



GLADMAN

**Land North of Carisbrook Road,
Mitcheldean**

Statement of Common Ground
between The Applicant and Forest
of Dean District Council

Planning Application Reference: P0672/25/OUT

Appeal Reference: APP/P1615/V/26/3378822

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Context	4
1.2	Purpose and Structure	4
1.3	Parties	4
2	Agreed Background and Description of the Proposals	5
2.1	Background to the Application	5
2.2	Site and Its Surroundings	7
2.3	The Proposals	7
2.4	Drawings Sought for Approval	7
3	Agreed Planning Policy Context	9
3.1	The Adopted Development Plan	9
3.2	Emerging Local Plan	10
3.3	National Planning Policy	11
4	Matters on Which the Parties Agree	12
4.1	Introduction	12
4.2	Access and Highways	12
4.3	Affordable Housing	12
4.4	Arboriculture	13
4.5	Archaeology and Built Heritage	14
4.6	Design and Layout	14
4.7	Ecology	15
4.8	Economic Benefits	15
4.9	Flood Risk and Drainage	16
4.10	Green Infrastructure	16
4.11	Housing Need, Supply and Delivery	17
4.12	Landscape and Visual	17
4.13	Locational Sustainability, Public Transport and Active Travel	18

4.14	Loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land	18
4.15	Mineral Safeguarding	18
4.16	Planning Obligations.....	19
4.17	Principle of Development.....	20
4.18	Residential Amenity.....	20
5	Matters on Which the Parties Disagree.....	22
5.1	Introduction.....	22
5.2	Loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land	22
5.3	Principle of Development.....	22
5.4	Planning Balance.....	22
5.5	Landscape Character and Appearance.....	23
6	Planning Obligations and Conditions.....	24
6.1	Section 106 Agreement.....	24
6.2	Planning Conditions	24

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground relates to a called-in outline planning application submitted by Gladman Developments Limited (the Applicant) to Forest of Dean District Council (the Council). The description of development is as follows:

“Outline planning permission for the erection of up to 180 residential dwellings (including affordable housing) with public open space, landscaping and vehicular access points. All matters reserved except for means of access”

1.2 Purpose and Structure

- 1.2.1 This statement sets out all matters agreed and not agreed between the Applicant and the Council.

1.3 Parties

- 1.3.1 This final version of SoCG is jointly agreed by

Signed:

Date: 26 August 2026



Name: Michael Dinn

On behalf of Gladman Developments Ltd

Signed:



Date: 26 August 2026

Name: Stephen Colegate

On behalf of Forest of Dean District Council

2 AGREED BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSALS

2.1 Background to the Application

- 2.1.1 The called-in outline planning application was validated by the Council on 18th June 2025 under reference P0672/25/OUT. The application was supported by a comprehensive suite of technical reports in accordance with the Council's planning application validation requirements (CD1).
- 2.1.2 The initial 13-week deadline for the determination of the application fell on 17th September 2025. The determination date was prolonged by a series of extensions of time agreed between both parties in order to resolve outstanding matters. The Applicant worked proactively with the Council, statutory consultees and key stakeholders throughout the determination period of the application.
- 2.1.3 The application was reported to the Council's Development Management Committee on 9th June 2026, with all technical matters being resolved and a recommendation for approval by the case officer. In addition, the site was identified as a residential allocation for approximately 180 dwellings under Policy RLP. 85 (Land off Carisbrook Road, Mitcheldean) in the then emerging Local Plan (CD5.4). Despite this, members resolved that they were minded to refuse the application, subject to referral to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government. Members put the following four reasons for refusal forward (CD4.2):
1. The proposal is considered to represent unsustainable development in the countryside owing to its location outside a settlement boundary where new residential development is restricted by local and national policy and would therefore be contrary to policies CSP.1, CSP.4 and CSP.5 of the Core Strategy and policy AP1 of the Allocations Plan, policy H2 of the Mitcheldean Neighbourhood Development Plan and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposal would be contrary to policies CSP.1, CSP.4 and CSP.5 of the Core Strategy, policy AP1 of the Allocations Plan and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework in that it would create a suburban form of development in this rural location on the best and most versatile agricultural land and this would mitigate against the food security of the nation as advised by the government in the Government Food Strategy for England, considering the wider UK Food System (2025) which would be out of character with the surroundings and would therefore represent an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.
3. The proposed development fails to take proper account of and, causes unacceptable harm to the significance of the affected designated heritage asset the Grade I Listed St Michael and All Angels Church which on balance is considered to be greater than the benefits of allowing the application. As a consequence it fails to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the affected listed building and its setting, as required under Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the national guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
4. The proposal fails to make provision for affordable housing, serviced flats [sic] for sale to self and custom builders, provision, laying out, management and maintenance of all open space on the site outside private gardens and including the attenuation pond should it not be adopted by a statutory body e.g. Severn Trent, the laying out, equipping of the trim trail and combined LEAP and LAP and contributions to deliver additional capacity at Mitcheldean surgery, primary education, libraries, travel plan, home to school transport, bus stop improvements, monitoring Biodiversity Net Gain via a Section 106 Legal Agreement where there are recognised shortfalls which would place an unacceptable burden on existing local services and

