



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/25/3367228

Land And Buildings South West Of Moorland Grange Farm, Otley Road, Eldwick, West Yorkshire, BD16 3LX

- 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 Michael Walton, Acrehowe Ltd against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00944/OUT.
 - The development proposed is an outline application for residential development of land for 5 dwellings requesting consideration of scale, layout, appearance and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Michael Walton, Acrehowe against the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. This proposal seeks outline planning permission for five dwellings. Approval is sought for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. Access is a reserved matter; however the plans show it would be taken from Otley Road.
4. The Procedural Guide states that it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority, and on which interested people's views were sought. The appellant has submitted documents¹ to address the fifth reason for refusal. This related to insufficient information in relation to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).
5. I have considered this additional information taking into consideration the principles established by the Courts in Holborn Studios Ltd². In this case, the additional information provides further evidence in relation to the Council's reason for refusal. As this information was submitted at an early stage of the appeal the Council and interested parties have therefore had the opportunity to comment on the new information.

¹ Biodiversity Accounting Assessment Report JCA Limited dated 16/06/2025, Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool and Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessments.

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

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

- the effect of the proposal on the South Pennine Moors Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC).
- whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the Framework;
- the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
- whether the proposed development would make adequate provision for Biodiversity Net Gain; and
- whether any 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 required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

South Pennine Moors SPA and SAC.

7. The appeal site is located within the open countryside and the Green Belt. The site also lies within Zones B and C of the South Pennine Moors SPA and the SAC. The proposal for five detached dwellings, would involve the removal of a large agricultural building.
8. The Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the Regulations) imposes a duty on the competent authority to consider whether a proposed development may have a significant effect on the conservation objectives of such sites either alone, or in combination with other proposals. The features of interest for which these sites are designated include breeding populations of bird species and their habitat as set out in the Council's South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC Supplementary Planning Document (the SPM SPD).
9. The Council has developed a strategy for protecting the habitats and birds from recreational activities associated with occupants of new dwellings including cat predation, increased occurrence of predators, increased fire risk, waste and proximity of built development. It has been identified that any additional dwellings within Zone B and C would be likely to result in significant effects on the protected habitats and species. Therefore, this development alone, and in combination with other developments, would have a likely significant effect on the integrity of the SPA and SAC and would be harmful to the site's conservation objectives.
10. Policy SC8 of Bradford's Core Strategy 2017 (the CS) states that a potential mitigation for the impact could be a financial contribution towards various habitat and access management measures to preserve the integrity of the SPA and SAC. The SPM SPD sets out further detail on how the mitigation strategy will be operated, and the measures upon which any contributions will be spent. It further explains that the appropriate mechanism to secure the tariff will be via a completed planning obligation pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country planning Act 1990 (S106).

11. Although the appellant has identified they would be willing to enter into such an agreement, no S106 was provided with the application or the appeal. There is limited information before me, for example, heads of terms, confirming any agreement between the main parties in this regard or a precise figure that the appellant would be willing to contribute.
12. I appreciate the Council did not actively seek the mitigation. However, the SPM SPD sets out the Council has prepared a standardised Unilateral Undertaking form which will be the legal mechanism for the tariff collection and is available on the Council's website. This was a matter for the applicant to address as part of the proposal. The Procedural Guide: Planning appeals – England (30 June 2025) advises that If the appeal is following the written representations procedure the appellant must ensure that we receive an executed and certified copy of the planning obligation at the time of making their appeal.
13. I have considered whether the matter could be resolved by planning conditions. The Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG) advises that positively worded conditions cannot be used to secure payment of money, and that negatively worded conditions to require a planning obligation should only be used in exceptional circumstances³. This may be where there is clear evidence that the delivery of the development would otherwise be at serious risk, such as in particularly complex development schemes. There is no such clear evidence before me, and the proposal is not complex.
14. I therefore do not have an appropriate mechanism before me which would secure the mitigation expected by Policies SC8 and the SPM SPD. In these circumstances, I am unable to undertake the Appropriate Assessment required by the Regulations or address the matter further.
15. Consequently, in the absence of secured mitigation I conclude that the proposal would adversely affect the integrity of the SPA and SAC, contrary to Policy SC8 of the CS. The proposal would also be contrary to Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) wherein it advises that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be adequately mitigated, then planning permission should be refused.

