



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2025

by F Cullen BA(Hons) MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/W/24/3353429

Thorley Wash Grange, Thorley Street, Thorley, Bishop's Stortford, Herefordshire CM23 4AT

- 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 Steve Allan, Stallan Group Ltd, against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 3/24/0192/FUL.
 - The development proposed is construction of four detached residential premises on land to the east of Thorley Wash Grange, Spellbrook.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above is taken from the application form. This differs to that in the Council's Decision Notice and the appellant's appeal form¹. The latter provides more clarity in terms of the proposal and I have determined the appeal on this basis. I am satisfied that no parties' interests are prejudiced by this approach.
3. Following the issue of the Council's Decision Notice and during the course of the appeal, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2024. Some of the revisions are relevant to the appeal. In the interest of fairness, the parties were given the opportunity to comment on the revised Framework. I have had regard to the responses received in determining the appeal.
4. The appeal site (the site) falls within the 'Hatfield Forest Zone of Influence'. Hatfield Forest is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and National Nature Reserve. Natural England confirmed that it has no objection to the proposed development subject to the appropriate mitigation being secured². The site also lies opposite Thorley Flood Pound SSSI and Thorley Wash Meadow Local Wildlife Site.
5. Following the issue of the Council's Decision Notice and during the course of the appeal, the Council advised that it had formally adopted a Strategic Access Management and Monitoring tariff for developments that are situated within the Hatfield Forest Zone of Influence³, and that the site is in an area where it 'would, in

¹ Erection of 4 detached dwellings, together with garages, driveways and associated landscaping works.

² Financial contribution towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring measures identified by the National Trust as landowners.

³ Email of 18 July 2025 confirming SAMM and tariff of £540.07 per dwelling.

normal circumstances, apply the tariff'. Nonetheless, given that I have found the scheme unacceptable for other reasons, it has not been necessary for me to consider this matter further and I have not pursued it with the parties.

6. A plan which was not part of the application has been submitted as part of the appeal, showing the locations of the proposed air source heat pumps (ASHP)⁴. The plan does not include a substantial difference or fundamental change to the development proposed, rather it provides additional information in support of the appellant's case⁵. Also, the Council and any interested parties have had the opportunity to comment on the plan as part of the appeal process. Having regard to procedural guidance and settled caselaw⁶, I am content that no parties' interests would be prejudiced by me accepting and taking the ASHP plan into account.
7. With regard to the ASHP plan, I note the Council's comments that the proposed positions of the ASHPs would be well separated from neighbours. Furthermore, that the detail of the ASHP units could be satisfactorily controlled by a suitably worded condition to ensure that there would be no harmful effects on the living conditions of neighbours, with regard to noise. From the evidence before me and my observations on site, I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, I have not assessed this matter as a main issue.

Main Issues

8. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, having regard to paragraph 154 g) of the Framework and relevant development plan policies;
 - Whether the appeal site is grey belt land and the proposal should not be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt, with particular reference to whether the nearby Grade II listed building, Thorley Wash Grange, provides a strong reason for refusing or restricting development;
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area;
 - The effect of the proposal on trees within the site; 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

9. The site is a rectangular shaped and gently sloping piece of land positioned immediately to the east of the Grade II listed building, Thorley Wash Grange⁷, and historically associated buildings. It is mostly grassland, with a formal driveway running through it, and bordered by a combination of a brick wall, timber fence, metal railings/gate, mature trees and well-established vegetation.

⁴ Appellant's Appeal Statement, Appendix 1.

⁵ To address the Council's third reason for refusal, Application Ref: 3/24/0192/FUL.

⁶ Section 16 Procedural Guide: Planning appeals – England; and *Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney* [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin).

⁷ National Heritage List for England – List Entry Number: 1213956.

10. It is located within the countryside and is designated as part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. The surrounding land is predominantly open fields and nature reserve, with some residential and commercial development present along the adjacent A1184. Bishop's Stortford and Spellbrook are located nearby to the north and south respectively.

Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt – paragraph 154 g)

11. The Framework identifies that 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 permanence⁸. Policy GBR1 of the East Herts District Plan, 2018, (the DP) sets out that Planning applications within the Green Belt, as defined on the Policies Map, will be considered in line with the provisions of the Framework.
12. In responding to the revised Framework, the appellant's case concerns paragraph 155, which is considered under the next main issue. However, in its response, the Council also assessed the proposal against paragraph 154 g), and so I have done the same.
13. Paragraph 154 states that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of a number of exceptions applies. These include 154 g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
14. The parties agree that the site constitutes 'previously developed land' (PDL). Having regard to the Framework's definition of PDL⁹ and the context of the site, I have no reason to take a different view. Mindful of the nature, scale and extent of the development proposed, the location of the site, and its relationship to any other existing development adjacent to it, it is reasonable to conclude that the proposal would not represent 'limited infilling'. Nonetheless, it would amount to the 'partial or complete redevelopment of PDL'.
15. Exception (g) then requires a further test of whether the proposal would 'cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt'. Openness is an essential characteristic of Green Belts and has both spatial and visual aspects. The National Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG) and settled caselaw¹⁰ confirm that assessing the impact of a proposal on the openness of the Green Belt requires a judgement based on the circumstances of the case; and that the matters relevant to openness in any particular case are a matter of planning judgement, not law.
16. The site is of a generous size, comprising for the most part an open and undeveloped grassed area, except for some small trees/bushes and an ornamental fountain within it, and the existing drive which runs through it. That said, the presence of adjacent buildings and boundary of mature trees and well-established vegetation, which the appellant states will 'largely be retained' as part of the proposal, provide ample screening to the site.

⁸ National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph 142.

⁹ Land which has been lawfully developed and is or was occupied by a permanent structure and any fixed surface infrastructure associated with it, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed).

¹⁰ Planning Practice Guidance: Paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 64-013-20250225 and *R (on the application of Samuel Smith Old Brewery (Tadcaster) and others) (Respondents) v North Yorkshire County Council (Appellant)* [2020] UKSC.

17. Even so, the proposal would introduce sizeable and permanent built form, in both footprint and volume, along with additional hardstanding and associated domestic paraphernalia, onto land and into space where presently there is none. Moreover, it would give rise to an enduring intensification of activity within the site which does not currently exist.
18. These outcomes would conspicuously reduce the spatial aspect of the Green Belt's openness in this location. The existing screening would lessen the proposal's effect on the visual aspect of the Green Belt's openness to a large extent. However, these harmful effects would still be apparent in glimpsed views into the site, particularly at the entrance point from the adjacent public highway. Taking these effects together, I am of the opinion that the proposal would cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
19. Consequently, I find that the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, having regard to paragraph 154 g) of the Framework and relevant development plan policies. It would therefore conflict with the provisions within the Framework regarding development in the Green Belt and preservation of openness; and with Policy GBR1 of the DP.

Whether grey belt land

20. The crux of the appellant's case in relation to the revised Framework and Green Belt is that the proposed development should not be regarded as inappropriate, as it constitutes grey belt land and meets all of the applicable criteria set out in paragraph 155 of the Framework.
21. Grey belt 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.
22. The above purposes are (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; and (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Given the position, size and characteristics of the land which forms the appeal site, it is reasonable to conclude that, of itself, it does not *strongly* contribute to the purposes above (my emphasis).
23. However, it is common ground between the parties that the site lies within the setting of the designated heritage asset of Thorley Wash Grange. Such assets are included within footnote 7 as being of particular importance and there are policies in the Framework which seek to protect them.
24. Consequently, in order to determine whether or not the land which forms the appeal site constitutes grey belt land, consideration is required as to the effect of the proposed development on the significance of this designated heritage asset. This approach reflects advice in the PPG, which states that where areas of grey belt would be covered by or affect other designations in footnote 7, it may only be possible to provisionally identify such land as grey belt in advance of more detailed specific proposals¹¹. Additionally, although footnote 7 does not explicitly reference

¹¹ Planning Practice Guidance: Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 64-006-20250225.

the ‘setting’ of designated heritage assets, the relevant policies in Chapter 16 of the Framework are clear in seeking to conserve, and where appropriate enhance, the ‘significance’ of heritage assets, which is derived not only from an asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting¹².

25. Thus, the effect of the proposal on the special interest and significance of Thorley Wash Grange is determinative in whether the site constitutes grey belt land, as well as being a main issue in its own right.