infrastructure. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies CSP.1, CSP.4, CSP.5 and CSP.9 of the Core Strategy, policies AP1 and AP7 of the Allocations Plan and the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 2.1.4 On 1st July 2026, the application was called in by the Secretary of State. The Council formally withdrew the third reason for refusal on 28th July 2026.

2.2 Site and Its Surroundings

- 2.2.1 The site measures approximately 9.72 hectares and is located on the northern edge of the town of Mitcheldean. It comprises an agricultural field with tree and hedgerow boundaries. The site is bounded by agricultural land to the north, Bradley Court Road to the east, Carisbrook Road to the south and Ross Road to the west. Vantage Point Business Village is located beyond Bradley Court Road, and residential development is situated on the opposite side of Carisbrook Road and Ross Road.

2.3 The Proposals

- 2.3.1 The Applicant seeks outline planning permission with all matters reserved except for access for a residential development comprising:
- Up to 180 dwellings, including 40% affordable housing (up to 72 affordable homes);
 - Vehicular access and active travel connections onto Ross Road;
 - 4.36 hectares of green infrastructure (approximately 45% of the total site area), comprising formal and informal public open space, recreational routes, children's play facilities, retained key landscape features, new landscaping and planting and an attenuation basin; and
 - A sustainable drainage system.

2.4 Drawings Sought for Approval

- 2.4.1 The drawings for which planning permission is sought are as follows:

Drawing NameDrawing Reference

Location Plan

CSA/4057/115 Rev A (CD1.2)

Proposed Access Arrangement

P24048-101D (CD1.14)

- 2.4.2 The Development Framework Plan (reference: CSA/4057/116 Rev G) (CD1.3) is an illustrative summary of how the site could be developed, and approval is not sought for it.

3 AGREED PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

3.1 The Adopted Development Plan

3.1.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

3.1.2 It is agreed that the development plan applicable to the application comprises:

- Core Strategy (adopted February 2012)
- Allocations Plan (adopted June 2018)
- Mitcheldean Neighbourhood Development Plan ('made' March 2020)
- Gloucester Waste Core Strategy (adopted November 2012)
- Minerals Local Plan for Gloucestershire (adopted March 2020)

3.1.3 It is agreed that the Core Strategy set a housing requirement of 6,200 dwellings over the plan period 2006-2026, which equates to 310 dwellings per annum (dpa). The Allocations Plan provides an updated housing requirement for the district, given that the housing requirement in the Core Strategy was derived from the South West Regional Spatial Strategy and failed to address the district's full objectivity assessed needs. The Allocations Plan sets a housing requirement of 330 dpa up until 2026. Settlement boundaries were also reviewed through the Allocations Plan.

3.1.4 The parties agree that the Allocations Plan is over five years old and the settlement boundaries were drawn up to accommodate a significantly lower housing requirement than currently applies. It is agreed that the Council's current local housing need figure is 598 dpa (May 2026), which is 81% higher than planned for by the Allocations Plan.

3.1.5 The parties agree that the reasons for refusal (CD4.2) put forward by members allege conflict with the following policies:

Core Strategy

- Policy CSP.1 – Design and environmental protection
- Policy CSP.4 – Development at Settlements
- Policy CSP.5 – Housing
- Policy CSP.9 – Recreational and amenity land

Allocations Plan

- Policy AP1 – Sustainable Development
- Policy AP7 – Biodiversity

Mitcheldean Neighbourhood Development Plan

- Policy H2 – Gateway and outside settlement boundary (outside the village)

