



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 1 July 2024

by Ben Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2024

Appeal A Ref: APP/D3125/W/23/3326709

Land at Burleigh Wood, Cassington Road, Bladon, Oxfordshire OX20 1RX

- 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 The Bushcraft Company Ltd C/O agent against the decision of West Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 22/03502/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as "Retrospective application for continued use of land for outdoor adventure camping for 22 weeks per calendar year between the 1st May to 2nd October, including camp areas, kitchen areas, storage areas, shower and toilet areas, drop off and turning areas".
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/D3125/W/23/3326710

land Northeast of Burleigh Lodge, Cassington Road, Bladon, Oxfordshire OX20 1RX

- 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 The Bushcraft Company Ltd C/O agent against the decision of West Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 22/03501/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as "Retrospective application for continued use of land for outdoor adventure camping for 22 weeks per calendar year between the 1st May to 2nd October, including camp areas, kitchen areas, storage areas, shower and toilet areas, drop off and turning areas".
-

Decision

1. Both appeals A and B are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal relates to two proposals, both for the same use, that would take place on two separate but adjoining sites. Appeal A relates to an area of woodland and open areas to the east of Cassington Road and appeal B relates to a woodland area to the west of the Road. Purely for convenience I shall refer to these sites as 'Site 1' and 'Site 2' respectively. The proposal at Site 2 was refused due to the impact on the Green Belt and an ancient woodland. The proposal for Site 1 was refused for these reasons and in addition it was deemed that the proposal would affect protected species and the area's landscape character. Where relevant I will discuss the effects of each scheme separately and elsewhere, together, where they have shared/similar effects.
3. The description of development refers to both proposals as being retrospective. It appears that both Sites 1 and 2 were being used for the proposed use since May 2022. However, the Appellant recently indicated that the use has ceased

awaiting the outcome of the appeals. During my visit, on a weekday when the activity was reported to take place, I saw no evidence that the use was currently active. The Appellant's Design and Access statement explains that all temporary facilities and buildings are proposed to be removed from the site each year on 2 October. However, during my visit many of the associated buildings, especially with respect to the demountable buildings of Site 2, were still in situ. Nonetheless, it appears that the use has ceased for the moment. Therefore, I have not considered the proposal associated with appeals A or B as being retrospective.

Main Issues

4. The main issues for appeals A and B are:
 - whether each proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and its effect on the openness of the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) and any relevant development plan policies;
 - the effect of each proposed development on irreplaceable habitat within the ancient woodland.
5. The main issues, only relevant to Appeal A, are:
 - the impact on the proposal on protected species, with particular regard to Great Crested Newts; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
6. Finally, with respect to appeals A and B if either, or both proposals, are found to be inappropriate development, a further issue would be whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to very special circumstances to justify it.

Reasons

Inappropriate development

7. The appeal sites are within the Oxford Green Belt. The development plan for the district includes the West Oxfordshire District Local Plan [2018](LP). LP policy OS2 establishes, *inter alia*, that all development in the Green Belt should comply with national policies. Furthermore, LP policy EW10, relating to the Eynsham-Woodstock Sub-Area identifies, among other matters, that development is required to protect the Green Belt.
8. The Framework explains, at paragraph 143, that the Green Belt serves five purposes. These are to check unrestricted sprawl, prevent towns merging, to safeguard the countryside from encroachment, to preserve the special character of historic towns and to assist in urban regeneration.
9. The Framework also explains that the Government attaches great importance to the Green Belt and that substantial weight is to be afforded to any harm. Paragraph 154, of the Framework, establishes that new buildings would be inappropriate development unless it would meet certain criteria. Part (b) allows for the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with a change of use) for a number of activities including outdoor recreation, provided the facilities

preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Furthermore, paragraph 155(e) relates to material changes of use, such as outdoor recreation. This would not be deemed to be inappropriate, provided it would preserve the openness of the Green Belt, and not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

10. The proposed use would be associated with the Bushcraft Company, delivering outdoor adventure for schools. Whilst the use includes components that could be regarded as tourist or education related, its primary purpose would be outdoor recreation, thus meeting the first parts of paragraph 154(b) and paragraph 155(e). The openness of the Green Belt has both spatial and visual dimensions.