Thorley Wash Grange – special interest and significance

26. As required by section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (The Act), I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
27. Thorley Wash Grange is stated to have been the farmhouse to Thorley Wash Farm, Thorley Wash Homestead. It is now separated from the adjacent historically associated ancillary farm buildings, which themselves have been converted to other uses, including residential and commercial.
28. Thorley Wash Grange dates from circa 1700, over a 16th century earlier cellar. It was refronted in the early 18th century and extended/alterd in the 19th and 20th centuries. It comprises a large, square, double-pile house of two storeys, with attic and cellar. Its construction incorporates a timber frame, rendered external walls and steep tiled roof.
29. From the evidence before me, the listed building’s special interest and significance mainly stem from its archaeological, architectural and historic interests in exemplifying a grand domestic property which has evolved over time. Important contributors in these regards which allude to the building’s phased development, are its use of traditional methods of construction and materials; surviving historic fabric; and ‘fine’¹³ architectural form and design.
30. Pertinent to the appeal, special interest and significance are also drawn, in part, from the asset’s setting. The building’s immediate surroundings, which includes the appeal site, are the principal spaces from which it is experienced and have historic, physical, visual and functional associations with the asset. Even though these immediate surroundings have evolved over time, the submitted evidence confirms that the garden area associated with Thorley Wash Grange has historically been free of development, allowing the building’s primary status and architectural grandeur to be legible on approach. As a result, this immediate setting, makes a tangible and meaningful contribution to both the listed building’s significance as an asset and the ability to appreciate that significance.
31. The asset’s wider surroundings have also evolved over time, and the visual and functional relationships it once had with neighbouring land have been reduced as a consequence. Nonetheless, the enduring, mostly rural, context of the asset still denotes its historic wider setting and reflects the links between the two. As a result, I find that the asset’s wider setting also makes a positive contribution to the listed building’s significance, albeit to a lesser degree.

¹² National Planning Policy Framework: Definition of significance (for heritage policy).

¹³ Listed building description.

Effects

32. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, this is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or from development within its setting and that this should have clear and convincing justification.
33. The special interest and significance of Thorley Wash Grange which stem from its historic development and fabric would be unaffected by the proposal. Furthermore all of the asset's wider setting and some of its immediate setting would remain undisturbed by the proposal. Nonetheless, the subdivision of the site and introduction of four dwellings, three garages, a reconfigured driveway and domestic paraphernalia, would profoundly diminish the intrinsic tranquil and undeveloped qualities of the historic front garden and approach to Thorley Wash Grange.
34. I acknowledge the appellant's submissions that the agrarian narrative of the building and its setting have been diluted, and accept the established residential uses of adjacent buildings. However, the proposal would adopt a challenging position, in close proximity to, and/or forward of, the front building line of the asset. It would also display considerable scale and massing across the whole of the site, and possess a basic suburban form and design (assessed in more detail under the next main issue).
35. The primacy of the listed building would be undermined, and the legibility of its associations with adjacent land and buildings would be weakened. Taken together, these would result in the proposal fundamentally disrupting how the listed building is experienced and detrimentally altering the ability to appreciate its significance.
36. The retention of mature trees and well-established vegetation around the site's borders, along with the inclusion of new and additional planting within the site, would moderate the harmful effects identified above to a degree. However, this is not a factor in the appeal's favour, as listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent special interest and significance, including their setting where relevant, irrespective of whether or not public views of the building can be gained.
37. For the above reasons, I am not convinced that, as asserted by the appellant, the proposal would engender the overarching enhancement of the site. Indeed, I find that it would not preserve the setting of the listed building and would therefore harm the asset's significance. On this basis, the proposal receives no support from paragraph 219 of the Framework.
38. The proposal would harmfully alter important attributes of the building's immediate setting and affect the authenticity of how the asset is experienced. In turn, this would lessen the positive contribution that this part of its setting makes to its significance, as well as reduce the ability to appreciate that significance. Overall, the proposal would not preserve the setting of the Grade II listed building, Thorley Wash Grange, and would harm its significance.

Public Benefits and Balance

39. In finding harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, the Framework and PPG require the magnitude of that harm to be assessed. The proposal would affect only part of the asset's setting, but to a considerable degree. Therefore, I find that the harm would be a moderate level of 'less than substantial'. This harm carries considerable importance and weight.
40. The Framework requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing the asset's optimum viable use. The proposed development would contribute four dwellings to the local housing mix and supply, in an accessible location, and which the appellant indicates could be delivered quickly. The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, with its position stated as being between 3.4 and 3.7 years. Therefore, these units would help to address this shortfall and accord with the Government's aim to boost the housing supply. Taking account of the extent of the deficit and the number of dwellings proposed, this public benefit carries moderate weight.
41. There would also be some time limited economic benefits generated by the construction of the dwellings, and further economic and social benefits arising from their occupation and future occupiers supporting local services and facilities. Environmental benefits would also arise from any new and additional landscaping, with the potential for bio-diversity net gain. Given the amount of development proposed, I give each of these benefits little weight. The appellant refers to the decline of the asset's state of repair since designation. Nonetheless, there is no evidence before me that the proposal is required to secure its continued optimum viable use as a dwelling house.
42. On balance, the totality of the public benefits which would accrue from the proposal is not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight that I attach to the identified harm to the building's significance. The proposal would conflict with the statutory presumption set out in section 66(1) of the Act and the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment. It would also conflict with Policies HA1 and HA7 of the DP in so far as they seek to preserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment of East Herts, including listed buildings and their settings.

Conclusion on whether grey belt land

43. Having regard to the above, the definition of grey belt and footnote 7, the application of policies relating to designated heritage assets provides a strong reason for refusing the development. On this basis, the site is excluded from being grey belt land and there is no requirement for me to consider the proposal against the other parts of paragraph 155.

Character and appearance of the site and surrounding area

44. With the exceptions of the modest ornamental fountain and formal drive, the site is largely characterised by its absence of built form and intrinsic verdant nature. The grassed, gently sloping land and well-established vegetative border reflect its garden use associated with the main house of Thorley Wash Grange. Thorley Wash Grange has sustained its historic residential use, and the evidence points to

the adjacent historically associated ancillary farm buildings having been converted to other uses, including residential and commercial.

45. The area surrounding the site is generally characterised by open fields and natural habitat, providing a semi-rural context and indicator of the former uses of Thorley Wash Grange and associated outbuildings. Some residential and commercial development is present fairly near to the site along the A1184. Pertinent to the appeal, the residential development is mostly of an informal ribbon pattern of detached or semi-detached properties. These dwellings front and are set back from the highway, and are varied in their design and materials. Bishop's Stortford lies to the north, with the St James' Park housing development¹⁴ approximately 0.2km away from the site. Spellbrook lies to the south.
46. The proposed dwellings and garages would accord with the residential use of the buildings adjacent to the site and those within the locale. Additionally, their set back, 'staggered' linear arrangement, size, scale, and varied design would reflect the informal pattern of development, dimensions, and diversity of residential buildings located along the A1184. Nonetheless, the site is clearly a different and more sensitive context to that of any nearby residential development, and I am not persuaded that the proposal is an appropriate or an acceptable design response.
47. The considerable extent of development proposed across the site, including hardstanding for access, would result in the marked erosion of the positive undeveloped and green qualities of the site. The staggered linear arrangement, lower ridge height and tiered roofscape of the proposed dwellings may afford a degree of subservience to the existing adjacent buildings. Nevertheless, these attributes would not satisfactorily offset the resultant harmful effects arising from the amount, forward position, and cumulative substantial size and scale of the proposed development.
48. Additionally, the dwellings' basic form with render and tile finish, but with an opposing complexity and elaboration of features and details, results in a proposed scheme of mediocre and inharmonious design and appearance. It would suburbanise the site; unduly detract from both the fine Thorley Wash Grange and the more modest historic outbuildings; and jar with the character of the semi-rural landscape within which the site sits. For all of these reasons, the proposed scheme would not assimilate well into the site or its surroundings.
49. The existing mature trees and vegetative cover as well as the inclusion of new and additional planting, would provide some screening of the proposal in views from public routes. Nonetheless, the identified harmful effects would still be read in glimpsed views into the site, particularly at the entrance point from the A1184.
50. Accordingly, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. As such, there would be conflict with Policies HOU2 and DES4 of the DP which, amongst other things, seek development to be of a high standard of design and layout to reflect and promote local distinctiveness. It would also not accord with the provisions within the Framework which seek to achieve well designed places.

¹⁴ St James' Park Development: 700 homes, a care home, up to 4ha of employment land, 1000sqm of retail, primary school and secondary school.

Trees

51. Policies DES3 and NE3 of the DP, amongst other things, seek to retain, protect and enhance existing landscape features which are of amenity and/or biodiversity value; and resist development that would result in the loss or significant damage to trees.
52. At the time of my site visit, I noted the mature trees and well-established vegetation present along the eastern, northern and southern boundaries of the site. Some smaller trees and bushes/hedges were also present within the site. Of these, whilst I am aware that none are formally protected, the tall cypress trees to the eastern boundary and the two large mature trees to the northern boundary, which the evidence states may be pine trees, were of particular prominence as positive natural features in the street scene. In this regard, I agree with the Council in that they possess amenity value as part of the site and wider landscape.
53. The loss of the smaller trees and bushes/hedges within the site as part of the proposal raises no concerns. Additionally, I am satisfied that the location of the proposed dwellings, garages and associated hardstanding would not harmfully impact on the mature cypress trees. Their presence and value within the site and landscape would therefore be maintained, and could be preserved by way of an appropriately worded condition.
54. However, the position of plot 1 is very close to the mature pine trees of amenity value, with the potential to impact on their root systems leading to their damage or loss. No information, in the form of an arboricultural report, has been provided regarding their retention or protection. In the absence of this information, I cannot be certain that the proposed development would not be harmful to trees with an identified amenity value. Mindful of the policy context in relation to this matter, it would not be appropriate to leave it to be dealt with by a pre-commencement condition as suggested by the appellant.
55. The planting of additional trees and soft landscaping as part of the scheme within the site would be beneficial and I note the appellant's agreement to a condition which would secure this. However, whilst this may mitigate the effects of any loss of or damage to trees of identified amenity value, it would not justify them.
56. Accordingly, for the above reasons, I find insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the effect of the proposal on trees within the site. With no evidence to the contrary, I cannot be certain that the proposal would not result in the loss of or damage to, and therefore have a harmful effect on, trees of identified amenity value. As such, there would be conflict with Policies DES3 and NE3 of the DP referred to above.

Other Considerations and Very Special Circumstances

57. The Framework is clear that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations¹⁵.

¹⁵ National Planning Policy Framework: Paragraph 153.

58. The 'public benefits and balance' section of the second main issue above sets out the benefits of the proposal. In summary these are, the delivery of four dwellings in the context of a five year housing land supply position of between 3.4 and 3.7 years; time limited economic benefits from the construction phase; and economic, social and environmental benefits from the dwellings' occupation, occupiers using local services and facilities and new/additional landscaping with the potential for bio-diversity net gain. Together, these carry moderate weight in favour of the proposal.
59. The appellant cites housing developments within the area which have been granted permission by the Council¹⁶. However, I do not have the full details of the circumstances which led to those developments being permitted. That said, the St James' Park scheme is clearly not comparable to the appeal proposal. Additionally, although the other scheme referred to is stated to be within the setting of a listed building, there is no confirmation as to whether it is also located within the Green Belt. As such, I cannot be sure that it represents a direct comparison to the proposal before me. Consequently, they carry little weight in favour of the proposal.
60. The proposal could be said to make effective use of land, and as much use as possible of PDL. However, as the proposal conflicts with other Green Belt and Heritage policies in the Framework, the policy support set out in paragraph 125 of the Framework does not apply¹⁷. Therefore, this is a neutral consideration and weighs neither for nor against the proposal.
61. That the Council concludes the proposal to be acceptable, subject to conditions, in relation to matters such as ecology, highways, living conditions of neighbours, and refuse, are neutral considerations and weigh neither for nor against the proposal.

Overall Planning Balance and Conclusion

62. In summary, I find that the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which is harmful by definition; and that it would not preserve, and would cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Furthermore, it would not constitute grey belt land, by virtue of footnote 7 of the Framework in that it would not preserve the setting and thus harm the significance of the designated heritage asset of Thorley Wash Grange, which would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Additionally, it would harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area; and I am unable to conclude that it would not have a harmful effect on trees of amenity value within the site. This Green Belt harm and 'other harms' carry substantial weight against the appeal.
63. I have had regard to 'other considerations' cited in support of the proposal and conclude that, collectively, these carry moderate weight in favour of the appeal.
64. On balance, I find that the other considerations in this case do not clearly outweigh the harm identified. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist.
65. As set out above, the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, with its position stated as being between 3.4 and 3.7 years. Having regard to footnote 8 of the Framework, paragraph 11(d) is triggered.

¹⁶ St James Park development and Application Ref: 3/19/0835/FUL.

¹⁷ National Planning Policy Framework: Footnote 49.

66. Nonetheless, with reference to footnote 7 of the Framework, given my conclusions above, the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance, which includes land designated as Green Belt, and designated heritage assets, provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed.
67. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole 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.

F Cullen

INSPECTOR