

**Proof of Evidence – Landscape Impact – Michael Bennett**

**LAND OFF SPRUCE CLOSE, EXETER**

**PINS ref. APP/Y1110/W/22/3292721**

**Exeter Greenspace Group (Rule 6 Party)**

**June 2022**

## **1. Executive Summary**

- 1.1. The proposed site is designated as landscape setting and subject to ECS Policy CP16. CP16 seeks to protect and enhance the character and local distinctiveness of Exeter's landscape setting. The site sits across two Zones, both of which are found to be of high intrinsic sensitivity by the Exeter Fringes Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study (2007), with very limited to no capacity for housing.<sup>1</sup> I do not agree with the appellant's conclusion that the site is in fact only of medium sensitivity.
- 1.2. It is my view that the appellant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) underestimates the sensitivity of the site and the extent and severity of harms to the landscape's amenity and character. This proof provides additional viewpoints and evidence that I believe reveals that the development would cause harm to the landscape character and therefore conflict with CP 16.
- 1.3. I also challenge the appellant's claims that the LPA must accept adverse impacts on landscape setting land in order to meet its housing supply requirements.
- 1.4. I conclude that the conflict with policy CP16 is unacceptable and should be given substantial weight in the overall planning balance.

## **2. Introduction to the Witnesses**

- 2.1. My name is Michael Bennett. I have a BSc in Geochemistry and have also studied Soil Science and Environmental Studies. I am also an amateur wildlife and landscape photographer.
- 2.2. In developing this Proof of Evidence, I received support from David Williams of David Williams Landscape Consultancy Limited. His advice is set out in full in Appendix CD MB3.

## **3. Relevant Documentation**

- 3.1. This proof should be read in conjunction with the following documents:

3.1.1. EGG Statement of Case [CD-ID7]

3.1.2. Statement of Common Ground between Exeter Greenspace Group and the Appellant  
(still in draft at the time of writing) [CD-ID11]

---

<sup>1</sup> Exeter Fringes Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study (2007) (CD-SPD14)

3.1.3. The following Proofs of Evidence:

- 3.1.3.1. On appropriate location [CD-GB1]
- 3.1.3.2. On Public Open Space [CD-SH1]
- 3.1.3.3. Summary of planning balance [CD-ID12]

3.2. This proof is supported by the following appendices:

- 3.2.1. LVIA review by David Williams, Landscape Consultant [CD-MB3]
- 3.2.2. Additional Viewpoints compiled by EGG [CD-MB4]
- 3.2.3. Verified Views by Ocean CGI [CD-MB5]

#### **4. Site description**

4.1. The site comprises two fields to the northeast of properties of Celia Crescent and to the northwest of the public open space above Juniper/Spruce Close. The two fields are designated as Landscape Setting on the Core Strategy Key Diagram and the Exeter Local Plan First Review.<sup>2</sup> A Site of Nature Conservation Importance covers the vegetation along the northeast boundary of the lower field and the bottom right corner of the upper field.

4.2. The three fields to the north of the site, proposed as compensatory open space, are also designated Landscape Setting. The field to west is a designated Site of Nature Conservation Interest and part of a Valley Park as shown on the ELPRF Proposal Map.<sup>3</sup>

4.3. The site is identified as unsuitable for development in the 2015 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.<sup>4</sup>

4.4. As described in the appellant's LVIA, "the proposed development would introduce development onto the site where there currently is none, resulting in an extension of the suburban edge and the Urban Boundary of Exeter into the landscape setting of the city."<sup>5</sup>

#### **5. Assessing site value and susceptibility**

---

<sup>2</sup> Exeter Core Strategy (2012-2026) (CD-DP4), Exeter Local Plan First Review (1995-2011) (CD-DP5)

<sup>3</sup> ELPRF Proposal Maps (CD-DP9)

<sup>4</sup> SHLAA 2015 (CD-SPD17)

<sup>5</sup> Appellant LVIA, 4.1, pg. 34 (CD-P49)

- 5.1. The two fields making up the proposed development are both assessed as having “high landscape sensitivity” in the Exeter Fringes Study (LCSC) with low and medium-low capacity for housing respectively (in Zones 4 and 6).<sup>6</sup> Zone 4 is characterised as a “prominent hill and valley sides with high intrinsic sensitivity [that forms a] strong positive rural backcloth to the city” that has “no capacity for housing.”<sup>7</sup> Zone 6 has “very limited capacity for housing” and “high visual sensitivity.”<sup>8</sup>
- 5.2. The Fringes Study comments that the urban boundary of Zone 4 already “intrudes on to the hillside, although bounded by trees”, strongly suggesting a view that the urban boundary has already sprawled beyond its natural edge.
- 5.3. The Inspector of the recently dismissed Pennsylvania Appeal - a site with similarly high intrinsic sensitivity and low capacity for housing - determined that “whilst [the LCSC] is now some years old, there is no evidence that the important characteristics and features of the surrounding area have significantly changed since this study was undertaken” and that “the LCSC therefore remains relevant.”<sup>9</sup>
- 5.4. The appellant’s LVIA however argues that the Exeter Fringes Study makes “quite broad-brush conclusions regarding the visibility and sensitivity applied over zones that cover large areas and have a range in elevation of up to 50m in some places.”<sup>10</sup> The appellant’s LVIA concludes instead that the site is only of medium sensitivity. I will return to this assessment below.
- 5.5. In assessing the value and susceptibility of the site, the appellant’s LVIA does not reference or make use of Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 02/21 (2021).<sup>11</sup> This guidance was developed in response to the need to interpret the NPPF term “valued landscape.” It is intended to provide guidance to professionals and others who need to make judgements about the value of a landscape and also assist those who review those judgments to ensure a common understanding of the approach.

---

<sup>6</sup> Exeter Fringes Study pg. 11 (CD-SPD14)

<sup>7</sup> Exeter Fringes Study, pg. 10 (CD-SPD14)

<sup>8</sup> Exeter Fringes Study, pg. 16 (CD-SPD14)

<sup>9</sup> APP/Y1110/W/20/3265253, para. 101(CD-A14)

<sup>10</sup> Appellant LVIA 2.8 pg 28 (CD-P49)

<sup>11</sup> TGN 02/21 Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations (CD-PA35)

5.6. TGN 02/021 states that “when assessing landscape value of a site as part of a planning application or appeal it is important to consider not only the site itself and its features/elements/characteristics/qualities, but also their relationship with, and the role they play within, the site’s context. **Value is best appreciated at the scale at which a landscape is perceived – rarely is this on a field-by-field basis.**”<sup>12</sup> This view is reinforced by the conclusion of the Inspector for APP/Z1510/W/16/3160474 that:

*“It would be too narrow to just consider the appeal site. A site might have a variety of characteristics but taken in isolation, for some sites it would be difficult to assess whether those characteristics have any particular value of importance. Moreover, a site might be important because of its position in the landscape as part of it rather than being important in its own right, rather like the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. Further, as my colleague in the Nanpanton Road appeal sets out, the interactions between people and place are important in the perceptions of landscape and people will perceive the site in a wider context.”<sup>13</sup>*

It is our view that the “zone” approach underpinning the Exeter Fringes Study reflects this stated importance of seeing landscape value in context.

5.7. In sharp distinction to this, however, the appellant’s LVIA argues that sensitivity should be assessed on a field-by-field basis and that, by doing so, “it could be argued that both Fields 1 and 2, that make up the site, have more capacity to accommodate development than the Fringes Study suggests.”<sup>14</sup> I do not accept that the findings of the Fringes Study which underpins both the ECS and the ELPF should be so easily dismissed by the appellant. Especially when such conclusions are drawn from an approach that runs counter to current guidance. I believe that weight must be given to the Fringes Study’s longstanding conclusion that the appeal site is of high intrinsic capacity with very limited to no capacity for housing.

5.8. On reviewing the appellant’s LVIA, an independent landscape consultant remarked that they were surprised that it did not include a more thorough assessment of the landscape character, including a deeper analysis of the landscape elements listed in the Regional and Local Landscape character Assessments reference; landscape patterns; and the wider landscape area. In addition, TGN 02/21 advises that factors used to assess landscape value be discussed with the LPA first before work commences.”<sup>15</sup> The LVIA does not reference any such discussions taking place.

