



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 29 October 2024

Site visit made on 29 October 2024

by K Lancaster BA(hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/W/24/3346144

Gibraltar Farm Campsite, Lindeth Road, Silverdale, Lancashire LA5 0UA

- 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 Mr James Burrow on behalf of Gibraltar Farm against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/00634/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of Agricultural Workers Cottage, provision of three parking spaces, alterations and additions to existing track, provision of associated landscape works and enhancement planting.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's first reason for refusal stated that the proposal failed to robustly demonstrate that the functional need for an agricultural worker could not be met by existing accommodation already present at, or adjoining, Gibraltar Farm. However, the main parties have agreed that in light of additional evidence submitted by the appellant, there is no existing accommodation available within or adjoining the holding which could meet the functional need for a dwelling. Therefore, the Council are not defending this reason for refusal, and I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. In respect of the Council's second reason for refusal, it cited conflict with Policy AS04 of the Arnsdale & Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Development Plan Document, adopted March 2019 (the AONB DPD). However, the Council have subsequently confirmed that this was an error, and the correct policy is AS07. I have therefore had regard to this policy in coming to my decision.
4. Prior to the hearing, the appellant submitted an updated Landscape Masterplan¹. I have had regard to the tests in the Holborn Studios² judgment, which refined the long-standing Wheatcroft³ principles. At the hearing comments were sought from all parties present on the amended plan. I consider the changes are relatively minor and therefore I am satisfied that there would be no prejudice to any party for me to take this amended plan into account in my determination of this appeal.

¹ Drawing No.1 - Revision A - Landscape Proposals and Listed Building Settings (dated October 2024)

² Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin)

³ Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v SSE [JPL 1982 P37]

5. In November 2023, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) were renamed 'National Landscapes', and the Arnside and Silverdale AONB within which the appeal site is located became known as the Arnside and Silverdale National Landscape. I have therefore referred to the National Landscapes and the Arnside and Silverdale National Landscape in my decision, except where legislation or policy documents continue to refer to AONBs.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:
- whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the setting of the Grade II listed buildings known as Gibraltar Farmhouse, Tower House and Lindeth Tower; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including the landscape and scenic beauty of the Arnside and Silverdale National Landscape (the ASNL).

Reasons

7. The appeal site, Gibraltar Farm and Campsite is located in a semi-rural location, to the edge of the village of Silverdale. It is located in close proximity to a cluster of buildings which are situated towards the end of Lindeth Road and close to the junction with Hollins Lane. The cluster of buildings includes a number of residential properties as well as some traditional and modern farm buildings.
8. The ownership of the farm and the former farmhouse, known as Gibraltar Farmhouse, were separated in around 2009, meaning that there is no residential property currently associated with Gibraltar Farm and Campsite. The land associated with the holding extends to approximately four hundred acres which includes a mix of owned and rented land, it also includes a large camping and caravanning site.
9. The site is a modern dairy farm with a small number of traditional buildings being subsidiary to a significant number of modern steel frame agricultural buildings and ancillary structures. The appeal site itself relates to a small parcel of land, currently grass and containing a small, shed type building, which appeared to be associated with the use of the wider site as a campsite. The site is located on elevated ground and is adjacent to the existing access track to the campsite.

Setting of Listed Buildings

10. The appeal site is located in close proximity to a group of grade II listed buildings which are individually known as Gibraltar Farmhouse, Lindeth Tower and Tower House. Section 66(1) of Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses.
11. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) highlights that designated heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource. As a result, Paragraph 205 of the Framework requires that when considering the impact

upon the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

12. Gibraltar Farmhouse⁴ is described in the listing as an early C19th, two-storey house, constructed of limestone rubble with sandstone dressings and a slate roof. The building has a central-entry plan, with gable stacks. The appellant also indicates⁵ that there is evidence of an earlier building on this site. The land immediately to the front of Gibraltar Farmhouse is now hard surfaced with some domestic paraphernalia present and a single storey timber constructed building, together these create the appearance of a domestic yard.
13. The special interest and significance of Gibraltar Farmhouse primarily stems from its architectural and historic interest. Its architectural interest is largely derived from its use of polite architecture and local vernacular features including the use of random local random coursed stone, rough quoins and central entry plan. Its historical interest is derived from its role as the principal farmstead, together with the building which surround it.
14. However, pertinent to the appeal, its significance is also derived from its open and agrarian setting, which includes the appeal site. Gibraltar Farmhouse is located on top of a hill, orientated specifically to survey its farmland and to take advantage of the views of Morecambe Bay. The significance of the building is not therefore only derived from its age and appearance, but also its former association with a wider farmstead. Its status as the farmhouse is evident through its prominent positioning, with the expanse of open land, agricultural buildings and working context to the side and rear. This hierarchy remains apparent today by virtue of the clear visual relationship between the former farmhouse and the agricultural land. Therefore, the views to and from the listed building make an important contribution to its significance and its setting.
15. To the front of Gibraltar Farmhouse is a large, timber, shelter-style building, referred to as the 'donkey shelter'. There is no known planning history for the building. However, the Council confirmed that a building appears to have been present in this location since the early 2000s. Whilst it is not a matter for this appeal to determine whether or not the current building is lawful, it is not disputed by the main parties that this building is located within the setting of Gibraltar Farmhouse.
16. Tower House⁶ is described in the listing as a two-storey house dating from 1816, it is pebble dashed rubble with the first floor of south wall slate hung and it has a slate roof. On the first floor is a slate plaque inscribed with 'Issac and Anne Hadwen MDCCCXVI'. The special interest and significance of Tower House primarily stems from its architectural and historic interest as an example of early C19th polite, vernacular architecture. Due to very limited views of Tower House from the appeal site, I recognise that the relationship between Tower House and the appeal site is more of a spatial one than a visual one.
17. Lindeth Tower⁷ is described in the listing as being located within the garden of Tower House and was built as a Summerhouse in 1842. It is three storeys

⁴ List Entry Number: 1362467

⁵ Paragraph 2.3.1 of the Heritage Statement (April 2023)

⁶ List Entry Number: 1071846

⁷ List Entry Number: 1071845

high and constructed of limestone rubble. Lindeth Tower, by virtue of its position, is afforded 360-degree views of the surrounding landscape. However, the primary views are towards the coastline. The special interest and significance of Lindeth Tower primarily stems from its historical and aesthetic interest as a solitary tower, but the building also has associative significance with Mrs Elizabeth Gaskell who is believed to have written some of her novels here.

18. In terms of the buildings as a group, the principal farmstead can be seen on the 1845 OS Map, which includes the three designated heritage assets and some curtilage listed barns. These buildings have been retained with the farm being extended to the north with modern farm infrastructure added. In terms of the wider setting, the historic farmyard and historic farm buildings have a strong group value with Gibraltar Farmhouse, Tower House and Lindeth Tower as they are contemporary vernacular farm buildings.
19. The modern farm buildings and storage yard detract from the visual setting of the listed building group due to their use of modern materials, their design and scale. However, whilst I acknowledge that they make a negative contribution they are nevertheless necessary elements of a working farm. The relationship between the farmstead and its agricultural, picturesque landscape contributes to what makes the site significant.
20. Policy DM37 of A Local Plan for Lancaster District 2011-2031 Part Two: Review of the Development Management Development Plan Document (the DM DPD) states that proposals affecting listed buildings should conserve and, where appropriate enhance those elements which contribute to its significance. It further states that the significance of a listed building can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of those elements which contribute to its special architectural or historic interest or through development within its setting. It states that any harm (substantial or less than substantial) to such elements will only be permitted where this is clearly justified and outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal.
21. The appeal site is located to the front and side of the Gibraltar Farmhouse, and forward of Lindeth Tower. Both the appeal site and surrounding agricultural land reflect the historical function of the farmhouse and are an intrinsic part of the environment in which the listed buildings are experienced and appreciated, and they contribute to the significance of the listed building. As a result, the appeal site clearly forms part of the original setting of the listed buildings, and it is not disputed that the views both to and from the assets contribute to their individual and group significance.
22. The landscape character and the setting of the listed buildings has already been somewhat altered by the presence of large, modern agricultural buildings and the formation of a large caravan park on the adjoining land. However, whilst these works have had some effect on the setting of the listed building, they do not demonstrably erode the wider setting.
23. By contrast, the proposed development due to its prominent position to the front of Lindeth Tower and Gibraltar Farmhouse, would be visually harmful in the context of views to and from the listed farmhouse as well as the views from Lindeth Tower which was deliberately sited to enjoy views of the coast and fields below. Furthermore, the proposed scale and massing of the proposed dwelling would be likely to result in a dominant presence in relation

to the listed farmhouse, thereby creating conflict with how Gibraltar Farmhouse is experienced, as the focal point of the farmstead.