Whether inappropriate development

16. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. At paragraph 154 of the Framework it states that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the exceptions a) to h) applies. The appeal site is not in a village and is not previously developed land. I have no substantive evidence before me that the proposal meets any of the criteria contained in Framework paragraph 154 a) to h).
17. Framework paragraph 155 also notes that the development of homes in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the development meets all of the criteria set out. Criterion a) includes where 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.

³ Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 21a-010-20190723

18. The appellant disputes the manner in which the Council reached its conclusion that the proposal was inappropriate development. My attention has been drawn to recent Judgments⁴ where the Court of Appeal provided guidance about the role and relationship of the Framework and the PPG. It explains at paragraph 34 how the policy objectives and purposes of the Framework are to be achieved, and the principles put into practice.⁵
19. Nevertheless, as set out in the Footnote 7 to paragraph 11 of the Framework and the PPG⁶ grey belt excludes land where the application of the policies relating to habitats sites would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development. Paragraph 194 of the Framework identifies that SPAs and SACs should be given the same protection as habitats sites.
20. In this case, the proposal has not shown that mitigation can be secured and that the proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA and SAC. Moreover, section 63(5) of the Regulations precludes the proposal from proceeding as it can only be agreed if it has been ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA and SAC. This provides a strong reason for refusing or restricting the proposed development. Therefore the appeal site does not comprise grey belt land and the criteria is not met. The proposal is not in the list of exclusions in paragraph 154 and/or 155 of the Framework contained in chapter 13.
21. I see no reason to disagree with the approach of the Inspectors who determined the various appeals which have been put before me in respect of their grey belt assessments⁷. However, for that reason they carry limited weight. In terms of this proposal, openness is an essential characteristic of the Green Belt which can have spatial as well as visual aspect. There is a strong rural character to the appeal site and the immediate area resulting from the group of dwellings and buildings with traditional appearances arranged in close proximity surrounded by large areas of open and undeveloped fields. Development further out from the appeal site consists of sporadic development of small groups of homes near the road, individual dwellings and/or agricultural type buildings set within the landscape. The surrounding undulating countryside contains a mixture of trees, hedges and low-level fencing and walls, giving the area a wild, remote, open and exposed feeling with long unobstructed views and a distinctive character. These are positive qualities of the site and the area.
22. The built form of the dwellings would replace a building (not in the same use) with a cumulative smaller ground floor footprint. However four of the main units are full two-storeys and would exceed the height of the existing agricultural building. The proposal would introduce development into space where none previously existed. In this regard there is no evidence there would not be an actual increase in volumetric built form.
23. Whilst I understand the design rationale for grouping buildings in the manner proposed, areas of unbuilt space within the courtyard framed by the proposed groups of dwellings would not be readily appreciable from the exterior. In openness terms alone I find that the proposal would appear of considerably greater mass and, in its setting, significantly more prominent than the existing built form.

⁴ Mead Realisations Ltd v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government [2025] EWCA Civ 3

⁵ Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 64-005-20250225, Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 64-008-20250225 and Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 64-009-20250225

⁶ Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 64-006-20250225

⁷ APP/H2265/W/24/3346228, APP/P1940/W/24/3346061, APP/M3645/W/24/3347328 and APP/R3650/W/24/3352222

24. Although there are homes at Sanctuary Way and Moorland Grange Barn, the site would also have a boundary with open countryside. The site plans show the development beyond the footprint of the agricultural building, advancing closer to the southerly and westerly extent of the site. The proposal would introduce access and turning areas, parking for vehicles, gardens and domestic paraphernalia. As well as built development, residential activity would also spread across parts of the wider site which are currently open. Many parts of the site are predominantly open in appearance and are perceived as a continuum of the surrounding countryside. Although the main part of the site is not extensive, the siting and arrangement of the dwellings would occupy a considerably greater part of the field of vision than the existing buildings.
25. Visually the rising land within and around the appeal site and homes towards Sanctuary Way could provide some moderation to the development within the wider landscape as the buildings would therefore not break the skyline in certain views. The development would be seen in the context of the nearby properties around Eldwick Hall. Although the ridge heights would be lower than these, no topographical survey, site levels, or building heights have been submitted to confirm this. The existing agricultural building can still be seen through gaps in walls from Otley Road. Moorland Grange Barn and therefore from several viewpoints many would appear appreciably taller than the structure which they would replace.
26. The associated reduction in visual openness would be readily perceived at close range by those using the public right of way,⁸ which runs through the appeal site as well as nearby homes. Despite the screening provided by vegetation and proposed landscape, the greater spread of the appeal scheme would be evident from longer range outlooks. There would therefore be a real and tangible reduction in openness.
27. The Council has not raised any concerns regarding the effect on the purposes contained in Framework paragraph 143 a), b) or d). I see no reason to disagree. As the site is rural it clearly would not conflict with purpose e) which seeks to assist in urban regeneration. However, the effect of development as encroachment on the countryside may also be in the form of loss of openness or intrusion. Through the loss of openness, there can also be an intrusion or encroachment into the countryside.
28. The site is but a small parcel of land, within the remaining Green Belt. There is built development in very close proximity to the site. As an individual site across the plan area it would have limited boundaries with open countryside. On a singular basis, the factors in this case mean that the scale of the proposal, and the replacement of an existing, albeit agricultural, building means is unlikely to fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt taken together across the area of the plan. However, as a matter of judgement, the proposal would not assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
29. The siting and arrangement of the proposal's built form would harm the openness of the Green Belt and not preserve it. Furthermore it would also breach a key purpose of Green Belt policy by encroaching into the countryside. In this respect the degree of harm to the openness of the Green Belt would moderate.

