



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2025

by R Major BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A0665/W/25/3364367

Land at Crown Inn Farm, Crown Lane, Lower Peover, Knutsford WA16 9QB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Duffy of Beluga Group Ltd against the decision of Cheshire West and Chester Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00386/OUT.
 - The development proposed is outline planning application for 12no. self-build/custom-build dwellings with associated access and supporting infrastructure. A Design Code and Plot Passports accompany this application. Matters of final appearance, landscaping, layout and scale will be confirmed with subsequent reserved matters applications for each plot.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Outline planning permission is sought with the means of access to be considered at this stage. The submitted application therefore includes a site access plan showing how the site would be accessed. The submitted application also includes an indicative layout plan showing how the dwellings could be arranged on the site, and I have had due regard to this illustrative plan in the consideration of this proposal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the appeal site is a suitable location for housing, having regard to the Council's spatial strategy, the relevant development plan policies and the proximity of facilities, services and sustainable modes of transport;
 - the effect of the proposal on protected species, with particular regard to bats;
 - the effect of the proposal on the efficiency of the Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope; and
 - whether a planning obligation is necessary in respect of matters relating to self-build; affordable housing; open space and education.

Reasons

Location and sustainability

4. The appeal relates to a site known as Crown Inn Farm to the west of Crown Lane in Swann Green, Lower Peover. The appellant states that the farm ceased operation in

2014, however the buildings relating to this previous agricultural use have been retained on the site.

5. I observed that some activities appeared to be taking place within a few of the existing buildings, and within parts of the external areas of the site. However, I have been provided with no substantive details in respect of any lawful change of use of the appeal site, and the buildings, from its former agricultural use.
6. The appeal proposal seeks outline planning permission to demolish the existing buildings on this site and replace them with 12no. self-build/custom-build dwellings with associated access and supporting infrastructure. The proposed dwellings would be accessed via the existing access point off Crown Lane.
7. Policy STRAT 2 of Cheshire West and Chester Council Local Plan (Part One) Strategic Policies (LP1) (2015) seeks to ensure that development is brought forward in line with a settlement hierarchy. As the villages of Swann Green and Lower Peover are not defined as settlements the appeal site falls within the open countryside. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy STRAT 2.
8. Additionally, Policy STRAT 9 of LP1 and Policy DM19 of Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan (Part Two) Land Allocations and Detailed Policies (2019) (LP2) set out the forms of development that will be permitted in the countryside. The appellant has not put forward a case that the proposal would constitute any of the forms of development that are listed within these policies, nor has it been demonstrated that the proposal could not be accommodated within identified settlements.
9. Policy STRAT 1 of LP1 seeks to enable development that improves and meets the economic, social and environmental objectives of the borough in line with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This policy includes a number of sustainable development principles, including the principle to locate new housing, with good accessibility to existing or proposed local shops, community facilities and primary schools with good connections to public transport.
10. Similarly, LP1 Policy STRAT 8 states that within the rural area the Council will support development that serves local needs in the most accessible and sustainable locations to sustain vibrant rural communities. At paragraph 5.67 this policy acknowledges that beyond key service centres there are many smaller settlements which have a lower level of services and access to public transport but could acceptably accommodate some small-scale development. This paragraph goes on to state that these settlements act as local service centres and will be identified through the LP2. In this regard, the settlements of Lower Peover or Swann Green are not identified as local service centres in LP2.
11. I did however observe that there is a convenience store / post office and a public house within close proximity to the appeal site. Also, to the north is a school, a church and another public house, and the appellant has also referred to a nursery. I found that these services and facilities were within a suitable walking distance of the appeal site via footways.
12. Nevertheless, I find the level of services and facilities in the vicinity to be limited and future occupiers would therefore need to travel to larger neighbouring settlements to meet their likely day-to-day requirements. These larger settlements would not be within a reasonable walking distance of the appeal site.

13. The appellant has drawn my attention to Plumley train station as a sustainable mode of transport. However, this train station is a significant walking distance from the appeal site and Plumley Moor Road does not benefit from a continuous footway or street lighting. As such, in order to access this train station on foot future occupiers would have to walk within the road and this would be particularly difficult and hazardous in darker conditions, and for pedestrians with young children, a disability or a buggy.
14. I acknowledge that cycling to the train station and facilities within neighbouring settlements may be an option for some future residents. However, it is not necessarily an attractive alternative given the lack of separate cycle lanes / routes and lack of street lighting on some of the roads. Additionally, not everyone has access to a bike or the ability to ride a bike.
15. I therefore find that walking and cycling to the Plumely train station, and the greater level of services and facilities in neighbouring settlements, are not realistic alternatives to the car for regular journeys. Furthermore, I have not been made aware of any existing bus services from Lower Peover to neighbouring settlements, or the train station.
16. In view of all the above, based on the evidence before me, I conclude that future occupiers of the proposed dwellings would not have good access to facilities, services and public transport connections. Consequently, future occupiers would be reliant on the private vehicle and the appeal site does not therefore represent a sustainable location. It would also be an inappropriate location for residential development according to the development plan's spatial strategy.
17. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies STRAT 1, STRAT 2 and STRAT 8 of LP1 where they together seek to direct new development to the most accessible and sustainable locations with good accessibility to existing or proposed local shops, community facilities and primary schools and with good connections to public transport. The proposal would also be contrary to the relevant sections of LP1 Policy STRAT 9 and LP2 Policy DM19 which limit development in countryside areas to that requiring a countryside location, and which set out the forms of development that will be permitted in the countryside.

Protected species

18. The appeal proposal is accompanied by an Ecological Assessment¹ (dated Feb 2022) (EA) and an Ecological Update² (dated Oct 2022) (EU). The EA details how bat droppings were found within one of the buildings (B1) on the appeal site, and that another building (B2) is not considered to provide roosting opportunities for bats due to its construction and materials.
19. As a result of the findings within B1, three emergence / re-entry surveys were carried out at this building in July, August and September 2021. The EA states that no bats were seen emerging from or re-entering the building during these surveys. It therefore advises that the building is considered to support a non-breeding day / night roost and feeding perch for Common Pipistrelle and Brown Long-eared bats.
20. The EA and EU from 2022 have not been updated as part of the appeal proposal.

¹ Ecology Solutions Ref: 9891.EcoAss.vf

² Ecology Solutions Ref: 9891.EcoUpdate.vf

21. The Council's Biodiversity Team assert that due to the submitted EA and surveys being more than three years old, new ecological surveys are required to assess the potential for bats to be present on this site. In the absence of such surveys the Council state that there is currently insufficient information to determine the impacts of the proposal on these protected species and secure any required mitigation or compensation.
22. In regard to the above, the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (Habitat Regulations) impose a duty on me to consider whether European Protected Species (EPS) would be affected by the development. All bat species are designated and protected as EPS and are protected under the Habitat Regulations.
23. The Government Guidance '*Bats: advice for making decisions*' states that proposals for demolition could affect a bat roost in a building and provides a list of characteristics and features a building may have where a survey should be asked for. This list includes where a building has cracks, crevices and small openings.
24. During my visit I saw that the building in question appeared to be of considerable age and was constructed with a traditional brick design. I observed that there were several small cracks and openings, particularly at first floor level.
25. As such, on the information before me and my observations on site, I cannot rule out that this building has the potential to be used as a habitat by bats. Furthermore, given the time that has elapsed since the submitted ecological surveys, and emergence / re-entry surveys, were undertaken, I cannot be sure that they accurately reflect the existing situation on site in respect of the potential presence of bats within this building.
26. Consequently, I find that updated ecological survey work, undertaken by a suitably qualified individual, is required to establish the level of risk of bats roosting within this building and to determine whether any further surveys would be required. Without this information I am unable to form a judgement on the potential impact of the proposal on this EPS.
27. I note the appellant's view that updated survey works could be controlled by planning condition and the results issued prior to commencement of works. However, Circular 06/2005: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation states that it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent to which they may be affected by development, is established before planning permission is granted. It would therefore not be appropriate to apply a condition requiring updated ecological survey works to be carried out.
28. In view of the above, I conclude that insufficient information has been submitted to adequately demonstrate that the proposed development would not cause harm to protected species, with particular regard to bats. The proposal would therefore conflict with the protected species aims of LP1 Policy ENV4 and LP2 Policy DM44 which together seek to protect habitats, sites and/or features and requires development likely to have an impact on protected species to be accompanied by an Ecological Assessment that complies with industry best practice and guidance. The proposal would also conflict with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to minimise the impact on priority or threatened species, such as bats.

Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope

29. The appeal site is located within the Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope Consultation Zone (Consultation Zone) where Policy DM12 of the LP2 supports development that would not impair the efficiency of the Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope, subject to other relevant development plan policies.
30. The explanation text to this policy details how the radio telescopes at Jodrell Bank are of international importance for radio astronomy and their value depends upon being able to receive radio emissions from space with a minimum of interference from electronic equipment.
31. Jodrell Bank is a designated World Heritage Site and is operated by the University of Manchester, who have provided comments on the appeal proposal. These comments detail how the future of radio astronomy relies on simultaneously maintaining the continued regulatory protection of key frequency bands, the continued protection of radio telescope sites from the build-up of activity which generates uncontrolled radio interference, and the continual development of radio astronomy techniques to distinguish between cosmic and terrestrial signals. It also details how the Lovell Telescope, and other telescopes at this facility, are used by hundreds of research astronomers from the UK and around the world.
32. I understand that equipment commonly found and used within residential dwellings causes radio frequency interference and this can impair the efficient operation of the radio telescopes. As such, the proposed dwellings would likely contain items of electrical and electronic equipment that generate radio noise, which in turn would interfere and impact with the radio telescopes at this internationally important facility.
33. Using detailed internationally accepted modelling³ the University of Manchester predict the levels of radio noise from the appeal proposal would exceed the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) Recommendation RA.769.2 threshold for harmful interference to radio astronomy by a factor of 8, assuming a typical inventory of electrical and electronic equipment is used within these properties. Furthermore, it is claimed that this may be a conservative estimate given allowances that have been made for building shielding and other clutter.
34. It is stated that the consequences of such a level of interference would cause additional unwanted perturbations of sensitive radio astronomy measurements. The evidence before me explains how this can lead to additional measurement error and irrecoverable loss of some data, potentially at key times and at key frequencies. Resulting in a requirement to extend or repeat observations to make up for lost data.
35. The appellant has not provided any detailed evidence to dispute the calculations submitted by the University of Manchester of the predicted levels of radio noise arising from the appeal proposal, and its potential effects on the Jodrell Bank facility.
36. I do however acknowledge that there are existing settlements between the appeal site and Jodrell Bank. I also recognise that existing development within the Consultation Zone will already interfere with the telescope and the scale of the development proposed is very small in comparison to the amount of housing already situated within this Consultation Zone.

³ ITU recommendation ITU-R P.452 'Prediction procedure for the evaluation of interference between stations on the surface of the Earth at frequencies above about 0.1 GHz'

37. Nevertheless, it is clear that whilst existing development is already impairing efficiency, the proposed development would exacerbate the interference and therefore further degrade the ability of the facility at Jodrell Bank to perform its internationally recognised function.
38. The appellant has drawn my attention to an allowed appeal⁴ for residential development, albeit in a neighbouring authority, within the Consultation Zone. Whilst each proposal must be judged on its own merits, this appeal decision is a material consideration.
39. However, I have not been provided with all the details in respect of that appeal and am therefore not aware of all the information the inspector had before them. Nevertheless, I note that appeal relates to a proposal for 4no. dwellings and therefore the quantum of development is not comparable to the scheme before me for 12no. dwellings.
40. Furthermore, it would appear from that decision letter that a 'Jodrell Bank Protection' plan detailing the construction and insulation measures was provided as part of that appeal. Such a document has not been provided with the appeal before me. Additionally, I note the inspector states there was nothing before them to indicate that the proposal would exceed the ITU recommendation. Again, this is not comparable to the case before me whereby detailed analysis of the predicted harmful effects of the appeal proposal on this facility, above the ITU recommendation threshold, have been provided.
41. As such, the differences between that appeal decision referred to by the appellant, and the appeal scheme before me, limits the weight I can attribute to it in my determination of this proposal.
42. The appellant has also stated that they would be willing to accept a planning condition requiring mitigation measures to limit the effect of the proposal on Jodrell Bank to be attached to any allowed appeal. However, in the absence of specific details I have no certainty that any such mitigation measures would be successful in adequately limiting the impact, or that any such condition would be enforceable over time.
43. In view of all the above, and on the evidence before me, I conclude that the appeal proposal would impair the efficiency of the Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope and consequently there would be conflict with Policy DM12 of LP2.