24. The appellant states that the design concept for the proposed agricultural dwelling is that it will be viewed as a traditional, vernacular farmhouse. However, it would also include some less traditional design elements such as a gabled porch on the single storey side extension and the French doors with glazing bars. The appellant confirmed at the hearing that the design was developed as a response to the Criteria (ii) of Policy AS07 of the AONB DPD which states that development should reflect local vernacular and the distinctive historic and settlement character, through design, style, scale, massing and materials used.
25. It is not disputed that the design and use of materials would be in keeping with the local vernacular. However, the design of the proposed dwelling appears to somewhat emulate the design and appearance of the listed farmhouse. As a result, it would introduce a visually competing design element which would erode some of the understanding of the farmhouse as the administrative and functional centre of the farm in this landscape. Therefore, I find that the proposed development would significantly erode and detract from the setting of the farmhouse and its significance. It would also to a lesser degree detract from the significance of Lindeth Tower and Tower House, due to its siting and prominence.
26. I accept views from the wider public realm would be limited. However, unlike the assessment of landscape impact, the guidance⁸ states that contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights of way or an ability to access or experience that setting. For these reasons, the absence of publicly accessible views does not alter my findings.
27. Whilst the proposed dwelling would from certain viewpoints effectively hide the 'donkey shelter', it would nevertheless still cause harm to the setting of the listed buildings. As noted above, it was agreed at the hearing that the presence of the donkey shelter building detracts from the setting of the listed building. Nevertheless, the existence of the 'donkey shelter' building is not justification to permit further development that would erode the significance of the listed buildings.
28. The Council has referred me to an alternative site location which they consider would not result in harm to the significance of designated heritage assets. They have identified an area of land immediately to the south of 44 Lindeth Road. Whilst I recognise that a proposed dwelling in this location could reflect the linear pattern of development found on this part of Lindeth Road, I have no specific details before me. Notwithstanding this, I acknowledge that in terms of heritage impact, this site would be located to the other side of the modern farm buildings and would therefore not cause harm to the setting of the aforementioned listed buildings.
29. However, although this area of land is shown as being within the 'blue line', at the hearing, the appellant set out that this land is in the ownership of the National Trust, with a covenant in place to prevent development taking place. Whilst I have not been presented with any substantive evidence to support

⁸ The Setting of Heritage Assets Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition)

this position, the absence of this location as an alternative site, does not alter my above findings.

30. For these reasons, I find that the proposed development by virtue of its siting and design would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of designated heritage assets. Paragraph 208 of the Framework states that where a development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the development.
31. The public benefits advanced at the hearing by the appellant include the provision of a comprehensive landscaping scheme, as shown on the submitted Landscape Masterplan; the improvement to the appearance of the site entrance and storage areas, particularly the area currently used for the storage of hay bales; the construction of new drystone walls and the planting of native species.
32. In addition, the proposal will allow the appellants to return to the farm to live where they work and manage the landscape for the public benefit. I have no doubt that the appellant's family have a long-standing connection to the site and play an important role in the local farming and wider community. It is also not disputed that there is a genuine need for suitable accommodation to be provided at the farm.
33. The appeal scheme may also provide socio-economic benefits, notably through underpinning the long-term vitality and viability of the farm enterprise, which as previously indicated could also make a positive contribution to the landscape of the area. The holiday accommodation also benefits the local economy, attracting in the region of 50,000 visitors per annum. However, based on the evidence before me, it seems that such benefits may also be achieved from a dwelling being sited in a more sensitive and appropriate location on the holding.
34. The appellant stated that there would be environmental benefits derived from new planting and biodiversity enhancements, including measures to contribute to reversing the effects of climate change. These aspects of the proposal generally represent good planning expected in all cases, and therefore as positive features of the development I attribute them limited weight.
35. It was also put to me that the proposal would deliver heritage benefits, including the creation of an enhanced sense of arrival to the campsite. However, whilst I do not dispute the benefits of improving the appearance of the site for visitors, this would not amount to a heritage benefit in that it would introduce landscape elements to the site, which are not part of the historical landscape of the site and therefore the setting of the listed buildings. For these reasons, I find that this would not amount to a heritage benefit. Furthermore, any improvement to the appearance of the site for visitors to the campsite would be a private benefit.
36. Based on my findings above, there is currently no compelling evidence that indicates that the proposed development is the only means of securing the ongoing success of the enterprise, nor any wider social and economic benefits that it brings. Therefore, I conclude that overall, the public benefits attract moderate weight.

37. Given the above and in the absence of any defined significant public benefit, I conclude that, on balance, that the proposed development would fail to preserve the special historic interest and significance of the adjacent listed buildings. Thus, the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and Paragraph 205 of the Framework. It would also fail to comply with Policy SP7 of the A Local Plan for Lancaster 2011-2031 Part One: Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document (the SPLA DPD), Policies DM29, DM37 and DM39 of the DM DPD and Policy ASO7 of the AONB DPD. These policies require amongst other things, good design which has regard to siting, orientation and scale and which preserves the elements which contribute to the significance of the heritage asset.

Landscape, Character and Appearance

38. The appeal site is within the ASNL, which extends some 75km² in south Cumbria and north Lancashire, and includes around 30km² of intertidal sand and mudflats in the Kent estuary and Morecambe Bay. The special qualities of the ASNL are set out in Paragraph 1.2.2 of the AONB DPD and include, its outstanding landscape and spectacular views, rare and precious habitats, and a sense of tranquillity, space and place.
39. The site sits within a landscape area identified as being 'D3 - Silverdale Coastal Pasture' in the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment, November 2015 (the LSCA). This landscape character encompasses the central sections of Silverdale village and the margins of the village towards the coast and outside of the wooded, undulating limestone hills that surround the village. It is described as an area of fields and some relict parkland which surround and form a setting to the communities of Silverdale and nearby hamlets like The Row. The fields to the east have a sheltered character, whilst the western edges of the coastal pasture enable panoramic views from the tops of the low limestone cliffs over pebble beaches out across Warton Sands and Morecambe Bay.
40. The appeal site and its surroundings reflect many of the above key characteristics highlighted within the Management Plan and LSCA. The site therefore contributes positively to the distinctive rural quality of the countryside in this area and to the landscape and scenic beauty of the ASNL.
41. The Framework⁹ states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty within AONBs, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. Additionally, Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (as amended) requires all relevant authorities to seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty when performing their functions.
42. Policies ASO1, ASO2 and ASO8 of the AONB DPD state, amongst others things, that great weight will be given to the principle of conserving landscape and natural beauty, wildlife, and cultural heritage in the AONB; that development proposals will be required to demonstrate the highest quality design and how they conserve and enhance the landscape and natural beauty of the area; and that proposals will not be permitted where they are unjustified or where public

⁹ Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework

benefits do not offset any harm that would occur to the significance of heritage assets, including the area's historic landscape character and cumulative impacts.

43. The appeal site is mostly concealed from public viewpoints by virtue of intervening buildings, topography and vegetation. There are no public rights of way within or immediately adjacent to the appeal site. The primary views of the proposed development would be from the campsite, which despite the presence of modern agricultural buildings and campsite infrastructure, remains distinctly rural and picturesque.
44. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)¹⁰ identifies a number of viewpoints, some of which are located within private land, some within publicly accessible land. At the hearing, I sought clarification from both parties that the public viewpoints identified were agreed.
45. However, within their evidence, and at the hearing, the Council drew to my attention a further viewpoint located at the end of a public footpath known as 'Know Hill'. In response, the appellant confirmed that this viewpoint was omitted from the assessment due to the absence of views of the appeal site from this location. Nevertheless, I was able to walk this footpath during my site visit and find that there are minimal possibilities of views from the footpath, whilst they may be possible from slightly higher ground away from the route of the footpath, I was not able to view the appeal site from the footpath itself, due to the intervening topography and landscape features.
46. Viewpoints A1 to A3 are located within the public highway on Lindeth Road, approximately 150 metres from the appeal site. This part of Lindeth Road contains a section of open land, and a linear pattern of dwellings, with their associated garden areas. Whilst some of these locations offer extensive views of the landscape and coastline, due to the location of the farm buildings at the entrance to Gibraltar Farm Campsite, views toward the appeal site from this location are screened from public views.
47. Viewpoint B1 is located within the public highway, at the entrance to Gibraltar Farmhouse. From this location, due to the topography of the site and presence of intervening buildings and structures, there would be no discernible change to the landscape, as the proposed dwelling would not be visible.
48. Viewpoints C1 to C4 are located within the public highway towards an area known as 'Jack Scout'. From these locations, the appeal site and existing buildings within the site are predominantly screened from view by mature vegetation. If stood within the highway verge and taking advantage of one of the few gaps in this vegetation, then some views towards the appeal site are possible. However, these views would be likely to be limited to glimpsed views of the roof and chimneys of the proposed dwelling. Therefore, I find that the proposed development from this location would have a negligible impact on the landscape. The LVIA also found that with the introduction of further planting, this would reduce the overall effect to having no impact by year 15.
49. Viewpoint D is located in the area known as 'Jack Scout', which is a National Trust Nature Reserve. From this location, the site is screened by intervening established woodland and topography.

¹⁰ LVIA prepared by Antony Wood RFS Cert Arb of Yew Tree and Gardens, dated 27 October 2022.

50. Viewpoints E1 to E5 are located on an area of clifftop, which is not publicly accessible. The definitive map shows no public rights of way in this location, although it was acknowledged at the hearing that members of the public may access this part of the clifftop. The appeal site and proposed development, due to the open nature of the landscape would be visible in this location and whilst the proposed dwelling would be viewed in the context of the existing buildings, would be visible from this location, at a distance of approximately 400 metres. However, as noted above this is understood to be private land, and therefore for the purposes of the LVIA cannot be considered as publicly accessible land. For these reasons, it was agreed at the hearing that this should not be considered a public viewpoint.
51. Viewpoint F1 is located approximately 2km away at the Pepperpot and Eaves Wood Viewpoint. The LVIA acknowledges that due to its elevated position, views of the appeal are possible from this location. However, due to the distance from the appeal site and the presence of a cluster of existing buildings, the proposed development would not be discernible from this location.
52. In respect of these viewpoints, I am satisfied that the proposed development could be accommodated within the site and the wider landscape without any significant detrimental change upon the wider landscape of the AONB, when viewed from the identified publicly accessible locations.
53. As noted above, the appeal site is located in close proximity to the campsite which attracts a large number of visitors each year. In this context, I accept that the proposed dwelling would be highly visible from viewpoints within the campsite. However, whilst accessed by the public, this is still private land and therefore these views would be limited to users of the campsite.
54. Given the evidence before me and visiting the site and local area whilst I acknowledge the proposal would result in a change to the character and appearance of the appeal site, this would not equate to a significant impact on the landscape character of the area. Therefore, whilst I accept there would be some change to the immediate landscape character of the site as a result of the proposed development, this would be contained to within the wider site and its immediate local landscape and that outside the site and its immediate environs, the scheme would be visually contained and would be barely discernible.
55. In respect of the proposed landscaping scheme, the appellant stated at the hearing and within their evidence that these proposed landscaping measures would combine with each other to bring benefits throughout the landscape as a whole, such that the landscape qualities of the AONB become protected and enhanced. The appellant also stated at the hearing that this plan has been produced to address comments made by the Parish Council and to include additional planting.
56. However, whilst there are undoubtedly benefits to the biodiversity and natural environment to be achieved through the introduction of native species planting, such landscaping is not typical of the immediate surrounding area, which as outlined above, has a distinctly open, pastoral character that is largely devoid of significant landscaping and which affords clear and uninterrupted views to the coastline. Therefore, whilst the proposed landscaping would use native species, provide screening to the proposed

development, and achieve some benefits, overall, the introduction of landscaping, on balance, would not reflect the landscape and natural scenic beauty of the ASNL in this location.

57. The AONB Management Plan sets out that built and cultural heritage, which includes traditional farmsteads are important and distinctive features of the landscape. Therefore, whilst I accept that views of the proposed development would be limited within the wider landscape, the proposal would nevertheless cause harm to the setting of a traditional farmstead, which contributes positively to the qualities of the protected landscape. For these reasons, I find that proposed development would cause some minor harm to the landscape and scenic beauty of the ASNL.
58. The LVIA also considered two alternative locations for the proposed dwelling, shown on a submitted plan as Site A and Site B. However, both sites were discounted, the reasons given include landscape sensitivity, heritage, operational reasons and surveillance. The appellant states that the proposed agricultural workers dwelling has been located in an area of the overall site which is close to the livestock housing but is screened from public viewpoints.
59. Whilst I acknowledge that the AONB Partnership did not object to the application, the absence of an objection does not alter my above findings.
60. Consequently, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would cause some minor harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the landscape and scenic beauty of the ASNL. Thus, I find that it would not conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Landscape and would not support its primary purpose. The proposed development would therefore fail to comply with Policies AS01, AS02 and AS08 of the AONB DPD, Policies DM10, DM29 and DM46 of the DM DPD, Policies EN2 and EN3 of the SPLA DPD. These policies require, amongst other things, that development proposals to demonstrate the highest quality design and how they conserve and enhance the landscape and natural beauty of the area.
61. There would also be conflict with the Framework which states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty.

Other Matters

62. Paragraph 84 of the Framework states that planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless certain circumstances apply, which includes where there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside.
63. It is not disputed that there is support in both local and national policies for the rural economy, and there is a proven need for an agricultural worker to reside on the site. It is also not disputed that there is no existing residential accommodation which could be used, nor any buildings suitable for conversion.
64. I have had regard to the letter of support submitted by the owners of Tower House, which states that from the viewpoint of animal welfare and security, they feel it is vital that a qualified person should be resident at Gibraltar Farm at all times. It further states that the farm itself has a history and a value

equal to that of Lindeth Tower and is a valuable part of the economy of the village.

65. I acknowledge that there would be no harm to highway safety from the use of the existing access and the proposed changes to the internal access arrangements to the campsite. However, the absence of harm is a neutral factor which neither weighs for nor against the proposal.
66. The appeal site is within the 3.5km buffer for the Morecambe Bay designated sites, located approximately 370 metres from the coast. In such a location, any new residential properties have the potential to increase recreational pressure on these designated sites. However, the Council found that subject to appropriate mitigation, which in this particular case would take the form of a 'Homeowner Pack', I find that the proposed development would have no adverse effects on the designated sites. Natural England have confirmed that they have no objection to this approach. As I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, it is therefore not necessary for me to consider this matter any further.

Conclusion

67. For the above reasons, I have found conflict with the Development Plan as a whole. The material considerations in this case, including the Framework, do not indicate a decision other than in accordance with the Development Plan. This leads me to conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr J Burrow	Appellant
Mrs A Burrow	Appellant
Mr P Deeley	Planning Consultant and Landscape Architect, Director, Deeley Horton Planning and Landscape
Mr J Hinchliffe	Heritage and Planning Consultant, Principal Hinchliffe Heritage
Mr D Horton	Planning Consultant: Director, Deeley Horton Planning and Landscape
Ms S Freeman	PA to Philip Deeley
Mr W Huck	Specialist Agricultural Advisor
Mr M Earl	Specialist Agricultural Insurer with NFU Mutual
Mr A Wood	Specialist Arboricultural consultant, LVIA Assessor and author of the LVIA.

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr P Hopwood	Planning Assistant
Mr M Jackson	Planning Applications Manager
Mrs M Hainsworth	Conservation Officer

AMENDED DOCUMENTS & PLANS

Drawing No.1 - Revision A - Landscape Proposals and Listed Building Settings
(received 24 October 2024)

Updated CGI of Proposed Development (received 29 October 2024)