



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2026

by **E Everitt BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/W/26/3377599

Land North of Whitewood, Redhill Road, Cobham, Surrey KT11 1EF

- 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 Crystal Smith against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1909.
 - The development proposed is proposed dwelling following demolition of existing stables and non-agricultural buildings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The address above is taken from the appeal form as it more accurately describes the location of the site than the address provided on the application form. It is consistent with the address used by the Council on its decision notice.
3. The appellant has submitted an additional plan as part of the appeal process, indicating proposed landscaping. Section 16 of the Procedural Guide: Planning appeals – England (2026) advises that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and that it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the Council and by interested parties at the application stage.
4. The appellant suggests that the submission of the additional plan is in line with the Wheatcroft principles¹. However, the plan alters the proposal from that originally submitted to the Council, consulted upon and upon which the Council based its decision. As such, accepting the additional plan at this stage would prejudice not only the interests of the Council but also interested parties and consultees, who may have observations to make on the revised proposal. Therefore, having regard to the principles of Holborn², acceptance of the additional plan would be procedurally unfair. As a result, I have proceeded to determine the appeal without having regard to the additional information submitted by the appellant.
5. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published during the consideration of the appeal. The main parties were provided with the opportunity to comment on the relevance of the Framework, and I have taken account of the comments received, and the Framework, in making my decision.

¹ Bernard Wheatcroft v Secretary of State for the Environment (1982)

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

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

- whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt;
- the effect of the proposal on the openness and purposes of the Green Belt;
- the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including whether the proposal would preserve the setting of nearby listed buildings comprising the Home Farm complex;
- the effect of the proposal on biodiversity;
- the effect of the proposal on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA); 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

Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt

7. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt where Policies DM17 and DM18 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (adopted 2015) (the DMP) and the Framework place strict control over inappropriate development. However, given that Policy DM18 relates to development of existing buildings, and replacement of buildings in the same use, it is not determinative in relation to this appeal.
8. The Framework establishes that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and within Policy GB2 the five purposes of the Green Belt are set out. Policy GB6 of the Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. Policy GB7 lists the types of development which are not regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt.

Whether previously developed land

9. The exception outlined in Policy GB7(1)(e) of the Framework allows for the redevelopment of previously developed land (PDL) (including a material change of use to residential or mixed-use including residential), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Policy DM17 of the DMP states that proposals for the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites will be considered in light of the size, height, type, layout and impact of existing buildings, structures and hard standing, together with the degree of dispersal throughout the site of existing and proposed development. Although Policy DM17 refers to additional considerations, the policy is not materially inconsistent with Policy GB7(1)(e) of the Framework as it relates to matters relevant to the assessment of harm to the openness of the Green Belt. As such, no reduction in the weight afforded to Policy DM17 is warranted.

10. The Framework defines PDL as 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 area. The definition excludes, among other things, land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings. The appeal site includes several low-level structures which are located close to the site access. However, these buildings extend across only the part of the appeal site closest to the site access and nearby buildings, with the majority of the site open and undeveloped. The proposed dwelling would be sited on land which is undeveloped.
11. On this basis, even were some parts of the site to accord with the Framework's definition of PDL, this would not encompass the part of the site where development is proposed. Accordingly, I do not need to consider the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt to conclude that the proposal would not meet the exception in Policy GB7(1)(e) of the Framework and Policy DM17 of the DMP.

Whether grey belt land

12. Policy GB7(1)(g) of the Framework allows for development where i. the development would utilise grey belt land and not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan, ii. there is an evidenced unmet need for the type of development proposed, iii. the development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to Policy TR3 of the Framework and iv. in the case of major development involving the provision of housing the development proposed complies with Policy GB8. As the development proposed does not constitute major development, criterion iv. is not applicable in this case.
13. The Framework defines grey belt as land in the Green Belt comprising PDL and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes a), b) or d) in Policy GB2. The definition of grey belt was revised as part of the latest iteration of the Framework, including by removing reference to constraints which prevent sites from being grey belt land. Consequently, the conclusions reached in the cases cited by the appellant regarding whether sites are considered to represent grey belt, in the context of the presence of heritage assets, are not determinative in this case.
14. I have concluded above that the part of the appeal site where the proposed dwelling would be sited does not meet the definition of PDL. Nevertheless, given the modest scale of development proposed and extent of Green Belt which would be affected by the proposal, relative to the quantum of Green Belt across the Borough, the proposal would not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. In this regard, the proposal is consistent with criterion i. of Policy GB7(1)(g) of the Framework.
15. The Council confirms that it is currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply. Criterion ii. of Policy GB7(1)(g) is, therefore, complied with.
16. In relation to criterion iii., Policy TR3 of the Framework sets out that development proposals which could generate a significant amount of movement, in the context of the area within which they would be situated, should be in locations that are sustainable, limiting the need to travel, particularly by private car, and offering a genuine choice of transport modes for residents and users.

