
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2016

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/W/16/3157582

Land at Crondall Road, Crookham Village, Fleet , Hampshire GU10 5RU

- 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 Miss Anne Murray against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref 15/02643/FUL, dated 28 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is change of use from agriculture to equestrian.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character of the countryside.

Reasons

3. Policy RUR 2 of the *Hart District Local Plan: Saved Policies* (LP) states that development in the open countryside will not be permitted unless it is specifically provided for by other policies in the LP and that it does not have a detrimental effect on the character or setting of the countryside. Policy RUR 3 states that development in the countryside which is provided for by other policies in the LP will be permitted where, amongst other things, the countryside and landscape is protected or enhanced. Policy RUR 34 relates specifically to horse related development and includes a criterion that such development should not create the need for an additional dwelling in the countryside.
4. The Council are concerned that the use of the land for keeping horses would give rise to the need for an additional dwelling. Apart from stating that the proposal would not give rise to the need for a dwelling, the appellant has provided no information in this respect. Documents submitted by the Council indicate that they asked the appellants for additional information during the course of considering the planning application but that none was forthcoming.
5. Without any further information being submitted with the appeal, it seems likely to me that there may well be circumstances arising when the horses would require the close presence of people. There may be issues relating to security, welfare, foaling or medical circumstances, some of which cannot be predicted, which could over time generate a desire or need for a dwelling on

the site. The Council rightly consider that if these circumstances were to arise, then they may be unreasonable to refuse to allow a dwelling. In the complete absence of any information from the appellant's as to how these or other circumstances could be dealt with, I find that the Council's concerns are justified. It should also be born in mind that even if the appellant was to intend a pattern of use, this may not be followed by subsequent users/owners of the site.

Conclusion

6. I consider that there is a strong likelihood that allowing the appeal could result in the need for a dwelling in the countryside, which would be contrary to Policies RUR 2 and RUR 34 of the LP and the appellant has failed to demonstrate that this would not be the case. There are no matters submitted with the appeal that outweigh my concerns and so the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR