



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by Mr Cullum Parker BA(Hons) PGCert MA MRTPI MCMI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/W/21/3284980

Thoby Priory, Thoby Lane, Mountnessing, Brentwood, Essex CM15 0TB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (TCPA) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Aliona Cojan of Europevans against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01142/FUL, dated 19 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 April 2021.
 - The development is described on the application form as '*proposed site alterations inc. replacement & new hardstanding, shelving and cover to work area*'.
 - The development is described on the appeal form as: '*Construct covered work area, free standing shelving units enclosed with open fronted structure for car part storage, double height portacabin for office use, detached waiting room/welfare unit, 2 tensile covers and 2 x hybrid scaffold structures with double storey container sides, construct U shaped hardstanding for vehicle storage and dismantling, change of use from B8 Storage to Breakers yard (Sui Generis) (Retrospective).*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the application was determined by the local planning authority, it has adopted the *Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033* (BLP) which now forms the adopted development plan for the area. The parties were given until 14 December 2022 to make any observations on this. I have proceeded on the basis that this forms the relevant local plan.
3. The main parties have both explained their views on whether part of the appeal site benefits from a lawful use – for example through possession of a scrap metal dealer's licence. There is an absence of a Certificate of Lawfulness which would provide a greater level of certainty in terms of lawful use in planning terms. However, the lawfulness of such use is not a matter before me: rightly being one for the main parties to clarify separately. I have proceeded on the basis of determining the acceptability of the appeal scheme through consideration under s78 of the TCPA.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - (i) Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, including any impact on openness, having regard to the

National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies;

- (ii) The effect of the development on heritage assets; specifically the Thoby Priory schedule monument, the Grade II listed building Thoby Priory Ruins, and archaeology, and;
- (iii) The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the location, and;
- (iv) The effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, including those at Thoby Priory, and;
- (v) The effect of the development on pollution and/or contamination risks, and;
- (vi) Whether the proposal provides adequate parking arrangements for employees, and;
- (vii) If there is any harm arising by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, whether this is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development

5. Policy MG02 of the BLP sets out that all development proposals within the Green Belt will be considered and assessed in accordance with the provisions of national planning policy. The Framework sets out national policy on Green Belts and is an important material consideration. Paragraph 147 of the Framework indicates that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraphs 149 and 150 of the Framework indicate limited exceptions to inappropriate development.
6. Whilst not clearly set out by the Appellant, the main exceptions in this instance which might apply are contained in Paragraph 149 d) the replacement of a building provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces, and g) the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt.
7. There are also other forms of development which are exceptions; provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it including that at Paragraph 150 e) material changes in the use of land.
8. It is clear from drawing 20-214 01, labelled Site and Location Plans, that the appeal scheme seeks permission for the removal of four small rectangular-shaped structures and the erection of two tensile covered areas, an uncovered storage area, hybrid scaffold and container structures, shelving units, and Portakabin and container structures. These buildings and structures have a height of between one and two storeys and have a considerably larger footprint than the previous structures shown on the drawings.

9. The plans also show the laying down of an elongated u-shaped area of hardstanding with further area labelled 'storage'. The application form indicates that existing hard-standing is crushed hardcore, and that proposed would be to match existing. However, I saw during my site inspection that a large area of the hardstanding, included that on the elongated U-shaped area, is formed of laid concrete.
10. In terms of Paragraph 149 d), the replacement buildings in this case are materially larger than those they replace. This is both in terms of height and their footprints. As such, the scheme does not benefit from this exception.
11. In terms of openness in relation to 149 g) and 150 e), the scheme seeks the replacement of four smaller units with at least seven significantly larger structures. These 'new' structures have considerably larger footprints compared to those labelled as 'to be removed'. Moreover, the structures and buildings for which permission is sought are, in some instances, more than one storey in height. In practical terms, where openness is typically considered as an absence of built form, the appeal scheme has resulted in an erosion of the openness of the Green Belt.
12. Furthermore, as set out in Paragraph 138, Green Belt serves five purposes including 'to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'. The scheme here encroaches into the countryside – through the erection of a number of buildings and shelving areas, the laying of concrete and/or hardstanding, and the use of large sections of the site for the storage of vehicles and vehicle parts. As such it fails to comply with this purpose of the Green Belt.
13. Accordingly, the proposal would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt as it does not fall within one of the exceptions set out in Paragraphs 149 and 150 of the Framework. For similar reasons it does not accord with Policy MG02 of the BLP.

Effect on heritage assets

14. The appeal site is located within and to the north of the scheduled monument known as 'Thoby Priory'. Scheduled monuments are amongst the highest order of designated heritage assets. Thoby Priory Ruins are also a Grade II listed building¹. The comments from Historic England, the government's adviser on the historic environment set out:
15. *'The scheduled monument comprises the archaeological remains of an Augustinian Priory dating from the 14th and 15th centuries. The priory was founded in the first half of the 12th century and suppressed in 1525. The scheduled monument includes a section of wall, circa 15 metres long E to W, which is believed to be the south wall of the presbytery. The wall includes two windows and two-centre arches. The remainder of the priory is (potentially) survives as below-ground archaeological remains.'*
16. *'The significance of the scheduled monument lies in a combination of its surviving upstanding remains which have architectural interest and aesthetic value, archaeological potential in surviving below-ground archaeological remains and in its historical value with supporting documentary evidence for its history and development.'*

¹ Appellant's Heritage Statement for Thoby Priory, Mountnessing, Page 2

17. On the basis of the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree with this analysis. Indeed, the visible remains above ground act as a portal to understanding and appreciating the wider monastic use of the appeal site and its surrounds. They also portend to the significance of the wider site in terms of the limited knowledge of the potential surviving below-ground archaeological remains; including those within and outside of the scheduled monument area. This former monastic use, from the C12th through to its suppression in around 1525, forms an important feature of the socio-economic history of this part of Essex during the later medieval period.
18. Unfortunately, at the time of my site inspection, I saw that the arch forming the 'Priory Ruin West Window'² shown on pages 9 and 10 of the Appellant's Heritage Statement has suffered significant collapse. All that remains upstanding from this window is a tiny part of the inner stonework and some clunch surround.
19. It is not possible to determine how this damage to the designated heritage asset, which is both a scheduled monument and listed building, has occurred. It is a matter for the local planning authority and other bodies, such as Historic England, to determine how this could be resolved. Nonetheless, in accordance with Paragraph 196 of the Framework, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision. I have proceeded in this manner.
20. As set out in the Appellant's Heritage Statement³, a 1923 Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments (RCHM) survey of Thoby Priory House and Priory Ruins identified that the nave and presbytery were likely located to the north of the remaining wall. This is further supported by the CgMs Archaeological Desk based assessment⁴ undertaken in September 2014 in which Trench 15 of the 2002 investigation revealed *'the structural remains of the chancel, a northern nave arch and a probable north aisle foundation'*.
21. This trench is approximately in part of the area covered by tensile cover 2 and the adjacent covered shelving. These were areas that, in the main, were not previously covered by structures as shown in the aerial photography within the Heritage Statement. The Appellant asserts that the 'no-dig' nature of the structures and the fact that it is not necessary to alter any identified historic fabric mean that the proposal is acceptable⁵.
22. Nonetheless, as pointed out by Historic England, the photos on pages 9 and 10 of the Heritage Statement show a difference in the ground levels on either side of the 'Heras' fencing and what appears to be cleared soil from behind the area where the tensile cover 2 and adjacent shelving have been erected. This would suggest that whilst the structures themselves might be 'no-dig' to facilitate their erection they have required some groundworks to take place.
23. These are groundworks which have preceded the opportunity to undertake archaeological field work, in both the area of the scheduled monument and adjacent areas, to better reveal the significance of the designated heritage

² Whilst referred to as 'West Window' this lies within the south wall.

³ Ibid, Page 6

⁴ See pages 8-12 of Appellant's Heritage Statement. Copy of this 2014 desk based assessment has not been supplied.

⁵ Though I note that the Heritage Statement does not conclude on whether the proposal would result in any harm to the heritage asset, and if so to what degree, as set out clearly in the Framework section on Conserving the Historic Environment.

asset. There is also little evidence of what further archaeological evaluation has taken place by the Appellant, if any, to assess the impact of any works on the significance of buried archaeological remains, which they identify within their Heritage Statement as having or potentially having high historical and archaeological value.

24. Indeed, the submitted information from the Appellant is characterised by a paucity of any significant detail of the archaeology of the site – whether within the area of the scheduled monument or in close proximity to it. For example, beyond the limited drawing from the 1923 RCHM survey on page 6 of the Heritage Statement referring to the presbytery and site of nave, there is little detail of the wider monastic complex. There is no detailed analysis or understanding about the location of other typical monastic structures such as the chapter house, kitchen, cloister, Abbot's/Prior's lodgings, infirmary or dormitory 'dorter' areas, or if these were present on this site. Whilst such remains are likely to be limited to subterranean building foundations, given the buttress-like projection on the south-eastern corner of the presbytery it is logical to assume that a large part of the monastic complex is located to the north of the listed building and scheduled monument ruins.
25. Historic England point out that '*Any fragile archaeological remains can be disturbed and damaged by compression and compaction – they can be damaged by the weight of the concrete apron and storage facilities erected on the site, as well as damaged by machinery during construction works.*' I saw during my site inspection that large parts of the site are covered by concrete apron(s) on which are stored parts for motor vehicles. As such, there is an extremely high likelihood that both the construction and the continued use of the concrete aprons and storage facilities and structures will have had an adverse impact on any surviving underground archaeological remains.
26. The Framework sets out that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). It goes on to set out that any harm, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification⁶.
27. In this respect, future visitors to the site are unable to view the above-ground upstanding ruins given the erection of two structures directly to the north of these and the large area of uncovered shelving used for tyres adjacent to tensile covered area 2. As such, it is difficult to appreciate their architectural and aesthetic interest from which their significance derives. This includes the important and lasting contribution they make to viewers being able to understand the historic use of the site and wider environs as part of a C12th monastic complex.
28. The effective result of the appeal scheme is that the remaining wall of the historic priory with its important window arch, which is a key element of its special architectural and historic interest⁷, being relegated to a freestanding

⁶ Framework Paragraphs 199 & 200

⁷ *Planning Practice Guidance* Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 18a-018-20190723 Revision date: 23 07 2019
<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/conserving-and-enhancing-the-historic-environment#decision-making-historic-environment>

wall without any obvious connection to the monastic history of the site. Visitors are no longer able to experience the connection between the Grade II Listed Building and scheduled monument, and the remaining archaeology (whether through the documented record or in situ). This results in material harm to the setting of the ruins as a scheduled monument and listed building.

29. I find, therefore, that the appeal scheme has a very significant negative impact on heritage assets in the form of the scheduled ancient monument, grade II listed building (including its setting), and on potential archaeological remains. As such, it fails to preserve the special interest of the listed building, the statutory duty as set out in s66(1) of the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*, as amended. Indeed, this harm to significance would, in my judgement, be of such a magnitude that their significance has been either vitiated altogether or very much reduced.
30. For the reasons given above, as a matter of planning judgment, I find that the scheme results in substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets in this case. Paragraph 201 of the Framework sets out that where a proposal will lead to substantial harm local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless the substantial harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm, or all of certain criteria apply. In terms of the criteria a) to d) none of these apply in this instance. For example, criterion a) the nature of the heritage asset does not prevent all reasonable uses of the site.
31. In terms of public benefits, whilst the Appellant has identified that there would be 'less than substantial harm'⁸ there are no public benefits cited which they consider would outweigh this harm. I note that, more broadly, there are some public benefits in terms of job creation. I also note that the Appellant indicates that there has been no further breaking of ground on the site and that the development located around the scheduled monument is 'temporary'. However this suggestion is tempered by the fact that it omits any detail that compression of underground archaeology is or has not occurred and that there is no mechanism to secure the removal of the structures and buildings within any such temporary timeframe. The public benefits cited in this case are therefore of very limited weight, and manifestly insufficient to outweigh the substantial harm arising to the heritage assets identified.
32. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy BE16 of the BLP, which, amongst other aims, seeks to give great weight to the preservation of designated heritage assets and their settings, and assess less than substantial and substantial harm in accordance with the statutory framework and national planning policy. For similar reasons, the proposal would conflict with the Policies of the Framework set out in Section 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Effect on character and appearance

