



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 13 June 2023

Site visit made on 12 June 2023 (unaccompanied) and 13 June 2023 (accompanied)

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R0335/W/23/3314630

Beaufort Park, South Road, Bracknell RG40 3DN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Southern Home Ownership against the decision of Bracknell Forest Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00986/FUL, dated 30 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is for 226 homes including associated on-site SANG with an access route, open space and pedestrian/cycle connections.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Planning permission was refused for 6 reasons. Reasons for refusal 2 to 6 related to the effect of the proposal on protected habitats in this case the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (the SPA), the provision of both affordable housing, highways and other infrastructure, biodiversity and flood risk. Following the submission of the appeal, further information has been provided. The agreed Statement of Common Ground sets out that, subject to the imposition of suitably worded conditions and / or the completion of a planning obligation to secure these requirements, then the Council would not defend these reasons for refusal. This was confirmed at the Hearing.
3. During the course of the appeal, the appellant submitted an agreement pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (the s106 agreement). This is signed and dated 8 June 2023. It deals with the provision of affordable housing, contributions to open space and community facilities, mitigation for habitats sites, biodiversity net gain, sustainable drainage, sustainable travel pack and travel plan and a woodland management plan. The Council has confirmed that this addresses their concerns as outlined above. I have proceeded to deal with the appeal on this basis.
4. Notwithstanding the Council's findings in respect of the protected habitats, in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Habitats Regulations) I am the competent authority for this appeal. In accordance with Regulation 63(3) I consulted the relevant nature conservation body, in this case Natural England (NE). I kept the Hearing open in the event I

would be seeking comments from the parties on NE's response. I have determined no further submissions were required. I therefore closed the Hearing in writing on 29 June 2023.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:

- the effect of the proposed development on highway safety, with particular regard to the provision of vehicular parking;
- whether or not the proposed development would affect the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area; and
- whether there are any other material considerations, including the benefits of the proposal, which would indicate that the proposal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the terms of the development plan.

Reasons

Highway safety

6. The appeal proposal would provide 226 dwellings, comprising 24 2-bedroom flats, 48 2-bedroom houses, 96 3-bedroom houses and 58 4-bedroom houses. All the flats would be affordable housing, the houses would be a combination of market and affordable housing. An area of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) would be provided with a separate parking area comprising 14 visitor spaces.
7. The Council has an adopted Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (the Parking SPD) which sets out the parking requirement for dwellings of different sizes. This sets out the requirement for residential development, including the minimum size for garages if they are to be counted towards parking provision. The guidance sets out the requirement that 2 and 3 bed units should provide 2 spaces per unit and 4+ bed units should provide 3 spaces per unit. In addition, visitor parking should be provided at 1 space per 5 units.
8. The Parking SPD requirements for the proposal would be for a total of 510 spaces for the units plus a further 45 visitor parking spaces. The amended proposal would provide 498 parking spaces and 37 visitor spaces, a shortfall of 12 and 8 spaces respectively.
9. The Council confirmed that the proposed parking spaces would be of an adequate size and that the number of spaces for the proposed houses would be acceptable but not for the affordable flats where a reduced provision of 1.5 spaces per unit is proposed. The Council also considers a higher provision of visitor parking to serve the SANG should be made. In addition to its concerns about the quantum of parking, the Council is concerned about the parking layout in certain locations and the distribution of visitor parking spaces across the development. I deal with each of these matters in turn.

Parking for affordable units

10. The Parking SPD recognises that evidence indicates that affordable housing schemes require lower levels of parking than market housing. However, this

should be assessed on a case-by-case basis, based on surveys of comparable sites and the location of the site in relation to public transport and local facilities as well as consideration of issues such as shared ownership, starter homes and right to buy.

