



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2023

by J Moore BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W2845/W/23/3317450

**Glebe Barn Stables, Blakesley Road, Maidford, Towcester,
Northamptonshire NN12 8HN**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Heather Kemp against West Northamptonshire Council.
- The application Ref WNS/2022/2131/FUL, is dated 21 October 2022.
- The development proposed is mobile home.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for mobile home at Glebe Barn Stables, Blakesley Road, Maidford, Towcester, Northamptonshire NN12 8HN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref WNS/2022/2131/FUL, dated 25 October 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The occupation of the dwelling shall be limited to a person solely or mainly employed or last employed in the business operating from the site currently known as Glebe Barn Stables as edged in red on the plan ref: *Site Location Plan received 11 July 2019* previously approved under planning permission ref: S/2019/1385/MAF on 12 December 2019, or a widow or widower or surviving civil partner of such a person, and to any resident dependants.

Preliminary Matters

2. No statement of case has been submitted by the Council and no development plan policies have been put forward for my consideration. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the evidence before me and the National Planning Policy Framework, December 2023 (the Framework).
3. The appeal site benefits from planning permission ref: S/2019/1385/MAF, for *Temporary consent (3 years) for a mobile home to provide capable guardianship over the site* at Glebe Lands, Blakesley Road, Maidford NN12 8HN granted 12 December 2019 (the temporary permission). During the appeal, the Council provided a copy of the decision notice and approved plans for the temporary permission, to include a plan defining the site of the business. I am satisfied that the mobile home is sited in accordance with the temporary permission. The appellant states that other conditions attached to the temporary permission have been discharged, and I find no reason to consider otherwise.
4. The proposal before me was originally described as '*Retention of Park Home*'. The description of development in my banner heading and formal decision

above reflects that of the temporary permission, excluding words that are not acts of development. While the address of the proposal before me differs slightly to that of the temporary permission, I am satisfied that Glebe Barn Stables is the current name of the business where the mobile home is situated.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the mobile home is in accordance with the Framework.

Reasons

6. The mobile home is located on land that forms part of an equestrian business known as Glebe Barn Stables. The front elevation faces buildings which were clearly in equestrian use at my visit, and the rear elevation faces extensive paddock land occupied by horses. Windows to all elevations allow surveillance of the land, buildings and access track serving the business. The appellant states that the occupier of the mobile home is an employee of the equestrian business which is focussed on the training of racehorses. I find no reason to consider otherwise.
7. The appellant states that the original consent was granted in light of an agricultural appraisal and financial forecast, ecological appraisal and concerns regarding crime. The decision notice for the temporary permission supports this position. Furthermore, a representation from Northamptonshire Police confirms their support for the retention of the mobile home as a means of active surveillance and guardianship following a series of criminal activities.
8. Paragraph 84 of the Framework states that planning decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside. The exception under sub-paragraph a) concerns circumstances where there is an essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside. Having regard to all of the above, and with no evidence to indicate otherwise, I am satisfied that the mobile home meets this exception, and that it accords with the Framework as a whole.

Conditions

9. I have considered the conditions applied to the temporary permission, the appellant's comments and in light of Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed an occupancy condition, without which the development would not be acceptable in planning terms. This condition references the approved plan of the temporary permission, which defines the site of the business.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission should be granted subject to the condition I have set out.

J Moore

INSPECTOR