11 8DP	The Applicants

- 1.3 The application is accompanied by the following plans and documents:
- Application Form
 - Planning, Design and Access Statement
 - Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
 - Drawing nos.
 - 4121.01 Site Location Plan
 - 4268.02 Existing Block Plan
 - 4268.03 Proposed Block Plan
- 1.4 The application is a resubmission following the appeal decision dated 10 April 2026 relating to application 20240684 (Outline application for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of new residential development with layout and access to be determined.)

2 Site Context

- 2.1 The application property, 4 Gouge Avenue is situated on the south west of Gouge Avenue some 50m from its junction with Park Avenue to the south east. Land levels along Gouge Avenue fall away from Park Avenue towards Thames Way.
- 2.2 The site is rectangular in shape and extends to 1264m² (approx. 0.13 ha) in area. It is some 78m in length and 16m in width and is currently occupied by a detached two-storey dwelling set-back into the site. It is adjoined by dwellings and their extensive rear gardens on either side.

- 2.3 The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and is largely comprised of two-storey terraced dwellings. The dwellings either side of the application site are, however, detached bungalows. They are set slightly higher (approximately 1.2m) than the highway.

3 Relevant History

- 3.1 The previous relevant planning history relating to the property is as follows.
- 19490846 (TH/3/49/44): Use of land for residential purposes: Permitted 02/05/1949
 - 20071085: Outline application for erection of a detached dwelling with car parking space: Withdrawn
 - 20080488: Outline application for the erection of a detached dwelling with off-street car parking: Permitted 24/09/2008
 - 20240071: Outline application with some matters reserved for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 4 no. residential dwellings, with layout and access to be determined. Refused 25/03/2024.
 - 20240684: Outline application for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of new residential development with layout and access to be determined. Refused 19/09/2024: Appeal Dismissed 10/04/2026
- 3.2 A copy of the recent appeal decision is attached at **Appendix One**.
- 3.3 The Inspector concluded
- That the development would not result in unacceptable overlooking to the occupiers of 2 Gouge Avenue,
 - That the indicated development would not conflict with policy C12 of the Core Strategy in terms of impact on ecology and biodiversity.
 - The Inspector did however refuse to accept and consider an updated site layout that indicated pedestrian visibility splays and dismissed the appeal on the grounds of impact on pedestrian safety.
- 3.4 This scheme now formally submits for consideration Drawing no. 4628.03 'Proposed Block Plan'. This was the drawing that was not accepted and considered by the Planning Inspector.
- 3.5 The drawing addresses the issues of pedestrian safety and clearly shows 2mx2m pedestrian visibility splays either side of the junction of the site access with Gouge Avenue. The drawing also makes it clear that there will be no obstruction above 0.6m in height within the splays. The splays are entirely contained within land under the applicants' control/ownership.

4 Proposed Development

- 4.1 The application seeks permission for the following development:

Outline application for the demolition of the existing detached two-storey dwelling and the erection of one pair of two-storey semi-detached dwellings and one pair of single-storey semi-detached dwellings sited to the rear with new site access, parking and associated works. Layout and Access to be determined.

- 4.2 It is proposed to demolish the existing dwelling and undertake a redevelopment of the site for residential purposes.
- 4.3 Drawing 4628.03 indicates that two pairs of semi-detached dwellings with one pair directly fronting the street and one pair behind would be provided. The dwellings would be separated by a distance of approximately 31m.
- 4.4 As set-out in the description, It is envisaged that the dwellings fronting the street would be two-storeys in height and the rear pair would be single-storey bungalows.
- 4.5 A new access is shown provided to to the south of the front pair of houses and would serve a parking area located between the two pairs of dwellings which would provide two spaces per dwelling. Pedestrian visibility splays of 2m x 2m are indicated on drawing no. 4628.03 .

5 Planning Policy

- 5.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 require that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Court of Appeal has clarified that for a decision maker this means establishing whether a proposal is in accordance with the development plan as a whole. The question of compliance with one policy should not dictate the outcome of a proposal in the absence of considering compliance with all other relevant policies. Decision makers are therefore tasked with identifying and understanding all relevant policies and material considerations in order to reach a properly informed planning judgment on a proposal, and to avoid an irrational or vulnerable decision that may be subject to criticism in a public law challenge.
- 5.2 Paragraph 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') reiterates what is said in Section 38(6), whilst paragraph 12 of the Framework is clear that the development plan is the starting point for decision making.

Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved, and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

- 5.3 Paragraph 39 of the Framework encourages local planning authorities to approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. It also encourages working proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area, adding that decision-makers should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.
- 5.4 Annex 1 of the Framework confirms that for the purposes of decision-taking, the policies in the plan should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted prior to the publication of the Framework. It adds that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the Framework, with greater weight being given to those policies that are closer to the policies in the Framework.

Development Plan

- 5.5 It is understood that the Development Plan for the area within which the appeal site is located comprises the following documents:
- Core Strategy 2014
 - Local Plan First Review (Saved Policies) 1994
- 5.6 In the Development Plan, the following policies are considered most relevant in the determination of this application:

Core Strategy

- CS01 Sustainable Development
- CS02 Scale and location of New Development
- CS12 Green Infrastructure
- CS14 Housing Size and Type
- CS15 Housing Density
- CS18 Climate Change
- CS19 Development and Design Principles

Gravesham Local Plan First Review (Saved Policies)

- T1 Impact of development on the highway network
- P3 Vehicle Parking Standards

Other Material Considerations

The Framework NPPF 2024 updated February 2025

- 5.7 In summary, the following paragraphs are considered most relevant as additional material considerations in the determination of this application:

7-8	Achieving sustainable development
11-12	Decision making & presumption in favour
39	Positive and creative decision making
61, 72-73, 78	Supply and Delivery of Housing
85, 87	Building a strong competitive economy
90-92	Ensuring the vitality of town centres
110, 115-116	Highway implications
124, 127	Making effective use of land
131, 135	Design

Gravesham Local Plan Regulation 19 pre-submission version 2026

- 5.8 The draft Local Plan is subject to consultation until 31 July 2026. As an emerging plan its policies do not have the weight of an adopted plan. Relevant policies are as follows;

- LP1: SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY: MANAGING CHANGE
- LP 8: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND NATURE RECOVERY
- LP 9: CLIMATE CHANGE
- LP 11: ACHIEVING HIGH-QUALITY DESIGN, SUSTAINABILITY & PLACE MAKING
- LP 12: HOUSING DELIVERY, MIX AND AFFORDABILITY
- LP 19: SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND DECARBONISATION

6 Planning Assessment

Key Issues

- 6.1 The following is considered to be the key issue in the assessment of this application:
- Housing Land Supply.
 - Impact on residential amenity.
 - Impact on highway safety.
 - Impact on ecology/biodiversity

Housing Land Supply

- 6.2 It remains the case that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites as required by paragraph 78 of the NPPF.

Therefore, the most important policies for determining the application are deemed to be out-of-date. In such circumstances, paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged.

6.3 Paragraph 11(d) applies when a council's local policies are out-of-date (e.g., they cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply). It states that planning permission should be granted unless: 11(d)(i): The application of policies in the NPPF (2024) that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development; OR 11(d)(ii): Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework as a whole.

6.4 The Inspector concluded as follows in this issue:

'15. The proposal would provide additional dwellings in a Borough that is currently delivering significantly below the level of housing supply required by national policy. These carry clear social and economic benefits, both during construction and once the units are occupied. National policy also attaches great weight to the use of suitable sites within existing settlements for new homes. In this case, the appeal site comprises previously developed land in an urban location with good access to a range of services and facilities. These factors weigh positively in favour of the development.'

6.5 The Council has published an updated assessment of a 5-year supply dated July 2026 which covers the period from 1 April 2025 to 31 March 2030. Table 7 of that document provides as follows (although it confusingly refers to 2022-2027).

Table 7: Calculation of the Borough's housing land supply 2022-2027

Component	No. of Deliverable Homes (net)	No. of Years
(a) Deliverable Housing Supply	2,053	
(b) Local Housing Need Figure (plus 20% buffer)	4,056	
Housing Supply Surplus/Shortfall (a) - (b)	-2,003	
(c) Annual requirement	811	
Years Supply Equivalent Over Five Years (a ÷ c)		2.53

6.6 There has clearly been no change in circumstances since the appeal decision was issued. The Council is also subject to a presumption in favour of sustainable development given that under the Housing Delivery Test 2023 (published December 12 2024) only 59% of the required number of dwellings within the

Borough had been delivered over the previous three year period. This not only engages the presumption in favour of sustainable development referred to above but also requires a 20% buffer to be applied to Housing Land Supply calculations .