3.2 Emerging Local Plan

- 3.2.1 The Council commenced preparing a new Local Plan in 2019, which was intended to replace the Core Strategy and Allocations Plan. It undertook an Issues and Options consultation in 2019, a Preferred Option consultation in 2021, a Second Preferred Option consultation in 2022, a Draft Local Plan consultation in 2024, an Options to Deliver the Additional Housing Requirement consultation in 2025 and a Revised Draft Local Plan consultation in 2026. A total of six Regulation 18 consultations were undertaken between 2019 and 2026.
- 3.2.2 The application site was proposed to be allocated for approximately 180 dwellings in the 2024 Draft Local Plan consultation under Policy LP. 93 (Land off Carisbrook Road, Mitcheldean). The application site remained a draft allocation in 2026 Revised Draft Local Plan consultation and was proposed to be allocated for approximately 180 dwellings under Policy LP. 85 (Land off Carisbrook Road, Mitcheldean) (CD5.4).
- 3.2.3 On 30th June 2026, the Council resolved to withdraw the emerging Local Plan, and the formal notice of withdrawal was issued on 6th July 2026. The Council will now prepare a new Local Plan under the new plan-making system.

- 3.2.4 It is agreed between the parties that both the former emerging Local Plan and the current emerging Local Plan should be afforded no weight, in accordance with Policy DM4(1) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2026.

3.3 National Planning Policy

- 3.3.1 It is agreed that the National Planning Policy Framework 2026 and planning practice guidance are important material considerations in the determination of this application.
- 3.3.2 It is agreed that the weight to be attached to relevant adopted policies should be informed by the degree of consistency of those policies with the Framework, in accordance with paragraph 2 of Annex A to the National Planning Policy Framework 2026.
- 3.3.3 The parties agree that Policy S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development means decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development
- 3.3.4 The parties agree that Policy S5: Principle of development outside settlements identifies the particular types and circumstances of development that are acceptable in principle outside of settlement boundaries. The parties agree that there is an identified unmet need but disagree on whether the site is well related to the settlement of Mitcheldean.
- 3.3.5 The parties also agree that Policy S6 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2026 does not apply in relation to the Mitcheldean Neighbourhood Development Plan.

4 MATTERS ON WHICH THE PARTIES AGREE

4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 The parties agree on the matters set out below.

4.2 Access and Highways

- 4.2.1 The principal means of access into the site is not reserved and is to be determined. The site would be served via a single priority-controlled T-junction from Ross Road, slightly to the north of the Hollywell Road junction. Pedestrian and cycle access will be provided from the vehicular access; footways will extend north and south and connect to uncontrolled crossing points, incorporating dropped kerbs and tactile paving. In addition, a dedicated shared footway/cycleway connection will be provided onto Carisbrook Road at the south of the site, which will lead to an uncontrolled crossing point, incorporating dropped kerbs and tactile paving, connecting to the footway on the southern side of Carisbrook Road. The submitted Transport Assessment (CD1.15) and Transport Assessment Addendum (CD2.8) provide further detail on the proposed access strategy and set out further off-site highway improvements.
- 4.2.2 Active Travel England (CD3.1) and Gloucestershire County Council (CD3.39), as the local highway authority, did not object to the proposals on highway grounds.
- 4.2.3 The Case Officer's Report (CD4.1) concludes that subject to suitable conditions, the proposed development would "not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety or severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network following mitigation".
- 4.2.4 It is agreed between the parties that the proposals would not lead to any unacceptable highway impacts.

4.3 Affordable Housing

- 4.3.1 Subject to a completed Section 106 Agreement, the proposals would secure 40% of the proposed dwellings as affordable homes. This is in accordance with Policy CSP.5

of the Core Strategy. Should 180 dwellings be constructed, this would equate to 72 affordable homes.

- 4.3.2 The parties agree there is a shortfall in affordable housing provision in the Forest of Dean District and that the provision of affordable housing from the scheme is a benefit to which positive weight should be afforded.
- 4.3.3 The affordable housing and its tenure split are secured through the Section 106 Agreement, which is to be submitted to the Inquiry.

4.4 Arboriculture

- 4.4.1 The submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report (CD1.12) considers the arboricultural implications of the proposed development. It confirms that no trees or hedgerows will need to be removed to implement the proposed vehicular access point or the shared footway/cycleway connection onto Carisbrook Road at the south of the site. There is a minor incursion by the new footway into the Root Protection Area of T7 (C1). The tree has symptoms of ash dieback disease and a short life expectancy. Crown lifting of ash and hawthorn group G3 (B2) and goat willow, ash, hawthorn and apple group G4 (B2) would be required to achieve the visibility splay to the north of the new access. This would require no tree or shrub removals.
- 4.4.2 The Development Framework Plan (CD1.3) has been designed to provide buffers to the trees along the site's boundaries. There would be no impact on the two protected trees T1 (A1) and T2 (B2). The Development Framework Plan (CD1.3) indicates that there is the potential to provide a significant increase in tree canopy cover, species diversity and habitat connectivity.
- 4.4.3 Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust (CD3.3) and the Council's Arboricultural Officer (CD3.7) did not object to the proposals.
- 4.4.4 The parties agree that the proposals will not give rise to any unacceptable arboricultural impacts.

4.5 Archaeology and Built Heritage

- 4.5.1 The submitted Archaeology and Heritage Assessment (CD1.20) concludes that the proposed development would likely result in some reduction in/loss of non-key views to the Church of St Michael and All Angels from within and looking across the site.
- 4.5.2 Harm to the significance of the Grade I listed Church of St Michael and All Angels and Mitcheldean Conservation Area would be at the very lower end of the spectrum. It is agreed that the harm would be outweighed by the public benefits arising from the development of the site in accordance with Policy HE6(4) of the NPPF. The proposal would not harm the significance of the Grade II listed Lagers Barn.
- 4.5.3 It is agreed that any archaeological interest in the site could be secured by planning condition.
- 4.5.4 The Conservation Officer (CD3.19) and the Archaeology Advisor (CD3.26) do not object to the proposals, subject to condition. Furthermore, the Case Officer's Report concludes (CD4.1) "that there is considered to be no harm to heritage assets".
- 4.5.5 The parties agree that there are no archaeology or heritage grounds for withholding planning permission on their own basis. However, the parties agree that the identified harm (very lower end of the spectrum) should be considered in the planning balance.

4.6 Design and Layout

- 4.6.1 The parties agree that as the application is in outline with only access to be determined at this stage, the matters of layout, design, scale, appearance and landscaping will be addressed through future reserved matters applications having regard the development framework plan drawing no CSA/4057/116 Rev G dated 25/11/2024.
- 4.6.2 The submitted Development Framework Plan (CD1.3) represents one way in which the site could be laid out and delivered. Both parties agree that the quantum of residential development sought is capable of being physically accommodated on the site.

4.7 Ecology

- 4.7.1 The parties agree that the site is not subject to any statutory or non-statutory designations for nature conservation.
- 4.7.2 Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust (CD3.3), Nature Space (CD3.18), Gloucestershire County Council (CD3.32) and Natural England (CD3.37) did not object to the proposals on ecology grounds, subject to conditions.
- 4.7.3 The Case Officer's Report (CD4.1) concludes that subject to conditions, the proposed development "would avoid adverse effects on the integrity of the Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites SAC and European Protected species, offer opportunities for biodiversity enhancement and would accord with policies CSP.1 and CSP.2 of the Core Strategy, policies AP1, AP7 and AP8 of the Allocations Plan, policies E4 and E5 of the Mitcheldean NDP and the advice in the NPPF and NPPG".
- 4.7.4 It is agreed that the proposals would not give rise to any impacts on protected species or designated nature conservation sites that could not be addressed through appropriate mitigation measures during the construction and operation phases of the development.
- 4.7.5 The biodiversity of the site will be protected, diversified and enhanced through measures including additional tree planting and the reinforcement of existing hedgerows and boundary features to improve habitat connectivity. The parties agree that the proposals will secure at least a 10% net gain in biodiversity and that the ecological benefits of the proposals should attract positive weight in the planning balance. A planning condition will be agreed to ensure that the biodiversity net gain is delivered.

4.8 Economic Benefits

- 4.8.1 Both parties agree that the proposal will generate positive economic benefits. The submitted Socio-Economic Benefits Statement (CD1.6) demonstrates that the proposals would, if 180 dwellings are constructed, deliver an estimated:

- Construction spend of £31.8m;

- 145 direct full-time equivalent (FTE) construction jobs, including 10 apprenticeships, and 197 indirect FTE jobs in associated industries per annum over the build-out period;
- New resident expenditure of £6.5m per annum, a proportion of which would be spent in local services and facilities.

4.8.2 It is agreed that the economic benefits that would flow from the proposals are a positive factor that should be afforded positive weight in the planning balance.

