



Appeal Decisions

Hearing and site visit held on 9 May 2017

by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 May 2017

Appeals A and B refs: APP/T2350/C/16/3161917 and 3161918

Timothy House Farm, Whalley Road, Hurst Green, Clitheroe BB7 9QL

- The appeals are made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeals are made by Mr John Anthony Nutter (Appeal A) and Mrs Linda Ann Nutter (Appeal B) against an enforcement notice issued by Ribble Valley Borough Council.
- The enforcement notice was issued on 14 September 2016.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without permission, the material change of the use of the land from use for agriculture to a mixed use of the land comprising land used for agriculture and for the stationing of a static caravan on the land for residential use, not reasonably required for agriculture.
- The requirements of the notice are to:
 - (1) Cease all use of the land for the stationing of a static caravan,
 - (2) Remove the static caravan from the land,
 - (3) Disconnect and make safe all services to the static caravan, and
 - (4) Remove the hard standing beneath the static caravan and reinstate it to its use as agricultural land.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is three months.
- Appeal A is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. Appeal B is proceeding on grounds (a) and (g). Since the prescribed fees have not been paid within the specified period for Appeal A, the application for planning permission deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act as amended does not fall to be considered.

Summary of Decision: Both Appeals are dismissed, and the enforcement notice is upheld with a correction and variations as set out in the formal decision at paragraph 46 below.

Appeal C ref: APP/T2350/W/16/3161673

Timothy House Farm, Whalley Road, Hurst Green, Clitheroe BB7 9QL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr John Nutter against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
- The application ref 3/2015/0780, dated 7 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2016.
- The development proposed is described in the application form as retrospective application for the sitting of a static caravan on land at Timothy House Farm for use as a temporary farm worker's dwelling.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is dismissed as set out in the formal decision at paragraph 53 below.

Appeal D ref: APP/T2350/W/16/3161671

Land off Lambing Clough Lane, Hurst Green, Clitheroe

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as
-

amended against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.

- The appeal is made by Mr John Nutter against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
- The application Ref 3/2015/0776, dated 7 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2016.
- The development proposed is outline application for the construction of a permanent farm worker's dwelling.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is dismissed as set out in the formal decision at paragraph 54 below.

Preliminary matters

1. At the Hearing an application for costs was made by the Council against the appellants, Mr and Mrs Nutter. This application is the subject of a separate Decision. Appeals A, B and C relate to the same site but outline planning permission is sought for a different site; I will separately assess the merits of Appeal D.
2. The allegation is a mixed use of the land. The notice attacks the residential use which has been facilitated by the stationing of a caravan. Therefore it is unnecessary to state *not reasonably required for agriculture*. I suggest these words should be deleted as they serve no purpose. For greater precision, the notice should specify the cessation of the residential use not just removal of the caravan. There is agreement between the appeal parties that the hard surface beneath the mobile home existed prior to the change of use; it is beyond the notice's scope to require removal of the hard-standing. The intended corrections are minor and do not fundamentally alter the nature of the development originally enforced against. The correction to the requirements does not make the notice any more onerous. I am satisfied no injustice is caused to any party by these corrections. I will correct the notice.

Ground (a) and S78 appeal

3. Mr and Mrs Nutter seek planning permission to continue the residential use of the site. Permission is sought for a limited period of 24 months on the basis of essential need in connection with a rural enterprise. The agricultural holding extends to some 195 hectares of grassland comprising tenanted and owner-occupied land. A further 540 ha is used during winter. Farming operations occur at Manor Farm where there is a group of rural buildings and a farm house. The farm is held on a secure agricultural holding tenancy with Stonyhurst Estate. The livestock enterprise comprises cattle and sheep breeding. There is broad agreement between the agricultural experts that the operations generate a functional need for at least two full-time workers to be on hand day and night, given the nature and scale of the enterprise. I have no reason to disagree. My assessment of the planning merits shall focus on the residential use of the site.
4. Mr Nutter, who is the main farm worker, employs two full-time workers including his son, Mr John Nutter junior, because he needs to be on hand day and night. He resides at Timothy House Farm and occupies the mobile home. The latter is located some distance from Manor Farm but is under the ownership of Mr and Mrs Nutter. The land at Timothy House Farm that is subject of enforcement action is located in the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty ['the AONB'], and adjacent to the boundary of the Hurst Green Conservation Area ['the CA']. There is a small group of dwellings close to the site.
5. I consider the **main issues** are the following: (1) The effect of the development upon the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB (2) the setting of the adjacent CA (3) the living conditions of nearby residents, and (4) if any harm arises, whether it is

outweighed by other considerations, including the essential need for an additional rural worker need to live permanently at or near their place of work.