6.7 The publication of the Regulation 19 Consultation Draft of the emerging Local Plan which is currently subject to consultation until 31 July does not seek to allocate the Site. At this stage, prior to the formal submission of the emerging plan for Examination, the policies in the emerging Plan carry little weight.

6.8 Its publication also does not, at this stage, alter the housing land supply position.

Impact on residential amenity

6.9 The layout and form of the proposed development has not changed from that considered by the Inspector.

6.10 The Inspector considered that the fact that the rear units were single-storey and took into account the single storey rear extension to the rear of number 2 and the detached single-storey outbuilding to the rear of number 2 which provides additional screening.

6.11 The inspector concluded on this issues as follows;

'9. In my view, these features would effectively mitigate any potential overlooking and would therefore protect the privacy of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at No.2. I note also that the Council's proposed Condition 10 seeks to prevent undue overlooking of the adjoining residential property. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with Policy CS19 of Gravesham's Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and the requirements of SPG 2.'

6.12 The proposed development will secure appropriate levels of amenity within the site itself and also in relation to adjacent development. No objections should be raised on the grounds of adverse impact in residential amenity.

6.13 The proposals continue to comply with Policy CS19 and the requirements of SPG2

Impact on highway safety

6.14 Planning application 20240684 was refused on three grounds including the following reason;

2. The proposed access represents a risk to pedestrian safety by virtue of unacceptable and impeded visibility splays. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy CS11 of Gravesham's Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), saved policies T1 and T5 of Gravesham's Local Plan First Review (1994), Kent County Council dropped kerb guidance (2023), as well as paragraph 115 and 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

- 6.15 The issue was not raised by Kent Highway Services in a formal application consultation response. Furthermore at the previous application stage, the Council did not seek to request a revised plan which would have simply and efficiently addressed the issue. A revised plan was subsequently prepared and submitted as part of the appeal process. However, as set out in the Appeal Decision, the Inspector did not accept a revised plan indicating appropriate pedestrian visibility splays and in the light of this dismissed the appeal on grounds of harm to pedestrian highway safety.
- 6.16 Drawing no. 4628.03 Proposed Block Plan submitted with this application now clearly indicates appropriate 2m x 2m pedestrian visibility splays either side of the site access. The splays would have no obstruction above 600mm in height within them. The splays are entirely contained within land under the applicants' control/ownership.
- 6.17 As such, the proposals clearly comply with the Kent County Council Dropped Kerb Application Guidance May 2023.
- 6.18 On this basis, previous concerns regarding potential harmful impact on pedestrian highway safety have been overcome and satisfactorily addressed.
- Impact on ecology and biodiversity
- 6.19 The Site is less than 0.2ha in area and does not affect or include Priority Habitat and is therefore exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain requirements.
- 6.20 The Site has been subject of a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal which did not identify the need for any additional species specific surveys. Precautionary mitigation for reptiles and hedgehogs is recommended. Submission and agreement of precautionary mitigation can be the subject of an appropriate planning condition on any permission that is granted
- 6.21 Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect and enhance Green Infrastructure and to ensure no net loss of biodiversity in the Borough. The Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar sites are an important and integral part of the Borough's Green Infrastructure, but they have increasingly been under recreational pressure from residential development in nearby areas on an in-combination basis, which has affected their role and existing biodiversity.
- 6.22 The SPA/Ramsar sites are a European designated sites afforded protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 as amended (the Habitat Regulations). SPAs are protected sites classified for rare and vulnerable birds and for regularly occurring migratory species. Article 4(4) of the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC) as now adopted in UK law following Brexit requires Member States to take appropriate steps to avoid pollution or deterioration of

habitats or any disturbances affecting the birds, as far as these would be significant having regard to the objectives of this Article.