4.9 Flood Risk and Drainage

4.9.1 The parties agree that the proposed development is located wholly within Flood Zone 1 where the NPPF sequential risk-based approach to the location of development seeks to direct housing.

4.9.2 The submitted Flood Risk Assessment with Outline Drainage Strategy (CD1.19) demonstrates that the proposed development would be operated without risk of flooding, would not increase flood risk elsewhere and is compliant with the requirements of national policy and guidance. Surface water would be appropriately managed based on the outline drainage strategy. A detailed drainage strategy would be provided at the reserved matters stage when a detailed layout is available.

4.9.3 The Lead Local Flood Authority (CD3.28) did not object to the proposals. Furthermore, the Case Officer's Report (CD4.1) concludes that the proposed development "could be accommodated on site without an unacceptable adverse impact due to flood risk and would not increase flood risk elsewhere".

4.9.4 It is agreed between the parties that there are no flood risk grounds for withholding planning permission.

4.10 Green Infrastructure

4.10.1 The proposals are capable of providing 4.36 hectares of green infrastructure (approximately 45% of the total site area), comprising formal and informal public

open space, recreational routes, children's play facilities, retained key landscape features, new landscaping and planting and an attenuation basin.

- 4.10.2 The parties agree that the provision of green infrastructure and public open space as proposed will benefit both new and existing residents and should be afforded positive weight in the planning balance.
- 4.10.3 It is agreed that children's play facilities and the maintenance and management of on-site public open space would be secured through the Section 106 Agreement.

4.11 Housing Need, Supply and Delivery

- 4.11.1 The parties agree that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply. It is agreed that based on the Council's latest claimed deliverable supply of 1,253 dwellings in its Housing Delivery Note 2024-2025 (CD5.6), the Council is now only able to demonstrate a supply of 2.00 years for the five-year period 1st April 2024 – 31st March 2029 when using the May 2026 local housing need figure of 598 dpa and applying a 5% buffer. The parties agree that this is a substantial shortfall against the five-year requirement and represents a deficit of 1,887 dwellings.
- 4.11.2 It is agreed that the ratio of the median house price to the median income in Forest of Dean District is 8.22. The parties agree that this is above the national average and that it is an indicator the housing market in Forest of Dean District is unaffordable.
- 4.11.3 It is agreed that the delivery of market housing is a benefit that should be afforded substantial weight in the planning balance, separate to that of affordable market housing weight.

4.12 Landscape and Visual

- 4.12.1 It is agreed that the site comprises greenfield land and is located outside of, but adjacent to Mitcheldean.
- 4.12.2 It is agreed that the site is not covered by any statutory or non-statutory designations for landscape character or quality. The parties also agree that the site is not, nor does it form part of, a designated or protected landscape.

4.13 Locational Sustainability, Public Transport and Active Travel

- 4.13.1 The parties agree that the development plan identifies Mitcheldean as a second-tier Major Village. Major Villages are described as large villages with employment opportunities and/or services important to a wider area and have some scope for additional development. It is agreed that Mitcheldean is a sustainable settlement.
- 4.13.2 It is agreed that facilities, services and bus stops are accessible by walking and cycling, as set out in Tables 5.2 and 5.3 of the Transport Assessment (CD1.15). In addition, the parties agree that the no. 33 bus service is accessible from the site and operates regularly, providing connections to Gloucester, Ross-on-Wye, Hereford and other locations. It is agreed that the site is not well located to any stations.
- 4.13.3 The Case Officer's Report (CD4.1) concludes that "the site's location can be considered to be within a sustainable location".
- 4.13.4 The parties agree that the site is accessibly located and offers future residents the ability to use various modes of transport to access services, facilities and employment opportunities in Mitcheldean, settlements in the immediate surrounding area and across the wider district.

4.14 Loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land

- 4.14.1 The submitted Agricultural Land Quality Report (CD2.11) identifies that the entire site (9.72 hectares) comprises Grade 1 agricultural land.
- 4.14.2 The parties agree that consultation with Natural England was not required in relation to the planning application because the site comprises 9.72 hectares of best and most versatile agricultural land and, as such, falls below the consultation threshold.
- 4.14.3 The parties agree that the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land is harm that needs to be weighed in the planning balance.

