



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2026

by **M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th of July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/W/24/3354884

Mr Motors, Whalebone Lane North, Romford, Essex, RM6 5QT

- 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 Cranbrook Motors against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application reference is 23/01827/FULL.
 - The development proposed is the construction of an additional two storeys above existing building to facilitate 9no residential units with associated refuse and cycle storage and the change of use of existing ground floor from Sui Generis to Use Class E.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal scheme was described on the planning application form as a “proposed development of existing building to provide 9 residential units (6x 1-bed units & 3x 2-bed units) with associated secured refuse & cycle storage”. Although it was stated on the appeal form that the description of development had not been changed, a different wording used on the decision notice issued by the Council (including reference to the change of use of the ground floor unit) had been adopted by the appellant; I have therefore used that amended description in the banner heading above.
3. The new Barking and Dagenham Local Plan (“the BDLP”) was adopted in September 2024, replacing the 2010 Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy and the 2011 Borough-wide Development Policies Development Plan Document extant when the planning application was determined. The decision notice issued by the Council referred to the draft policies of the then-emerging BDLP, and both main parties’ appeal submissions were made in the light of the new local plan; I have determined the appeal with reference to the up-to-date development plan.
4. On 12 December 2024 the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (“the Framework”), replacing the December 2023 version. Among other things, it included changes in respect of the Green Belt; both main parties were given the opportunity to comment on the changes to the Framework during this appeal. Where I have referred to specific paragraphs of the Framework, the numbering is that of the December 2024 version.

Main Issues

5. The decision notice issued by the Council gave five reasons for which it had refused planning permission. As well Green Belt matters, the reasons covered a wide range of other themes which, for the sake of clarity I have broken down into

smaller groupings here. Based on all the evidence before me, I consider that the main issues in the appeal are:

- Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt having regard to the Framework and any relevant development plan policies;
- The effects of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt;
- Whether the site represents an appropriate and sustainable location for the proposed development, with particular regard to accessibility, compatibility with neighbouring uses, and (in respect of the Class E use) its effect on town and district centres;
- Whether there would be an appropriate housing mix, including accessible housing, to meet identified need in the area;
- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including the setting of the White House, a nearby Grade II Listed Building;
- The effect of the proposed development on a nearby Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (a “SINC”);
- Whether the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for future residents, with particular regard to daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy, ventilation, overheating, noise and general disturbance;
- The effect on living conditions for residents of the White House, with particular regard to outlook and natural light;
- Whether the proposed development would offer safe and convenient access and servicing, with particular regard to the provision of adequate car parking, the provision of adequate refuse and cycle storage arrangements, support for the use of sustainable transport, and its effects on pedestrian and highway safety;
- If the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Green Belt

6. The appeal site is a single-storey light industrial building on the eastern side of Whalebone Lane, within the Metropolitan Green Belt, currently occupied by a motor services business. The proposed development is the construction of a two-storey extension on top of the existing building, to provide nine new flats; the scheme would also include the change of use of the ground floor to the commercial, business and service Use Class E (no specific use within that class was proposed).

7. Policy SP6 of the BDLP and Policy G2 of the London Plan 2021 seek to protect the Green Belt in accordance with national planning policy set out in the Framework. Paragraph 153 of the Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very specific circumstances. Paragraph 154 indicates that, other than for listed exceptions, development in the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate; Paragraph 154 c) allows for “the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building”.
8. The appeal scheme would see the existing floorspace on the site more than doubled; based on the submitted drawings (though I have not been provided with precise details) there would be a correspondingly large increase in the built volume. Although I have not been made aware of anything in the development plan or associated planning guidance which sets parameters for the scale of extensions within the Green Belt, the scale of the development proposed here is such that it would seem to me to clearly be disproportionate. Consequently, it would not fall within the exception described in Paragraph 149(c) of the Framework; it would also would not comply with Policy SP6 of the BDLP and Policy G2 of the London Plan 2021 in this respect.

Openness of the Green Belt

9. A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy, set out Paragraph 142 of the Framework, is to keep land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The baseline for considering the effect on openness, which is the absence of development and which has both a spatial and visual aspect, must be what currently exists at the site.
10. Although the appeal site is already occupied by a building, the amount of built form would be increased significantly; there would therefore be a loss of spatial openness. The extended building would be considerably taller than it is at present, and more prominent in views along Whalebone Lane North and elsewhere in the vicinity; there would also be a loss of visual openness. While the loss of openness would be localised, and small in the context of the Green Belt as a whole, the Framework is clear that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt.

Location

11. Policy H2 of the London Plan 2021 recognises the contribution that small sites make to meeting London’s housing needs. However, the supporting text to that policy is clear that connections to services and transport links are key considerations in creating well-designed and sustainable places; it places a particular focus on intensifying residential uses in areas with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (“PTAL”) of 3 or more, or within 800m of a station or town centre boundary.
12. The appeal site has a PTAL of 2, representing poor public transport connectivity. The appellant has suggested that the site is “within a short distance of Romford town centre”. I travelled to the site by public transport from Romford town centre to conduct the site visit and found it to be a 25-30 minute bus journey; even allowing for the slightly circuitous route taken by the bus, the appeal site is certainly not within 800m of the town centre, and there is little by way of day-to-day services in

the immediate vicinity of the site. I address other matters relating to parking, travel and transport below, but in broad terms the appeal site is in a location where it seems to me that future residents of the proposed flats would be likely to be reliant on private transport for access to most day-to-day services.

13. There are commercial and industrial uses at the rear of the appeal site, dealing with vehicle repairs and suchlike; one of those had car bodies stacked (presumably while, or in preparation for, being scrapped) immediately adjoining the appeal site boundary. This would be right next to the balconies of the proposed rear first-floor flats, which would be only 1.2m or so from the site boundary. I address matters relating specifically to living conditions below, but the very close relationship between the appeal site and the industrial uses at its rear raises “in principle” concerns about the suitability of the site for the proposed residential use.
14. As windows and balconies of rooms of the proposed flats at the rear of the first- and second- floors would be very close to the sites to the rear, the proposed development could prejudice the continued operation of those businesses. The appellant referred to the “agent of change” principle (and, in passing, to fire safety and acoustic performance), but no detail has been provided to demonstrate how the matter might be addressed satisfactorily. The rooms served by the same first- and second-floor windows and balconies would overlook the sites at the rear from very close range; that proximity could prejudice (by limiting, if not totally preventing) any future redevelopment proposals for neighbouring sites.
15. The appeal scheme would also see the ground floor unit changed from a *sui generis* vehicle services use to Use Class E. The appeal site is not within, or especially close to, a town centre. The existing use is one to which, by its nature, customers must drive their vehicle; that consideration does not apply to the general Class E use proposed, and nothing has been put before me which justifies why an out-of-centre location would be appropriate in this case. While there are some other business uses nearby (carrying out a wide range of activities), my assumption based on the evidence available is that they, or at least their sites, pre-date the latest development plan; they do not weigh significantly in favour of the appeal proposal.
16. I conclude that because of poor connectivity to shops and services by a variety of transport options, the unsatisfactory relationship with nearby commercial and industrial uses, and the proposed introduction of a large Class E unit in an out-of-centre location, that the appeal site is not an appropriate or sustainable location for the proposed development. The development would therefore conflict with various policies of the London Plan 2021; Policy H2 which I have summarised above, Policies D13 which sets out the “agent of change” principle and seeks to ensure that established noise and other nuisance-generating uses remain viable and can continue or grow without unreasonable restrictions being placed on them, and Policies SD6 and SD7 which, among other things, promote a “town centre first” approach to development for main town centre uses.

Housing mix and accessible housing

17. Policy DMH2 of the BDLP and Policy H10 of the London Plan 2021 seek the provision of a range of unit sizes in residential developments; for private housing Policy DMH2 requires 39% of units to have one bedroom, 26% to have two bedrooms, 25% to have three bedrooms, and 10% to have four or more bedrooms.

The appeal scheme would provide six one-bedroom flats, and three two-bedroom flats (respectively 66.67% and 33.33% of the total); all would be private housing for market rental.

18. The appellant suggests that “the inclusion of smaller units was recommended in the pre-application [consultation] report”, but it is apparent from the Council’s evidence that this advice was in the context of it being part of a more diverse overall mix. The appellant’s comment that “the site is not within a town centre and [the] number of proposed units is relatively small” does not amount to a substantive justification for failing to provide the required housing mix.
19. Policy D7 of the London Plan 2021 requires that at least 10% of dwellings meet Building Regulations requirement M4(3) “wheelchair user dwellings”, and all others meet Building Regulations requirement M4(2) “accessible and adaptable dwellings”. The submitted plans show that access to the proposed flats would only be possible via a staircase, which would not comply with those requirements of the Building Regulations. The development would not therefore provide suitably accessible housing.
20. I conclude that the development would not provide an appropriate housing mix, including accessible housing, to meet identified need in the area. It would not therefore comply with Policy DMH2 of the BDLP, or Policies H10 and D7 of the London Plan 2021, the relevant provisions of which I have summarised in the preceding paragraphs.

Character and appearance, Listed Building

21. The appeal site is in a location where suburban London gives way to areas of countryside. Housing, including the neighbouring White House to the north of the appeal site, and the estate across Whalebone Lane North (including the three-storey block of flats on Kingston Hill Avenue) is overwhelmingly modest in scale, and of a traditional, pitched-roof suburban form.
22. There are also various commercial sites north and south of the appeal site, on the same eastern side of Whalebone Lane North. Some of these are little more than open yards with demountable buildings providing space for offices and other facilities but some, including the vehicle-related uses behind the appeal site (described previously) have larger single-storey shed type buildings. Although the appeal building also has only a single storey, the high ceiling height (presumably to accommodate workshop uses) means that it is a relatively tall and fairly prominent building, especially when approaching from the south where the sweeping open curve of the road means that it is visible for a good distance. Nevertheless, the simple, boxy form of the existing building is broadly in keeping with other commercial premises nearby.
23. The first floor of the proposed extension would be finished in red brickwork; the second floor would be flat-roofed, finished in dark grey zinc cladding, and set back behind the parapet of the floors below. The development would continue the boxy form of the existing building, and it would therefore retain a commercial or post-industrial appearance. However, while this might be expected in or on the edge of a town centre (or even in or close to a smaller district centre), it would be unusual for housing in the context of the surrounding area. The three-storey height would give the building a bulk and massing which would set it well above other low-rise development in the area; again, because of the open curve of Whalebone Lane

North the extension would be a prominent and intrusive addition, quite at odds with the prevailing character of the area.

24. The White House, immediately to the north of the appeal site, is a Grade II listed building¹, and I have a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, the Framework states that they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, that any harm or loss requires clear and convincing justification, and that any harm that is less than substantial must be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal.
25. I have been provided with limited information about The White House; the “Heritage Statement” submitted by the appellant referred to “the Conservation Area” – the appeal site is not in a conservation area – but omitted to mention the adjacent Listed Building². The official list entry describes the White House as dating from the early 19th century, possibly with an earlier core; it is three bays wide across its front with a gabled central porch, finished in white-painted render, with rendered chimney stacks and a pitched slate roof. The existing building on the appeal site is a very visible part of the backdrop of the listed building, especially when approaching from the west along Billet Road. While neither the existing building on the appeal site or the commercial/industrial buildings to its rear are especially sympathetic neighbours to the White House, the proposed extensions would introduce further bulky and jarring development which would dominate, and draw attention away from, the listed building thereby causing harm to its setting.
26. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, and the setting of the Grade II listed White House would not be preserved. In the Framework’s terms, the harm to the listed building as a designated heritage asset would be less than substantial. The creation of nine new flats would add to the supply of housing in the area, though as I have already described in dealing with the preceding main issues this would be in an area relatively poorly connected to everyday services, and the proposed housing mix would not be well-matched to local need; it would therefore represent only a moderate public benefit. The public benefits which have been identified would not outweigh the harm to the heritage asset, to which I must attribute great weight.
27. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD4 of the BDLP, and with Policies D1, D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021. Together, and among other things, these policies seek to ensure that development proposals demonstrate high-quality design which relates to its local context (including in respect of height, scale, massing and form), and that that the setting of designated heritage assets is protected. It would also conflict with the provisions of the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

SINC

28. The appeal site is adjacent to a SINC. No further information has been provided to me by either main party about the SINC – its status, characteristics, quality, or anything else. The appellant has suggested that the flat second-floor roof “could be utilised for green roofing which would dramatically improve the current ecological state of the site”. Given that almost the entirety of the appeal site is

¹ List entry No 1359308

² It also referred to Chingford town centre, and to policies of the Waltham Forest Local Plan, neither of which has relevance to this appeal.

given over to a building used for vehicle repairs, that may well be so. However, it still does not identify or address mitigation of potential impacts on the SINC.

29. In the absence of such information, I cannot be satisfied that the development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the nearby SINC. It would therefore conflict with Policy DMNE3 of the BDLP and Policy GG2 of the London Plan 2021 which, among other things, seek to prevent loss or degradation of SINCs, and to protect and enhance open spaces (including designated nature conservation sites).

Living conditions – proposed dwellings

30. As I have already described above, the windows and balconies of the three rear-facing first-floor flats would be little more than 1m away from the site's boundary with the industrial/commercial use at the back. Given that the activities carried out on that site appear to include the repair and breaking-up, or at least the part-breaking-up, of vehicles, it would give rise to considerable noise disturbance for occupiers of those three flats. The outlook from those flats, over an industrial yard from very short range, would also be particularly poor; the use of lifting machinery within the yard, or (say) the need for staff to climb onto stacked cars or supplies, may also have an adverse impact on privacy for occupiers of the rear flats.
31. The nature and proximity of the noise from the site at the rear would also be likely to be disturbing to residents of other flats throughout the development, not just the three at the rear of the first floor. Within the development the internal layout of the dwellings would be such that incompatible rooms would be stacked – for example, the combined living room and kitchen in Unit 7 would be directly above the bedroom in Unit 2 – so it is likely that there would also be internal noise disturbance and nuisance. Only one of the flats within the development would be genuinely dual-aspect, so the others would have limited natural ventilation and would potentially be susceptible to unacceptable overheating.
32. All habitable rooms within the development would have east- or west-facing windows, so it appears likely (though no evidence has been submitted to compellingly demonstrate) that all would receive adequate daylight and sunlight. All units would also comply with the space standards applied by the development plan, and indeed six of the nine would meet “best practice” standards. However, that the development would be acceptable in these regards would not mitigate the other shortcomings identified here.
33. I conclude that, because of those shortcomings in respect of noise and other disturbance, outlook, privacy, and ventilation and overheating, the proposed development would not provide acceptable living conditions for future residents. It would therefore conflict with Policies DMD1 and DMS13 of the BDLP, and Policies D4, D6, D13 and D14 of the London Plan 2021. Together, and among other things, those policies seek to ensure that development demonstrates high-quality design, provide comfortable and functional housing, and manages and mitigates the impact of nuisance (including noise nuisance).

Living conditions – neighbours

34. In the absence of a daylight and sunlight assessment, the Council expressed concern that the proposed development would result in a loss of natural light and outlook for occupiers of the White House. There is somewhere around 11m

between the northern edge of the appeal building and the nearest part of the White House. Although the development would see two storeys added to the existing building, the second of these would, other than for the stairwell, be set well back from the northern edge of the building; this would reduce its overall impact on sunlight or daylight reaching the neighbouring building.

35. Furthermore, the appeal site is due south of the White House; this means that (seen from the White House) the sun would be at its highest over the appeal site, further limiting the impact of the appeal scheme. Also, from what I could see during my site visit there appeared to be very few windows on the south side of the White House, so it appears largely to function as a side or secondary elevation.
36. Taking all this together, I am satisfied that the appeal scheme would not cause unacceptable harm to living conditions for occupiers of the White House. There would therefore be no conflict on this matter with Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMSI3 of the BDLP, or with Policies D4 and D6 of the London Plan 2021. Together, and among other things, these policies seek to ensure that development is well-designed and appropriate for its context, and does not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Access, servicing, transport and travel, highways

37. The submitted drawings show that a covered parking area with six spaces would be provided on the ground floor of the building to serve the proposed flats. It shows the tracked path of a single car accessing, or perhaps leaving, the space furthest from the entrance. However, it is dependent on the vehicle being reversed into, or out of, the building as there is no internal turning space; it seems likely that this would require a degree of skill in manoeuvring the vehicle which is not necessarily possessed by all motorists. Furthermore, there is no tracking shown for the other parking spaces, which would be likely to be more difficult to enter or leave. The proposed arrangement appears likely to lead to significant conflict between vehicles, or between vehicles and pedestrians, to the detriment of highway safety.
38. No vehicle parking provision is shown at all for the Class E unit which, given its poor location in respect of public transport and likely dependence on car-borne custom, is a significant shortcoming. The appellant suggests that parking spaces for the commercial unit would be provided at the side of the unit “as existing”. However, that is outside the appeal site’s “red line” boundary, and would potentially cause conflict with access to the industrial site at the rear (though I note there is already a sliding door on that elevation serving the existing vehicle services business). However, the layout may encourage other visitors to park on street. At the time of my site visit there was a great deal of parking on the footway on parts of Whalebone Lane North, so the area appears to already have something of a deficit of decent-quality parking spaces; the appeal proposal could well exacerbate this and lead to increased conflict between drivers and pedestrians or cyclists. There is also no obvious provision of cycle parking for the commercial unit which might otherwise serve to encourage and support the use of sustainable means of transport.
39. A single refuse storage area is shown on the ground floor of the building. It is not clear if it would be intended to serve only the proposed flats but, if so, there is no provision shown for the storage and collection of refuse from the Class E unit. If,

on the other hand, the internal store would be intended to serve the whole building, it is not clear that it would have sufficient capacity to be able to perform that function. Furthermore, the reliance on the same storage space and bins for the flats and the Class E unit would be a sub-optimal arrangement, likely to lead to conflict between the two groups of users. Either way, it has not been shown that the development would include adequate provision for the storage and collection of refuse and recycling.

40. Taking these points together, I conclude that the proposed development would not offer safe and convenient access and servicing. It would conflict with Policies DMT1 and DMT2 of the BDLP and Policy T6 of the London Plan 2021 which seek to reduce the dominance of vehicles and which require the provision of well-designed and managed parking; with Policy DMT3 of the BDLP and Policies T1, T2 and T5 of the London Plan which seek to support residents making shorter trips by sustainable means of transport including by providing adequate cycle parking; and with Policy DMS18 of the BDLP which requires the provision of appropriate facilities for the storage and collection of waste and recycling.

Other considerations

41. The appeal proposal would represent the development of a small site which could come forward quickly, and thus make a prompt contribution to meeting housing need. For the same reasons I have set out in addressing the heritage balance above, this is something which I consider would be a moderate benefit of the scheme.

Other Matters

42. As I have already explained above, I consulted the main parties on the relevance of the December 2024 changes to the Framework to this appeal. The appellant chose not to comment. The Council raised the issue of “grey belt”, a concept introduced in that revision of the Framework. Paragraph 155 now provides that (though I have omitted footnotes):

“the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should also not be regarded as inappropriate where all the following apply:

- a. The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;*
- b. There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed;*
- c. The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework; and*
- d. Where applicable the development proposed meets the ‘Golden Rules’ requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157 [...].”*

43. “Grey belt land” is defined in the Framework as:

“land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. ‘Grey belt’ excludes land where the application of the policies

relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development”.

44. The appeal site is undoubtedly previously developed land, and there is no suggestion from the Council that it contributes strongly to the three relevant purposes of the Green Belt; on the face of it, the site may well therefore be considered “grey belt”. However, my conclusion in respect of the Class E unit in assessing the “location” main issue also leads me to conclude that there is not a demonstrable unmet need for that aspect of the development.
45. I also find that the development would not be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to Paragraphs 110 (which says that “significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes”) and 115 (which states that “it should be ensured that sustainable transport modes are prioritised” and that “safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users”, for reasons set out in my assessment of the “location” and “access, servicing, transport and travel, highways” main issues. The proposed development would not therefore fall within the “grey belt” exception provided by Paragraph 155 of the Framework.
46. Issues relating to the delivery of housing and housing land supply in the borough are addressed in the following section; in view of my other findings set out in this section they could not have led me to a different conclusion on the question of “grey belt” development.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

47. The proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and would cause some harm to the openness of the Green Belt. These are matters to which I attach substantial weight, as required by Paragraph 153 of the Framework. In addition, it would not be an appropriate or sustainable location for the proposed development, would not provide an appropriate mix of housing (including accessible housing), would harm the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the Grade II listed White House, would not provide acceptable living conditions for future residents, and would not offer safe and convenient access and servicing; it has also not been demonstrated that it would not harm the nearby SINCE. I have found that the development would not cause unacceptable harm to living conditions for residents of the White House; this is a neutral factor in the overall balance. I have also considered and weighed the matters in the scheme’s favour which have been put to me by the appellant.
48. The appellant’s Design and Access Statement referred to the Council having a housing land supply shortfall, while the Council’s officer report noted that “Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is applicable to this application (pursuant to footnote 8)”.
49. Paragraph 11 d) of the Framework states that where policies which are most important for determining an application are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless either “the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed” or “any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key

policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination”.

50. Footnote 8, referred to by the Council, gives examples of “out-of-date” in this context; it includes, for applications involving the provision of housing, “situations where: the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (with the appropriate buffer as set out in paragraph 78); or where the Housing Delivery Test (“HDT”) indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75% of) the housing requirement over the previous three years”.
51. I have no detailed or up-to-date evidence before me in respect of the Council’s housing land supply position or HDT performance, including whether either has changed as a consequence of the adoption of the BDLP or the publication of the latest Framework. However, even if the situation now is that the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land, or adequate HDT performance, or both, Footnote 7 of the Framework explains that the “areas or assets of particular importance” referred to in Paragraph 11 d) include land designated as Green Belt, and designated heritage assets. In this case, the harm to the Green Belt, and to the setting of the Grade II listed White House, provide strong reasons for refusing the proposal. The “presumption” set out in Paragraph 11 of the Framework is therefore not engaged.
52. I conclude that the substantial weight to be given to the Green Belt harm, and the other identified harm above, arising from the development is not clearly outweighed by other considerations sufficient to demonstrate very special circumstances. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector