



Kim Webber B.Sc. M.Sc.
Chief Executive
52 Derby Street
Ormskirk
West Lancashire
L39 2DF

Wednesday, 14 March 2018

TO: COUNCILLORS **G DOWLING, M MILLS, I ASHCROFT, MRS P BAYBUTT,
T DEVINE, D EVANS, G HODSON, C MARSHALL, D MCKAY,
D O'TOOLE, R PENDLETON, E POPE, A PRITCHARD,
MRS M WESTLEY AND A YATES**

Dear Councillor,

LATE INFORMATION

Please find attached a report containing details of Late Information prepared by the Director of Development and Regeneration relating to items appearing on the agenda for the above meeting.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Kim Webber', written over a horizontal line.

Kim Webber
Chief Executive

AGENDA (Open to the Public)

7. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

1115 -
1128

To consider the report of the Director of Development and Regeneration.

We can provide this document, upon request, on audiotape, in large print, in Braille and in other languages.

FIRE EVACUATION PROCEDURE: Please see attached sheet.

MOBILE PHONES: These should be switched off or to 'silent' at all meetings.

For further information, please contact:-

Jill Ryan on 01695 585017

Or email jill.ryan@westlancs.gov.uk



**PLANNING COMMITTEE:
22nd MARCH 2018**

Report of: Director of Development and Regeneration

Contact: Mrs. C. Thomas (Extn.5134)
Email: catherine.thomas@westlancs.gov.uk

SUBJECT: LATE INFORMATION

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The information below has been received since compilation of your Agenda. The following also includes suggested adjustments to the recommendations further to the receipt of late plans and/or information.

2.0 ITEM 7 – PLANNING APPLICATIONS

REPORT NO. 2 – MARTIN INN, MARTIN LANE, BURSCOUGH

The applicant has submitted details of 6 no. appeal and High Court decisions in respect of the issue of isolation and previously developed land, which they consider are relevant to the current application. These can be summarised as:

1. Braintree District Council v. Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (15th November 2017).

Braintree District Council challenged the decision of a planning inspector that a proposal for new housing in the countryside would not result in new isolated homes because 'there are a number of dwellings nearby'. The Council submitted that this could not be reconciled with the inspector's view that the accessibility of the proposed site to 'services, facilities and employment' would be 'poor'.

The Council's case was rejected and the Secretary of State said that the word 'isolated' in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) should be given its ordinary, objective meaning. This is a home 'far away from other places, buildings, or people; remote'. A home that is 'isolated from services and facilities' is not, therefore, necessarily an 'isolated home' as the Council contended. This resulted in the proposed dwellings being approved.

2. Durham County Council. Appeal Ref APP/X1355/W/17/3180304.

This site lies within the open countryside for planning policy purposes, and the Inspector stated that the main issue to consider is whether the site is in a suitable location having regard to the accessibility of services and facilities. The appeal was allowed.

3. Newark & Sherwood District Council. Appeal Ref APP/B3030/W/17/3169590.

This site is located within the Green Belt and in his decision the Inspector referred to the Braintree judgement and concluded that the development would meet with the 'policy in favour of locating housing where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities'. The appeal was allowed.

4. Dartford Borough Council v. The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and ORS (14th March 2017)

As with this appeal site, the site of the Martin Inn is brownfield land, the development of which is advocated in the NPPF.

5. West Lancashire Borough Council. Appeal Ref APP/P2365/W/17/3182494. Barn at Plumtree Barn, Black-a Moor Lane, Downholland

There are differences between this appeal and the current planning application at the Martin Inn. The Martin Inn site is within a cluster of residential properties and the development proposals include 4no. affordable homes. Whilst the plans for the Martin Inn do not utilise the existing structure, they do utilise the mass of the public house. The application site is not isolated in terms of being far away from other places, buildings or people. There are a number of existing residential properties surrounding the site and small businesses at the Farm, Martin Lane, including a farm shop, bed and breakfast and dog groomers. The site is accessible because there is a regular bus service between Southport and Wigan which can be accessed at Heaton's Bridge (0.9 miles from the site), and the rail network serving Southport, Burscough and Wigan can be accessed from New Lane train station 1.4 miles away. Car journeys would decrease from the previous use as a public house. Bullet point 3 of paragraph 55 of the NPPF states that special circumstances would exist 'where the development would.....lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting'. It has been illustrated that the public house has become unviable and is falling in to disrepair and the proposal for housing seeks to bring the site back into use. Without this, the situation would worsen.

6. West Lancashire Borough Council. Appeal Ref APP/P2365/W/17/3183002.

There are differences between this appeal decision and the current application at the Martin Inn. The current scheme includes 4 affordable houses. The development would lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting. The development would remove the large hard surfaced car park and redundant public house and enhance the setting with areas of soft landscaping and gardens. The application site is within a cluster of residential dwellings. As detailed above, there are bus and train links in close proximity to the site.

OBSERVATIONS OF DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT AND REGENERATION

I have given due regard to recent appeal decisions and judgments in making a recommendation that planning permission be refused. For Members information I attach copies of both the Charity Farm and Plumtree Barn appeal decisions.

All matters relating to the issue of isolated dwellings have been fully discussed in the Planning Committee report and I remain of the opinion that the development of the site for 8 no. dwellings would result in new isolated homes in the countryside and the delivery of market housing outside of a settlement boundary in an unsustainable location, which would be contrary to paragraph 55 of the NPPF.



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2018

by **Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 25th January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/P2365/W/17/3183002

Brookfields, Charity Lane, Westhead L40 6LG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Malcolm Johnson against the decision of West Lancashire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/0457/COU, dated 21 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of existing brick built barn to a single residential dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the Council made its decision a High Court judgement¹ was handed down which included consideration of the interpretation of the term "isolated homes in the countryside" within paragraph 55 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework). I have had regard to this and to the comments made by the main parties in respect of the judgement.

Background and Main Issue

3. The appeal site lies within the Green Belt. It is proposed to convert an existing barn to a dwelling. To facilitate this the height of the building would be increased to enable the creation of a first floor, various windows and doors would be added and the large barn opening would be closed. Having regard to paragraphs 89 and 90 of the Framework and Policies GB2(1) and GB4 of the *Development in the Green Belt Supplementary Planning Document (adopted October 2015)* (SPD), the Council is satisfied that the proposal would not represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Nothing I have seen or read leads me to come to different conclusion in this regard.
4. Therefore, the main issue in the appeal is whether or not the site represents a suitable location for new housing having regard to national and local policies.

Reasons

5. The appeal site forms part of a cluster of buildings, located to the south of the village of Westhead. The buildings include a stable complex associated with an

¹ Braintree District Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Greyread Limited & Granville Developments Limited [2017] EWHC 2743 (Admin)

equine business that has now ceased. The barn, which is the subject of the appeal was used in connection with this. The buildings also include an office used by the appellant for business purposes. Adjacent to this lie the appellant's house and Charity Farm.

6. Policy GN1(b) of the *West Lancashire Local Plan (2012-2027) Development Plan Document (adopted October 2013)* (WLLP) indicates that outside of settlement boundaries development proposals within the Green Belt will be assessed against national policy and any relevant Local Plan policies. In addition, Policy RS1 of the WLLP seeks to direct the majority of new housing to within existing settlements, with new residential development in the Green Belt, outside settlement boundaries, being restricted to small scale affordable housing schemes where it is proven that there are no suitable non-Green Belt sites.
7. A core planning principle of the Framework is to focus development in locations which are, or can be made, sustainable. With the aim of promoting sustainable development in rural areas, paragraph 55 directs housing to areas where it will enhance, or maintain, the vitality of rural communities, and isolated new homes are to be avoided, unless there are special circumstances. One of the special circumstances is where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting.
8. Whilst the dwelling would be close to two other dwellings and not remote from them, they are a small group and not within a village or settlement. They are located some distance along Charity Lane, a private road with no pavement or street lights. Differing figures are given by the parties for the distance the site is from the edge of the village. However, the site is clearly separated from it by open fields.
9. Westhead has a limited range of services and facilities including a primary school, village hall and public house, but has a bus service to nearby towns. Nevertheless, based on my observations, the majority of the services and facilities within the village are located at a distance that most people, and especially those with young children, would be more likely to drive. Moreover, regardless of the willingness to walk or cycle to the village, given the limited range of services in Westhead, future occupiers would be required to travel further afield, to meet the majority of their day to day needs. However, whilst, the private car is likely to be used primarily to access these, given the bus service in the village future occupiers would not be entirely reliant on the private car.
10. I note that it is intended that the dwelling would be occupied by the appellant's daughter and her family, and that she works at the family business run from the office within the adjacent cluster of buildings. Whilst this may reduce the need for some journeys, it would still create others. In addition, circumstances may change, including the occupation of the dwelling.
11. Both parties have drawn my attention to a number of different appeal decisions in relation to whether the appeal site is isolated or not. Having regard to the aforementioned High Court judgement, I note that it refers to the Framework's distinction between rural communities, settlements and villages on the one hand, and the countryside on the other, which suggests that "isolated homes in the countryside" in the Framework's terms are those not in such communities and settlements. On the basis of the evidence before me, and from my

- observations, the site and its neighbours could not reasonably be considered as a settlement, or community, in this context. I consequently consider that the development would result in isolated housing development in the countryside which the Framework seeks to avoid apart from in special circumstances.
12. As the equine business in the adjacent stables has ceased the appellant has argued that the barn is disused and redundant but this is disputed by the Council. The term 'disused' must mean not used at all and 'redundant' means superfluous and no longer needed. However, even if one accepts the appellant's argument that the barn is now redundant, to comply with the third bullet point of paragraph 55 of the Framework, the proposal must also lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting.
 13. Although a modern building, the barn, which is in good condition, has a rural character which does not detract from the surrounding countryside. It is proposed to create a garden area immediately around the property. Some of this area currently contains various paraphernalia associated with the former use of the stables. Whilst this is not particularly attractive, it is relatively superficial and its removal, and thus the tidying up of this area, could easily take place irrespective of whether or not the barn is converted.
 14. At present much of the land that is proposed to be the garden for the dwelling is devoid of planting, and the appellant has therefore suggested landscaping of the garden could visually, and ecologically, enhance the area. It is also suggested that a wider area of land in appellant's ownership, mainly beyond the appeal site to the north east of the barn, would be planted with mixed deciduous woodland which would also enhance the area.
 15. However, very few details of the planting proposed, either in the garden or the woodland, have been provided. Given its importance in establishing the visual and ecological impact of the scheme, I am not satisfied that it can be left to be dealt with by way of a condition. In addition, in terms of any planting associated with the garden area, as a private domestic garden, I consider it would be difficult to ensure the future management and maintenance of this. As such, even if any such planting could be considered to bring visual and/or ecological enhancement to the area, it would not be possible to ensure this would be retained for any length of time. Furthermore, I agree with the Council that provision of the woodland area on other land owned by the appellant could take place irrespective of the conversion of the barn and so cannot be considered an enhancement.
 16. Thus overall, I consider that the actual appeal scheme would have a neutral impact on the immediate setting of the building rather than resulting in any enhancement to it. As such, even if the barn is considered to be dis-used or redundant, the proposal would not comply with the third bullet point exception in paragraph 55. Nor is it any part of the appellant's case that it could be considered under any other exception listed in this paragraph.
 17. The appellant has highlighted recent changes that have expanded the permitted development rights for agricultural buildings. However, as this is not an agricultural barn, these permitted development rights are not relevant to this case. The appellant has drawn my attention to an appeal decision² where he states that these changes were considered to be a relevant consideration.

² Appeal Reference APP/Q1153/A/14/2228741

Be that as it may, I note that this appeal was for the removal of a condition to allow a building, that was originally an agricultural barn, but that was now used for holiday lets, to be used as a permanent dwelling. In addition, it was not considered to be an isolated dwelling. As such, its circumstances are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme.

18. Overall, as the appeal scheme would result in a new isolated house in the countryside, and there would be no special circumstances to justify it, I consider that the site would not represent a suitable location for new housing, and it would conflict with Policies GN1(b) and RS1 of the WLLP.

Other matters

19. I note the personal circumstances put forward by the appellant who has stated that the dwelling would be utilised by his daughter and her family and that he would be willing to accept a personal condition to this end. Whilst I accept that it might be more convenient for the daughter to live at this location, there is no evidence that it is in anyway essential. Moreover, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh more general planning considerations, and it is likely that the dwelling would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to be material. In addition, I am not persuaded that a personal condition would be appropriate or reasonable either. In this respect I note that the *Planning Practice Guidance* indicates that a condition to grant permission solely on grounds of an individual's personal circumstances will scarcely ever be justified in the case of permission for the erection of a permanent building.
20. The conversion of the building would provide some work for local contractors, and spending by new residents would also be beneficial to the local economy, but given the size of the development these benefits would be limited, and in common with developments located within villages and settlements. The addition of an open market dwelling would make a small contribution to housing supply in the area, and to sustaining local services. The scheme would also result in the re-use of previously developed land and buildings and this together with the letters of support from local residents, favour the scheme.

Conclusion

21. The proposal would result in the creation of a new isolated dwelling in the countryside, contrary to both national and local policies, and so does not represent a suitable site for new housing. Whilst I have given weight to the benefits of the scheme in my decision, they would not outweigh the harm that I have identified it would cause, and the conflict the scheme has with the policies of the development plan.
22. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2017

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P2365/W/17/3182494

**Barn at Plumtree Barn, Black-a-moor Lane, Downholland, Ormskirk
L39 7HX**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Toby Gill against the decision of West Lancashire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/1223/FUL, dated 17 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is conversion and roof extension to existing outbuilding to form a single residential property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have, for completeness, used the appellant's full name which is set out on the appeal form in my decision.
3. During the course of the appeal a High Court judgement¹ was handed down regarding paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and new isolated homes in the countryside. I wrote to the main parties to ask them whether this judgment has any bearing on the appeal. I have had regard to their responses in my findings.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether or not the proposal would be appropriate in principle in such a location having regard to relevant local and national policies.

Reasons

5. The appeal building is to the north of Black-a-moor Lane which connects Downholland Cross to Haskayne via School Lane. Access to the site is gained from the lane. The immediate area around the appeal site is sparsely developed in terms of buildings. There are fields either side of the lane which provide a backdrop to the appeal site on its northern, south-eastern, southern and western sides. The appeal site is in the Green Belt. Immediately adjacent to the appeal building are the residential dwellings of Plum Tree Barn and Bank Farmhouse. The former is occupied by the appellant and his family.

¹ Braintree District Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Greyread Limited & Granville Developments Limited [2017] EWHC 2743 (Admin)

6. Haskayne is defined as a Rural Sustainable Village in Policy SP1 of the West Lancashire Local Plan 2012-2027 Development Plan Document (Local Plan). The policy sets out that development in rural settlements will be focussed on the Key and Rural Sustainable Villages and that all new built development will take place within settlement boundaries (as defined by Policy GN1), except where a specific need for development for a countryside use is identified that retains or enhances the rural character of an area.
7. The Council notes that the appeal site is outside of the settlement boundary of Haskayne and is therefore considered to lie in the countryside. Haskayne is roughly 0.9 miles away. To the north is the Rural Sustainable Village of Halsall which is about 2.75 miles away. The appeal site is physically separated from Haskayne by fields and a country lane. Thus, I agree that the appeal site is within the countryside and not a settlement.
8. Local Plan Policies GN1 and RS1 aim to support the formation of sustainable communities and direct development to sustainable locations. Local Plan Policy GN1 b) explains that "*Development proposals within the Green Belt will be assessed against national policy and any relevant Local Plan policies.*" While Local Plan Policy RS1 explains the exception to this is the provision of very limited affordable housing, none is proposed.
9. The Council question whether the appeal building is authorised having regard to the planning application that they approved in March 2002 (Ref: 2001/1186) which included conditions that removed permitted development rights. While there may be differences as the Council suggest, my decision will be nearly 11 years on from the approval of building regulations in January 2007. Hence, the works undertaken may well be over the ten-year limit mentioned by the Council for pursuing enforcement action. I have therefore considered the appeal on the merits of the building as I saw on site.
10. With regard to Framework paragraphs 89 and 90 the appeal scheme would re-use the existing building. The Council accept that the building is of permanent and substantial construction and that the proposed alterations would not be disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. I share their conclusion that the appeal scheme would follow the advice contained in the Framework. Hence, the proposal is not inappropriate development and very special circumstances do not need to be demonstrated.
11. Despite the re-use of the appeal building the proposal would result in a new home in the countryside. The main parties dispute whether the appeal scheme would result in a new isolated home in the countryside. The word 'isolated' is not defined in the Framework. In the High Court judgement, it was clarified that 'isolated' should be given its ordinary dictionary meaning of "far away from other places, buildings or people; remote". Given the proximity of the appeal building to two existing residential dwellings, the proposed dwelling would not be far away from other buildings or people. While, the potential occupants of the development currently live in Plum Tree Barn, this would not stop social sustainability from occurring now or in the future given that it would be a market dwelling.
12. However, there is still a need to consider whether the proposed development would be far away from other places. This includes consideration of whether the appeal site is a suitable location for housing having regard to its location and accessibility.

13. My attention has been drawn to a considerable number of cases. I note Figure 1 in the Applicant's Written Statement, but I do not have details of the cases closer to the appeal site to the north, south and south-west. I understand that planning permission was granted in the Barton case² following an earlier application³ as it was considered that the site would not be isolated. While, there are some details of this case before me, I do not have the full circumstances of the case to be able to draw an accurate comparison. With regards to the other cases, even though many were determined after the publication of the Framework, they are all located in very different social and environmental contexts⁴. As such, they are not directly comparable to the proposal that is before me, which I have considered on its own planning merits based on the evidence before me and my observations from my site visit.
14. In terms of facilities and services, the appeal site is between a 5 and 15 minute walk of Downholland Business Park (storage units, a pet/equine/country clothing shop, a coffee shop and dog grooming), a primary school, restaurant, village hall/activity centre, playing fields/play area and a nursery. While there are holiday cottages nearby, they would not serve future occupiers day-to-day needs. A farm shop, Farmer Ted's and St Thomas' Church are either beyond a distance that the most people would be prepared to walk or require the use of a busy road with no footway.
15. Haskayne has relatively few facilities and services, although it does have two public houses, a bus stop, a kitchen/furniture shop and a crafts shop. Halsall has a primary school, church, beauty salon, offices, a car repair garage/car sales, a delicatessen and a limited post office service. A public house is also on the periphery of Halsall. The range of facilities and services on offer in the appeal site's immediate area together with those on offer in Haskayne would mean that occupants of the development would need to travel further afield to other settlements. Even so, there would be a limited benefit linked to the proposal in terms of supporting local services and community facilities.
16. The Framework recognises that different policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas.
17. The two sections of Black-a-moor Lane provide contrasting pedestrian footway facilities. The lane is, however, generally lit, while the short eastern section between Altcar Lane and Mairsough Lane would be suitable for pedestrians during daylight hours, and offer access to the Leeds and Liverpool Canal towpath. However, the use of the eastern section and the towpath would be less attractive at night or in poor weather conditions. Despite the narrow width of the western section of the lane, it offers a safe pedestrian environment in a rural area. While Lydiate and Maghull maybe a walkable distance away for some, the distance would not be suitable for all and occupants would be unlikely to travel to them on foot regularly for their day-to-day needs.
18. The western section of the lane and School Lane offer a suitable environment for cyclists and for persons on mobility scooters. However, the eastern section of the lane, Altcar Lane and Mairsough Lane are far busier with vehicular

² Council Application Ref: 2016/0624/FUL

³ Council Application Ref: 2015/0310/FUL

⁴ Refs: 12/01726/FUL; 2013/1163/FUL; 2014/0969/FUL; 2016/0708/FUL; APP/P0119/A/10/2130078; APP/D3505/W/17/3180004; 2016/0667/FUL and APP/P2365/W/16/3144303; 2014/0205/FUL and APP/P2365/A/14/2218836; APP/P2365/W/17/3173814; 2015/0630/OUT and APP/P2365/W/15/3138570; 2015/0816/FUL and APP/P2365/W/15/3136774; and APP/P2365/W/15/3035959

traffic travelling to and from Formby and between Maghull and Southport. Although these roads may be used by cyclists and by persons on mobility scooters, they would not be attractive for all and especially during the hours of darkness or in poor weather conditions.

19. The bus service between Southport and Liverpool runs every 30 minutes throughout the day and passes through various settlements containing a range of facilities and services. Although there is a bus service through Haskayne, I do not have details of its frequency.
20. Notwithstanding these sustainable modes of transport, and the occupants potentially leading healthy lifestyles, the appellant accepts that the proposed dwelling would primarily be accessed by private motor car. No additional journeys would be created if the appellant and his family occupy the dwelling, especially if the appellant and his wife work from home. However, this arrangement would not stop car journeys. Circumstances may also change, including the occupation of the dwelling. Even so, the number of extra journeys would be modest.
21. While the appellant has lived in the area for some time, it is a matter of fact and degree as to whether the appeal building and its occupants would be far away from other places. In this case, although there are some facilities and services in the area, I am not persuaded that the appeal site is not far away from places with day-to-day facilities and services. Thus, on the whole, the site is remote. Consequently, the proposed development would be a new isolated home in the countryside.
22. Turning now to the special circumstances listed in Framework paragraph 55 which is a distinct and separate test to the very special circumstances associated with Green Belt policy. Bullet point three explains that such special circumstances can be: *where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting*. Both aspects of this bullet point need to be satisfied. While the Council's evidence refers to the term 'traditional barn', the Framework does not use this phrase.
23. The Design and Access Statement confirms that the building is an existing garage, stables and storage facility for the main dwelling. It is submitted that the building is surplus to requirements and that large parts of the building are left unused. I observed on site that the building comprised of three areas. The first was a garage; the second a first floor; the third a series of stables and a larger room. The three areas were all being used for domestic storage of items such as fishing equipment, tools, a boat, garden equipment, fridge, tumble dryer and timber. The garage could be used by vehicles. No part of the building was in use for the stabling of horses.
24. Although the appellant considers that large parts of the building are left unused, the term 'disused' must mean not used at all. In terms of 'redundant' this must mean 'superfluous' which is *not or no longer needed or wanted*. The appellant's evidence and my observations on site confirm the building is not redundant or disused. I recognise the Government encourages the re-use of existing resources⁵ and empty and under-used buildings. Furthermore I acknowledge the proposal would allow the family to stay on the site and support visiting family. However, the building appeared perfectly capable of

⁵ National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraphs 17, 51 and 90

continuing to offer stable facilities or ancillary domestic storage. Thus, I am not persuaded that the building is empty or under-used.

25. Added to this, I do not consider that permitted development rights, for the conversion of agricultural buildings⁶, are relevant to this case, even if they do not contain a pre-requisite that the building must be redundant or disused. I also do not share the appellant's view that the building would become untidy and unmanaged or that it would fall into a state of disrepair.
26. Although the appeal scheme would lead to an enhancement to the site's immediate setting, in terms of biodiversity character and its visual appearance, the creation of a new isolated dwelling in the countryside is contrary to both national and local planning policy other than in special circumstances. As the scheme does not satisfy the first part of bullet point three, I have found that none apply in this case.
27. Although the proposal would comply with, in terms of the Green Belt, Local Plan Policy GN1 and paragraphs 89 and 90 of the Framework, I conclude that this is outweighed by the significant harm that would arise from the appeal proposal not being appropriate in principle in such a location. In this regard, the proposal would conflict with Local Plan Policies GN1 b) and RS1 b) along with paragraph 55 of the Framework. These policies, among other things, jointly seek to direct development to sustainable locations where the environment is accessible to all sections of the community and encourages the use of public transport, so to avoid new isolated homes in the countryside.

Other Matters

28. I have had regard to the appellant's concerns regarding the Council's handling of the planning application. I also note that the appellant entered into pre-application discussions with the Council and that amendments were made with a view to finding a solution. However, these matters do not alter or outweigh my findings on the proposal before me, which I have considered on its merits.

Conclusion

29. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR

⁶ The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q

