

- support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas
- promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land based rural businesses
- support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors and which respect the character of the countryside.

Pool Bridge is an example of rural diversification and is a tourist facility in the local area and the retention and expansion of the business would meet the above criteria. The application expresses a requirement to live on the site in order to run the enterprise. It is important that the needs of the business and the applicant are properly understood in weighing the benefits of this proposal. By hearing the application at Planning Committee, Members would be able to make a full assessment of the evidence with the benefit of a site visit to Pool Bridge alongside representations from the applicant.

1.5 Planning history

- 09/00179/CLU - Certificate of lawful development for stationing of touring caravans for occasional or holiday occupation - Granted
- 09/00215/CLU - Use of four ponds and adjoining land for recreational fishing and ancillary facilities - Granted
- 09/00480/FULM - Creation of new fishing pond (Retrospective) - Approved
- 09/00719/FUL - Alterations and change of use of existing building to create ancillary refreshment facilities (retrospective) – Approved
- 16/001624/OUT – Erection of two storey dwelling with office including the conversion of existing storage building - Withdrawn

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

City Boundary GMS Constraints: York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams GMS Constraints: East Area (1) 0003

Floodzone 2 GMS Constraints: Floodzone 2

Floodzone 3 GMS Constraints: Floodzone 3

2.2 Policies:

CYGP1
Design

CYGB1
Development within the Green Belt

CYGB7
Agricultural or forestry dwellings

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL

Public protection

3.1 No objections in principle however, as there is potential for noise disturbance from the existing farm and commercial enterprise, it is recommended that occupancy of the dwelling is restricted via condition. Conditions regarding the discovery of unexpected contamination on site and the installation of an electric vehicle charging point are also recommended.

Countryside and Ecology

3.2 Two separate bat roosts have been identified in the brickwork of the single storey barn to be converted to residential use. The roosts support low numbers of common pipistrelle bats (four in 2015 and two in 2016), thought likely to be male or non-breeding females. It is very likely that the roosts will be disturbed and destroyed as part of the conversion works, e.g. re-pointing of the brickwork; however with appropriate mitigation the loss of these roosts is unlikely to significantly impact the favourable conservation status of common pipistrelle bats at a local level. All bats are protected by UK and European legislation and the works will require a European Protected Species Licence from Natural England. Conditions are recommended to provide mitigation and to ensure that the appropriate licence is in place.

EXTERNAL

Environment Agency

3.3 They have no objections to the application in principle however note that, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 101, development should not be permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. It is for the local planning authority to determine if the Sequential Test has

to be applied and whether or not there are other sites available at lower flood risk as required by the Sequential Test in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Ouse and Derwent IDB

3.4 No objections are raised and a condition is recommended requiring details of surface water drainage works to be submitted for approval.

Heslington Parish Council

3.5 No objection

Neighbourhood notification and publicity

3.6 A letter has been received from Julian Sturdy MP supporting the application. This notes that he met with the applicant who explained the circumstances of his father's ill health which had required him to undertake more out of hours work on the site. The applicant indicated that he would be happy for an agricultural occupancy condition to be imposed on the dwelling and Mr Sturdy MP made note that his support was subject to this and consideration of the impact of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 The main considerations relevant to the determination of this application are:

- Principle of development;
- Green Belt policy;
- Character and appearance;
- Residential amenity;
- Flood risk and drainage;
- Protected species;
- Other considerations.

POLICY CONTEXT

4.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compensation Act 2004 requires determinations to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. There is no development plan for York other than the retained policies in the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Spatial Strategy ("RSS"), saved under the Regional Strategy for Yorkshire and Humber (Partial Revocation) Order 2013. These policies, YH9(C) and Y1(C1 and C2), relate to York's Green Belt and the key diagram, Figure 6.2, insofar as it illustrates the general extent of the Green Belt. The policies state that the detailed inner and rest of the outer boundaries of the Green Belt around York (described as being 'about 6 miles' from York centre) should be defined to protect and enhance the nationally

significant historical and environmental character of York, including its historic setting, views of the Minster and important open areas. The site is approximately 4 miles from York City Centre, and as such is within the general extent of York Green Belt.

4.3 The National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF", March 2012) establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 7 states that planning should contribute to the achievement of sustainable development by balancing its economic, social and environmental roles. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted (paragraph 14). Footnote 9 to paragraph 14 specifically includes Green Belt policy among those policies in the Framework that indicate development should be restricted.

4.4 Although there is no formally adopted local plan, the City of York Draft Local Plan (DLP) was approved for development control purposes in April 2005. Whilst it does not form part of the statutory development plan for the purposes of S38, its policies are considered to be capable of being material considerations in the determination of planning applications where they are in accordance with the NPPF. The relevant policies are summarised in section 2.2 above. The Proposals Map accompanying the Plan identifies the site as being within the general extent of York's Green Belt.

4.5 At this stage, policies in the 2014 Publication Draft Local Plan are considered to carry very little weight in the decision making process (in accordance with paragraph 216 of the NPPF). However, the evidence base that underpins the proposed emerging policies is capable of being a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. The 2014 Plan continues the designation of the site as falling within the general extent of York Green Belt.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

4.6 Whilst the RSS has otherwise been revoked, its Green Belt policies relating to York have been saved together with the key diagram which illustrates the general extent of the Green Belt around York. These policies comprise the Development Plan for York. Figure 6.2 of the RSS and the 2005 Draft Local Plan proposals map identify the site within the general extent of Green Belt. In accordance with footnote 9 to paragraph 14 of the NPPF, the usual presumption in favour of sustainable development established by the NPPF does not apply in Green Belt locations. Instead, the more restrictive policies in section 9 of the NPPF apply.

GREEN BELT POLICY

4.7 Paragraph 79 of the NPPF states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence. Paragraph 80 sets out the five purposes of the Green Belt. The most relevant to the determination of this application is safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment.

4.8 In terms of the Green Belt status of the site, the main considerations are:

- whether the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt;
- its effect on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it;
- if it is inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

(a) Assessment of harm by definition

4.9 In accordance with paragraph 89 of the NPPF, the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it falls within one of the listed exceptions. One of the exceptions is buildings for agriculture and forestry. However, dwellings for rural workers are intended for residential occupation and, as such, are not considered to be buildings for agriculture even though they are intended to support such a use. Therefore, the proposal does not satisfy the wording contained in the first exception. Consequently, in not complying with the listed exceptions in paragraph 89 of the NPPF, the scheme would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Paragraph 87 of the Framework states that such development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 of the Framework indicates that in considering a planning application, substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt.

(b) Impact on openness and Green Belt purpose

4.10 In addition to assessing whether there is any harm arising from inappropriateness, consideration needs to be given to other harm to the Green Belt. The NPPF states that the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. 'Openness' is generally accepted as being the absence of built development.

4.11 The proposal would involve the construction of a detached dwelling house - part single storey conversion and part two storey new build - within the existing farm building complex. Within this area there is a cluster of buildings including the original

two storey farm house, two large agricultural stores, a Dutch barn, the single storey brick store to be converted and a single storey cafe. The new dwelling would be adjacent to one of the agricultural stores and would be a similar height. The proposed siting adjacent to the building complex on the site would result in the new dwelling being not overly prominent as it would be viewed against the back drop of existing buildings. However, the building is not insignificant in size. The footprint of the converted part of the building is 67.5m² with an additional new build footprint of 135.5m² giving a total footprint of 203m². This compares with the footprint of the existing farmhouse at approximately 96m². While the application is in outline with all matters (excepting access) reserved, the proposed dwelling is significant in scale and notwithstanding its location, and the screening provided by existing buildings, would clearly harm the openness of the Green Belt by introducing additional built development into the area. As stated above, paragraph 88 of the NPPF indicates that in considering a planning application, substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt.

CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE

4.12 Chapter 7 of the NPPF gives advice on design, placing great importance to the design of the built environment and stating that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development that should contribute positively to making places better for people. Paragraph 61 requires planning decisions to integrate new development into the natural, built and historic environment. The NPPF goes on to say that poor quality design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions should be resisted (paragraph 64). This advice is reflected in Development Control Local Plan Policy GP1.

4.13 The application proposes a single dwelling of traditional form constructed from brick with a pitched pantile roof. The fenestration is appropriate with main windows predominantly facing the east and south. The application is in outline with all matters reserved (excepting access) so it is accepted that these details are only indicative. The curtilage of the building will include a small patio area to the south of the property on land which is currently open paddock and to the North West an area of courtyard, to include parking, on an existing grassed area.

4.14 Whilst the proposal would extend the built form on the site, its design and appearance would not appear incongruous in this rural setting. Overall, the design of the dwelling would integrate with its surroundings. No further harm is identified to Green Belt on these grounds.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

4.15 One of the core principles of the planning system outlined in the NPPF is to seek a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants. It is proposed

that the new dwelling is occupied in connection with the operation of the agricultural holding and existing rural business operation and, as such, there are no objections in terms of residential amenity of its future occupants notwithstanding the close proximity to farm buildings. The dwelling would not be considered to be a 'protected building' as defined in Class 6 of the GPDO 2015 in relation to agricultural buildings erected under permitted development rights. However, due to the proximity to farm buildings and the commercial nature of the neighbouring areas of the site, objections would be raised if the occupation of the dwelling was not related to the running of the agricultural holding and rural business operation. Therefore, if planning permission was granted, a condition would be required to restrict its occupancy.

4.16 The layout of the proposed dwelling, both internally and externally, is considered to be acceptable and would provide adequate parking and refuse storage facilities. Public Protection has raised no objections to the application on the basis of the information provided subject to conditions to address unexpected contamination and the provision of an electric vehicle recharge point in line with paragraph 35 of the NPPF.

FLOOD RISK

4.17 The NPPF states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk but, where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere (paragraph 100). The site lies within Flood Zone 2. Paragraph 100 of the NPPF requires that 'Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere'. In this instance, it is necessary that the development is located within the site given the circumstances put forward by the applicant for the requirement for a manager's house on the site. It is noted that the site is on the edge of the flood zone and also, re-positioning the dwelling outside of the flood zone would move it away from the built development on site resulting in further harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

4.18 Para.100 states that if development is necessary it should then be made safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the application states that as the application is in outline, details of raised floor levels etc will be developed with the detailed design at a later stage. It also notes that in the 64 years the site has been in the ownership of the applicant's family, no flooding has occurred.

PROTECTED SPECIES

4.19 A bat survey has identified two bat roosts within the building to be converted. These roosts will be lost as a result of the conversion but as this species of bat is

not at significant risk then appropriate mitigation measures are considered sufficient in this instance. Appropriate planning conditions could ensure that the mitigation and correct licenses were in place if planning permission were allowed.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

4.20 In accordance with paragraph 88 of the NPPF, any harm to the Green Belt must be given substantial weight. It has been identified that the proposal would be inappropriate and would result in harm to Green Belt by definition, and harm to its openness and purposes. There is no harm identified in relation to general visual amenity, highway safety, residential amenity and flood risk subject to conditions. Paragraph 87 advises that inappropriate development in Green Belt should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

4.21 The planning, design and access statement outlines the benefits of the proposal as providing for the functional need to support the agricultural holding and rural enterprise and allow expansion of the business, reduce reliance on the applicant's father who has recently suffered from ill health, allow 24 hour manager's presence on site, improve security and maintain animal welfare.

4.22 One of the key objectives of the NPPF is to ensure that the planning process contributes to the achievement of sustainable development by balancing its economic, social and environmental roles. Paragraph 28 indicates support for economic growth in rural areas. Paragraph 55 refers to the 'essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work' as a special circumstance for allowing isolated new homes in the countryside. Essential need is not defined in the NPPF and, at this time, there is no other specific guidance that provides advice on how essential need is determined.

4.23 Annex A to the former Planning Policy Statement 7 "Sustainable Development in Rural Areas" which is referred to in the appraisal submission, is no longer part of Central Government policy following the publication of the NPPF in 2012, but Inspectors in appeal decisions have accepted it as a useful tool in establishing whether there is a functional necessity for a new dwelling. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to require the applicant to demonstrate (a) that there is an existing agricultural or horticultural enterprise in being, (b) that it is commercially viable, and (c) that the permanent presence of someone on-site is essential to the enterprise (as opposed to merely being convenient).

4.24 Policy GB7 of the Development Control Local Plan, which pre-dates the NPPF, is nevertheless compatible with the Framework's aims and as such is a material consideration. The policy states that new agricultural and forestry dwellings in the Green Belt will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the dwelling cannot be located in an existing settlement, is essential to the functioning of a well-

established holding and will be located on the holding concerned and appropriately located adjacent to any existing buildings.

(a) There is an existing agricultural enterprise

4.25 It is clear from the documentation submitted with the application that the dwelling relates to an existing, established business which consists of an arable land holding which has diversified over the past 30 years to include fishing lakes and camping/caravanning.

(b) The business is commercially viable

4.26 The planning, design and access statement confirms that the business has operated as a profitable business for many years with the initial fishing lakes having been opened in 1984 along with the camping and caravan site. The farm has continued to diversify with additional lakes being constructed as well as continuing with arable farming on part of the site. The applicant has not provided any financial information but officers accept that this is a long standing business and its financial viability is not questioned.

(c) There is a requirement for a permanent presence

4.27 Notwithstanding the fact that the proposal relates to an existing agricultural enterprise that is commercially viable, officers are not convinced that there is an essential need for a permanent presence on the site. The applicant has provided detailed information relating to the day to day running of the business but, while accepting that long hours are sometimes required, officers do not believe, from the information given, that there is a need for an additional dwelling on site and that the tasks described could not equally successfully be undertaken by someone living off-site, such as in a nearby village or southern edge of York.

4.28 To summarise the information provided, the applicant has indicated that the following tasks are undertaken on a daily basis:

Checking and maintaining otter fencing

Checking water quality

Removing any dead fish

Opening/ locking the gates, welcoming customers, cleaning facilities, customer care and bookings, collecting fees

Maintenance of keepnets for fishing matches, maintaining fishing pegs

Grass cutting, litter collection

Stocking cafe

Caravan and tent pitch maintenance

Maintain farmland, woodland and wetland

Further to these daily tasks, the applicant has also indicated that the following tasks may be undertaken on a call-out basis outside standard working hours:

- Rescuing specimen carp that have become tangled in the weed
- Dealing with issues on the camp/caravan site
- Letting fishermen off site
- Letting emergency services on site
- Dealing with poaching incidents

4.29 Officers consider that the daily tasks indicated do not constitute an essential need for a worker to live on the site. None of the daily tasks could not equally easily be undertaken by someone living off the site and many of them would be undertaken on an ad-hoc basis in conjunction with other tasks – for example many of the tasks around the lake, like litter picking, checking fencing and water quality, could all be done in conjunction with each other. Also, a number of tasks will require little time out of season – e.g. grass cutting, camp site maintenance. The applicant has indicated that management of the grassland to the north of the site equates to 100 man hours per year. Again, whilst in conjunction with the other tasks on the site this may equate to a full time job, there is no essential need for someone to live on site to perform these tasks.

4.30 The tasks which are undertaken out of hours are on a call out basis and officers do not believe that they could not equally successfully be completed by someone living locally. In addition to this, the applicant's brother lives in the existing farmhouse on the site and provides a presence to deter intruders in the same way as would the applicant living in the proposed new dwelling.

4.31 So far as animal welfare issues are concerned, previous appeal decisions have indicated that animal welfare is capable of justifying the need for an agricultural workers' dwelling and the applicant has provided information regarding a need to rescue high value fish from being tangled in pondweed. As the specimen carp in the large Q Lake are nocturnal and can be worth up to £5000, the applicant claims that it is necessary for him to be on site overnight to be on-call to free the fish. The number of call outs that can occur is not clear although the applicant has stated that it can be a number of times in a week. Officers would note, however, that there is not always someone using the lake, particularly in the winter months, and therefore no one to alert the manager to the fish becoming entangled at this time. It would appear that during winter months, when there is less surveillance, that the fish are currently surviving without being released from the weed until morning and therefore, on balance, officers consider that welfare of the fish cannot be a determining factor in showing essential need.

4.32 The other concern related to animal welfare relates to predation issues. The applicant has provided information on issues related to otter, mink and cormorant predation of the fish. The measures required to deter predators involve the applicant

being on site at first light. Discouraging cormorants is undertaken by deterring them from landing at dawn by scaring them off and not allowing them to feed. It can take up to a week to permanently deter them from the site. The applicant also has a license to shoot up to 3 cormorants between February and April 2017. Otters are discouraged from the Q Lake by electric fences which require maintenance. Mink and rats are controlled by shooting which is done out of hours. On balance, while officers accept that it would be more convenient for the site manager to live on site to undertake these tasks, it does not appear that it is essential.

4.33 The applicant also refers to a wildlife photography business which he runs on the site. This involves the feeding of wild animals at various points on the site so that they are encouraged on to the site at specific points adjacent to wildlife hides where customers are then taken to await animal activity to photograph. The applicant states that operation of this business requires him to feed animals at dawn/dusk and to transport customers to/ from hides at anti-social hours (eg owl photography takes place after dark). Poaching on the site disrupts the wildlife and the applicant states that his presence is required to deal with trespass and poaching issues which scares the wildlife away. Officers have discounted this element of the business as it relies on wildlife which cannot be depended upon to visit the site and provide the necessary opportunities for photographers. For instance, it would appear plausible that poachers outside the site could scare away hare and deer from the area so that they could not be encouraged back on to the site to provide the photography opportunities. This absence of wildlife could result in the photography business no longer being viable for reasons outside the applicant's control.

4.34 In response to this assessment of the wildlife photography business, the applicant has made the following statement: *'This aspect of the business has not been developed on a presumption that wild animals can be encouraged on to the site - it is a reality. The team at Pool Bridge have gone to great lengths to enhance the ecological value of the farm, which was awarded the David Bellamy Conservation Award (Gold) for the work that had been carried out to "protect and enhance Britain's natural environment". The landscape has been carefully managed to attract the species listed in our report, which in turn creates an additional income stream for the farm (the wildlife photography) as a successful form of rural diversification. The photography courses run to date have shown to be popular and Stephen (the applicant) has plans to further develop this side of the business. However, it will be difficult to do this without the ability to reside on the site as the management of the hides requires a number of 'out of hours' tasks to be completed on a day to day basis.*

4.35 Previous case law indicates that issues of security cannot, on their own, justify the need for an agricultural worker's dwelling but that they can contribute to that need. In this instance, the applicant has provided evidence of a small number of incidents to which the police were called out. The applicant's concerns regarding poaching have been discussed above but information has not been supplied

regarding other measures that which have been trialled to deter intruders. From the information supplied with the application, it does appear that there are fishermen using the Q Lake overnight for most nights over the warmer months of the year and more intermittently for the rest of the year. These must provide some deterrent for intruders and while it might be preferable for the applicant to live on site to deal with issues that arise, it would not appear to be essential. The distance from the nearest settlements is not significant, and the number of instances of intruders appears small, therefore it appears that the applicant could travel from a property locally and there is not an essential need for them to be on site for security reasons.

4.36 It is noted that there is a farmhouse on the holding within the ownership of the applicant's brother. This dwelling was sold separately from the holding in 2007. At this time the family had been building up the fishing lakes and camping sites for over ten years. When in existence, Planning Policy Statement 7 addressed the controversial point that farmers may deliberately create a situation which would make a case for a new agricultural dwelling where none existed before. The paragraph stated that "In cases where the local planning authority is particularly concerned about possible abuse, it may be helpful to investigate the history of the holding to establish the recent pattern of use of land and buildings, and whether, for example, any dwellings or buildings suitable for conversion have recently been sold separately from the farmland concerned. Such a sale could constitute evidence of lack of agricultural need." The applicant's father has been running the business until recently when ill health has forced him to reduce his workload. He currently lives at a property adjacent to the site, close to the access, on Wheldrake Lane. This property was approved with an agricultural occupancy condition in c.1972 but a subsequent certificate of lawful development (08/00809/CLU) in 2008 determined that the property had not been built in accordance with the approved plans and therefore the original planning permission had not been implemented. As a result the dwelling did not benefit from planning permission. However, as the dwelling had been constructed more than 4 years previously it was immune from enforcement action and that the originally imposed planning conditions, including the agricultural occupancy condition, no longer applied to it.

4.37 While it is recognized that there can be no requirement to force a retiring farmer to vacate his home, it does appear that the selling off of the farmhouse in the middle of the holding might indicate that, even though the fishing business was already successfully in operation, they did not anticipate that there would be a need for a manager to live on the site. The applicant has stated that his brother does help out on the site when his other main job allows. The presence of permanent residents in the farmhouse would also presumably be as much of a deterrent to intruders as would that of the applicant living within a new property.

4.38 It is also considered relevant that the applicant does not currently work full time as site manager of the business. At the present time he is also self-employed as a contractor working on a project for Arla Foods. At present he fits this work around

his work at the site with his father undertaking those tasks he cannot manage himself. Officers note that the wording of the standard agricultural occupancy condition is “The occupation of the dwelling shall be limited to a person *solely or mainly working* (our emphasis), or last working, in the locality in agriculture or in forestry, or a widow or widower of such a person, and to any other resident dependants”. While it may be his intention to work solely on the site if the dwelling is approved, his shared employment adds weight to the argument that there is not an *essential* need for him to live on the site.

(d) Suitability of location of dwelling

4.39 As referred to above, the proposed dwelling is part conversion, part new build and is located within the existing farm building complex. As such the siting is considered appropriate as the existing buildings provide a backdrop and some screening of the proposal.

(e) Size of dwelling commensurate with holding

4.40 With a floor area of 203 sq m, the proposed dwelling is generous in its proportions; however it would contain only two bedrooms. It is noted that approximately one third of the dwelling (67.5 sq m) would be formed from the conversion of the existing storage building, with the remainder (135. sq m) being new build. A significant proportion of the ground floor would be taken up by a large double garage, utility room/plant room and a boot room. There would be a farm office on the first floor. Taking all of these factors into account, it is not considered that the dwelling would be excessive in size in relation to the use(s) it would serve.

Summary of other considerations

4.41 In light of the above, it is not accepted that there is not an essential need for an additional dwelling to serve the holding. The applicant has failed to provide sufficient evidence that there is an essential need for a site manager to live on the site. Officers believe that the majority of tasks could equally be undertaken by a worker or workers living off site such as in a nearby village or southern edge of York. It is acknowledged that there are issues surrounding animal welfare but, on balance, it is not believed that these occur frequently enough to justify a permanent on-site presence. Therefore, it is not considered that there are very special circumstances that clearly outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 The proposed new dwelling would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to the NPPF. As such, and as required by the NPPF, the harm by reason of inappropriateness and other identified harm, including harm to openness and purposes of the Green Belt, must be accorded substantial weight.

5.2 On the basis of the plans, and following assessment of the documentation and information in support of the application, it is considered that the very special circumstances put forward by the applicant are not sufficient to clearly outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Refuse

1 The proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The applicant has failed to present a compelling case of "very special circumstances", in particular that there is an essential need for a rural worker to live permanently on the site, to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness as specifically required by paragraph 88 of the National Planning Policy Framework. As such, the proposal would be harmful to the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it, contrary to paragraphs 88 and 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy GB1 of the Development Control Local Plan.

2 The proposal has failed to demonstrate an essential need for the provision of a permanent dwelling in an isolated location in the open countryside contrary to Central Government guidance as outlined in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact details:

Author: Alison Stockdale, Development Management Officer (Wed - Fri)

Tel No: (01904) 555730