33. The main parties agree that at least part of the site comprises Grade 2 (Very Good) agricultural land⁹. I also saw during my site inspection that, as the Appellant suggests, the site is in 'a largely isolated and rural in nature' location¹⁰ and that the site is 'surrounded by commercial scrap yards and

⁸ Appellant Statement of Case, pages 13-14

⁹ Ibid, pages 14-15

¹⁰ Planning Design and Access Statement, page 3

similar agricultural uses'¹¹. It is unclear from the submitted evidence how the use of the site as 'storage' altered its appearance from its previous use. Beside aerial photos from the 1950s in the Heritage Statement and an aerial photo of site in Figure 1 of the Planning Design and Access (PDA) Statement, there is extremely limited information as to the appearance of the site before the works for which permission is sought took place.

34. Nonetheless, the appeal development seeks permission for the introduction of a number of buildings, including at two-storey height, and the increase of areas of hardstanding, in addition to the loss of at least one tree. The cumulative impact of these changes is that the character of formerly green site area (compared to historic photos and the surrounding area) has become distinctly urbanised.
35. This change in the character and appearance of the site, including the southern area, and erosion of its former rural appearance has resulted in an adverse impact on the green infrastructure of the area. This is harm which is further exacerbated by the juxtaposition between the current appearance of the appeal site, and the wider Special Landscape Area which is generally characterised by open agricultural fields, and the highly contrasting nature of the appeal site arising from its use as a breakers yard.
36. Accordingly, the development conflicts with Policy NE02 of the BLP which sets out that '*Brentwood's network of green ... infrastructure will be protected, enhanced and managed to provide a multi-functional, high quality open space resource, capable of delivering opportunities for recreation, health and wellbeing, ecological connectivity, biodiversity net-gain as well as wider ecosystem services for climate change adaption*' and Policy BE14 of the BLP which sets out that '*proposals will be required to meet high design standards ... and that proposals should respond positively and sympathetically to their context and retain or enhance features which make a positive contribution to the character, appearance or significance of the local area (including natural and heritage assets)*'.

Living conditions

37. To the immediate south of the appeal site is the residential building known as 'Thoby Priory' as shown on drawing 20-214 01 Rev A. No noise assessment has been submitted to set out what noise and disturbance might arise from the use sought. It was clear during my site inspection that whilst large areas of the site are used for storage of vehicles and/or their parts – including both covered and uncovered areas of shelving and areas where items are stored on the ground – the activity to remove the parts from the vehicles also appears to take place on site.
38. I acknowledge the Appellant's point that conditions could be used to control the hours of operation of the site. Nonetheless, this does not address how noise from the breaking-up of vehicles could or would be mitigated within any such operating hours. Such activities would take place either within the tensile buildings, other buildings on the site which are principally covered by corrugated sheeting or in the open. All are environments which are not conducive to containing sound.

¹¹ Ibid, page 14

39. In the absence of a noise assessment and any detailed mitigation measures, I cannot be certain that the use for which permission is sought would not have an adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers; including those at Thoby Priory.
40. As such, the proposal would conflict with Policy BE14 of the BLP, which, amongst other aims, seeks to ensure that proposals respond positively and sympathetically to their context. It would also conflict with Paragraph 174 of the Framework, which indicates that planning decisions should contribute and enhance the local environment by preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of noise pollution.

Pollution impacts

41. The potential impact arising from pollution risk is two-fold. Firstly, as advised by the Council's Environmental Health Team, there is a need to provide separate toilet facilities on the site. The application form indicates that the existing number of employees is five full time equivalent (FTE). The proposed number of employees is shown as 56 FTE. The provision of toilet facilities for employees is not shown on the submitted drawings. It is unclear as to how foul wastewater, which would be created from an over 10 ten-fold increase in employees on site, would be either treated and/or disposed so as to not have an adverse impact on local groundwater or quality of surface water.
42. Secondly, little detail as to the potential contamination arising from the vehicle breaking up has been provided. It is unclear as to where and how oils, fuels and other substances that might likely arise from the new use would be stored and disposed of so as to not pollute local groundwater and/or soils. The Planning Design and Access (PDA) Statement suggests that rainwater run off would be collected in an existing 30'000 litre capacity water tank; though little detail of this and calculations as to whether this capacity is adequate have been provided.
43. Moreover, no details of the 'permeable surfaces' referred to in the PDA Statement at page 18 have been provided. As noted elsewhere in this decision, during my site inspection I saw that a large part of the 'existing' and proposed hardstanding area appeared to be formed of laid concrete, which is typically an impermeable surface material, rather than crushed hardcore as suggested in the application form. There also did not appear to be any obvious channelling solutions so that surface water run-off would be directed to any pre-existing water storage tanks.
44. Accordingly, in light of the limited information before me, I find that the appeal scheme has an adverse impact on pollution and/or contamination risks. As such, it is contrary to Policy NE10 of the BLP which, amongst other aims, seeks to only grant planning permission for developments where the Council is satisfied that any risks, including to human health and the environment can be adequately addressed in order to make the development safe, and that there will be no adverse impact on the environment and quality of local groundwater or surface water.
45. The scheme also conflicts with Paragraph 174 e) of the Framework which sets out that planning decisions should contribute and enhance the local environment by preventing new and existing development from contributing to,

being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, or water pollution and development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality.

Parking

46. With regard to parking matters, I note that the Council's Highway Team identify that the level of car parking appears insufficient for the number of employees expected at the site (in the region of 56 FTE). The application form indicates that there is no change in the number of 10 spaces provided on the appeal site. However, the submitted drawings do not detail where these spaces are provided on the appeal site. During my site visit there were no obvious marked out parking bays within the red line site area.
47. Paragraph 104 e) of the Framework sets out that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of development proposals so that parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes. Whilst the Appellant suggests that a minibus service is provided for employees, there is hardly any evidence of how this is provided or would be secured over the lifetime of the development, or take into account the proposed increase in number of employees on the site.
48. I note the suggestion that there is an unmade road of around 600 metres from the highway at Thoby Lane which could be used by employees to park vehicles. Nonetheless, this lies outside of the appeal site area and it is unclear as to what permission might or might not be required for vehicles to be parked there for extended periods. In the absence of some form of transport assessment and/or transport plan it is unclear as to how the appeal scheme provides an integral parking and transport solution associated with the change of use sought and the considerable increase in employees likely to be operating on the appeal site.
49. I therefore find that the scheme would conflict with Policies BE12 and BE13 of the BLP, which, amongst other aims, seeks to ensure that development proposals take account of the Essex Parking Standards and that new development proposal will be required to be supported by travel plans, transport assessments and/or statements. It would also conflict with the aforesaid Paragraph 104 of the Framework.

Other considerations

50. The Appellant considers that the following considerations provide the very special circumstances to justify it to be permitted in Green Belt terms.
51. In terms of improving site safety and business operation through tidying of the site, there is limited information as to how the site was laid out prior to the works and change of use taking place. Moreover, as considered elsewhere in this decision, there is very limited information on matters such as pollution control and parking, which are themselves part of the consideration of safety matters. This factor is therefore afforded medium weight in favour of the development.
52. The scheme has resulted in the creation of around 56 FTE jobs and is a rural business, which local and national planning policy supports. I also acknowledge the significant economic benefits this can create for the both the

local and regional economy. This factor is afforded considerable weight in favour of the scheme.

53. In terms of the suggested 'temporary' nature of the structures erected, whilst I note that they are unlikely to have substantial foundations compared to other buildings, they are nonetheless located on areas of hardstanding. There is also a large area of hardstanding for which permission is sought, yet no effective mechanism suggested to secure the removal of this 'temporary' surfacing material. This factor is afforded minimal weight in favour of the scheme.
54. With regard to the development reducing the spread of buildings and improving the visual appearance of the site within the Green Belt and, thus, its openness, I disagree. I have found that the various structures, which have both a greater land coverage and vertical emphasis, would erode the openness of the Green Belt. Moreover, they act as a proliferation of built form within the Green Belt. This is not, therefore, a positive factor that weighs in favour of the scheme.
55. Similarly, I note the point made that the site is not surrounded by any settlements with no views being available of the site. Therefore, the Appellant suggests, that even though it is located in the Green Belt, the proposed buildings will have no adverse impact on the objectives in which Green Belt policy sought to protect. However, I have found above that the scheme does have an adverse impact on the objectives of the Green Belt. Accordingly, this factor is not a positive one that weighs in favour of the development.
56. Lastly, the Appellant suggests that the scheme provides an opportunity for the council to attach conditions controlling certain aspects of operation or specific landscaping requirements which, in their view, would improve the site and its use. However, the plan-led system, as its name suggests, should be plan-led; and this is not only in terms of planning for an area through a local plan, but through the careful planning of proposals for development. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and creates better places in which to live and work.
57. In this case, no detailed landscaping scheme has been suggested by the Appellant and in the absence of such details at the application stage, it is unclear as to where, if anywhere, on the appeal site, landscaping could be implemented so as to 'improve' the site. Moreover, it would be open to the Appellant to implement a landscaping scheme regardless of whether permission was sought to change the use of the land from storage to a *sui generis* breakers yard. This factor is therefore afforded miniscule weight in favour of the proposal.

Other Matters

58. My attention has been drawn to an outline application for the appeal site relating to a residential development (Ref: 15/00527/OUT). I understand that this has not yet been determined. Nonetheless, this does not provide justification for the approval of the scheme before me, which I have considered on its own planning merits.

Conclusion

59. Paragraph 148 of the Framework requires decision-makers to ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. In this case the

proposal is inappropriate development and would reduce openness of the Green Belt.

60. Other considerations weighing in favour of the development must clearly outweigh this harm. Principal among these are; the tidying of the site, the economic benefits, the temporary nature of the structures, and the potential to implement a landscaping scheme. Whilst I acknowledge these, and all other considerations put forward by the appellant, Paragraph 148 makes clear that all development in the Green Belt is subject to stringent national planning policy tests, which I have applied.
61. In light of this, I conclude that those considerations put forward which weigh in favour of the proposal fail to clearly outweigh the substantial harm by reason of inappropriateness. The very special circumstances needed to justify the proposal do not therefore arise.
62. Furthermore, the proposal would result in substantial harm to a number of designated heritage assets which would not be outweighed by substantial public benefits. There is also harm arising to character and appearance, the living conditions of nearby occupiers, from potential water and/or soil pollution and/or contamination risks, and in terms of a lack of identified parking provision on the appeal site.
63. The appeal scheme therefore conflicts with the adopted development plan for the area, and also the Policies of the Framework which is an important material consideration, and there are no material considerations indicating a decision otherwise than in accordance with the adopted development plan.
64. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Parker

INSPECTOR