4.15 Mineral Safeguarding

- 4.15.1 The submitted Mineral Resource Assessment (CD2.9) outlines that the site is located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area and Mineral Consultation Area for Sandstone and

Limestone. The safeguarded mineral is Brownstones Formation, which is recognised primarily as a source of natural building stone but is durable enough to be used as a potential construction aggregate. The assessment concludes that from an aggregate extraction perspective, the site is considered to be too small to be economically viable as a standalone operation. For use as a building stone, the assessment concludes that the proximity to surrounding environmentally sensitive receptors reduces the workable area to such an extent that the residual potential mineral would be too small to be commercially viable.

- 4.15.2 The proposed development is compatible with criterion three of Policy MS01 of the Minerals Local Plan for Gloucestershire, which sets out that non-mineral development proposals within Mineral Safeguarded Areas will be permitted where the mineral resources of concern are not economically valuable.
- 4.15.3 Gloucestershire County Council, as the Mineral Planning Authority, did not object to the proposals (CD3.31).
- 4.15.4 The parties agree that there are no mineral grounds for withholding planning permission.

4.16 Planning Obligations

- 4.16.1 The parties agree that planning obligations will be required towards local infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of the development and provide improvements that will be of benefit to the local community.
- 4.16.2 It is agreed by the parties that all planning obligations must be reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development and must also meet the statutory tests set out in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.
- 4.16.3 Subject to making provision for any necessary developer contributions requested by consultees and meeting the relevant tests above, it is agreed that the proposals would not have an unacceptable impact on infrastructure, services or facilities in the local area.

4.17 Principle of Development

- 4.17.1 It is agreed that the site is not allocated in the adopted development plan for residential development and is classified as open countryside in planning policy terms.
- 4.17.2 As the site is situated outside of the Mitcheldean settlement boundary, it is acknowledged that the proposals would conflict with development plan policies CSP.4, CSP. 5, CSP.16 and H2 in principle. It is agreed that the proposed development does not accord with the Development Plan when read as a whole, as acknowledged in the Applicant's planning statement at paragraph 4.15.2. The parties agree specific housing policies are out of date as a result of the Council being unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply and that weight attributed to policies within the development plan is dependent on their consistency with the Framework (2026).
- 4.17.3 It is agreed between the parties that Mitcheldean is an accessible location in principle for residential development in relation to transport and infrastructure, subject to conditions. .
- 4.17.4 The parties agree that the principle of development was considered to be acceptable in the Case Officer's Report (CD4.1) subject to the issues of integrating the proposal into the surrounding area without causing harm.

4.18 Residential Amenity

- 4.18.1 The application is supported by a Design and Access Statement (CD1.4), Air Quality Assessment (CD1.17) and a Noise Assessment (CD1.18).
- 4.18.2 Environmental Protection (CD3.2 and CD3.9) and the Environmental Health Officer (CD3.8) did not object to the proposals.
- 4.18.3 The Case Officer's Report (CD4.1) concludes "a scheme could be delivered which would respect the living conditions for existing residents during both the construction phase and the life of the development, but conditions to secure this would be

required. With careful design it is considered that an acceptable layout could be provided to ensure satisfactory living condition for future occupiers.”

- 4.18.4 The parties agree that the proposals would not give rise to any unacceptable impacts on residential amenity.

5 MATTERS ON WHICH THE PARTIES DISAGREE

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 The parties do not agree on the following matters:

- Well related to existing built form
- Loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land
- Principle of Development
- Planning Balance
- Harm to character and appearance of the area (including both landscape and visual effects)
- Heritage harm

5.1.2 Well- related to the existing built form

5.1.3 The parties disagree on whether the site is well related to the existing built form of Mitcheldean.

5.2 Loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land

5.2.1 The parties disagree as to the weight to be afforded to the loss of Grade 1 agricultural land.

5.3 Principle of Development

5.3.1 The parties disagree as to whether the principle of development is acceptable and whether the policy conflict and harm justify the refusal of planning permission.

5.4 Planning Balance

5.4.1 The parties disagree as to the weight to be afforded to policies of the development plan and other material considerations.

5.5 Landscape Character and Appearance

- 5.4.2 The parties disagree as to the nature and degree of impacts on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area, and the weight to be afforded to the adverse impacts.

6 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS AND CONDITIONS

6.1 Section 106 Agreement

- 6.1.1 The Applicant and the Council are working collaboratively to draft a Section 106 Agreement. The final draft Section 106 Agreement will be provided to the Inspector in advance of the Inquiry.

6.2 Planning Conditions

- 6.2.1 The parties are collating a list of suggested planning conditions and this will be provided in advance of the Inquiry opening.