17. The number of vehicle movements generated by the proposed development may not be large, and may be less than the existing stables use. Nevertheless, based on the information before me and my observations during my site visit, it is evident that future occupiers of the proposed development would be required to travel outside of the immediate vicinity of the site to access services and facilities as well as train stations or bus stops. Accessing such services, facilities and transport options would require walking or cycling along routes which include stretches with limited street lighting and limited natural surveillance. As such, the journey by foot or bicycle may be regarded as inconvenient and lack appeal for many, particularly during winter months, after dusk or during poor weather. Accordingly, future occupiers are likely to be reliant on private vehicles to meet many of their day-to-day needs.
18. The appellant has put to me that the site lies close to a Hail and Ride bus route. However, in the absence of any details regarding the route and frequency of services I am not satisfied that this service represents a realistic alternative to the use of private vehicles. Similarly, although e-bike charging facilities could support an alternative to car usage, it has not been demonstrated that, in the context of the site's distance from services and facilities, e-bikes represent a realistic alternative transport mode.
19. As such, based on the evidence before me, the development would not be in a sustainable location. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to Policy GB7(1)(g)iii.
20. Taking all of the above into account, the proposal would fail to satisfy all of the criteria set out in Policy GB7(1)(g) of the Framework.

Whether well-connected land

21. Policy GB7(1)(h) of the Framework allows for residential development which complies with criteria including that it would be within reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station and physically well-connected to the station or the settlement within which the station is located.
22. Based on the evidence before me and my observations during my site visit, I am not satisfied that the proposal would be in a location consistent with the provisions of Policy GB7(1)(h). As such, even if the development would be of a scale which could be accommodated by existing or proposed infrastructure and would not prejudice any proposals for long-term comprehensive development, I conclude that the proposal would not meet the exception in Policy GB7(1)(h).
23. The development does not fall under one of the categories permitted under Policy GB7(1)(f). It is not part of the appellant's case that the proposal falls within any of the other exceptions set out in Policy GB7 of the Framework. Accordingly, I conclude that it would, in accordance with Policy GB6 of the Framework, be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Openness of the Green Belt

24. The construction of a dwelling on the site would result in built development where there is presently none. Even if the footprint of the dwelling would be less than that of the existing structures on site, its bulk would, in combination with associated domestic paraphernalia, inevitably lead to a loss of spatial and visual

openness. This is particularly the case as the proposed dwelling would be separated from the existing built form in the surrounding area and greater in height than the existing structures on the site.

25. Moreover, as the site forms part of the countryside, the development would lead to encroachment of development into the countryside. It would, therefore, be contrary to purpose c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
26. Consequently, the proposal would result in harm to the openness of the Green Belt and conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Given the scale of the proposal, the harm would be limited in extent. Nevertheless, it adds to the harm arising from inappropriateness. In accordance with Policy GB6 of the Framework, the totality of the harm to the Green Belt attracts substantial weight.

Character and appearance

27. As outlined above, the appeal site is predominantly undeveloped, other than several low-level structures which are located close to the site access. As a result, the majority of the site has an open and verdant character.
28. While there is some built development present in the immediate surroundings of the site, this is largely focused around the access from Redhill Road which serves the site. Beyond this cluster of buildings, the surrounding area is verdant and open in character.
29. The appeal site is located close to, and within the setting of, the Grade II* listed Home Farm House and Barns and Grade II listed Shed to South of Home Farm and Octagonal Storage Shed South of Model Farm³. As such, I have had regard to the statutory duty set out in section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
30. The special interest and significance of the listed buildings is largely derived from their historic and architectural interests as part of the former Home Farm model farm complex which dates from the 19th century. Pertinent to this appeal, the buildings' special interest and significance are also derived, in part, from their setting. The setting of the assets is largely open and verdant. Whilst some buildings are present close to the listed buildings, including on the appeal site, these are generally reasonably modest in scale and limited to the immediate surroundings of the listed buildings, with open land extending beyond. Land to the west of the listed buildings in particular is characterised by its openness and verdancy. This setting contributes positively to the assets' special interest and significance.
31. The appeal proposal would replace the existing low-level structures on the appeal site with a more consolidated built footprint which would be located a greater distance from the listed buildings than the existing structures. The appellant argues that the proposal would enhance the immediate setting of the listed buildings. In particular, it is suggested that the removal of the existing structures and the creation of a paddock in the same location as recorded in historic mapping would increase the openness of the immediate setting of the assets.
32. However, the existing structures on the appeal site are low-lying which limits intervisibility between them and the listed buildings, particularly given intervening

³ List entry numbers 1377473, 1030095 and 1030096

boundary treatments and vegetation. Their form and design are akin to that of agricultural buildings that would be expected in the surroundings of a farm complex. Their locations are also reflective of the established pattern of development in the area, being sited close to the site access. That being the case, I do not consider that the structures compromise the setting of the listed buildings.

33. Even were the removal of the existing structures to enhance the immediate setting of the listed buildings, the proposed dwelling would be sited on land to the west of the listed buildings which contributes to their setting by reason of its openness. As a result, the proposal would erode the open, verdant setting of the listed buildings. The greater height of the appeal proposal compared to the existing structures on this site would exacerbate this effect. Consequently, the proposal would have a harmful urbanising effect on the setting of the listed buildings, weakening the contribution the setting makes to the significance of the assets. This is irrespective of whether the proposed dwelling would be visible from the listed buildings themselves or in views of the listed buildings from Redhill Road and whether the appearance of the dwelling would be in-keeping with that of Whitewood.
34. The proposal would also have a harmful urbanising effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area through the introduction of new built form on land which is open and undeveloped. Even though the dwelling would be set back from the streetscene and existing vegetation would provide some screening, it would, where visible, appear incongruous in the context of the established pattern of development in the area. This is regardless of any lack of rhythm or consistency in the form of buildings in the surrounding area and whether the design of the dwelling would be based on sound architectural principles and subordinate to, in-keeping with and responsive to the prevailing characteristics of development in the surrounding area.
35. A planning condition could be used to secure a landscaping scheme including screening which could minimise the visual impact of the development. However, I am not satisfied that landscaping would be sufficient to entirely mitigate the harm resulting from the proposal I have identified above. Equally, I am not satisfied that conditions relating to materials would be sufficient to overcome the harm that the proposal would result in.
36. The appellant has highlighted Policy L3 of the Framework regarding making an efficient use of land. Policy L3 sets out that development footprints should make the best use of a site's development potential, taking into account the policies in the Framework. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with Policy DP3 of the Framework which seeks development proposals which respond to their context so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings. Therefore, the efficiency of the use of the land is not determinative in this case.
37. The appellant also refers to the proposal's consistency with Essex Design guidance. This guidance is not before me. As such, I am unable to ascertain the relevance of this guidance to the case before me or comment upon the consistency of the proposal with the guidance.
38. Policy HE6 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Policy HE4 of the

Framework states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should have a clear and convincing justification.

39. The Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance require the category of harm to be explicitly identified, and the extent of harm within that category to be clearly articulated. Given the scale of the proposed development, I find that the harm to the significance of the heritage assets would be towards the lower end of the spectrum of harm. Nonetheless, in accordance with Policy HE6 of the Framework, the harm is of considerable importance and weight.
40. Policy HE6 sets out that where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset, the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal.
41. The proposal would provide one new dwelling. In the context of the current housing land supply shortfall in the Borough, the provision of new housing, even a single dwelling, is valuable and a public benefit of substantial weight. However, given the scale of the proposed development, the benefit would be small in scale. Consequently, I attach moderate weight to this benefit.
42. My attention has been drawn to a recent appeal decision where the removal of existing buildings was considered beneficial to the setting of nearby listed buildings⁴. However, in that case, the buildings to be removed were found to adversely compromise the setting of the listed buildings. In contrast, for the reasons set out above, I do not consider that the structures of the appeal site compromise the setting of the listed buildings. In this context, given my findings above, any benefits resulting from the removal of the existing structures are of limited weight.
43. In this case, mindful of my duties under the Act, I conclude that the public benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the harm to the listed buildings that I have identified above. Accordingly, it does not provide a clear and convincing justification for the harm to the heritage assets.
44. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and fail to preserve the setting of nearby listed buildings. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the requirements of section 66(1) of the Act and conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies CS10 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (adopted 2011) (the CS) and Policies DM2 and DM12 of the DMP. In summary, these policies seek to ensure that new development is well designed, integrates with and enhances local character and protects, conserves and enhances the Borough's historic environment.

Biodiversity

45. Policy CS15 of the CS seeks to avoid loss and contribute to a net gain in biodiversity across the region, including by ensuring new development does not result in a net loss of biodiversity and where feasible contributes to a net gain through the incorporation of biodiversity features. Policy DM21 of the DMP states

⁴ APP/M3645/W/24/3352066

that all new development will be expected to preserve, manage and where possible enhance existing habitats, protected species and biodiversity features.

46. The appellant has provided a Preliminary Ecological Assessment which details the results of a site survey and recommendations for further work. Recommended further work includes bat emergence surveys of the stable, which the Assessment identifies as having moderate bat roost potential. No such surveys are before me.
47. Some commentary is provided in the appellant's final comments regarding the suitability of the stable for roosting bats due to its condition. Nevertheless, there is no substantive evidence before me demonstrating that the stable would not be suitable for roosting bats. In this context, I am not satisfied that the suitability of the site for roosting bats has been appropriately and robustly assessed.
48. Therefore, even if the site is not located in an area important for biodiversity, in the absence of appropriate evidence, I have insufficient information before me to conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on biodiversity, particularly on bats which are a protected species. Ultimately, given the potential for harm to a protected species, I am not satisfied that the use of a condition requiring the presence of an ecologist during the demolition of the stable or further survey work to be undertaken prior to demolition would provide sufficient certainty to ensure compliance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).
49. In respect of biodiversity net gain (BNG), the appellant asserts that the completion of a self-build exemption form is sufficient to secure the dwelling as self-build, such that the self and custom build exemption would apply. However, even if a similar mechanism has been accepted elsewhere, I am not satisfied that this would be a robust mechanism by which the proposed dwelling could be secured as self-build. In particular, the form does not provide any mechanism to commit the appellant to the building remaining a self-build or any mechanism by which non-compliance with the intended self-build use could be enforced against.
50. Accordingly, in the absence of a robust mechanism securing the dwelling as self-build, the exemption would not apply. As it has not been put to me that any other BNG exemption would apply, the statutory requirement for at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat would apply. Matters relating to this could be dealt with through the discharge of the biodiversity gain condition which would be attached to any planning permission in accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and, as such, would not warrant the refusal of planning permission. Biodiversity enhancements could also, where appropriate, be secured by condition.
51. Nonetheless, for the reasons set out above and in taking a precautionary approach, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on biodiversity. As such, it would not accord with the relevant provisions of Policy CS15 of the CS and Policy DM21 of the DMP, which are outlined above.

Thames Basin Heaths SPA

52. The site lies within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. This European site provides internationally important habitat for three rare species of ground nesting birds. It has been established that residential development within the zone of

influence would likely result in harm to the protected areas through additional recreation disturbance. The proposal would create a net gain of one dwelling and in combination with other developments permitted in the area there would be a likely significant effect on the SPA.

53. Policy CS13 of the CS and the Council's Development Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (2021) require that adequate measures are put in place to avoid or mitigate any potential adverse effects of development on the integrity of the SPA. This includes the payment of financial contributions towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) measures, specifying that the contribution has to be secured by a legal agreement prior to determination of the relevant application. The application is accompanied by a draft Unilateral Undertaking intended to secure the required SAMM contribution. However, the Undertaking is not complete or signed.
54. The appellant indicates that they sought a hearing so that the Undertaking could have been signed on the day. Nonetheless, some time has elapsed since the appeal procedure was confirmed, and since the Council commented upon the draft Undertaking, and no completed planning obligation has been provided.
55. Therefore, as the competent authority in relation to this appeal, I am not satisfied that, in the absence of a completed legal agreement, the delivery of mitigation sufficient to address the harm likely to be caused by the development has been secured. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. In this regard, it would be contrary to the relevant provisions of Policy CS13 of the CS, the provisions of which are summarised above.

Other considerations

56. As outlined above, the proposed development would contribute towards an acknowledged housing land supply shortfall, a benefit which, in accordance with Policy HO7 of the Framework, attracts substantial weight. Nevertheless, the development's contribution towards housing supply would be small in scale. Consequently, in this case, I attach moderate weight to the benefits associated with housing delivery.
57. The appellant asserts that the development would also provide an opportunity for a self-build dwelling. However, as I have explained above, there is no robust mechanism before me securing the dwelling as self-build. As a result, I afford the opportunity for a self-build dwelling limited weight.
58. The appellant has set out that the use of permitted development rights forms a fallback option, allowing some existing buildings on the site to be used for a use falling within Use Class B8 or a flexible commercial use. Nevertheless, I have no substantive evidence before me to suggest that there is a greater than theoretical possibility that such a scheme would be implemented. Moreover, there is no evidence before me demonstrating that such a scheme would result in an equivalent or greater extent of harm than the appeal scheme. I, therefore, afford this consideration only limited weight in favour of allowing the appeal.
59. I have been provided with evidence setting out the appellant's personal circumstances. Accordingly, I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. The appellant has also

referenced the rights set out under Article 3(1) of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, and I have taken the best interests of the child into consideration in making my decision. I appreciate that in dismissing the appeal, individuals would be unable to derive the benefits associated with the proposed living accommodation, having the potential to disproportionately affect them. However, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal before me is the only way in which the desired benefits could be achieved. In this context, I attach moderate weight to the appellant's personal circumstances.

Other Matters

60. A lack of harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties does not render the proposal acceptable or overcome the harm I have identified above in relation to the main issues. While I note the inclusion of energy efficiency and renewable energy features, they are neutral in my consideration as they are requirements of local planning policy and national guidance.
61. The appellant has drawn my attention to Policy L1 of the Framework, which relates to planning for an effective use of land. However, Policy L1 is identified as a plan-making policy, which paragraph 8 of the Framework specifies should not be used when making decisions on development proposals. I have, therefore, not considered this policy.
62. My attention has been drawn to Policy L3 part 2.c. of the Framework regarding the density of development within reasonable walking distance of well-connected stations. As set out above, the appeal site is located some distance from a train station. As such, it would not accord with the definition of 'reasonable walking distance' set out in Annex B of the Framework. This matter is, therefore, not determinative.
63. I appreciate the frustrations of the appellant in relation to the Council's approach to the application and appeal, including in respect of the references made to pre-application engagement which was not undertaken by the appellant and the limited references within the Officer Report to the Framework.
64. I acknowledge that concerns regarding the location of the site were not explicitly raised by the Council prior to the appeal. Nonetheless, the lack of a reason for refusal relating to such matters does not demonstrate that the Council had no concerns in that regard at the time it determined the application. Moreover, it is evident that having found that the now superseded definition of grey belt was not complied with, it was not necessary for the Council to consider the other criteria within the former paragraph 155 of the Framework. Consequently, it was only when the revised definition was applied by the Council that the other criteria needed to be addressed specifically. Nevertheless, these matters do not alter my consideration of the appeal which I have determined on its own merits based on the evidence before me and my observations during my site visit.

Green Belt Balance and Conclusion

65. As I have explained above, I have found that the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Policy GB6 of the Framework sets out that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances (VSC). Policy GB6 specifies that

VSC will not exist unless the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

66. The proposal would harm the openness of the Green Belt and conflict with the purposes of including land within it. The proposal would also have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, biodiversity and the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and fail to preserve the setting of nearby listed buildings. In these respects, the proposal conflicts with the relevant provisions of policies set out within the development plan as well as the underlying objectives of these policies. The benefits which would accrue from the provision of one new self-build dwelling for use by the appellant and their family are, collectively, of moderate weight. Ultimately, therefore, they are not considerations that clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm associated with the proposal. Consequently, the VSC required to justify the proposal do not exist.
67. Policy S3 of the Framework establishes that decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Policy S5 of the Framework allows for certain forms of development outside settlements. However, Policy S5(5) states that this policy does not apply to development proposals in the Green Belt, which should instead be determined in accordance with Policies GB6, GB7 and GB8. Policy GB8 is not determinative in this case as it relates to major development. As the proposal would not accord with any of the specified categories of development which are not inappropriate in the Green Belt, and in the absence of VSC, it would be contrary to Policies GB6 and GB7.
68. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

E Everitt

INSPECTOR