---

<sup>12</sup> TGN 02/21, pg. 12 (CD-PA35)

<sup>13</sup> As quoted in TGN 02/21 Appendix 5, A5.1.7 (CD-PA35)

<sup>14</sup> As above, pgs. 28-29 (CD-PA35)

<sup>15</sup> As above pg. 11 (CD-PA35)

5.9. On this basis, the LVIA concludes that the site is of medium sensitivity and can therefore accommodate development. It finds that a) while the site contains some characteristics described in the Landscape Character Assessments, it is also influenced by its proximity to the suburban development, b) a large part of the site occupies a similar elevation to the adjacent development at Celia Crescent and c) the land within the site is not visible due to the scale of the fields and the screening provided by boundary trees/hedges which merge into the surrounding well-wooded appearance of the slopes.”<sup>16</sup>

5.10. The first of these conclusions suggests that the landscape characteristics of the site – and therefore its sensitivity - are diluted by the site’s proximity to the built urban environment. For example, the LVIA finds when assessing the site against the characteristics Devon County Council’s Exeter Slopes and Hills Landscape Character Area (LCA), that a “strong sense of tranquility and dark night skies” is present at the site but that it is “disturbed to some extent by the close proximity of [the existing] settlement”<sup>17</sup>. I am concerned by this conclusion, which appears to justify piecemeal development based on previous piecemeal development. If followed to its logical conclusion, this would eventually justify development of all of Zone 4 and Zone 6 as each part becomes less sensitive and valued due the sprawling urban boundary. It also highlights the fact that the tranquillity of three more sensitive fields to the north of the development site (proposed New Valley Park) would also be harmed by the extension of the settlement to the south.

5.11. Secondly, the LVIA finds that while the site does occupy an elevation position on landscape setting slopes, it occupies a similar elevation to the adjacent development at Celia Crescent. I note that the LPA requested that the development be contained to the 115.5 metre contour to correspond with the highest level of existing housing in the area.<sup>18</sup> However, it is my view that this is not an acceptable build line. It equates the height of the entire new proposed development with one small section of Beacon Heath urbanisation. It is pertinent to note that the majority of housing in the adjacent development sits between the 50m and 105 contour lines. It is clear when seen from long distance viewpoints, that the housing towards the 115.5m contour in Beacon Heath has already sprawled beyond its natural edge and harmed the landscape setting. I do not agree, therefore, that the 115.5m contour should be taken as a “build

---

<sup>16</sup> Appellant LVIA 2.8 pg. 28 (CD-P49)

<sup>17</sup> Appellant LVIA pg. 10 (CD-P49)

<sup>18</sup> Appellant Statement of Case, para 2.3 (CD-ID2)

to” target. If this development proceeds, it would cement the idea that this is an acceptable build level. It is my view that the adjacent housing should be seen as an unfortunate anomaly and not the norm.

5.12. Thirdly, the claim that the site is less sensitive due to its being screened by boundary trees and hedges only serves to highlight that the site sits above the urban boundary, a fact that is acknowledged in the LVIA.<sup>19</sup> The “tall and well-established hedges” bounding the site, form the natural edge of the city and mark the start of the rural character of Exeter’s landscape setting. It is concerning to see this treeline used as justification for extending development further up the slope. The Inspector of the Land at Pennsylvania Road appeal site – which also sits above the urban edge - expressed a similar concern, concluding that “it would appear as an anomalous form of development projecting beyond the clearly defined limits of the city and its natural boundary formed by the belt of trees.”<sup>20</sup> Further, the LVIA states the importance of maintaining “the screening and contribution to the well-treed landscape setting of the upper slopes.” The appellant claims that beyond the removal of trees to create two access points, trees will be carefully maintained on the site. However, it is unusual that the application does not include a Landscape Strategy Plan that gives a detailed view of mitigation measures, including which key features will be maintained and where planting is proposed and what the relevant timescales so that there is greater clarity on what is actually being assessed and what will be delivered as part of the landscape scheme. The LVIA leaves all of this to the reserved matters stage, which is concerning in the case of a site where the trees and hedges are so integral to assessments of value and sensitivity.

5.13. It is my view that the proposal site is of high value and sensitivity. It has a fundamentally rural character and contributes to the landscape setting of Exeter. It also exemplifies many of the value factors outlined in TGN 02/21, as shown in Table 5.13.1

**Table 5.13.1: Analysis of site using TGN 02/21 factors**

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Evidence Source</b>
<b>Natural heritage</b>	A Site of Nature Conservation Importance runs through the site	Exeter Local Plan First Review – Proposals Map

<sup>19</sup> Appellant LVIA pg. 10 (CD-P49)

<sup>20</sup> Land at Pennsylvania Road appeal decision – para. 35 (CD-A14)

	<p>Presence of wildlife and habitats of ecological interest, including bats, dormice and slowworms</p> <p>Historic Parkland designation – “historic and cultural elements in the landscape.”</p>	<p>Appellant Ecological Impact Assessment</p> <p>Green Infrastructure Strategy Phase 2 – pgs 12 and 17</p>
<b>Landscape condition</b>	<p>“Mature trees of mixed species are present along the majority of the site boundary as well as a hedge line dividing the two fields.”</p> <p>“The site is noted to have been undeveloped since the earliest maps (1889 - 90)”</p>	<p>Appellant Phase 1 Geo-environmental Assessment - pg 2 and 3</p>
<b>Distinctiveness</b>	<p>Site designated as landscape setting in ELPFR and ECS. Site makes an important contribution to the character of Exeter’s landscape setting</p> <p>“The hills to the north and northwest of the city, particularly the ridgelines, give Exeter a distinctive character.”</p>	<p>Exeter Local Plan First Review – Proposals Map</p> <p>Exeter Core Strategy - pg 9</p>
<b>Recreational</b>	<p>While no formal rights of way are recorded, it is accepted that the site has long been used for informal recreation and desire lines indicate routes through and around the proposed sites and surrounding fields.</p> <p>Evidence of foraging on hedgerows in Celia Meadow</p>	<p>Appellant LVIA, 5.2, pg 37</p> <p>Resident Survey (Appendix CD GB9) showed that 92% of residents used the fields for recreation and to enjoy nature</p> <p>What.three.words map for “map my blackberries”  <a href="https://what3words.com/with.exist.owner">https://what3words.com/with.exist.owner</a></p>
<b>Perceptual (wildness and tranquillity)</b>	<p>High level of tranquillity and sense of remoteness</p>	<p>Resident surveys responses included 15 free</p>



		text references to the peace and tranquility of the site (CD GB9)
<b>Functional</b>	Part of the green infrastructure network Identified as a key element of the GI Spatial Framework	Green Infrastructure Strategy Phase 2 pg. 9

5.14. It is my view that the LIVA assessment therefore underestimates the value of the site. It is our view, supported by the Exeter Fringes Study, Local and Regional LCAs and TGN 02/21 that the site is indeed of high value and sensitivity and has an overwhelmingly rural character that should be the baseline of assessing the visual impact of the proposed development.

## 6. Assessing the visual impact of the development

6.1. The LVIA concludes that “there are actually very few opportunities to view the site itself from public locations within the city.”<sup>21</sup> However, it is my view that there are additional viewpoints which should have been considered. GLVIA3 encourages landscape consultants to agree viewpoints with the Local Planning Authority before commencing work. Due to staffing changes, the LPA were unable to confirm whether this happened.

6.2. The viewpoints included in the appellant’s LVIA are limited in a number of ways. Firstly, unusually, only six viewpoints are included, when a scheme of this size should normally use 10 to 20 viewpoints. By way of comparison, the appeal scheme APP/Q3304/W/21/3280802 for 95 dwellings included 16 viewpoints and five wireframe visualisations.<sup>22</sup> The appellant’s LVIA includes no wireframe visualisations.

6.3. In addition to being limited in number, the viewpoints are limited in their representation and assessment of relevant visual receptors - including residents, walkers, cyclists, horse riders and drivers. The appellant’s LVIA does not assess uses separately, instead combining them in each viewpoint, which reduces the overall sensitivity of the receptors.

<sup>21</sup> Appellant LVIA, pg. 30 (CD-P49)

<sup>22</sup> Land at Hoecroft, Chilcompton, Wells, Somerset, APP/Q3305/W/21/3280802 para 25. (CD-A29)

- 6.4. The LVIA also concentrates on longer views, not local impacts which is normally the key issue. In particular, it is our view that it should have assessed residential views in greater detail as this is now common in LVIA's.<sup>23</sup> The Inspector for the above mentioned appeal commented on the appellant's "serious omission" to fail to include viewpoints that assess the impact on occupiers of adjacent residential property, despite these being **accepted as high-sensitivity receptors**.<sup>24</sup> The Spruce Close appellant's LVIA does not include any direct residential amenity VPs and only three from the surrounding residential area (viewpoints 1a, b and c). No mention is made of occupiers of adjacent residential properties – especially those who overlook the green and fields – as being high-sensitivity receptors. The LVIA concludes that the impact on local visual amenity would only be moderate adverse. In contrast, the Inspector of Appeal APP/Q3305/W/21/3280802 concluded that there would be a **"major adverse impact"** on local visual impacts given the sensitivity of the receptors.
- 6.5. It is also my view that the quality of the images viewpoints in the appellant's LVIA do not accurately convey the scale or severity of the visual impact. The image from viewpoint 2a does not really indicate how it would be impacted as the actual grass level is only just out of vision. Image 3 (i), from Cheneygate Lane, is of such poor quality that it is difficult to see where it was taken from, it was certainly a different position to 3 (ii), which is taken from a point where a large bush is between the camera and the view of the site.
- 6.6. I also believe that the Zone of Theoretical Visibility map (LVIA, figure 5) underestimates the potential areas affected by the development since it uses 8m high target points, where modern housing has a much higher ridgeline, with a minimum of 9.5m to 11.0m for a two-storey house. Based on a 9.5m ridge height, one would expect greater areas of visibility reaching further up the slopes to the the north and possibly including the footpaths to the north and east. The ZTV also does not include visual barriers. More generally, I do not believe the LVIA adequately addresses the question of how the development would impact the landscape setting of Exeter, which is a key consideration for assessing compliance or not with ECS Policy CP16, more on which below. None of the appellant's viewpoints extend beyond the 3km zone. It is my view that you cannot capture the impact on the wider character of the landscape setting without zooming out and seeing in a wider context.

---

<sup>23</sup> See Landscape Institute guidance on residential visual amenity assessment (TGN 02/2019) (CD-SPD20)

<sup>24</sup> Appeal Decision APP/Q3305/W/21/3280802 paras 25 and 32. (CD-A29)

- 6.7. To assist the inquiry, we have produced our own set of images from additional viewpoints of both short and long distance (Appendix C-MB4), including two residential viewpoints from adjacent properties. All viewpoints have a main type A Photograph that has been produced using GLIVA3 guidance, most have a further photo to show the perceived naked eye view and some have zooms to show context and the fragility of the so called shield which would supposedly obscure the new development. This would otherwise be difficult to convey without site visits to all viewpoints. I have also included viewpoints from the 3-5m and >5km range, which I believe are relevant to understanding the impact on the wider landscape setting.
- 6.8. To better visualise the impact of the development on visual amenity, we have also commissioned three Verified Views that model the impact of the proposed development using the appellant's viewpoints 1a and 2a from the appellant's LVIA (Appendix CD-MB5). I believe that these confirm that the visual harm on local residential views has been underestimated by the appellant and would in fact have a substantial adverse impact. Viewpoint 2a also in my view confirms that there would be a fundamental shift of the landscape character of the surrounding area from a tranquil rural space to a cityscape.
- 6.9. It is therefore my opinion, when considering all relevant viewpoints, that the LVIA underestimates both the sensitivity of the site and the scale of negative visual impacts – both locally and from afar. The introduction of housing beyond the current urban boundary would intrude even further into the landscape setting than it already has and would fundamentally change its rural character. In the context of above-mentioned appeal APP/Q3305/W/21/3280802, the Inspector found that “the change from open pasture to built-up residential housing estate would fundamentally harm the rural character of the site.”<sup>25</sup> This is echoed by the Inspector of the Land at Pennsylvania Road appeal who found that “the introduction of up to 26 houses on the appeal site ... would have an urbanising effect in a strongly rural context that would encroach into the open countryside and the sensitive and valued landscape setting of the city.”<sup>26</sup> Given the sensitivity of the site and the fundamental character change that would occur, I strongly disagree that the landscape effects would only be “slight-moderate adverse”. Finally, the LVIA fails to deal with the three fields of the proposed new valley park, which are highly sensitive and visibly exposed on the upper slopes of the landscape setting. The formalisation of public access and the new proximity of urban

---

<sup>25</sup> Appeal Decision for APP/Q3305/W/21/3280802, para 34. (CD-A29)

<sup>26</sup> Land at Pennsylvania Road, appeal decision para 35. (CD-A14)

development would negatively impact their rural character. This negative impact should be factored into any assessment of the overall visual impact of the development.

## **7. Interpreting ECS Policy CP16 and previous appeal decisions**

7.1. The development site is designated as landscape setting on the ECS Key Strategy Diagram. Therefore, Policy CP16 applies.

7.2. The appellant states that “when properly considered on their merits and applying ECS policy CP16 in a correct manner as endorsed through recent appeal decisions, there is no conflict with the Development Plan.”<sup>27</sup> They also state that “CP16 does not seek to prevent all development within the areas shown on the Key Diagram... which is not intrinsically harmful to the setting of the city.”<sup>28</sup>

7.3. It is our view based on the above that the proposed development does intrinsically harm the setting of the city. Even if the Inspector agrees with the appellant’s assessment that there would be a “slight-moderate adverse impact”, it is our view that any adverse impact constitutes harm and therefore conflicts with CP16. As the Inspector of the Land to the West of Clyst Road, Topsham appeal (APP/Y1110/W/18/3202635) puts it, “given my findings about the scheme’s adverse effect on Topsham’s attractive setting, I conclude that the appeal development would not protect the character and local distinctiveness of the strategic gap. As such, it would conflict with Policy CP16 in that regard.”<sup>29</sup>

7.4. At the same time as arguing that the proposed scheme would not cause any harm to the landscape, the appellant also cites previous appeal decisions to argue that the LPA must accept adverse impacts on designated land in order to meet their overall housing requirement. One such appeal is the above-mentioned Land at Clyst Road, Topsham appeal, whose Inspector gave limited weight due the conflict with CP16 due to the “significant need for new housing in the city” and because the Council had conceded that planning permission would need to be granted to land subject to policies LS1 and CP16 in order to meet this need.

---

<sup>27</sup> Appellant SoC 3.44 (CD-ID2)

<sup>28</sup> Appellant SoC 3.5 (CD-ID2)

<sup>29</sup> Land to the west of Clyst Road, Topsham, Exeter, Devon, APP/Y1110/W/18/3202635, para 26. (CD-A13)

7.5. However, on closer examination, it is our view that this decision does not set a relevant precedent from which to conclude that adverse impacts on landscape setting land should be accepted. Firstly, the “Topsham Gap” is judged to be of “medium value” in the Exeter Fringes Study. By contrast, the proposal site is judged to be of “high sensitivity” in the same. Secondly, at the time of this decision (2018), Exeter had a housing land supply of two years and one month, which the Inspector described as “considerable”. By contrast, the LPA currently has a housing land supply of four years and eight months, with a shortfall of only 213 homes.<sup>30</sup> This shortfall was described as “modest” by the Inspector of the Land at Pennsylvania Road appeal.<sup>31</sup> Exeter also scored 155% on the 2021 Housing Delivery Test and has no need to take remedial action.<sup>32</sup> Finally, while we acknowledge that the Council did concede under cross-examination that it would need to develop some land subject to LS1 and CP16 to deliver its housing supply, this must be seen in the context of a time where there was a “considerable” housing shortfall. The context is different now and this concession therefore bears little to no relevance to the present appeal.

7.6. Finally, it is pertinent to note that the Inspector of the Clyst Road himself acknowledges that his decision should not been seen to set a precedent, writing “I note the concerns raised by various parties in respect of precedent... while future decisions will need to take account of the relevant policy context at the appropriate time, it seems to me that allowing this appeal will not prevent other proposals from being considered on their own merits.”<sup>33</sup>

## **8. Conclusion**

8.1. It is my view that the appellant’s LVIA underestimates the value and sensitivity of the proposed site as well as its visual impacts. I believe the additional viewpoints (Appendix CD MB4) show that the visual impact of the development would be both more widespread and more significant. It is our conclusion that visual harm would occur and that, therefore, the proposed development would conflict with CP16.

8.2. I do not agree with the appellant’s claims that the LPA is required to consent to greenfield development in order to meet its housing supply requirements.<sup>34</sup> I also do not agree that

---

<sup>30</sup> Letter from Tetra Tech Planning to Emery Planning on Housing Land Supply (26/05/2022) (CD-MB6)

<sup>31</sup> Land at Pennsylvania Road appeal decision (CD-A14)

<sup>32</sup> 2021 Housing Delivery Test (CD-SPD11)

<sup>33</sup> APP/Y110/W/18/3202635 para 45. (CD-A13)

<sup>34</sup> See EGG Proof of Evidence – Appropriate Location for more on sustainable development sites (CD-GB1)

previous appeal decisions bear much relevance to the present appeal, especially given that the LPA has only a “modest” housing shortfall.

- 8.3. I believe that the fundamental character change that this development would bring to the landscape setting of Exeter must be given significant weight in the overall planning balance.