11. The appellant has argued that a lower level of provision would be appropriate in this case. The parking for the flats would be laid out in parking courts to the rear of the apartment buildings. These would be unallocated space for residents intended to make for a more efficient use of spaces.
12. To support its position, the appellant has provided evidence from the 2011 Census and TRICS data to demonstrate a lower level of provision would be appropriate in this case. In response to concerns from the Council that the 2011 Census data was out of date, updated Census data from 2021 was submitted at the Hearing.
13. The 2011 Census evidences a lower level of car ownership between private and affordable tenures both at a national level as well as for the Bracknell Forest local authority area. The more recent 2021 Census data for Crowthorne ward in which the site is located, shows the same trend. In addition, TRICS data demonstrates that for all sites in the database, the average car parking ownership for affordable apartments is 60% of private apartments. The affordable units to which the parking provision relates would all be social rented accommodation rather than shared ownership properties for which a lower level of provision is supported by the data. This evidence therefore supports the appellant's position that a lower level of parking would be appropriate.
14. The appellant has additionally undertaken surveys of affordable tenure residential schemes. This included 2 sites at each Bucklers Park and Watersplash Lane which occupy similar suburban and edge of town locations to the appeal site. These are a mix of houses and flats, although the Bucklers Park flats include more 1 bedroom units than the appeal proposal. In these cases, there was no reduction in the parking standards.
15. The survey identified that the average parking stress at these sites was 74%, ranging from 58% to 83%. Further calculations provided by the appellant have sought to relate that parking stress to the size of apartments. Whilst this survey demonstrates there is parking capacity at these sites, this is based on a short survey period of just two consecutive nights. It is also not known whether these apartments were fully occupied at the time or whether there is any on-street parking associated with the developments. I find this survey information to be inconclusive and I give it limited weight.
16. An overnight parking survey was also undertaken of Cardew Court¹ on Crowthorne Road where a parking requirement of 1.5 spaces per unit was applied. This indicated that 77% of the spaces were used. However, this site is not directly comparable to the appeal site as it is located much closer to the town centre of Bracknell and the rail and bus stations. I therefore attribute very little weight to this.
17. The surveys indicate that there is parking capacity in all these cases although it is not significant and there are various unknowns. Nevertheless, it is agreed

¹ Council Ref: 14/00437/FUL

that proposed development would be within recognised walking and cycling distances of surrounding facilities as well as having access to public transport, including buses on Nine Mile Ride.

18. The data indicates that car ownership for social rented accommodation is less than for market housing. Taking all these factors into account including the flexible approach to the allocation of spaces for the flats, on balance, I find that a lower level of provision for these affordable rental units would be appropriate.

Visitor parking

19. The 37 visitor parking spaces would be distributed throughout the development, but predominantly towards the south and east of the site. The north-eastern section of the proposed development provides 67 dwellings accessed separately from South Road. This area would be served by significantly fewer spaces compared to remainder of the development, with just 8 of the visitor spaces being accessed from South Road. In the absence of sufficient allocated visitor parking, particularly in this part of the development, it is likely that overspill parking would occur along the roads within the development.
20. The appellant has submitted a visitor parking plan indicating locations both along the roads within the development for up to 22 spaces as well as curtilage parking within 40 properties, potentially providing an additional 44 visitor spaces. From the submitted plan, it appears that a reasonable number of spaces would be available through this additional capacity within the north-eastern part of the site which would go some way to addressing the shortfall in formal provision in this area.
21. The Manual for Streets recognises that visitor parking is generally served by unallocated parking and includes on-street provision. There is no policy requirement for visitor parking to be within designated bays. The scheme offers a combination of this type of parking and on-street parking. In this regard, the proposal would be compliant.
22. The main spine road through the development would be 5.5m wide which accords with the Council's requirements set out in the Highways Guide for Development, Steetscene SPD Annex 1. This would be wide enough to accommodate some on-street visitor parking. A swept-path analysis indicates that it would be possible for an emergency vehicle to manoeuvre through the area on the streets where there would be on-street parking. The same is shown for the main road through the north-eastern section of the development. As such, even if on-street parking occurs in these locations, it would not give rise to unacceptable congestion, inconvenience nor cause harm to highway safety.
23. I appreciate that large amounts of on-street parking can detract from the quality of an area. However, the areas identified as appropriate for on-street parking are relatively short sections, dispersed along the road and would not dominate its character.
24. Overall, I find that the quantum of both allocated visitor parking in combination with the informal provision of on-street parking would provide a sufficient amount of visitor parking to serve the development.

Parking layout

25. In order to accommodate the higher number of parking spaces associated with larger properties, several of the proposed houses would be served by triple tandem parking. Several instances of this would be located on the road leading to the proposed car parking area for the SANG as well as along the main spine road of the development.
26. Where such parking exists and is fully parked, in order for the rearmost car to exit the site, three cars would be required to manoeuvre on and off the driveway. This would occur in locations on the development where there are likely to be other vehicles either accessing the SANG or simply moving around the estate.
27. The roads throughout the proposed development, whilst not substandard in width, are not especially wide. Consequently, with multiple vehicles manoeuvring on and off the driveways, there would be inconvenience arising for other road users waiting for any manoeuvring to be completed. More fundamentally, a risk of conflict between road users could arise, particularly if cars are reversing off the driveway into the road. This would be exacerbated by several properties with this same parking arrangement being adjacent to each other. Moreover, this arrangement of parking would not be the most convenient for occupants who may decide to park on-street, particularly if only stopping for a short while. Where such manoeuvring or on-street parking may occur at the same time, in addition to the potential conflict between road users, this would lead to congestion on the road.
28. The Council has additionally raised other concerns with the parking layout, notably in respect of Plots H08 to H13 which are set too far forward thereby restricting pedestrian visibility from the driveway to the footway; Plot J11 where parking would obscure access to the front door of the property and Plot J24 where the available parking space would be cramped and likely to lead to vehicles overhanging the pavement and causing an obstruction.
29. The quantum of parking required for the proposed mix of dwellings and its layout would give rise to inconvenience, congestion and an increased risk of conflict between road users in a number of locations throughout the development. Cumulatively, this would cause significant harm to highway safety.

SANG Parking

30. The proposal would provide 5.5 hectares of publicly accessible SANG. This would be served by a dedicated car parking area of 14 spaces. This would be accessed via one of the smaller roads within the development. In addition, the SANG is intended to be linked with both the Great Hollands SANG and Bucklers Forest SANG in order to form a 'Super SANG'.
31. The provision of parking for a SANG or other open space is not listed within the Parking SPD. However, the Council considers the SANG to be a sui generis use. For such uses, the Parking SPD states that the parking requirement will be considered on need. In this respect, it considers there was a lack of evidence to justify the level of parking for the SANG.
32. NE SANG Guidelines state that where parking is required, 1 space per hectare of SANG is appropriate. In addition, the SANG is within 400m walking distance of the residential properties and therefore users of the SANG could access it by

means other than the private car. The appeal proposal would meet the NE SANG Guidelines. However, these are guidelines and it is appropriate to consider the requirement in the context of what is being provided, where it is located and the usage of the SANG.

33. As originally submitted, the proposal was to provide 21 car parking spaces for the SANG. This was reduced to 14 by the time the application was determined by the Council. The Council considers 14 spaces insufficient and that it would lead to overspill parking on the surrounding streets. In coming to this view, it has referred me to concerns arising in respect of other SANGs within the locality where overspill parking has occurred, namely at Bucklers Forest SANG, giving rise to the implementation of parking restrictions in nearby streets.
34. The appellant has undertaken surveys of other local SANG sites to demonstrate parking demand. This includes surveys of Bucklers Forest SANG which is some 42 hectares in size and therefore significantly larger than the proposed SANG. The appellant undertook a survey on a Saturday in November. This showed a maximum parking stress of 58% at Bucklers Forest SANG, with around 40% for the other SANGs. The Council disputes the survey data, notably in respect of Bucklers Forest SANG given it had to introduce parking restrictions.
35. I recognise that SANGs are often used by dog walkers throughout the year. However, a survey undertaken in November is not representative of the use of the SANG that may occur in summer months when visitors to the SANG are likely to visit for additional reasons other than dog walking and may stay longer when the weather is more clement. Furthermore, the parking interventions that were required at Bucklers Forest SANG suggest that a greater demand for parking at this SANG occurs than the survey indicates. In view of this and given the duration and timing of the survey, I give limited weight to the survey data.
36. In order to access the SANG, visitors would be passing through a residential area. Even taking into account the identified areas for overspill on-street visitor parking, a limited amount of this would be in close proximity to the SANG. In such circumstances, visitors may end up driving around looking for a space or parking inconsiderately, all of which adds to inconvenience for occupants of the development as well as increased highway safety concerns.
37. I appreciate that the proposed SANG would be modest in size. I also recognised that some visitors to the SANG would walk to it from nearby development. However, I was told that the SANG would be expected to meet the needs of other developments in terms of providing mitigation against harm to habitats sites which I discuss in the next main issue. Visitors to the SANG from these other developments would be further away and therefore more likely to drive. Furthermore, given the SANG is intended to link with others to form a network, it seems to me that visitors may stay for a while when visiting the SANG or may park at this SANG as part of their visit to the wider SANG network.
38. For all these reasons, I consider the parking demand generated by the proposed SANG is likely to be higher than the proposal would provide for. Consequently, I consider the likelihood of overspill parking onto surrounding streets to be quite high, with consequent impacts on highway safety.
39. The design of the car park requires a turning area when all spaces are full. As designed, this turning area has a similar appearance to a parking space and

could therefore end up being parked in when there are no free spaces. If this were to occur, then vehicles would have to reverse out of the car park which would increase the risk of conflict with other road users, including pedestrians and cyclists accessing the SANG. The appellant has suggested that a condition could be imposed for the redesign of the turning area. This may alleviate some of the Council's concerns but it would not overcome the shortfall in provision.

Overall findings on highway safety

40. In addition to the above, it is proposed to provide improved cycle and pedestrian paths linking directly into existing public transport links, to encourage travel by means other than the private car. To support this, all new residents would be issued with a Travel Information pack promoting sustainable transport options.
41. My attention has been drawn to the Bucklers Park development by residents of that development who explained that issues they experience with on-street parking and congestion due to the narrowness of the road. I consider this would be similar to what would occur if the appeal proposal was to go ahead in its current form. I visited Bucklers Park as part of my site visit. I observed the roads were relatively narrow and at the time of my visit there was some on-street parking. However, the evidence put to me in this appeal shows a road wide enough to accommodate on-street parking for visitors. I do however find that the narrower road leading to the SANG if parked would be likely to give rise to these similar issues.
42. The appeal scheme would deliver a suitable amount of parking including visitor parking to serve the residential element of the scheme. However, the layout of some of this parking, notably the triple tandem parking, as well where it would either obstruct access to the property or overhang the footway, would cause a significant risk of conflict between road users as well as inconvenience. This would be a particular issue where there are consecutive houses with served by triple tandem parking. Furthermore, the shortfall in parking associated with the SANG would be likely to lead to overspill parking in surrounding streets which in combination with the poor design of the car park area, would lead to significant concerns about cars reversing out of the car park area. During warmer months when demand for the SANG is likely to be higher than people simply taking their dogs for walks, this would be likely to occur frequently.
43. I have considered whether these matters could be addressed through a condition. Whilst some elements could be, such as the SANG car park design, others could not because they may require a change in residential unit sizes and the overall mix of housing. I have also considered the appellant's proposed condition to require a safety audit to be completed post-occupation and, if issues are found, for remedial actions to be taken. However, given that I have already found highway safety issues, it would not be appropriate to seek to address these once the development has been completed but rather to design these out prior to development taking place. Given this is a greenfield site, there is no justification for taking an alternative approach. Such a condition would not overcome my concerns.
44. For all these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would give rise to an increased risk of conflict between road users. It would therefore adversely affect highway safety as well as causing inconvenience. As such, it would conflict with Policies EN20 and M9 of the Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan

2002 (the LP) Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008 (the CS) and the Parking SPD. These policies together require a high quality of design and for development to make satisfactory parking provision for vehicles.

Habitats sites

45. The appeal site is located within the 400m to 5km buffer zone for the SPA, with part of the site within 400m of the SPA. No dwellings are proposed within the 400m zone. The SPA is a European Site of Nature Conservation Importance and is subject to statutory protection under the Habitats Regulations. Regulation 63 prevents the competent authority from granting permission unless the proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of the European site.
46. The SPA is a network of lowland heathland sites which provide a habitat for the internationally important breeding bird species of woodlark, European nightjar and Dartford warbler. These are ground-nesting species. The sites conservation objectives can be summarised as avoiding a deterioration of habitats and minimising bird disturbance, thereby ensuring the integrity of the sites is maintained.
47. The Council has determined that additional residential development would, in combination with other plans and projects, have a significant adverse effect on the SPA through increased recreational use of the SPA causing damage to the habitat and disturbance to the protected species within it. In order to avoid any such harms, suitable mitigation would be required. It could also lead to the loss of functionally linked land in relation to the SPA and adverse effects on the site due to air pollution.
48. The adopted *Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Supplementary Planning Document 2018* (the TBHSPA SPD) provides guidance on measures to avoid likely significant effects on the integrity of the SPA from development. This includes the provision of both SANG to attract people away from the SPA and reduce pressure on it and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) to reduce the effect of people who visit the SPA.
49. The scheme proposes the provision of on-site SANG to be created within the northern part of the site which would provide space for dog walkers and other recreational users. It would be around 5.5 hectares. A further 5.9 hectares of land would be a safeguarded biodiversity area with no public access. In addition, the s106 agreement secures contributions to SAMM to mitigate the impact of development.
50. Policy requires 8 hectares of SANG per 1,000 new population. The proposal would exceed this.
51. NE has confirmed that it is satisfied that the proposed measures are sufficient to avoid an adverse impact on the integrity of the SPA and its relevant features and that these are adequately secured. I am also satisfied that the proposed development in making provision for on-site SANG and contributions to SAMM through the s106 agreement meets the requirement.
52. As such, I have been able to complete my appropriate assessment and to conclude that the proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA. In this regard, the scheme therefore accords with Policy EN3 of the LP, Policy CS14 of the CS, Saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009 and the

TBHSPA SPD which together seek the protection of the SPA and protected species and their habitats.

Other considerations

53. The appeal site is the subject of a draft allocation in the emerging Local Plan which has been through the examination process. It has been identified as a suitable and sustainable location for residential development. There is no objection to the scheme from the Council in respect of the loss of a strategic gap between settlements or on the basis that it lies outside the settlement boundary.
54. The Council did not refuse the proposal on design grounds. However, the increase in triple tandem parking, proposed as amendments during the appeal process, has raised concerns about its visual impact. Cars parked in this manner are less prominent on the property frontages than cars parked side by side. As such, although more parking would extend further into each plot, in terms of the streetscene it would not be widely visible except when close to the properties. In this regard, I find there would be limited difference in terms of visual impact compared to cars parked side by side or just two cars parked in tandem when viewed from the street.
55. The planning application was recommended for approval by planning officers but the elected Members disagreed with that recommendation. They are entitled to reach a different view to their officers. The reasons for this have been set out within the Council's statement of case. In any event, this is a procedural matter.
56. It is common ground that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. For the period 2021 to 2026, the supply was 4.2 years. The Council has not published its supply for the period 2022 to 2027. It is agreed that the provisions of paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) would apply. The proposed development would deliver a number of benefits.
57. The scheme would provide 226 homes. This would make a significant contribution to the Council's supply of housing. However, in recent years the Council has achieved a high rate of delivery, with the 2021 Housing Delivery Test indicating delivery between 2018/19 and 2020/21 of 217% of its housing requirement for that period. Whilst I acknowledge this recent delivery, there is nevertheless a reasonably significant shortfall in housing land supply. I attribute significant weight to the delivery of housing.
58. I have been referred to recent appeals in both Bracknell Forest Borough Council² and neighbouring Wokingham Borough Council³. In both these appeals, there had been a shortfall in housing land supply but strong evidence of recent high delivery of housing and on that basis, the Inspectors attributed no more than significant weight to the delivery of housing. I have taken a similar approach here.
59. The scheme would also deliver 50% affordable housing half of which would be secured through the s106 agreement plus an additional 25% affordable housing, funded by Homes England which could be secured through an

² APP/R0335/W/22/3298503

³ APP/X0360/W/22/3309202

appropriately worded planning condition. In the context of significant under-delivery over several years, just 32% of need was met in 2020-21, the affordable housing contribution is a substantial benefit of the scheme which carries very significant weight

60. The proposal would also deliver the social benefit of providing a mix of tenures and sizes to meet need and contributing to the creation of mixed and diverse communities. This is a positive aspect of the scheme which carries moderate weight.
61. The site has access to public transport, services and facilities, reducing the reliance of future occupants on the private car to meet their day-to-day needs. The accessibility of the site is a benefit of the scheme to which I attribute moderate weight.
62. The proposal would deliver green infrastructure which would mean open space is in easy reach for future occupants. It would deliver on-site SANG, which both exceeds policy requirements and also enables connectivity to create a Super-SANG with Great Hollands SANG and Bucklers Park SANG. Whilst some of this would be to meet the needs of future occupants, this provision would be available for existing residents with associated health and social benefits. I attribute moderate weight to these social and environmental benefits.
63. The scheme would deliver biodiversity enhancements in excess of either local or national policy requirements, amounting to a Biodiversity Net Gain of 12.91% for habitat areas, 100% gain in hedgerow units and 23.19% in river (ditch) units. The management of these enhancements would be secured through the s106 agreement. It would also deliver other ecological enhancements including bat boxes, bird nesting boxes, new woodland and native grassland planting, timber piles to provide habitat for reptiles and invertebrates and restoration of acid grassland and heathlands. This would be a significant environmental benefit of the scheme.
64. The proposal exceeds policy requirements with CO2 emissions reduced by 43.79%. It has also been designed to secure at least 20% of the expected energy demand from on-site renewables or low-carbon sources. These environmental benefits carry moderate weight in the scheme's favour.
65. The proposal would deliver a number of economic benefits during the construction phase including investment into the local economy, supporting local traders and contractors and potentially generating new employment, apprenticeship and training opportunities. The sale of houses and subsequent occupation would generate tax revenues. In addition, the Council would receive a New Homes Bonus which would contribute to delivery of services and local facilities.
66. Occupants of the proposed development would contribute to the local workforce as well as spending and making use of services and facilities in the local area.
67. The Borough's economy is considered to be healthy with considerable construction development taking place. In this context, the economic benefits, whilst many, are attributed moderate weight.
68. The proposal would be delivered by the appellant and its delivery partner who state they have a track record of delivering high quality housing. I have no firm

evidence of this. It is intended to bring forward the site quickly in order to meet the Homes England target to start on site before March 2024, the deadline which has only been deferred due to the refusal of the application. However, this is a greenfield site and there is nothing to suggest that this scheme would be brought forward any quicker than any comparable development proposal on a greenfield site. I therefore attribute limited weight to this.

69. I have been told that the local Easthampstead Park School is currently undersubscribed and future occupants would help to address this. However, I have no firm evidence of this and attribute limited weight to the benefit arising from this.
70. The proposal would be brought forward on non-Green Belt land and without harm to the SPA. This is a neutral factor.
71. All the dwellings would have access to private or communal amenity space. However, this is a requirement of development and not in itself a benefit of the scheme.

Planning Balance

72. I have found that the proposal would not harm the integrity of the protected habitats sites. However, this is a neutral factor in the balance.
73. The scheme would deliver a large number of economic, social and environmental benefits as I have outlined above. Cumulatively, the benefits of the scheme carry significant weight.
74. However, my finding is that the significant harm to highway safety arising from a poor layout and under-provision of SANG parking would be in conflict with both development plan policies as referred to above and the Framework policies that seek to achieve well-designed places and to prevent development on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. This is a matter to which I attribute substantial weight. This would not be outweighed by the significant benefits of the scheme. My conclusion is therefore that the scheme conflicts with the development plan as a whole.

Conclusion

75. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that outweigh this conflict. Consequently, with reference to Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Morag Ellis KC	Barrister representing the appellant
Rachel Murrell	Senior Land Manager
James Price	Head of Acquisitions and Partnerships
Colin Campbell	Head of Planning, Hill Group UK
Jamie Sullivan	Director of Planning, Icen Projects
Sophie Heritage	Senior Planner, Icen Projects
Chris Holdup	Associate Director, Mode Transport Planning
Karina Mudjahid	Senior Transport Planner, Mode Transport Planning
Clare Caudwell	Associate Director (Ecology) CSA

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Margaret McEvit	Principal Planning Officer, Major Sites Team
James Turner	Development & Adoptions Manager, Highways and Transport

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Mr Andy Holley	Chairman, Crowthorne Village Action Group
Ms Carole Doran	Secretary, Crowthorne Village Action Group
Cllr Guy Gillbe	Executive Member for Planning and Transport
Cllr Jeff Allen	Crowthorne Parish Council
Mr Alan Rope	Local Resident

HEARING DOCUMENTS

HD1 2021 Census data relating to tenure by car or van availability

POST-HEARING DOCUMENTS

PHD1 Consultation response from Natural England dated 20 June 2023

PHD2 List of final agreed conditions