Planning obligation

44. The Council's Officer Report and Statement of Case provide details of provisions and contributions which they consider are required to be secured by way of a planning obligation. However, a completed planning obligation has not been provided with the appeal. In this regard the planning obligations section of the procedural guidance⁵ states that for appeals following the written representations procedure the appellant must ensure that an executed and certified copy of the planning obligation is received at the time of making their appeal.
45. In the absence of a completed planning obligation it is however for me to determine whether a planning obligation is necessary to secure these provisions and whether

⁴ APP/R0660/W/22/3291202

⁵ Planning Inspectorate Procedural Guide: Planning Appeals – England

the contributions requested by the Council all meet the tests for planning obligations outlined in paragraph 58 of the Framework and Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (CIL Regulations).

Self-build

46. The appeal proposal has been submitted as a self/custom-build development. The Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act (2015) (as amended) places a statutory duty on Council's to keep a register of the persons who are interested in acquiring a self-build or custom-build plot, and to grant enough suitable development permissions for serviced plots to meet the demand.
47. The appellant asserts that the Council does not have sufficient evidence of an adequate supply of permissions for self/custom build housing to meet its statutory duty. The Council dispute this claim. The appellant has also drawn my attention to appeal decisions relating to shortcomings used in identifying permissions that would meet the demand for self-build plots⁶ and doubts about using single dwelling permissions within the calculation of self-build permissions granted⁷.
48. Nevertheless, and notwithstanding these appeal decisions, in order to meet the legislative requirements for self/custom-build housing, and therefore meet the statutory duty, developments must be adequately secured as such.
49. In this regard, the appellant states that the proposed dwellings can be secured as self/custom-build housing by a planning condition or a planning obligation. The Council contend that this should be secured by way of a planning obligation and have drawn my attention to an appeal decision⁸ relating to how self-build provision is secured.
50. The appellant has not provided a planning obligation with this appeal, nor have they provided any suggested wording for a planning condition to secure the properties as self/custom-build housing. I note the Council, despite their view clearly being that self/custom-build housing should be secured by a planning obligation, has provided a suggested condition relating to this matter in the event that the appeal be allowed without a planning obligation.
51. However, in my view this condition is not enforceable and therefore would not meet the requirements of paragraph 57 of the Framework. As such, I have no legal agreement, undertaking or other mechanism before me to secure these dwellings as self-build plots under the legislative requirements of the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended).
52. Consequently, in the absence of any mechanism to secure this provision, I cannot give any weight to the self/custom-build consideration in favour of the appeal proposal.

Affordable Housing

53. The subtext to Policy SOC1 of LP1 identifies a net shortfall of 714no. affordable homes each year for the five-year period between 2013/14 – 2017/18. It goes on to state that this demonstrates the degree of imbalance between supply and demand

⁶ APP/A0665/W/14/2212671

⁷ APP/G2435/W/18/3214451

⁸ APP/F2415/W/24/3338486

for affordable housing, rather than being specific targets for affordable housing, and highlights that there is a clear justification for an affordable housing policy.

54. To that end Policy SOC1 states that in rural areas a target of 30% affordable housing will be sought on all new residential development on sites with a capacity of three or more dwellings.
55. I acknowledge that the appellant's submission states that the proposed development would provide 4no. affordable plots that would be sold at a discounted rate of 80% of market value.
56. I also note that the Council states that given high property prices, local incomes and high build costs it is likely that the affordable units would need to be discounted by significantly more than 20% of market value and this would need to be secured by a legal agreement.
57. Nevertheless, as detailed above a planning obligation has not been provided to secure any affordable housing as part of this proposed development. Accordingly, the absence of a planning obligation to secure any affordable housing results in conflict with LP1 Policy SOC1, and this weighs significantly against the appeal proposal given the identified need for affordable housing.

Open Space

58. Policy SOC6 of LP1 states that development will be required to incorporate or contribute towards the provision of an appropriate level and quality of open space, sport and recreation provision.
59. Policy DM35 of LP2 states that proposals for new residential development will be required to provide open space, where there are existing deficiencies in quantity, quality or access to open space or the development generates a need that cannot be met by existing provision. This policy goes on to explain that where on-site provision is not practical, a financial contribution will be sought to secure open space provision elsewhere or enhancement to an existing site(s).
60. Policy DM35 further states that in establishing the amount and type of open space provision and/or of financial contribution required the Council will have regard to:
 - quantity, quality and access to existing provision, as set out in the Open Space Study;
 - nature of the proposed development and surrounding area; and
 - site constraints
61. The Council's Officer Report details that the development would require contributions, in relation to amenity greenspace, play child, play youth, allotments and parks and recreation totalling £27,186. It also refers to a sports pitch contribution amounting to £4,909, as well as a 10-year maintenance sum of £6,510, and a changing facility capital sum of £8,581, allocated to Winnington Park RUFC.
62. Whilst no specific analysis has been provided as to why an on-site contribution is not practical, it is reasonable to assume that the fact the Council has requested an off-site contribution be secured via a planning obligation suggests they are satisfied that the required on-site provision cannot be provided.

63. Nevertheless, as part of their submissions the Council has not provided any details relating to evidence of existing deficiencies in open space provision, or details of the methodology for calculating the requested contributions. Furthermore, it is unclear whether all the requested contributions would be allocated to Winnington Park RUFC, or just the sports pitch, maintenance and changing facility contributions.
64. Accordingly, and in view of the above, I cannot be certain that the contributions sought in relation to off-site open space provision would be necessary to make the development acceptable or that they would be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
65. Consequently, and notwithstanding the aims of LP1 Policy SOC6 and LP2 Policy DM34, on the evidence before me I am unable to conclude that a planning obligation seeking to provide these contributions for off-site open space provision would comply with the CIL Regulations and paragraph 58 of the Framework. In these circumstances the absence of a planning obligation to secure these contributions does not weigh against the development.

Education

66. The Council's Officer report states that a Special Education Needs contribution, equating to £16,376 would be required and this request arises from comments received from the Education Team. Whilst the Education Team's comments provide some details as to how this figure has been calculated, I have not been provided with any Local Plan Policy, Supplementary Planning Document or advice note relating to education contributions for new development.
67. As such, due to the lack of substantive evidence before me, I am unable to conclude that a planning obligation seeking to provide a contribution towards education provision would be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and therefore complies with the CIL Regulations and paragraph 58 of the Framework. In these circumstances the absence of a planning obligation to secure this contribution does not weigh against the development.

Summary

68. In view of all the above, on the basis of the information before me I conclude that the requested contributions for off-site open space provision and education would not comply with CIL Regulations and paragraph 58 of the Framework.
69. However, a planning obligation would be required to secure the provision of on-site affordable housing and the development as self/custom-build housing.
70. The absence of a completed planning obligation to secure any affordable housing within this appeal scheme results in conflict with the requirements of LP1 Policy SOC1, where it states in rural areas a target of 30% affordable housing will be sought on all new residential development on sites with a capacity of three or more dwellings. As detailed above, this weighs significantly against the appeal proposal.

Planning Balance

71. The proposal does not represent a suitable location for housing when having regard to the relevant development plan policies and its spatial strategy. Furthermore, future occupiers of the proposed dwellings would not have good access to facilities, services and public transport connections and would be reliant on the private vehicle. The

appeal site does not therefore represent a sustainable location for residential development. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies STRAT 1, STRAT 2, STRAT 8 and STRAT 9 of LP1, and LP2 Policy DM19.

72. There is insufficient information submitted with this appeal to adequately demonstrate that the proposed development would not cause harm to protected species, with particular regard to bats. The proposal would therefore conflict with the protected species aims of LP1 Policy ENV4 and LP2 Policy DM44.
73. From the evidence before me I also find that the appeal proposal would impair the efficiency of the Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope and consequently there would be conflict with Policy DM12 of LP2. Additionally, the absence of a completed planning obligation to secure any affordable housing within this appeal scheme results in conflict with the requirements of LP1 Policy SOC 1.
74. I find the cumulative harm arising from the above conflicts to be substantial.
75. Paragraph 225 of the Framework makes it clear that due weight should be given to existing policies according to their degree of consistency with the Framework. In this respect the Framework seeks to direct new housing to suitable locations, to actively manage patterns of growth, and expects development to promote sustainable travel modes, such as walking and cycling, that limit future car use. The Framework also seeks to minimise the impact on priority or threatened species and make provision for affordable housing. I therefore give significant weight to the conflict between the proposal and LP1 Policies STRAT 1, STRAT 2, STRAT 8, STRAT 9, ENV4 and SOC1, and LP2 Policies DM12, DM19 and DM44. As the proposal would be contrary to these policies there would be conflict with the development plan as a whole.
76. The Council has confirmed that it cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. In these circumstances footnote 8 of the Framework establishes that the policies which are most important for determining the appeal are deemed out-of-date. Consequently, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the 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.
77. Footnote 9 explains the policies referred to are those in paragraphs 66; 84; 91; 110; 115; 129, 135 and 139 of the Framework (as the appeal proposal does not propose a main town centre use paragraph 91 is not relevant to this appeal).
78. In respect of paragraph 84, the appeal site is in proximity to existing built development and the proposal would not therefore result in isolated homes in the countryside. I find paragraph 84 is therefore not applicable. Nevertheless, even if applicable, the proposal would not adhere to any of the five criteria within paragraph 84 which permits isolated homes in the countryside.
79. The appeal proposal is submitted in outline form with layout, scale, landscaping and appearance reserved matters. Based on the information submitted at outline permission stage, I find no conflict with the design provisions of paragraphs 135 and 139 of the Framework.
80. The proposal relates to major development involving the provision of housing and has failed to secure the provision of affordable housing. The proposal would therefore fail

to comply with paragraph 66 of the Framework relating to the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs.

81. Furthermore, I have found that the appeal site is not located within a sustainable location and would not limit future car use as the site does not have good access to facilities, services and public transport connections. The proposal would not therefore accord with paragraphs 110, 115 (a) and 129 (c) of the Framework.
82. In addition, the Framework seeks to significantly boost the supply of homes and make efficient use of land. The Council has confirmed that it can currently demonstrate a 1.89-year supply of deliverable housing sites. As such, whilst the provision of 12no. additional dwellings would make a fairly moderate contribution to the Council's housing land supply position, taking into account the Council's significant shortfall in deliverable housing sites, I attach significant weight to the social benefits arising from the provision of 12no. dwellings.
83. The appellant states that the provision of affordable housing on this site is a benefit, as is the provision of self/custom building housing. However, as detailed earlier there is no legal agreement or other mechanism before me to secure the required affordable housing provision, or to secure the properties as self/custom-build housing under the legislative requirements of the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended). Consequently, due to a lack of a mechanism to secure these matters, I cannot give the self/custom-build and affordable housing considerations any weight in favour of the appeal proposal. Moreover, for the reasons given earlier the lack of a mechanism to secure the required affordable housing provision weighs against the proposal.
84. Economic benefits would arise from the proposal, including contributions to the local economy during the construction phase of the development. These however would be short term benefits. In accordance with paragraph 83 of the Framework further economic benefits would also arise from additional spending in the wider area by future occupants of the dwellings. Cumulatively, given the scale of development the economic support to the area arising from the appeal proposal would be relatively modest. I therefore attach moderate weight in respect of the economic benefits.
85. I note the appellant has made reference to additional Council Tax revenue as a benefit of the appeal proposal. The Planning Practice Guidance is however clear that it would not be appropriate to make a decision based on the potential for a scheme to raise money for the local authority or other government body. As such, Council Tax contributions do not add weight in favour of the appeal scheme.
86. The appellant states that the appeal proposal would result in a visual improvement when compared to the existing appearance of the site. I observed that the existing buildings on this site are set back behind the properties fronting the highway and are therefore partially screened. They also have a design and appearance commonly found on former agricultural sites, such as this, within the open countryside. I do not therefore find the existing site has an unduly harmful visual impact upon the character and appearance of the area.
87. Furthermore, matters relating to the layout, appearance, scale and landscaping are all reserved and therefore on the information before me at outline stage I cannot be sure that the final design of the proposed development would result in a visual improvement of the existing site. This therefore limits the weight I can attribute to this matter at outline stage.

88. Additionally, the appellant also states that the proposed dwellings would incorporate renewable energy techniques. However, there is no energy statement before me to demonstrate the exact energy efficiency level that the proposed dwellings would achieve. This therefore limits the weight I can attribute to this as a matter in favour of the appeal proposal at outline stage.
89. In view of all the above, I find that the adverse impacts arising from the appeal site's unsustainable location; the impacts on the Council's development strategy for the location of new development; the lack of sufficient information relating to protected species; the impact on the efficiency of the Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope; and the absence of a completed planning obligation to secure the required level of affordable housing, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

90. I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

R Major

INSPECTOR