Appeal A – Site 1

11. Within the woodland of Site 1 the proposed use would consist of four camps, two staff camps, two activity areas, a shower zone and a welcome area. A car park is also proposed, and has been constructed, to the side of the woodland which is enclosed by a post and rail fence. The appeal sites are largely within a woodland setting, obscuring distant views of the features associated with the use. However, locally the impact of the tents, temporary buildings and associated paraphernalia would combine to create a significant visual and spatial impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Moreover, the car park is a stark form of development that, whilst having a limited visual effect on the openness of the area, would spatially result in an encroachment of development into this countryside setting.
12. The constructed car park consists of a large expanse of hardstanding, within the corner of a former field. The Appellant indicates that around 160 students would attend the sites every week. Whilst outdoor recreation is not inappropriate in the Green Belt, the manner in which the proposed use would operate includes a number of coach arrivals and departures, deliveries and attending staff that would introduce a relatively intensive form of activity that would be of scale that would be commercial in character at busy periods. As such, the proposed use would have a material effect on the openness of the land on which it takes place for at least as long as it takes place.
13. In terms of associated facilities to the recreational use, the proposed activity would include a range of support structures. The shower and toilet units associated with the use would be temporary in nature, being readily demountable and proposed to be removed from site regularly. Consequently, these associated buildings would not amount to operational development.
14. However, the associated support buildings and related paraphernalia that, in combination with the hardstanding, would have a localised visual impact on the appeal site. The Associated features of the proposal, apart from the car park area, would be largely screened from distant views within the woodland setting. Nonetheless, the proposed use, associated demountable buildings and car park area would spatially erode the open character of the site. Therefore, the proposal associated with appeal A would have a moderately harmful impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

Appeal site B – Site 2

15. The appeal site of Site 2 proposes the use of an existing area of hardstanding as a small car park, temporary buildings associated with the welcome area, four camps, two activity areas, a kitchen camp and shower area.
16. This proposed activity of Site 2 would also include demountable structures, such as shower blocks and toilets that would not amount to operational development. Nonetheless, the existing hardstanding also accommodates a range of buildings including four storage containers, an office building, staff welfare building, accessible toilet, shower block and bin and bag storage area¹. Many of the larger buildings would not be considered as demountable structures. These would be deemed to be building operations that would require planning permission.
17. The Appellant asserts that the hardstanding has been historically used in association with a former logging activity and all buildings (apart from a metal storage container) have been on site for over four years and this will be confirmed by a Certificate of Lawful Use in due course, but I have not been informed of any update to this. As such, the status of the hardstanding and buildings is not fully established. These buildings are bulky additions to the site that are, in combination, dominant features that diminish the openness of the woodland.
18. In terms of the use of the site for recreational purposes, it is noted that most associated facilities and equipment would be removed from the site at the end of a season. However, the visual effects of the proposed use could linger even assuming clearance of the sites, with tracks created, flattened/compressed vegetation and other signs of damage to the landscape. By example, when undertaking my site visit, I observed that the Kitchen Camp (area 3) showed substantial signs of erosion and damage. The area was devoid of ground cover and consisted of compacted bare earth. Also, a dirt track with deep ruts marked the worn vehicular route to this cooking area. Whether or not this erosion was caused by the recent activity undertaken in association with the use, this clearly demonstrates the lasting effects of human activity within this woodland area.
19. Accordingly, the effect of the storage and office buildings, the associated demountable buildings, tents and other equipment and the attendant use of the site for camping purposes, when taken together, would substantially erode the openness of the site. Consequently, the proposal associated with appeal B would have a moderately harmful impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

Summary of the Green Belt issues for both sites

20. Accordingly, the visual effects of the proposed use, for both Sites 1 and 2, would be likely to remain within the site after the use has ceased. This visual impact would affect the openness of the Green Belt. The nature of the activity would, and has, created a lasting visual effect with tracks, the creation of new hardstanding (in association with Site 1) and other signs of human intrusion.
21. As such, although the proposed use would be temporary, the ongoing visual effect of the hardstanding and human activity would be evident within these sites. This intrusion into the Green Belt, taking all activity and development

¹ As shown on Reception and Drop off Plan 096-22-HBA-13

associated with the use into account, would represent an encroachment of development that would conflict with a main purpose of the Green Belt. This would be contrary to a fundamental aim of the Green Belt to keep land permanently open.

22. As it has not been demonstrated that the proposals for Sites 1 and 2 would preserve the openness of the Green Belt, and would result in encroachment, the proposals associated with Appeals A and B would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which are, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt.

Ancient woodland

23. Sites 1 and 2 are defined as ancient woodland by Natural England's Ancient Woodland (England) inventory [2023]. Ancient woodland can include ancient semi-natural woodland, plantations replanted with conifers or broad-leaved trees that retain ancient woodland features, such as undisturbed soil, ground flora and fungi. Paragraph 186, of the Framework, identifies that development resulting in the loss of irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons for such loss.
24. LP Policy EH3, with respect to biodiversity and geodiversity, seeks to protect and enhance the district's biodiversity and achieve an overall net gain in biodiversity. The policy explains this will be achieved through a series of measures including avoiding the loss, deterioration or harm to locally important wildlife sites and sites supporting irreplaceable habitats, except in exceptional circumstances. Such circumstances might be where the importance of the development significantly and demonstrably outweighs the harm and can be mitigated through appropriate measures and where net gain in biodiversity can be achieved.

Site 1 – ecology interests

25. In connection with Site 1, the Appellant's Preliminary Ecological Appraisal² identifies that the woodland consists of ancient and semi-natural woodland to the north and northwest parts of the site, with most of the rest identified as ancient-replanted woodland. The site is designated as the Bladon Heath Local Wildlife Site (LWS). The Appraisal found that the site would be suitable for bats, birds (including red kite and barn owls), dormouse although suboptimal, badger although no setts were found on site around the camps, Great crested newts and hedgehogs.
26. The locations of the proposed camps are within replanted woodland, being a combination of broadleaved, mixed, and coniferous woodland. The Appellant states that the camps would be located in parts of the woods that are coniferous woodland which are of limited ecological value.
27. Proposed avoidance measures would include to prohibit activities within the woodland in the northwest parts of the site except on supervised walks on the track, no tree felling, or firewood collection would take place. Mitigation measures are proposed in the form of minimised lighting and the use only of biodegradable washing products in showers and the kitchen camp.

² Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, BSG Ecology, December 2022

28. Compensation would consist of the creation of two clearings, within part of the coniferous plantation, that would allow native scrub vegetation to regenerate to provide more species diversity to the woodland. In terms of enhancements, measures would include the provision of ten bat boxes, twenty dormouse boxes, retain any fallen trees as intact deadwood and retain brash to create habitat piles. The mitigation and enhancement measures could be suitably secured by condition. The Appellant states that these measures would generate a biodiversity net gain but has been unable to demonstrate this in a suitable metric.

Site 2 – ecology interests

29. With respect to Site 2, the Appellant's Preliminary Ecological Appraisal³ identifies that the site partly includes the Burleigh Wood LWS. This identifies Broad-leaved semi-mature woodland to the southeast corner of the site, a broad-leaved plantation in the centre of the site and coniferous planting predominantly in the west of the site. The area also includes mixed-semi natural woodland areas, semi-improved natural grassland and marshy grassland. The site was found suitable to provide habitat for bats, dormouse, hedgehogs, badgers, Great crested newts, common toads, birds and other protected species. The assessment of impacts suggests that encroachment into the woodland has been limited and has been largely non-invasive.
30. Nonetheless, the Appraisal also explains that several parts of the woodland have been subject to harmful invasive action, such as at the Aspens Camp within the LWS. Here it is shown that vegetation clearance and tree felling has created a significant clearing within ancient semi-natural woodland. The understorey, field layer and ground flora have been removed in an area of around 0.2ha. Although, limited in scale this demonstrates the harmful effect of the camping use within the ancient woodland. The Appraisal recommends that the use of this area ceases, and the area is reestablished as woodland vegetation. The Appraisal also finds that the plantation area is of limited ecological value as vegetation under the tree canopy is sparse.
31. In terms of impacts on species, the report finds that most impacts would not be significant due to the limited nature of the proposed use. In terms of badgers, the Appraisal identifies that an active badger sett could be obstructed or damaged and the effect on badgers in other areas, whilst unlikely, would require annual surveys to ensure badger colonies are not subject to interference. Furthermore, the report notes that if walking takes place within the southeast of the site there is a danger, albeit limited, that dormouse may suffer trampling. As a result, some potentially harmful impacts on protected species have been identified.
32. The Appraisal identifies a range of avoidance and mitigation measures. These including closing Aspen Camp, to avoid Bushcraft activity within the southeast parts of the site, to avoid an increase in capacity of the site, to avoid new buildings being installed, undergo annual ecology checks and for firewood collection to not be carried out on site. In terms of mitigation, the Appraisal recommends minimal lighting and for the washing facilities to only use biodegradable products. Compensation is also offered. This would take the form of the retention of open glades and the replacement of some conifer planted areas with new woodland glades. Enhancements are also offered for

³ Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, by BSG Ecology, dated December 2022

the mowing of marshy grassland, the installation of bat and dormouse boxes and the control of any invasive plant species, such as yellow archangel found near the site entrance.

Summary of impact on ancient woodland

33. Camp areas could be moved away from the more ecologically sensitive parts of Site 2 from the east and Site 1 from the north. Nonetheless, the effect of the proposed activity, as a whole, could not be readily constrained to limited parts of the woodland without the addition of physical barriers that would harmfully visually intrude into this natural setting. Equally, managing on-site visitors by staff cannot provide sufficient assurance that the ecologically sensitive areas within the woodland would not suffer loss or deterioration of habitat. Moreover, ongoing ecological monitoring by specialists would be likely to place a substantial burden on the Council's resources.
34. The Appellant proposes to contain activity to the plantation areas. However, these areas are ecologically important as they are established on ancient woodland sites. These areas have been replanted with conifer or broadleaved trees which are typically characterised by imperfectly developed, primitive forms of ground flora. As such, plantation areas are priorities for restoration and biodiversity enhancement as they still contain features, such as unmodified soils and seed banks, that are capable of supporting the full restoration of ancient, semi-natural woodland cover. As such, they are no less important than ancient semi-natural woodland which is why they are protected to the same extent by the Framework.
35. Therefore, whilst recognising that attending students would be supervised within the woodland, with no free play, I am unconvinced that maps and signage would prevent attendees from straying into ecologically diverse areas of the site. Such damage has been identified in the Ecological Appraisals, although these are noted as being outside the broad-leaved semi-natural woodland.
36. Damage would be lessened to understorey flora and fungi within the plantation areas as these areas have a sparse shrub layer. However, the conglomerate effect of trampling of vegetation and vegetation clearance throughout the woodland would be tangible and harmful. Although such action is deemed unlikely by the Appellant, there is no compelling explanation to demonstrate why visitors would not stray into the most significant parts of the woodland. Such intrusion would be exacerbated through ongoing use at the relatively high intensity levels proposed. Also, the associated activity and movement of groups through the woodland would create light and noise disturbance. This would also disturb wildlife, even if artificial light around the tents would be limited and only supplemented by torches.
37. The Framework requires consideration as to whether wholly exceptional reasons exist that might outweigh any identified harm. Footnote 67 describes that exceptional reasons could include, by example, national infrastructure projects where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat. The proposed use would provide week-long residential school trips, for students aged between 7 to 18, providing outdoor adventure. Activities would include bushcraft, archery and wild swimming. The proposal would enable students to enjoy an outdoor adventure gaining skills and having fun. Nevertheless, the benefits of this proposal, whilst significant, would not

demonstrate the wholly exceptional reasons that would outweigh the deterioration as required by the Framework.

38. The proposed enhancement and compensation measures, associated with both Sites 1 and 2 would be of biodiversity benefit to the woodlands. However, these would be of only moderate weight when compared to the sustained harm conveyed to the ancient woodland by the ongoing access and impact of occupation of frequent visitors into these sites. Moreover, Planning Practice Guidance is clear that compensation measures should be considered in isolation of whether there are wholly exceptional reasons to outweigh the harmful effect of the proposal.
39. Accordingly, the proposed use, in respect of both Appeals A and B, would result in significant and sustained harm to the ancient woodland. This harm would result in conflict with LP policy EH3 and the Framework in terms of its effect on the ancient woodland. These seek, among other matters, for development to avoid the loss, deterioration or harm to locally important wildlife and geological sites and sites supporting irreplaceable habitats except in exceptional circumstances.