Reasons - *Landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB*

6. Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in an AONB. This is echoed in key statement EN2, landscape, of the Core Strategy 2008 – 2028 [‘the CS’] as well as aims of policies DMG1, DMG2, DMH3 and DME4. In assessment of any proposal for development within the AONB, the CS indicates that the most important consideration will be the protection, conservation and enhancement of the landscape.
7. There is a scattering of built development in the form of rural buildings however the surrounding area is characterised by attractive undulating countryside. From higher ground there is a most beautiful vista of lush green scenery. The introduction of primary residential use has significantly changed the appearance of the site. It has introduced residential activity coupled with the spread of domestic paraphernalia and an increase in comings and goings associated with residential living to this part of the countryside. All of these have the potential to cause visual harm to the scenic beauty of the landscape. I do not consider caravans are characteristic of the area.
8. The caravan’s pitched roof rises above the adjacent curtilage wall and it is noticeable from various public footpaths that traverse the locality. In short and medium distance views the mobile home is, due to its exposed position, intrusive. It has a jarring effect because of its siting. I reject the notion that the mobile home successfully integrates with the adjacent rural buildings.
9. Mr and Mrs Nutter argue that the caravan is a temporary structure and it will be removed once a permanent solution is found to meet the operational requirements of the enterprise. It is claimed soft landscaping, or a perimeter timber fence, could be installed to hide the caravan. However, in my assessment, it is the existence of the caravan in this location that causes considerable visual harm to the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. I reject the argument that soft landscaping would sufficiently mitigate that harm. The development materially conflicts with CS key statement EN2 and policies DMG1, DMG2, DMH3 and DME4.

Setting of the CA

10. Timothy House Farm and Timothy Cottage, which are both identified as buildings of townscape merit within the Hurst Green CA character appraisal, are situated in proximity to the caravan. The adjacent CA special interest is derived from the architectural style and layout of traditional stone buildings. The open and mainly undeveloped vastness of the surrounding countryside forms a visual backdrop and landscaped setting in which the heritage asset is experienced. In contrast, the mobile home forms an incongruous feature in the landscape.
11. The siting of the caravan is an integral part of the land’s primary residential use and its visual effect on the setting of the adjacent CA is immense. The mobile home is an alien feature in comparison to traditional stone buildings. It has a visually incongruous impact on the appearance of the heritage asset because of its rectangular shape and layout, which is out of keeping with the area’s special architectural interest. In views from public footpaths and the adjacent highway the caravan has a dominant visual effect given the area’s topography. Its utilitarian design draws the naked eye.
12. In terms of the National Planning Policy Framework [‘the NPPF’], development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA; nevertheless, there is real

and serious harm. Mr Hoerty, quite rightly in my opinion, conceded that the stationing of a caravan for primary residential use brings no public benefit.

13. On the main issue, I conclude that the residential use facilitated by the stationing of the caravan has a materially harmful effect upon the setting of the adjacent CA. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with CS policies with Policies DS2, DME4, DMG1, DMG2 and DMH3.

Neighbours' living conditions

14. The occupant of Timothy House Farm does not object to the stationing of a temporary residential dwelling. Nevertheless it should be borne in mind that planning permission runs with the land and, irrespective of who occupies the property currently, it is necessary and reasonable to examine the general characteristics of the land use and any environmental consequences. In that context, the caravan is situated alongside the residential curtilage to neighbouring properties. It is clearly visible from adjoining properties due to the difference in topography. Given the considerable degree of overlooking of private gardens, these areas are likely to be less pleasant to enjoy especially during the summer months.
15. Rear elevation windows are visible from the caravan and vice-versa. The perception of being overlooked is likely to greatly increase because of the caravan's elevated positioning and orientation. In this rural location I do not consider that the development secures high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants. I therefore conclude that the development has materially harmful effect upon the living conditions of nearby residents. Accordingly, it conflicts with CS policy DMG1.

Other considerations

16. I turn now to consider other planning matters which, potentially, might be held to weigh in favour of granting planning permission. Principal amongst these is the claim that residential accommodation for which planning permission is sought facilitates a viable livestock farming and breeding business requiring a constant on-site presence for at least one additional full-time worker. In this case that worker is Mr Nutter junior.
17. CS policy DMH3 seeks to limit residential development in the countryside including AONB to development essential for the purposes of agriculture or to meet local need. Amongst other things, it states that, in assessing proposals for agricultural worker's dwellings, a functional and financial test must be applied. I think that approach is broadly consistent with NPPF paragraph 55. It indicates isolated new homes in the countryside should be avoided. It identifies a number of special circumstances in which isolated new homes would be justified. One exception is the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work. It is therefore necessary to show a special justification having regard to the needs of this particular enterprise rather than personal desire or circumstances.
18. The chorus of disagreement focuses on whether it is necessary for Mr Nutter junior to live at Timothy House Farm in order for the enterprise to function properly. The evidence indicates to me there is properties for sale in Hurst Green, but these fall within the bracket £199,950 – £300,000 for a two-bedroom terraced dwelling. Three and four bedroom properties far exceed these figures. Mr Hoerty did his utmost to explain why a two-bedroom property is unsuitable for Mr Nutter Junior to occupy because of his intentions. However, it is the needs of the enterprise that prevail and not of those individuals involved in the business.
19. I appreciate that the price range for modest size dwelling seems unaffordable on an agricultural wage. However, that is not the end of the matter. This is because Mr Nutter

junior owns a property at Ribchester. That could be sold to help purchase a suitable dwelling closer to Manor Farm, which would potentially allow him to live near his place of work. There is nothing before me to suggest this option has been adequately or properly explored. I am also not persuaded that renting has been properly examined. Homes of varying sizes are available for rent in nearby settlements including Hurst Green. The rental price is up to about £750 per calendar month depending on what is on the market.

20. According to Mr Nutter a rural worker living in the village has the potential to cause angst amongst the settled community because of noise and general disturbance generated by early morning/late evening tractor manoeuvres. I give little credence to this line of argument. There is nothing to suggest the farm worker must commute by tractor.
21. There is an added complexity. This is because the circumstances surrounding occupation of Timothy House Farm is unclear. The latter is a terraced property and while of modest size; it is occupied and used as someone's home for a charge. There is genuine concern about terminating the tenancy and potential implications, yet there is nothing before me to suggest the property is not available because of the tenant's legal rights. For instance, the nature and scope of any tenancy remain unclear. The available evidence does not sufficiently show to me that this property is not available. Furthermore, while I understand Mr and Mrs Nutter's aim is to bequeath Timothy House Farm to their children this, I am afraid, is not a strong enough reason to discount its suitability or availability.
22. There is another complication. Timothy House Farm is attached to a substantial traditional stone barn currently used for agricultural purposes. The Council suggest that a modern farm building could be built at Manor Farm thus releasing the stone barn for residential conversion. That seems sensible given the spatial strategy that seeks to focus residential development in sustainable locations, but is supportive of conversion of rural buildings. Again, Mr Hoerty did his utmost to demonstrate that the barn is unsuitable for conversion, but there is no evidence before me to suggest that it is structurally unsound or that its residential conversion would be unviable.
23. For the reasons given in the preceding paragraphs, I consider that, even if there is a functional need for at least one additional full-time worker to be on hand day and night, the evidence presented does not sufficiently show that there is no appropriate alternative accommodation available. This finding is fatal to Mr and Mrs Nutter's case but, for the sake of completeness, I will assess the viability arguments.
24. Circumstances vary infinitely and I consider that a financial test should not be applied too rigidly; it should be applied with a margin of flexibility. It is important however to secure the underlying purposes of local and national policy. Trading, profit and loss accounts for year end 31 January 2014 show a loss of £38,196; I recognise this dip is probably because of adverse weather conditions. Year-end 31 January 2015 show a profit of £39,672 and £29,994 in 2016. Projected accounts show profit of £31,972 in 2017 although projected costs beyond that period have not been provided for consideration.
25. The financial information lacks specificity as it does not sufficiently show how the enterprise would fund the construction of a new dwelling and remain profitable. Again Mr Hoerty did his utmost to explain how the development would be funded but debt repayment remains unclear. I understand that there is a possibility of selling Mr Nutter junior's home at Ribchester or realise equity to help fund a permanent dwelling, but specifics have not been provided. In total there is insufficient evidence showing the potential impact of the construction costs on the long-term viability of this enterprise.

Added to those concerns is lack of wage transparency. In the accounts this is shown as *contract bailing & haulage costs* yet it is unclear whether a minimum agricultural wage is actually paid to employees. While Mr Nutter junior benefits from the land, it remains uncertain as to whether the minimum agricultural wage would have any impact upon profitability.

26. So, even if a different view prevails on the availability of alternative accommodation I do not share Mr Hoerty's very optimistic outlook that this enterprise has been planned on a realistic and sound financial basis to support an additional rural worker and dwelling. In reaching my findings, I have taken into account farming methods and the involvement of family members in the operations. Nevertheless, the evidence presented does not sufficiently show to me that suitable affordable alternative existing accommodation is not available to meet the identified functional need. To allow the appeals without clear evidence of alternative accommodation or financial planning could potentially result in a dwelling, permanent or temporary, in the countryside without agricultural justification. In my opinion, that would clearly violate the purposes of local and national planning policy. I therefore attach limited weight to the agricultural justification advanced in support of temporary or permanent agricultural worker's dwelling.
27. Mr Nutter junior's Human Rights, under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, should be taken into consideration. This includes not only respect for home but also private and family life. Dismissal would be likely to result in him and his partner's eviction resulting in interference with their home, private and family life. This interference with the rights of the occupiers must be balanced against the wider public interest in pursuing the legitimate aims stated in Article 8. The overall harm to the character and appearance of the AONB represents a serious objection to the residential use of the land, which cannot be overcome by mitigation alone. There is a need for restrictive policies to be applied to such areas and this restriction is an appropriate proportional response to that need. The Council state there is alternative accommodation in the locality and I also heard Mr Nutter Junior and partner have alternative accommodation elsewhere. This requires investigation.

Additional matters

28. Whilst the findings of other Inspectors may well be relevant, and there is a need for consistency in the planning process, these are not Case Law. I am not bound to reach the same conclusions provided there are sound planning reasons for departing from their approach. In that context, I should remind the appeal parties that each proposal should be assessed upon its individual merits. Nonetheless, I have considered all of the submitted appeal decisions in reaching my findings above.
29. Mr Hoerty made much of the appeal decision at the Old Dairy Farm, Chipping Road, Chaigley, which falls within the administrative area¹. My interrogation reveals that case can be distinguished on facts. For example, there is insufficient evidence to show existing alternative accommodation is not available given the circumstances surrounding Timothy House Farm and the adjacent traditional stone built farm; this is very much different to the findings in Chaigley. Likewise, financial details are incomplete. In the latter case the level of borrowing was high but the assets comprising the farm house, owned land and buildings were available as security to meet the liabilities of that farm enterprise. No such level of detail has been provided in this case.

¹ APP/T2350/A/10/2131469, APP/Q9495/A/13/2207717, APP/C2708/A/13/2205798 and APP/C/97/R2330/647276 referred to by Mr Hoerty, and APP/P2365/A/13/2199218 by the Council.

30. The particular facts and circumstances of the case before me are materially different compared to these other appeal sites. I do not consider that these appeal decisions are strong precedents to grant planning permission for unwarranted development inside the countryside. On the main issues, I find nothing to indicate planning permission ought to be granted.

Planning balance

31. I have found that the development fails to conserve landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB to which great weight is given. I also attach considerable importance and weight to my finding on the second main issue above. Additional weight is given to the adverse effect of the development upon nearby residents' living conditions.
32. On the other side of the scales, there are some social and economic benefits in that a temporary agricultural worker's dwelling would meet the identified functional need. But there is significant environmental harm and that aspect of sustainable development is not met.
33. There is a functional need for an additional rural worker to live permanently at or near Manor Farm. However, the weight I attach to this is considerably reduced because the evidence presented does not sufficiently show existing alternative accommodation is not available. I therefore attach limited weight to the agricultural justification.
34. I have also had regard to the consequences of these appeals being dismissed for the appellants and, in particular, Mr Nutter junior and his partner. However, there is possible alternative accommodation in the locality and a reasonable period of compliance would address concerns about disruption to their lives. Given the serious harm identified above, in my opinion, protection of the public interest cannot be achieved by means that are less interfering. In these circumstances, a refusal of planning permission is a proportionate response. I therefore attach limited weight to this factor.
35. On balance, I conclude that the other considerations advanced, whether taken individually or collectively, do not outweigh the serious adverse impact of the development on the character and appearance of this rural site and landscape, setting of the CA and harm caused to neighbours' quality of life. Therefore, there is conflict with the cited CS policies above as well as relevant section of the NPPF.

Appeals A and B – Ground (g)

36. It is necessary to consider whether the specified compliance period, three months, falls short of what should reasonably be allowed. Twelve months as a period of compliance would be excessive given the nature of the work required by the notice and the harm caused by the residential use. Nonetheless, arrangements would need to be made to cease the residential use of the land and remove the caravan. That would require some planning and is likely to take time.
37. Mr Nutter Junior has accommodation elsewhere but Mr and Mrs Nutter maintain the mobile home is sometimes used by him when he works on the farm. There is no substantive evidence to make less than probable that assertion. In my opinion a slightly extended period of compliance avoids significant disruption and hardship to Mr Nutter junior while alternative arrangements are made. I am therefore of the firm opinion six months is reasonable and appropriate. This is a just and proportionate response to the particular circumstances presented, and strikes a fair balance between the competing interests of the wider public and individuals involved in this case. Therefore, ground (g) succeeds.

Appeal D - Outline planning permission for construction of a permanent farm worker's dwelling²

38. The **main issue** is whether or not the proposed development would be in an acceptable location and, if any harm arises, whether it is outweighed by other considerations, including the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work.

Reasons

39. The appeal site is in Mr Nutter's ownership some 300 metres from main farm buildings at Manor Farm. Although situated on the outskirts of Hurst Green where there is a scattering of rural buildings, the site is surrounded by rolling countryside. Apart from a college there are no local amenities within the settlement. The closest town being Clitheroe, which has a wide-range of competitor retail outlets, services and facilities. It is not within reasonable walking or cycling distance from the site. There is, however, limited public transport serving the village.
40. Realistically, given the relatively isolated location of the site, future residents would be heavily reliant almost entirely upon the private motor car for most of their day-to-day travel needs. Car-based commuting is likely as occupiers would be reliant on private transportation for a weekly shop or a trip to the health centre. This would not be ideal and does not sit comfortably with the Government's objectives of delivering sustainable development in a planned and coordinated manner, minimise and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.
41. Reliance on private mode of transport is not totally uncommon in a mainly rural area such as this and existing residents are likely to rely on private transportation to meet their day-to-day needs. The travel distance to Clitheroe is not too great. This argument however could be often repeated in favour of isolated rural sites such as this, and it is not persuasive enough to justify a new residential use in this rural location away from settlements. This level of reliance on the private car does not necessarily mean the development is unsustainable given the wider approach endorsed in the NPPF; it is not just about transport mode or access to local facilities. That said, however, Mr Nutter concedes there would be limited social benefits. Economic advantages of the scheme are likely to be restricted to the limited extent to which the occupiers would contribute to the local economy.
42. At risk of repetition, there is broad agreement that a functional need exists for an additional farm worker's dwelling so that Mr Nutter junior can live permanently near his place of work. The contention is that the proposed dwelling would meet that specific need in the long-term. However, for reasons set out above the evidence presented does not sufficiently show that there is no existing accommodation available to meet the functional need. Likewise, agricultural justification does not adequately show that this enterprise has been planned on a realistic and sound financial basis to support the construction of a permanent farm worker's dwelling or rural worker.
43. The site is not located within a reasonable distance to local facilities and services and its use for residential purposes would encourage unsustainable pattern of travel. There is therefore an in principle objection to the development because the scheme would conflict with the spatial strategy set out in CS key statement DS1, which describes Hurst Green

² All matters reserved apart from access. The appeal parties agreed highway reason for refusal 2) has been addressed, because sufficient detail shows the proposed development would not create adverse impact on the use of Lambing Clough Lane by occupants and other highway users. This issue is no longer in dispute and I shall focus on other planning matters raised in the Council's decision notice.

as a Tier 2 less sustainable settlement where development will need to meet proven local needs or deliver regeneration benefits. It would conflict with purposes of CS key statement DS1 and DS2, policies DMG2, DMG3 and DMH3.

44. Drawing all of the above threads together, on the main issue, the proposed development would not be in an acceptable location and the site is unsuitable and unsustainable for this kind of residential development. On balance and the available evidence, I conclude that the perceived harm is not outweighed by the identified functional need for an additional agricultural worker's dwelling.

Appeals A to D - overall conclusions

45. For all of the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that Appeals B and C should not succeed. In Appeals A and B I shall vary the period of compliance and uphold the enforcement notice and refuse to grant planning permission on the deemed application in Appeal B. I further conclude that Appeal D should be dismissed.

Formal Decisions - APP/T2350/C/16/3161917

46. It is directed that the notice is corrected by:

Delete all of the text in section 3: the breach of planning control alleged, and substitute therefor by the following text: *Without planning permission, the material change of use of the land from agriculture to a mixed agricultural and residential use facilitated by the stationing of a caravan.*

47. It is directed that the notice is varied by:

Delete the text in section 5: what you are required to do, sub section (1) and substitute therefor by following text: *Cease the use of the land for residential purposes,*

And

Delete all of the following text in sub section (4): *Remove the hard standing beneath the static caravan and reinstate it to its use as agricultural land.*

And

Delete the number and text *3 months* in section 6: time for compliance, and substitute therefor by the following period of compliance: *6 months*.

48. Subject to the corrections and variations, the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

For the avoidance of any doubt, the requirements and period of compliance is now:

- (1) Cease the use of the land for residential purposes,
 - (2) Remove the static caravan from the land, and
 - (3) Disconnect and make safe all services to the static caravan.
- Period of compliance: Six months.

APP/T2350/C/16/3161918

49. It is directed that the notice is corrected by:

Delete all of the text in section 3: the breach of planning control alleged, and substitute therefor by the following text: *Without planning permission, the material change of use*

of the land from agriculture to a mixed agricultural and residential use facilitated by the stationing of a caravan.

50. It is directed that the notice is varied by:

Delete the text in section 5: what you are required to do, sub section (1) and substitute therefor by following text: *Cease the use of the land for residential purposes*,

And

Delete all of the following text in sub section (4): *Remove the hard standing beneath the static caravan and reinstate it to its use as agricultural land*.

And

51. Delete the number and text *3 months* in section 6: time for compliance, and substitute therefor by the following period of compliance: *6 months*.

52. Subject to the correction and variations above, the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld, and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

For the avoidance of any doubt, the requirements and period of compliance is now:

(1) Cease the use of the land for residential purposes,

(2) Remove the static caravan from the land, and

(3) Disconnect and make safe all services to the static caravan.

Period of compliance: Six months.

APP/T2350/W/16/3161673

53. The appeal is dismissed.

APP/T2350/W/16/3161671

54. The appeal is dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

Inspector

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Gary Hoerty	Gary Hoerty Associates
John Nutter	Appellant
Linda Nutter	Appellant

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

John Macholc	Head of Planning Services
Nicholas Bower	Agricultural Consultant, Lancashire County Council

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Alison Roland	Town Planners Ltd
Chris Berry	Local resident
Jan Alcock	Borough Councillor

DOCUMENTS HANDED IN AT THE HEARING

- 1) Aerial images handed in by the Council
- 2) Property search handed in by Alison Roland
- 3) Accounts handed in by Gary Hoerty
- 4) Full set of Core Strategy policies by the Council.