- 6.23 The proposal therefore has potential to affect the said sites features of interest.
- 6.24 The proposed development is of a very small scale, and in itself, would not have a direct adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA. However, in combination with other development and proposed development, there is considered to be a likely impact in terms of additional recreational pressure. In the light of this, Natural England the Government's Conservation Body has stipulated that, when considering any residential development within 6km of the SPA, Councils should secure financial contributions to the Thames Estuary and Marshes Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) Strategy in accordance with the recommendations of the North Kent Environmental Planning Group (NKEPG), and that such strategic mitigation must be in place before the dwellings are occupied. Such a mechanism was put in place in 2015 following discussion with Natural England and the affected North Kent Authorities. This is applied to all proposed residential development situated within 6km of the SPA/Ramsar Sites.
- 6.25 Prior to the determination of the current application, the applicant will make an appropriate SAMMS payment of £1050.48 at the published rate of £350.16/dwelling and relating to the net increase of three dwellings on the site.
- 6.26 This being the case it is contended that the Council as the decision maker and Competent Authority in this case can conclude that any in-combination impact on the SPA/Ramsar sites has been appropriately mitigated.
- 6.27 The Inspector concluded that appropriate landscape and biodiversity enhancements could be secured by planning condition. This remains the case.

7 Conclusions

- 7.1 The sole reason for the recent dismissal of the appeal against the refusal of application 20240684 was the harm to pedestrian highway safety due to the lack of appropriate pedestrian visibility splays at the point where the site access road meets the highway in Gouge Avenue.
- 7.2 This has now been addressed through the formal submission of drawing no. 4628.03 which demonstrates that appropriate two separate 2m x 2m pedestrian visibility splays with no obstruction above 0.6m in height within the splays can be provided within land wholly under the applicants' ownership and control.

- 7.3 All other aspects of the development proposal remain as accepted by the Inspector.
- 7.4 The proposal would provide additional dwellings in a Borough with a significant housing shortfall alongside a significant under-delivery of new housing.
- 7.5 The proposal would provide social and economic benefits during and post construction.
- 7.6 The site is previously developed land in a sustainable urban location.
- 7.7 The applicant will make an appropriate SAMMS payment that will mitigate any in-combination impact on the Thames Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar Sites.
- 7.8 With this in mind it is abundantly clear that the application of the policies in the Framework to any of the protected areas or assets of particular importance referenced in Footnote 7 of the Framework **do not in this case provide a strong reason for refusing the proposed development.**
- 7.9 Furthermore as demonstrated in this Statement and in the submitted details any possible adverse impacts of approving the development do not **significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, (my emphasis)**
- 7.10 Since the policies in the Development Plan which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, the 'tilted balance' applies and planning permission should be granted.
- 7.11 Therefore in consideration of all relevant development plan policies and material considerations, this application should be viewed positively by the authority and it is respectfully requested that this submission is approved without delay.

APPENDIX ONE

Appeal decision dated 10/04/2026



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2025

by A Oyebade MSc FCILT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/K2230/W/25/3362251

4 Gouge Avenue, Northfleet, Gravesend, Kent DA11 8DP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Messrs. Nathan Bal and Ashveer Bains against the decision of Gravesend Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 20240684.
 - The development proposed is an outline application for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of new residential development with layout and access to be determined.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The application was submitted in outline, with the matters of appearance, landscaping and scale reserved for future consideration. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The appellant submitted a revised block plan after the decision notice was issued. The main changes from the original plan are the reduced and interrupted permeability around Plots 1 and 2, along with associated alterations to the footprint of Plot 1. As these amount to a fundamental modification, I have determined the appeal based on the original block plan.

Main issues

4. The main issues are the effect on:
 - living conditions of residents of neighbouring dwelling;
 - highway safety in the locality; and
 - biodiversity in the area.

Reasons

Effect on living conditions of residents of neighbouring dwelling

5. Gouge Avenue is a late-20th-century suburban street characterised by brick-built homes, including two-storey detached, semi-detached and terraced houses, along with a small number of single-storey bungalows. The area forms an established residential neighbourhood with a cohesive, low-density character and a distinctly family-oriented feel.

6. The appeal proposal comprises two pairs of dwellings. The first pair (Plots 1 and 2), positioned along the street frontage, would be two storeys in height, while the second pair (Plots 3 and 4), located toward the rear of the site, would take the form of single-storey bungalows. Gravesham Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 2 (Adopted February 1996; amended June 2020) requires that, where facing windows serve habitable rooms and a private garden of the neighbouring property falls within the field of view from a development, whether directly or diagonally, the minimum separation distance between dwellings must be 26 metres.
7. The Council acknowledges that the amendments made to the previously refused scheme (Ref: 20240071) have addressed earlier concerns relating to outlook, sense of enclosure and loss of light. This improvement arises from the increased separation distance between the proposed front building and the neighbouring property at No. 2 Gouge Avenue. As a result, the Council considers that the revised proposal would adequately safeguard the amenity of the adjoining residents in these respects.
8. Nonetheless, the Council argues that Plot 3 would harm the privacy of the occupiers of 2 Gouge Avenue because the window-to-window distance between the two dwellings would fall below the minimum 26 metres referenced above. The appellant explains, however, that the single-storey Plot 3 would sit 24 metres from the rear wall of the single-storey rear extension at No. 2, and approximately 31 metres from the upper front elevation of the main house. Therefore, the appeal proposal would not affect the privacy of the main building at No. 2 given that the window-to-window distance between this property and Plot 3 would be more than the required 26metres. While the window-to-window distance between the rear extension of No. 2 and Plot 3 may be less than the required 26metres, given that Plot 3 would be single-storey like No. 2 and a degree of mutual overlooking is characteristic of development in locations of this type, the effect on the privacy of the residents in the rear extension of No.2 would be minimal. Moreover, the appellant has highlighted the presence of a substantial detached outbuilding, around 3 metres in height (Ref. 20210532, approved 04/08/2021), located at the rear of No. 2, which provides additional screening to its amenity area.
9. In my view, these features would effectively mitigate any potential overlooking and would therefore protect the privacy of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at No.2. I note also that the Council's proposed Condition 10 seeks to prevent undue overlooking of the adjoining residential property. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with Policy CS19 of Gravesham's Local Plan Core Strategy (2014) and the requirements of SPG 2.

Effect on highway safety in the locality

10. The Council submits that the dwelling at No. 2 features a brick wall and pillar along the shared boundary with the appeal site, the height of which exceeds twice the 600 mm threshold at which pedestrian visibility would be impeded. It is argued that this results in an unacceptable risk to pedestrian safety. I agree that the existing boundary treatment on this side of the access, if left unaltered, would restrict the ability of drivers leaving the site to observe pedestrians approaching from the direction of No. 2.
11. As indicated above, I am unable to accept the revised block plan submitted with this appeal. I do not have before me any scheme that would secure the necessary

footway visibility of 2m x 2m with no obstructions over a height of 600mm. Without this evidence and the provision of the necessary visibility splay on land within the appellant's control, I consider that the development would unacceptably harm pedestrian highway safety at this location. In reaching this conclusion, I have had regard to the extent of any likely impact in the context of the site in question. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy CS11 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014), saved Policies T1 and T5 of the Gravesham Local Plan First Review (1994), and Kent County Council's Dropped Kerb Guidance (2023).

Effect on biodiversity in the area

12. The Council explains that, subject to certain exceptions, developments are required to deliver a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the site. It argues, however, that the appellant's calculation is flawed because it uses the post-clearance condition of the land as the baseline. The Council states that, for more than 16 years, the site supported numerous trees and shrubs and had become an unmanaged area that may have contained protected or notable species. In its view, this earlier condition should have formed the baseline for the biodiversity assessment.
13. The appellant acknowledges that the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) referred to in the Planning Statement was omitted from the original submission. The PEA including the proposed biodiversity mitigation measures therein, together with a revised BNG Metric, has now been provided as part of the appeal. I note that the updated metric includes the proposed enhancements to the amenity areas, including additional tree planting. Based on the information now before me, I am satisfied that any outstanding matters can be secured through an appropriately worded planning condition. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy CS12 of the Gravesham Local Plan Core Strategy (2014).

Other Considerations and Planning Balance

14. It is common ground that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, with the Council's officer's statement identifying only a 2.9 years' supply, which is substantially below that required. In such circumstances, paragraph 11(d)(ii) of the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework") provides that planning permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the Framework policies taken as a whole.
15. The proposal would provide additional dwellings in a Borough that is currently delivering significantly below the level of housing supply required by national policy. These carry clear social and economic benefits, both during construction and once the units are occupied. National policy also attaches great weight to the use of suitable sites within existing settlements for new homes. In this case, the appeal site comprises previously developed land in an urban location with good access to a range of services and facilities. These factors weigh positively in favour of the development.
16. In the circumstances of this case, I have concluded that there would be harm to pedestrian highway safety in the area, which would be long lasting. The adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework policies taken as a whole. The

proposed development would not therefore benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development, found at paragraph 11 of the Framework.

Conclusion

17. Overall, none of the other considerations material to the proposed development indicate that this appeal decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Oyebade
INSPECTOR