⁸ Public Footpath 68 Bingley

30. I therefore conclude that the proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt in terms of the Framework. Although the Council has not referred to any relevant development plan policies the proposal would not satisfy the criteria contained within paragraphs 154 and 155 of chapter 13 of the Framework. The Framework paragraph 153 states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Harm by virtue of inappropriateness and harm to openness attracts substantial weight.

Character and appearance

31. The overriding strategy for Rombalds Ridge within Volume 4 of the Bradford Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document (LC SPD) is to conserve the landscape elements that contribute to its strength. The positive qualities of appeal site referred to above reflect the key landscape elements identified within the SPD. Whilst the SPD acknowledges that civilisation is rarely out of sight, I consider that in this context, being on the edge of open countryside close to a public route, this wild and exposed landscape and the appeal site is particularly sensitive to change.
32. It is clear that the appellant is not attempting to undertake a pastiche development. However, a contemporary interpretation of a loose rural courtyard farmstead is proposed. Unit A is intended to reflect a later two-storey industrial barn. Unit B is proposed as a modern interpretation of Yorkshire farmhouse, with the timber cladding intended to reflect a coal tar painted barn. Units C and D would be constructed from stone. I recognise that Unit E has been designed with a sedum sloping roof with the intention to transition with the landscape.
33. Although the timber material proposed for Units A and B reflect the building in the foreground, the origins of using such a dark colour treatment is not sufficiently evidenced. I find it would be uncomfortable against the more muted tones of Moorland Grange Barn. Although this could be tempered and alternative materials could be used, there are no specific details before me to consider this. In relation to Unit E, I find this to be a harsh and defined steeply sloped feature, which would not appear natural and would be an incongruous form of development in the area, as well as significantly undermining the farmstead arrangement.
34. The nearby existing dwellings, buildings and plot sizes around Eldwick Hall vary in scale, however, they have a gentle, communal and cohesive appearance. In my view the limited variation in the ridge height, form massing and layout and external appearance of the proposed units would also be clearly residential but would appear more urban and assertive than nearby homes.
35. The proposed combination of the design of the units and their overall scales and arrangement would not in my view be suitable for the context. The extent and scale of the development, combined with its discernibly contemporary appearance, would stand starkly and dominantly within the rural landscape. The presence of Moorland Grange Barn would not mitigate the proposed built development particularly as this unit and the proposed development is sited further away from the urbanising feature of the main road. The proposal would have a significant urbanising effect on the surrounding area, thereby diminishing the intrinsic qualities of the site and its surroundings.

36. There is also little discussion regarding the formation of gardens or any engineering that may be required. Due to the site's location, the proposed houses and associated gardens, along with the creation of the access road and parking areas, would result in a significant change to this landscape here. The built development, alongside the likely associated domestic paraphernalia and increased activity, signifies a fundamental shift in land use from rural to residential.
37. New landscape planting would help reduce the proposals impact upon the area. However, the scheme is not specific on the numbers of species or their positions. The landscape intention to not obscure views from existing homes and create low growing habitat towards the north of the application site means that I am not certain the proposed landscape would be effective especially during autumn and winter or that it would screen views from the right of way.
38. Overall, there is no particular evidence to demonstrate that I should find the arrangement, materials, and features are typical or reflective of any traditional gritstone farmstead in this location. Whilst contrasting development can be an opportunity to highlight the qualities of traditional building forms and the evolution of the area, they should also fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.
39. The LC SPD notes large modern farm buildings within the upland pasture are detractors in the landscape. The existing agricultural building to be demolished is clad with steel sheets of multiple different colours. Whilst it has a somewhat vibrant appearance, nevertheless, the building is relatively low and set into the landscape. The setting of the building within a field largely void of hardstanding, means that the site does not significantly detract from the predominant rural land use and character of the area.
40. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies, EN4, DS1, DS2, DS3 AND HO9 of the CS. Together, and insofar as they are relevant to this matter these seek to ensure that proposal should make a positive contribution towards conservation of landscapes, integrates with the landscape and ensure that development achieves good design, informed by the site and its context to ensure proposals create a strong sense of place.
41. I have not been provided with the Homes and Neighbourhoods Supplementary Planning Document, and therefore I am unable to conclude whether the proposal is in accordance with this guidance.

Biodiversity Net Gain

42. Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (the Schedule) introduced a statutory framework for BNG. There is nothing before me which indicates that the proposed development would not be subject to the mandatory BNG condition, which requires developers to deliver a BNG of at least 10%. Article 7(1A) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 (as amended) sets out the minimum information requirements that should accompany applications that are subject to the BNG requirement.
43. The appellant has provided a BNG assessment and matrix and has outlined enhancements. The baseline habitat units present on site have been identified. The

report concludes that the proposal will result in an equivalent net gain of 10.72%. The Council had the opportunity to review these and has not disputed the findings in the documents.

44. I therefore conclude that the proposal has provided sufficient information and would fulfil the requirement of CS Policy EN2 insofar as it seeks to ensure that proposals should contribute towards the overall enhancement of the District's biodiversity resource.

Other Considerations

45. There is dispute between the parties regarding the accessibility of the appeal site. I was able to walk along the right of way across the site towards the main road. There was a bus stop in close by. The appellant has provided some bus timetables, which indicates that residents would have access to non-car modes of transport to reach facilities and services. There is also a pavement at this point, with street lights leading to Eldwick, which has various services and facilities. Whilst not suitable for all users this would allow some people to walk and cycle there. Overall the appeal site is close to existing homes and is not in any less of a suitable location than those. I am also mindful that the Framework at paragraph 110 advises that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas. This attracts positive weight in favour of the proposal.
46. A suitable and safe access for all is something that all development must achieve. I have noted that the Highway Authority has identified that the proposed development would lead to an intensification in use of a substandard access track. However, the Council has not refused the proposal on this matter. It has not been substantiated that the road could not be brought up to adoptable standards. Whilst the potential for the proposal to improve a substandard access would be a benefit, I cannot attribute any weight to this as there are no final details before me.
47. The Council has a deficient five year housing land supply. The weight the Council gives to other proposals⁹ is a planning judgement based on a range of factors. However, in this case the provision of five homes in a location capable of being served by non-car modes of transport, streetlights and pavements in relatively close proximity to a larger settlement where there is an under provision of homes, would make a small but valuable contribution to the supply. This is a clear benefit of the proposal, which attracts moderate weight.
48. There would be some economic benefits through the construction and occupation of the development. Paragraph 73 of the Framework states that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, are essential for Small and Medium Enterprise housebuilders to deliver new homes and are often built-out relatively quickly. The proposal would provide over 10% biodiversity net gain, potentially increasing the biodiversity of the site. I attach moderate weight to these benefits.
49. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 (7) of the Equality Act 2010 (the EqA), which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.

⁹ 23/04366/OUT

50. It has been put to me that people who benefit from multi-generational homes can hold relevant protected characteristics, in particular age, disability and race. Multi-generational homes could benefit all groups with protected characteristics; however such proposals could also support in particular those with protected characteristics of pregnancy and maternity and religion or belief. Since there is the potential for my decision to affect persons with protected characteristics, I have therefore had due regard to the three equality principles set out in Section 149 (1) of the EqA.
51. I do not doubt that multi-generational homes would provide meaningful benefits in terms of health, social support, and assistance, particularly where they provide ground floor annex accommodation. There would likely be benefits in terms of health and well-being for residents who need such homes. Potentially benefits could also arise though less reliance on social and health services.
52. However, there is no mechanism before me that could secure this use in perpetuity. There is also no evidence the homes are to be provided for a specific group, family or individual. Although it is purported that rural areas have fewer multi-generation homes, it has also not been substantiated if there is a particular unmet need for this type of development, other than a more general housing supply need. As such, given the number of homes proposed I attribute limited weight to this aspect.
53. The existing agricultural building could be used for livestock in the future. This can be undesirable depending on a range of factors and how the site is managed. However, the benefit of removing this potential use is tempered as it is not known if this is likely to occur, the number of livestock or if any complaints were raised when it was in such use by nearby residents. Furthermore, it is not known if the location of the prior approval scheme was assessed in terms of whether its proximity to a livestock building was impractical or undesirable for living conditions or whether any mitigation was provided. I therefore attribute limited weight to this.
54. Under section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings. Eldwick Hall, the Eldwick Hall enclosed garden wall and gate-piers, flanking walls approximately 15 metres east of Eldwick Hall and Moorland Grange Farmhouse¹⁰ are Grade II listed. Their significance and special interest can be derived from their architectural quality, linked with the historic and social development of the area. The appeal site is some distance from these and separated by intervening land and later built development. I have no evidence of any special or historical link between the appeal site and these listed buildings. As a consequence, I consider there would be no harm to their setting, this weighs neither for nor against the proposal.
55. The appellant contends the approved development¹¹ shows the prior acceptance of materials, and forms of development within or near the Rombalds Ridge Landscape Character Area and Green Belt, which justify the current proposed development. I note the Tewitt Lane, and Cragg Farm approvals were for replacement dwellings. I have also been referred to other approvals at Raines Farm for a small rural housing scheme with a similar design ethos to this proposal. Other schemes at Sun Hill Drive on a housing estate and a proposal that benefitted from a Class Q conversion to a dwelling at Ramsgill have also been submitted.

¹⁰ List Entries: 1133333, 1133334, 113333 and 1314292

¹¹ 20/02366/FUL, 11/00978/FUL, 08/03862/FUL, 16/01921/FUL, 24/04336/FUL, 21/06205/FUL

56. Whilst I note the similarities in particular with the Raines Farm development, only basic elevations and description of the circumstances were supplied. Without the complete officer reports, I cannot be certain of the weight that was attributed to any other considerations that may have been relevant at that time. I have considered this appeal on its own merits, and the use of similar materials and modern features on other development elsewhere, even if nearby, or for a similar type of development does not justify a proposal that is harmful.
57. The appellant proposes that permitted development rights under Class Q and R of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the GPDO) could be exercised for the conversion of the existing agricultural building into homes, a hotel or industrial units. This represents a fallback position. However, permitted development under the GPDO is subject to a number of conditions and limitations. There is no discussion on these conditions, and the submitted plans are restricted to floor area only. Consequently, it is not possible to ascertain if it would be a realistic or probable alternative and if prior approval would be given. Furthermore, in comparison to the fall-back proposals, the evidence I have suggests there would be a greater spread of the development arising from the proposed development. I find the suggested fallback positions to have limited weight in the determination of the appeal.

Other Matters

58. It is not necessary to comment on Council policy regarding the number of home served by a private roads. In any event, I have not been provided with the policy and it is unclear if this a policy within the development plan or required for good reasons related to highway safety. Nor are matters relating to the political make-up of the Council within my remit to discuss.
59. Whilst I note the comments of interested parties, other than specified they did not form a reason for refusal. There is no substantive evidence the proposal would result in other harms. As I am dismissing the appeal, there is no reason for me to consider these matters further.

Green Belt and Planning Balance

60. When a Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, the Framework advises planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the proposal. The Green Belt and SPA/SAC are such areas/assets, and I have found harm in these respects, providing strong reasons for refusing the appeal proposal. Consequently, paragraph 11 d) of the Framework is disengaged and the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.
61. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations as set out at Paragraph 153 of the Framework. The harm to the Green Belt, SPA/SAC and the related policy conflicts are substantial objections to the appeal proposal in their own right, however taken together they weigh substantially against the appeal proposal. The proposal also harms the character and appearance of the area, which attracts significant weight against the proposal in its own right.

62. The other considerations put forward together carry moderate weight. It follows that the totality of the substantial weight to be given to Green Belt harm, and the other harm to the SPA/SAC and the character and appearance of the area, is not clearly outweighed by other considerations in this case and therefore the very special circumstances required to justify the proposed development do not exist. The moderate weight to the benefits would not outweigh this harm and policy conflict.

Conclusion

63. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR