



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2019

by David Wyborn BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J9497/W/19/3235634

South Downs, Sampford Spiney, Yelverton, Devon PL20 6LD

- 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 Mrs Amanda Sharp against the decision of Dartmoor National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref 0127/19, dated 8 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "replacement of dilapidated building with wooden mobile building measuring 7.32m x 3.66m sat on a permeable hardcore base".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I noted on site that the appeal building was in place. It is said that the structure is mobile, however, the application seeks planning permission for a building and I saw that it was set on a permeable hard core base edged by kerbs. I will deal with the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty of National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. Development Plan policies have a similar approach.
5. The site lies within the Dartmoor National Park and is part of an agricultural and equestrian holding. There is a group of farm buildings further down the slope and the appeal building is located on higher land adjoining the access from the road. The adjoining roads are bounded by hedgebanks with mature trees and the immediate surroundings include grazing fields. There are views of open moorland in the distance in a broadly easterly direction. The area is attractive countryside befitting of its National Park status.
6. The building is modest in size, nevertheless, with its location by the field gate and its height extending above the hedgebank, it is clearly apparent from the adjoining roads, especially when approaching the site along the road from the

- north. When approaching from this direction, the triangle of grassed land by the road junctions forms an attractive feature and the reasonably prominent structure appears as an isolated and discordant built form in the backdrop. In this way the building diminishes the pleasant and generally undeveloped character of this location.
7. The building may be typical of some other storage and equestrian buildings, however, it is still somewhat functional in appearance, and does not contribute positively to the immediate area. There are few other buildings adjoining the road in the vicinity of the site, with other buildings, including the buildings that serve this holding, usually set in more discreet locations.
 8. For these reasons, the building harms the immediate character and appearance of the locality. I understand that there was a building previously in this location, nevertheless this building has been removed and it is necessary to consider the present proposal on its planning merits.
 9. I understand that the building would assist the appellant¹ with deliveries and allow livestock to be isolated. However, I am not satisfied that this is the only option available to address these matters and accordingly, if the appeal were to be dismissed, it would be a proportionate response given the harm that I have identified. Furthermore, while the holding contributes to the economic well-being of the area, there is little evidence that this relies especially on this building, given the range of other buildings and land available on the holding.
 10. I have taken into account that the Parish Council raise no objection and to all the appellant's analysis of the various planning policies and the submitted photos. However, based on my assessment of all the evidence, I conclude that the building has a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. While this harm is localised, the proposal, nevertheless, does not conserve or enhance the landscape of this part of the National Park. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with Policies COR1, COR3 and COR4 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2006-2026, Policies DMD1b, DMD5, DMD33 and DMD34 of the Development Management and Delivery Development Plan Document (July 2013) and the Framework which seeks proposals to, amongst other things, conserve or enhance the quality and distinctiveness of local landscape character.
 11. The building also does not accord with the general approach for the location of agricultural and equestrian buildings set out in the Dartmoor National Park Design Guide, nor the broad principles for the conservation and enhancement of National Parks as set out in the English National Parks and the Broads UK Government Vision and Circular 2010.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Wyborn

INSPECTOR

¹ I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 and to the evidence available to me regarding the appellant's age and disability.