



Appeal Decision

Hearing opened on 26 May 2021

Site visits made on 28 May 2021

by Richard Clegg BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19/07/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/W/20/3257313

Gaitbarrow Farm, Brackenthwaite Road, Yealand Redmayne, Carnforth, LA5 9TE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr P & Mrs L Tyson against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01197/OUT, dated 25 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of an agricultural worker's dwelling.
 - The hearing was conducted over two days, 26 & 27 May 2021.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The application was submitted in outline form, with approval sought for access, appearance, layout and scale at this stage.
3. The reasons for refusal of planning permission refer to policies in the Lancaster District Core Strategy, the Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) and the Arnsdale & Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) DPD. Since the planning application was refused, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) has adopted, in July 2020, A Local Plan for Lancaster District 2011-2031. The new Local Plan comprises two parts: *Part One: Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD* replaced the remaining policies of the Core Strategy and the residual saved policies of the District Local Plan of 2004, and *Part Two: Review of the Development Management DPD* updated the policies in the previous version of the Development Management DPD. It is the policies in Parts One and Two of the new Local Plan which now, with the AONB DPD, form part of the Development Plan, and to which I must have regard in determining this appeal. The statement of common ground, prepared by both main parties, addresses this situation, and refers to policies in the new Local Plan.

Main Issues

4. The third reason for refusal of planning permission refers to the effect of the proposal on sites of importance for biodiversity. Given what I find below on the other areas of dispute between the main parties, it is not necessary for this topic to be identified as a main issue, but I do consider it under *Other matters*.

Having regard to the representations made, I consider that the main issues in this appeal are:

- i) Whether the site on Brackenthwaite Road is a sustainable location for residential development.
- ii) The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Arnside & Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- iii) Whether there is an essential need for an agricultural worker's dwelling at Gaitbarrow Farm.
- iv) Whether Gaitbarrow Farm is a sufficiently viable business to support an agricultural worker.
- v) The effect of the proposed development on ancient woodland.

Reasons

Locational sustainability

- 5. Gaitbarrow Farm is situated within the open countryside, away from settlements in this part of the AONB. Both the Local Plan and the AONB DPD restrict development in the open countryside, seeking to guide most new development to locations within settlements. Policy AS01 of the AONB DPD supports small-scale growth in local service centres, and provides for limited development opportunities in small villages, and in the Local Plan Part One, Policy SP2 provides for development which would meet local needs only at rural villages, the lowest level in the settlement hierarchy. Arnside, which is identified as a local service centre in Policy AS01, is only about 4km from the site, but the site is nevertheless set apart from local facilities and services.
- 6. Policy DM4 of the Local Plan Part Two makes it clear that proposals for new homes outside identified sustainable settlements or other rural villages are unacceptable unless they meet the circumstances set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The main parties agreed that that is intended to be a reference to paragraph 79 of the NPPF¹ which gives the essential need for a rural worker to live at or near their place of work as one of the circumstances which may support the development of an isolated home in the countryside. Policy AS01 similarly provides for proposals where there is an essential need for a rural location, and for those which would help to sustain an existing business.
- 7. Both the Local Plan and the AONB DPD seek to guide most new development to settlements. The appeal site is in the open countryside, and is away from local facilities and services. I conclude that, without justification in line with policies relating to the open countryside, this is not a location where new housing would normally be consistent with a sustainable pattern of development.

¹ Policy DM4 actually refers to paragraph 55 of the NPPF which is concerned with the use of conditions. The original version of the NPPF referred to isolated homes in the countryside at paragraph 55, and I heard that the text of Policy DM4 had not been brought into line with this change.

Character and appearance of the AONB

8. The AONB is an important landscape. The NPPF (at paragraph 172) explains that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs which (with national parks) have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The special qualities of the Arnside & Silverdale AONB are set out in the DPD (paragraph 1.2.1), and include outstanding landscape and spectacular views, rare and precious habitats, and a sense of tranquillity, space and place. Its landscape character is summarised in the AONB DPD as an intimate mosaic of low limestone hills, woodland, wetland, pastures, limestone pavements, intertidal flats, coastal scenery and distinctive settlements.
9. The Appellants' Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA)² refers to the AONB Landscape & Seascape Character Assessment, which indicates that the appeal site is on the boundary between the inland pasture and parkland landscape character type (LCT) and the wooded limestone hills and pavements LCT. It is considered, in the LVA, that the appeal site exhibits characteristics which are most closely associated with the inland pasture and parkland LCT, a view which is not disputed by the LPA.
10. The proposal involves a single house and a package sewage treatment plant, with this latter part of the scheme being largely installed below ground level. The main part of the house would be a two-storey structure, with a two-storey rear projection. Single storey elements on the south side and back would extend the footprint of the dwelling. On the front elevation, fenestration would be arranged around a central doorway, and the building would be constructed from limestone with a slate roof. I agree with the LPA that the overall design would not be out of keeping with the local vernacular style of building.
11. However, with an overall length of about 17m and an overall width of about 12m, the proposal would not be a modest property. The physical presence of the house would consolidate the cluster of built development close to the junction of Brackenthwaite Road and Beetham Lane, which includes the existing buildings at the farmstead and a few nearby dwellings. A key characteristic of the inland pasture and parkland LCT is tranquil and peaceful areas of farmland with a more lush, damp and enclosed character than the coastal farmland, and with a backdrop of wooded hills. The additional presence of the farmhouse, strengthening the built form in the locality, would detract from this characteristic of the LCT and impinge on the attractive landscape of this part of the AONB.
12. There are wooded areas around the farmstead which would restrict views of the farmhouse. It would be visible from the access to the farm, where it would be seen with the existing contemporary farm buildings. From this direction the new dwelling would encroach into the open area to the west of the existing buildings, and the farmstead would appear as a more intrusive element in the landscape. Views from further along Brackenthwaite Road are heavily filtered by the tree cover, and there would be no additional adverse effect from the road to that at the site access. A public footpath runs through the field to the east of the farmstead. The house would be positioned beyond and at a somewhat lower level than the intervening farm buildings, but its presence

² Appendix 6 to the Planning & Environmental Statement.

would nevertheless emphasise the visual impact of the farmstead in views to the north-west from the footpath.

13. There is an existing group of buildings at Gaitbarrow Farm and a number of other buildings are nearby. Whilst the appeal proposal involves a single dwelling, I conclude that the consolidation of built form in this rural location would cause harm to the character and appearance of the AONB. The proposed development would thereby conflict with Policy EN2 of the Local Plan Part One, Policy DM46 of the Local Plan Part Two, and Policy AS02 of the AONB DPD. It follows that the development would also conflict with the aim of the Management Plan to conserve and enhance the natural beauty and special qualities of the AONB. Given the location of the site within the AONB, where landscape protection is of particular importance, I give great weight to this adverse effect of the proposed development.

Whether there is an essential need for an agricultural worker's dwelling

14. The Appellants acquired the land at Gaitbarrow Farm in 2012, and they have built up the business since then. They own 18.21ha there, and have the use of an adjacent 1.2ha. A further 3.06ha is rented near Hale, about 2km to the east, making a total of 22.47ha. Although there is a group of farm buildings, there is no dwelling on the holding, and the Appellants explained that the farmstead was built as a secondary unit for nearby farms. Gaitbarrow Farm is a livestock operation, raising sheep, pigs and poultry.
15. The main parties agree that an annual labour input of 1,900 hours³ indicates a requirement for a full-time worker. A series of labour assessments have been produced on behalf of the Appellants in connection with the proposal. The most recent was prepared for the position at the date of the hearing, and calculates a labour input of 2,079.6 hours per year⁴. The LPA's agricultural consultants argued that the labour requirement for lambs and tups (550.2 hours) is already taken into account in calculating the requirement for ewes and rams (842.4 hours). They also pointed out that a flat rate of 2.3 hours had been used for weaner pigs. As some young pigs would be likely to be below 20kg and some to be 20kg or more at any one time, the LPA's position was that the lower labour rate of 0.2 hours should be applied to half the number of weaners. Moreover, as weaners have a life of six months, and would not be on the farm throughout the year, the labour input should be reduced accordingly.
16. The Appellants explained that both the sheep and pigs required much attention, and maintained that no double-counting of sheep labour requirements had taken place. However, given that the Appellants raise their own weaner pigs, I agree with the LPA that the assessment should take into account the labour rate for the pigs below 20kg. That consideration alone would bring the annual labour requirement down to 1,890.6 hours per year, below the 1,900 hours threshold for a full-time worker. The Appellants did not dispute the length of time weaners are normally on the farm, a factor which further reduces the annual labour requirement.
17. It is clear from the two earlier labour assessments and evidence given on behalf of the Appellants that the number of stock on the farm fluctuates, and it

³ The labour requirement for a full-time worker is taken from The Farm Management Handbook by SAC Consulting.

⁴ The second schedule in Document 4.

was suggested that present stock levels are probably as low as they are likely to be. That said, the labour input for weaners appears excessive, and, even disregarding the argument about double-counting in respect of sheep, the evidence before me indicates a total labour requirement which is likely to be clearly less than that equating to the time of a full-time worker.

18. I note that the labour requirement would increase markedly if the Appellants were able to take on a pig rearing contract. It was pointed out that, whilst a contract had been offered to the Appellants, no producer would enter into such an arrangement without a presence on site throughout the day and night. I understand that the Appellants see the lack of a dwelling as being a constraint on their development of the business. Although Policy AS01 of the AONB DPD provides for development in the open countryside which would help to sustain an existing business, it would not be appropriate for a permanent agricultural workers dwelling to be justified on the basis of potential activities about which there cannot be certainty, rather than on the extent of existing operations at the farm.
19. Policy DM10 of the Local Plan Part Two sets out criteria for assessing proposals to provide accommodation for rural workers, the first of which is that there must be a clearly identified existing functional need. Further detail is provided in Appendix F, which explains that a functional test is necessary to establish whether it is essential for one or more workers to be readily available at most times. The provision of essential care for animals at short notice is given as an example of such a situation.
20. The main parties agree that there is a requirement for someone to be available for most of the time during the lambing season. This is a specific period of the year, referred to by the LPA's consultants as lasting for 8-10 weeks. They also suggested that temporary accommodation could be used during this time. The Appellants argued that there is also a need for a worker to be available when sows are farrowing as complications can occur, particularly in winter when some piglets may not find the infra-red heat source and, in consequence, may not survive low temperatures. That position was disputed by the LPA's consultants who advised that sows are generally able to farrow by themselves, and that, in any event, it is possible to predict when farrowing will occur. It is the Appellants' evidence that their sows would each produce two litters each year. There are only six sows at present, and, even if litters produced by different sows do not coincide, I do not consider that the number of times an overnight presence may be required to assist with farrowing would be significant.
21. I appreciate that the Appellants are involved throughout the year in many other activities on the holding, including dipping and shearing sheep, mucking out and feeding pigs, cleaning and feeding hens, and field work. However it is the lambing and farrowing which are most likely to necessitate work outside the normal working day, and this would be for a limited period.
22. The Appellants have referred to security concerns, and mentioned the loss of poultry to foxes, and instances of sheep worrying and rustling. I do not doubt that a residential presence on the farm would act as a deterrent to such incidents. Appendix 7 of the Local Plan Part Two acknowledges that the protection of livestock from theft or injury may contribute to animal welfare

grounds for the need for an agricultural worker's dwelling. It is not, though, a primary reason for such development.

23. On the evidence before me, and taking into account the value to the Appellants of greater security for livestock, I do not consider that it is essential for a full-time worker to be readily available at Gaitbarrow Farm at most times. Accordingly, the appeal proposal would fail to comply with criteria (i) and (ii) in Policy DM10 of the Local Plan Part Two. The Appellants refer to Gaitbarrow Farm as a sustainable family farm which only lacks a farmhouse, and point out that one of the aims of the AONB Management Plan is to promote sustainable agriculture. However, the construction of a dwelling in the open countryside intended to accommodate an agricultural worker, but where a functional need has not been demonstrated, would not represent a sustainable form of development, having regard to the provisions of the Development Plan and the NPPF concerning rural housing.
24. Criteria (iv) and (v) of Policy DM10 are concerned with the opportunity to provide accommodation in an existing dwelling or building on the farm, and with the availability of suitable accommodation in the area. There are no buildings at the farm which could be used to provide living accommodation. I heard that there is property for sale nearby at Brackenthwaite Farm, but the Appellants suggested that this was only available as a package including holiday accommodation. Although nearby, Brackenthwaite Farm is clearly separate from the farmstead at Gaitbarrow Farm, and the LPA did not provide evidence of any possible alternative suitable and available accommodation. Given my finding that there is not a functional need for an agricultural worker to be readily available at Gaitbarrow Farm at most times, the absence of alternative accommodation opportunities is not a factor which counts in favour of the appeal proposal.
25. I conclude that there is not an essential need for an agricultural worker's dwelling at Gaitbarrow Farm.

Whether Gaitbarrow Farm is sufficiently viable to support an agricultural worker

26. In the case of proposals for permanent dwellings for rural workers, Policy DM10 requires that the unit concerned is economically viable and has been established for at least three years. These are important considerations in assessing whether a permanent dwelling for an agricultural worker would be justified in an open countryside location where new housing is restricted. Gaitbarrow Farm has been operated by the Appellants since 2012, and the proposal meets the second test in criterion (iii) of Policy DM10.
27. Insofar as viability is concerned, the Appellants have submitted management accounts for the three years 2018/19 – 2020/21, which record net income increasing from £15,016 to £31,327. Although the Appellants argued that accounts in this form give a better indication of the financial health of the business than an alternative form of presentation, I share the reservations of the LPA that they do not show provision for depreciation or payment of a wage. I heard that the profit of the business equates to a wage, but no profit after depreciation is set out in these management accounts. Moreover the value of the increase in stock has the effect of reducing the amount of direct expenditure, and it thereby contributes to the calculated level of net income.

28. The Appellants disputed the LPA's suggestion that the salary of an agricultural worker would be about £30,000. It is not clear though that the net income figures in the management accounts would be sufficient to allow for depreciation and to pay an appropriate level of salary for one worker.
29. I am also concerned about intended arrangements for financing the proposed farmhouse and future investment. The Appellants explained that they had sufficient funds to pay for the construction of the house, and that money from the sale of their existing home would be available for investment in the farm. This intended use of personal funds casts further doubt as to whether the farming business is sustainable financially.
30. I conclude that the available information fails to demonstrate that Gaitbarow Farm would be sufficiently viable to support an agricultural worker.

Ancient woodland

31. An area of ancient semi-natural woodland extends to the north-west of the existing farm buildings⁵. The designated area includes open areas within and around the woodland. Construction of the proposed dwelling would take place on a grassed area close to the existing buildings, and would not necessitate the felling of any trees. However it is clear from comparison of the proposed site plan and the designation map that a large part of the house would be positioned within the ancient woodland as would the treatment plant and drainage field. Guidance from Natural England and the Forestry Commission⁶ seeks a buffer zone of at least 15m to protect ancient woodland. Neither the Appellants' Ecological Appraisal⁷ nor their Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA - Document 2) reflect the footprint of the proposed dwelling, and, although the AIA refers to root protection areas of nearby trees it does not acknowledge their inclusion within ancient woodland. The Ecological Appraisal incorrectly claims that the ancient woodland designation does not extend onto the area where the dwelling would be built.
32. Paragraph 175(c) of the NPPF refers to ancient woodlands as irreplaceable habitats, and makes clear that development which would result in their deterioration should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons (such as infrastructure projects providing a public benefit) and a suitable compensation strategy exists. It is not clear that a minimum 15m buffer zone would be achieved between the building and the nearest trees, and I share the concern of the LPA that construction work, involving ground compaction and disturbance to existing drainage conditions, could have an adverse impact on the ancient woodland. The intended position of the sewage treatment plant and the associated drainage field, although a grassed area, projects between trees. Whilst the LPA does not suggest that the use of a package treatment plant would be unacceptable in principle, and it accepts that the output would be appropriately treated for discharge into the wider environment, it refers to the potential impact of installing the system proposed on the trees, soils, and woodland drainage. I share this concern, since insufficient information has been provided about the proposed drainage system, in particular its dimensions and relationship with nearby trees. Given the sensitive nature of the ancient

⁵ A map showing the extent of the ancient woodland designation is included in Document 10.

⁶ Referred to in Natural England's consultation response to the planning application.

⁷ Appendix 4 to the Planning & Environmental Statement.

woodland environment, I do not consider that it would be appropriate to address these matters at a subsequent stage, through the use of conditions.

33. My attention was drawn to planning permission which had been granted for the erection of a covered midden and the extension to a building to house sheep handling pens. The position of the former structure would have been within the designated ancient woodland, but I heard that the permission had expired. The Appellants explained that ash die-back was present in the woodland and that a number of trees would need felling. That situation does not justify the prospect of additional harm to an ancient woodland.
34. I conclude that the proposal would be likely to have an adverse effect on the ancient woodland, a matter to which I attach significant weight. It would therefore conflict with Policy DM45 of the Local Plan Part Two which seeks to protect such habitats and with Policy AS04 of the AONB DPD.

Other matters

Sites of importance for biodiversity

35. The appeal site falls within the area covered by the Gait Barrows Limestone Pavement Order (LPO), and is within the Gait Barrows Limestone Pavement, Grassland and Woodland outside the SSSI/ NNR Biological Heritage Site (BHS), referred to by the LPA as important for its grassland and woodland. The Morecambe Bay Pavements Special Area of Conservation (SAC), the Gait Barrows Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the Gait Barrows National Nature Reserve (NNR) are all about 150m to the west of the site, and the Morecambe Bay & Duddon Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) is about 2.2km to the north-west.
36. The LPA has raised concerns about the potential effect of the drainage scheme on the LPO and the BHS, referring to the potential impact of installing the system proposed on soils, geology and existing drainage of the area. A geological report, prepared for the Appellants, records that at a depth of 60cm there was no evidence of the underlying bedrock, although I note that the treatment plant could require a deeper excavation of about 1m. The Appellants suggested that a watching brief could be required on a test pit to check for the presence of limestone, and that a type of treatment plant could be specified which is not fully buried. However, whilst I agree that the principle of a package treatment plant would not be unacceptable, in this sensitive location it is important that the effect of the drainage works can be fully assessed, and there is insufficient detail to enable this to be done. Consequently the proposal would conflict with Policy SP8 of the Local Plan Part One and Policy AS04 of the AONB DPD.
37. Because of the uncertainties concerning drainage, the LPA argued that it is not possible to rule out adverse effects on the nearby SAC/ SSSI and on the SPA. I do not share this concern. Given that the principle of a package treatment plant would not be unacceptable, and that there is no dispute about the quality of the output which could be achieved, I do not consider that the proposal would have a likely significant effect beyond its close surroundings.

Other schemes involving sewage treatment plants

38. The Appellants refer to several schemes involving sewage treatment plants which have received planning permission within the AONB. I have read that

biodiversity designations were also relevant to these developments. However each proposal must be judged on its own merits, and full details of the relationship of the sewage treatment plants to designated areas, in particular to ancient woodland, are not before me.

Personal security and security from theft

39. Mrs Tyson referred to occasions when one person is alone at the farm during the night, and I appreciate that that situation could give rise to feelings of vulnerability. I also heard that the farm had suffered several instances of theft of equipment and tools. Although these considerations are not part of the functional justification for a dwelling for a rural worker, a permanent residential presence would provide security benefits for the Appellants and their business, which merit moderate weight.

Lack of amenities

40. Gaitbarrow Farm has no toilet and no hot running water. It was explained that there is a need for a drying room and facilities for the preparation of food. The Appellants tried to hire a portable toilet during the covid-19 restrictions, but businesses providing this service were closed, and subsequently it was not possible to make a regular arrangement for cleaning such a facility. That does not mean that important amenities could not be installed separately from a dwelling, and I give limited weight to their absence.

Travelling to and from the farm

41. The Appellants make many journeys between their home and the farm. Although this is inconvenient, the distance is about 4km. There is reference to flooding on roads used to reach Gaitbarrow Farm, but no indication is given as to the frequency with which such incidents occur. The need to travel between the Appellants' home and the farm is a factor which carries limited weight in support of the proposal.

Alternative uses

42. It was suggested by the Appellant's son that, if the farm were unable to continue to function due to the absence of a dwelling at the site, the buildings may be used for less appropriate purposes such as caravan storage, or industrial or commercial activities, or that the land may be developed as a caravan site. For a fallback argument to carry weight there should be a real prospect of alternative development coming forward. There is no evidence to this effect, and this is not a matter which supports the appeal proposal.

Local support

43. Yealand Redmayne Parish Council, a local councillor and several individuals, including local residents, support the proposal, with references made to the importance of a dwelling for the operation of the farm and for security and the provision of amenities. These are all matters which I have taken into account in my consideration of the appeal proposal.

Conclusions

44. The appeal proposal would conflict with Policy DM10 of the Local Plan Part Two since it would fail to satisfy criteria relating to functional need, a full-time worker, and viability. Since the proposal does not meet the requirements for a

rural worker's dwelling, set out in Policy DM10 and paragraph 79(a) of the NPPF, it would also conflict with Policy DM4 of the Local Plan Part Two and Policy AS01 of the AONB DPD, and the site is not a sustainable location for residential development. The development would detract from the character and appearance of the AONB, contrary to Policy EN2 of the Local Plan Part One, Policy DM46 of the Local Plan Part Two and Policy AS02 of the AONB DPD, a matter of great weight. Because of its threat to the ancient woodland, which merits significant weight, and the potential effect of the drainage scheme on the LPO and BHS, the proposal would fail to comply with Policy DM45 of the Local Plan Part Two and Policy SP8 of the Local Plan Part One respectively, and with Policy AS04 of the AONB DPD. I find that the proposal would conflict with the Development Plan considered as a whole.

45. I acknowledge that the presence of a dwelling at the farm would improve personal security and reduce the risk of theft, a matter to which I attach moderate weight. It would also provide amenities to improve working conditions and end the inconvenience of repeated journeys to and from the Appellants' present home, but these are matters of limited weight. There is no wholly exceptional reason to justify the prospect of deterioration to an area of ancient woodland, and, although reserved matters for landscaping could include additional tree planting, there is no suitable compensation strategy as required by the NPPF.
46. The benefits of the proposed development are insufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified, and do not indicate that a decision on this appeal should be taken other than in accordance with the Development Plan.
47. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, including the suggested conditions, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Clegg

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANTS:

Ms J Liddle MRICS FAAV	Director, Robson & Liddle (Rural) Ltd.
Mr P Tyson	Joint Appellant.
Mrs L Tyson	Joint Appellant.
Mr B Tyson	Son of the Appellants.
Ms L Berridge	Friend of the Appellants and volunteer worker at Gaitbarrow Farm.

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr R Clarke BSc(Hons)	Planning Officer, Lancaster City Council.
Mr K Dhillon BSc(Hons) PgCert MTRPI	Associate Director Planning, ADAS.
Mr J Atkinson BA(Hons)	Planning Consultant, ADAS.
Mr I Snowden BSc(Hons) CMgr MIAgrM	Senior Agricultural Consultant, ADAS.

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Councillor J Greenwell	Member of and representing Yealand Redmayne Parish Council, and Member of Lancaster City Council for Silverdale Ward.
------------------------	---

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Policy DM60 of the Development Management DPD.
- 2 Arboricultural Impact Assessment with Method Statement by DHA Trees Ltd, 8 January 2019.
- 3 Planning for Ancient Woodland, The Woodland Trust, 2019.
- 4 Revised schedules of labour requirements for Gaitbarrow Farm. Submitted by Ms Liddle.
- 5 Extract from The Farm Management Handbook, SAC Consulting. Submitted by Mr Clarke.
- 6 Mr B Tyson's statement.
- 7 Ms Berridges's statement.
- 8 Mrs Tyson's statement.
- 9 Mr P Tyson's statement.
- 10 Bundle of maps showing nature conservation designations in the vicinity of the appeal site.
- 11 Gaitbarrow Farm accounts 2020-21. Submitted on behalf of the Appellants.
- 12 Ms Liddle's closing statement.