Protected species (Site 1)

40. Site 1 is identified as a local wildlife site. The Appellants Preliminary Ecological Appraisal sets out that there is some potential for impacts on individual great crested newts (GCN) at the site and that an environmental DNA survey should be carried out so that if present, activities can be moved away from ponds supporting this species.
41. The Council's RfR3 states that the site may negatively affect GCNs, which are a protected species, and that the proposal fails to demonstrate how any impacts will be appropriately managed. The site has three ponds. The Appellant identifies that two of these were dry and the third was tested for GCN which eDNA testing found to be negative. As no GCNs have been found on site it is unlikely that this species would be affected by the proposed development and therefore no mitigation is required.
42. Therefore, the development would not affect habitat associated with GCN. As such, the proposal connected with appeal A, would comply with the part of LP policy EH3 and the Framework that relates to protected species. These seek, *inter alia*, for development to protect and mitigate impacts on priority habitats, protected species and priority species, and to protect and recover priority species.

Character and appearance (Site 1)

43. Cassington Road is a country lane that connects Bladon with Cassington. It includes grass verges and ditches with low hedging, enabling wide views of distant woodland areas for users of the route. There is a public right of way that runs from Bladon village to Cassington Road. This follows the side of the field that has been subdivided to create the car park and provides clear views of the hard surfaced area and its enclosure. Due to the open character of the site, and being formerly part of the adjacent field, the undeveloped site would have made a positive contribution to the surround open countryside.
44. The appeal site consists of woodland area, of around 38ha, and pockets of open land. The proposal includes the provision of six camp areas, temporary

modules for showering and a WC. These components would be temporary, demountable features that would be largely screened within the woodland setting having a minimal affect on the open character of the area.

45. Whereas, the constructed car parking area is a large parcel of compacted gravel surfacing, that can be readily seen from the public realm. This is an overt, visually obtrusive addition to the rural setting. It appears out of place, poorly conceived in the open countryside setting and purely functional in appearance. It is an urbanising feature that, whether in use or not, does not integrate well with the surrounding area. Moreover, the addition of parked vehicles within this area would substantially increase the harmful juxtaposition of the car park with the surrounding countryside.
46. The Appellant suggests that the area of hardstanding already existed in part prior to the new car park being created and that Permitted Development (PD) Rights exist for such works to be undertaken. However, no evidence has been submitted to illustrate the nature of previous hardstanding. Furthermore, the Appellant has not demonstrated, through a Certificate of Lawfulness, that PD rights exist for agricultural works or that these would be 'reasonably necessary' at a scale similar to that proposed. Therefore, I afford limited weight to this potential fallback position.
47. The car park area is proposed to be enclosed by additional tree planting and hedging and the Appellant has offered to provide a different form of gravel treatment (darker gravel) to assist integrating it with the surrounding area. However, the harmful visual impact of the car park partly relates to it being enclosed as this creates an artificial field boundary around a small parcel of land. If reinforced with new planting, this would only exacerbate this harmful visual effect. Also, different surface material treatment would not materially reduce the overall visual impact of the proposal.
48. Accordingly, the proposal would harm the site's countryside setting and the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the proposal associated with appeal A would conflict with LP policy EH2 and the Framework. These policies include the requirement for development to conserve the natural features of the landscape and to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Other Matters

49. Blenheim Palace, a Grade I listed registered park and garden and World Heritage Site (WHS) is around 0.5km to the northwest of Site 1. The palace represents a unique architectural achievement celebrating the triumph of the English armies over the French and stands within a park created by Capability Brown. The woodland areas to the south of the WHS, including the appeal site, is noted by LP policy EW9 to make a contribution to its significance. However, whilst the proposal may result in some localised degrading of the quality of the woodland it would not have a material effect on the significance of the WHS or the registered park and garden.
50. Bladon Camp is a Scheduled Ancient Monument outside the site, adjacent to the northeast boundary of Site 1. Bladon Camp is a hillfort in Bladon Heath. Its significance derives from its archaeological interest and intact nature. The proposed activity would be set away from the Monument preserving its significance.

51. The proposed use would accommodate 160 students per week, aged between 7 and 18 years, providing residential school trips. The outdoor adventure camping use would provide education and recreation for children which would enable pupils to explore nature, encounter people of different cultures and improve social skills. The Bushcraft Company is an accredited provider of outdoor education and is well respected locally, with positive reviews of the company provided by several local schools. The facility provides outdoor learning that is recognised nationally as important for children's development and improved academic outcomes.
52. LP Policy E2 supports development in the rural economy that would contribute to the diversification of a country estate. The facility would contribute financially towards the Blenheim Estate for which money would be spent on delivering new deciduous planting improving biodiversity. However, there is no tangible guarantee that collected money would be spent in this manner and as such I attribute limited weight to this benefit.
53. The Appellant asserts that the facility would employ between 16 and 19 full time seasonal jobs, would contribute to the local employment in chartering transport services and provide a £1 million annual investment in food supplies.
54. In locational terms, the Appellant indicates that the proposed use cannot be provided in service centres or villages, as it would destroy the ethos of the experience. However, this does not provide clear justification as to why the facility would need to operate within the selected sensitive sites.
55. The proposal has not generated an objection from several consultees, including the Council's Environmental Health Team or the Highway Authority. However, an absence of harm in these respects can only be considered as neutral factors in the planning balance.
56. LP Policy E4 relates to sustainable tourism in the open countryside. The Appellant asserts that the proposal complies with this policy conveying support for the scheme. However, the proposed use does not comfortably fall within my understanding of a tourism use being for outdoor sport and recreation for educational purposes. As such, this policy is unlikely to be relevant to the proposal. Even if it were relevant, complying with this policy would only represent convey limited support in the planning balance.
57. The Appellant informs that the car park of Site 2, and the adjoining agricultural land, is within the Botley West Solar Farm project which is a National Infrastructure Project, with a generation capacity of 840MW, currently at a pre-submission stage. This is noted, but any future decisions made with respect to the siting of such a solar farm would be subject to different circumstances having no material bearing on the outcome of these appeals.
58. The Appellant refers to other appeal decisions that confirm that the proposed use is outdoor sport and recreation and has been found to have no adverse effect on the openness of the Green Belt, but such cases are not before me. Even so, each case must be considered on its own merits taking the proposal and the site context into consideration.

Whether there would be Very Special Circumstances

59. Paragraphs 142 and 143 of the Framework set out the general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt. They explain that

such development should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

60. I have concluded that both appeal A and B would result in development that would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt and would result in encroachment. These would therefore be inappropriate development that would, by definition, harm the Green Belt. Paragraph 153 of the Framework requires substantial weight to be given to any harm to the Green Belt. Furthermore, both proposals would result in the degradation of the ancient woodland, a further matter of substantial weight.
61. The proposal associated with appeal A would contribute educational benefits to local school children developing confidence and social skills and to this I attach significant weight. However, as well as identifying harm to the Green Belt and the ancient woodland, the proposal associated with Appeal A would also have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. As such, the harm to the Green Belt in connection with Appeal A, and the other identified harm, is not clearly outweighed by the other considerations identified and therefore the very special circumstances, necessary to justify the development, either alone or in combination, do not exist.
62. The proposal associated with appeal B would generate similar benefits as Appeal A. However, the other considerations identified, including the educational benefits, the diversification of the Blenheim Estate and providing seasonal employment, are benefits of only limited to moderate weight in favour of the proposal. As such, the harm to the Green Belt is not clearly outweighed by the other considerations identified and therefore the very special circumstances, necessary to justify the development associated with appeal B, either alone or in combination, do not exist.
63. Accordingly, the proposals of both Appeals A and B fail to adhere to the local and national Green Belt policies I have already outlined.

Conclusion

64. The proposed development proposals would not accord with the development plan or national policy in relation to Green Belt. There are no other considerations which outweigh these findings. Accordingly, for the reasons given, appeals A and B should not succeed.

Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR