

The Planning Inspectorate

ENFORCEMENT NOTICE APPEAL FORM (Online Version)

WARNING: The appeal **must** be received by the Inspectorate **before** the effective date of the local planning authority's enforcement notice.

Appeal Reference: APP/C3430/C/23/3324573

A. APPELLANT DETAILS

Name

Mr Lee Pountain

Address

Meadow View Paradise Lane
Slade Heath
WOLVERHAMPTON
WV10 7NZ

Phone number

Email

Preferred contact method

Email Post

A(i). ADDITIONAL APPELLANTS

Do you want to use this form to submit appeals by more than one person (e.g. Mr and Mrs Smith), with the same address, against the same Enforcement notice?

Yes No

Additional Appellant: Mrs Laura Pountain
Appeal Reference: APP/C3430/C/23/3324574

B. AGENT DETAILS

Do you have an Agent acting on your behalf?

Yes No

Name

Mr Simon Lawson

Company/Group Name

2 Cities Planning Consultancy

Address

Phone number

Email

Your reference

Preferred contact method Email Post

C. LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY (LPA) DETAILS

Name of the Local Planning Authority

Date of issue of enforcement notice

Effective date of enforcement notice

D. APPEAL SITE ADDRESS

Is the address of the affected land the same as the appellant's address? Yes No

Address

Are there any health and safety issues at, or near, the site which the Inspector would need to take into account when visiting the site? Yes No

What is your/the appellant's interest in the land/building?

Owner

Tenant

Mortgagee

None of the above

E. GROUNDS AND FACTS

Do you intend to submit a planning obligation (a section 106 agreement or a unilateral undertaking) with this appeal? Yes No

(a) That planning permission should be granted for what is alleged in the notice.

The facts are set out in

[see 'Appeal Documents' section](#)

(b) That the breach of control alleged in the enforcement notice has not occurred as a matter of fact.

(c) That there has not been a breach of planning control (for example because permission has already been granted, or it is "permitted development").

(d) That, at the time the enforcement notice was issued, it was too late to take enforcement action against the matters stated in the notice.

(e) The notice was not properly served on everyone with an interest in the land.

(f) The steps required to comply with the requirements of the notice are excessive, and lesser steps would overcome the objections.

(g) The time given to comply with the notice is too short. Please state what you consider to be a reasonable compliance period, and why.

F. CHOICE OF PROCEDURE

There are three different procedures that the appeal could follow. Please select one.

1. Written Representations

(a) Could the Inspector see the relevant parts of the appeal site sufficiently to judge the proposal from public land? Yes No

(b) Is it essential for the Inspector to enter the site to check measurements or other relevant facts? Yes No

Please explain.

The dwelling house is located at the end of a long access track and in order to appraise the relationship with the adjacent property the Inspector would need to access the site.

2. Hearing

3. Inquiry

G. FEE FOR THE DEEMED PLANNING APPLICATION

1. Has the appellant applied for planning permission and paid the appropriate fee for the same development as in the enforcement notice? Yes No

2. Are there any planning reasons why a fee should not be paid for this appeal? Yes No

If no, and you have pleaded ground (a) to have the deemed planning application considered as part of your appeal, you must pay the fee shown in the explanatory note accompanying your Enforcement Notice.

H. OTHER APPEALS

Have you sent other appeals for this or nearby sites to us which have not yet been decided? Yes No

I. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

01. Enforcement Notice:

[see 'Appeal Documents' section](#)

J. CHECK SIGN AND DATE

I confirm that all sections have been fully completed and that the details are correct to the best of my knowledge.

I confirm that I will send a copy of this appeal form and supporting documents (including the full grounds of appeal) to the LPA today.

Signature

Mr Simon Lawson

Date

21/06/2023 23:06:29

Name

Mr Simon Lawson

On behalf of

Mr Lee Pountain

The gathering and subsequent processing of the personal data supplied by you in this form, is in accordance with the terms of our registration under the Data Protection Act 2018.

The Planning Inspectorate takes its data protection responsibilities for the information you provide us with very seriously. To find out more about how we use and manage your personal data, please go to our [privacy notice](#).

K. NOW SEND**Send a copy to the LPA**

Send a copy of the completed appeal form and any supporting documents (including the full grounds of the appeal) to the LPA.

To do this by email:

- open and save a copy of your appeal form
- locating your local planning authority's email address:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sending-a-copy-of-the-appeal-form-to-the-council>
- attaching the saved appeal form including any supporting documents

To send them by post, send them to the address from which the enforcement notice was sent (or to the address shown on any letters received from the LPA).

When we receive your appeal form, we will write to you letting you know if your appeal is valid, who is dealing with it and what happens next.

You may wish to keep a copy of the completed form for your records.

L. APPEAL DOCUMENTS

We will not be able to validate the appeal until all the necessary supporting documents are received.

Please remember that all supporting documentation needs to be received by us within the appropriate deadline for the case type. If forwarding the documents by email, please send to **appeals@planninginspectorate.gov.uk**. If posting, please enclose the section of the form that lists the supporting documents and send it to Initial Appeals, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, BRISTOL, BS1 6PN.

You will not be sent any further reminders.

Please ensure that anything you do send by post or email is clearly marked with the reference number.

The documents listed below were uploaded with this form:

Relates to Section: GROUNDS AND FACTS
Document Description: Facts to support that planning permission should be granted for what is alleged in the notice.
File name: Grounds of Appeal Meadow View Paradise Lane Slade Heath June 2023.doc

Relates to Section: SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS
Document Description: 01. The Enforcement Notice.
File name: Enforcement Notice Meadow View.pdf

Completed by MR SIMON LAWSON

Date 21/06/2023 23:06:29



Mr L Pountain & Mrs L M Pountain

**Appeal Under Sec.174(2)a of the Town
and Country Planning Act 1990 Against
South Staffordshire District Councils
Issue of an Enforcement Notice Under
Sec.172 of the Town and Country
Planning Act 1990 Relating to an Alleged
Breach of Planning Control Under
Sec.171A(1) of the Town and Country
Planning Act – Construction of Brick Built
Two-Storey Building for the Purposes of
Independent Residential Dwelling House
at Meadow View, Paradise Lane, Slade
Heath, Staffordshire, WV10 7NZ.**

June 2023

2 Cities Planning Consultancy

18 Rogerson Road | Fradley | Staffs | WS13 8PE | 07825 323277

APPEAL UNDER SEC.174(2)A OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 AGAINST SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCILS ISSUE OF AN ENFORCEMENT NOTICE UNDER SEC.172 OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 RELATING TO AN ALLEGED BREACH OF PLANNING CONTROL UNDER SEC.171A(1) OF THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT – CONSTRUCTION OF BRICK BUILT TWO-STOREY BUILDING FOR THE PURPOSES OF INDEPENDENT RESIDENTIAL DWELLING HOUSE AT MEADOW VIEW, PARADISE LANE, SLADE HEATH, STAFFORDSHIRE.

APPEAL REFERENCE:

GROUND OFS OF APPEAL

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 2 Cities Planning Consultancy are a Planning Consultancy based in Fradley near Lichfield, Staffordshire with over 30 year's experience in dealing with complex development management, planning policy and enforcement matters. We have been instructed by the appellants, Mr and Mrs Pountain to take this appeal forward.
- 1.2 On 19th May 2023 an Enforcement Notice was served on the appellants, Mr L Pountain and Mrs L M Pountain, both of which reside at the appeal premises, Meadow View, Paradise Lane, Slade Heath, Wolverhampton WV10 7NZ and Together Personal Finance Limited of Lake View, Lakeside, Cheadle SK8 3GW under Sec.172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Enforcement Notice alleges that there has been a breach of planning control, within paragraph (a) of Sec.171A (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The issued Enforcement Notice describes the matter which appears to constitute planning permission as 'the construction of a brick built two storey building ("the Building") for

the purposes of an independent residential dwelling house in the approximate position shaded blue on the plan’.

- 1.3 The Enforcement Notice notes that it appears to the Council that the breach of planning control (the construction of the brick built two storey building) on the land had occurred within the last four years and therefore is not immune from enforcement action. The appellants do not dispute this.
- 1.4 The Enforcement Notice (the “Notice”) continues by noting that the unauthorised development is located in an area of countryside and designated Green Belt to the east of the village of Coven. The land is also within a 15km radius Zone of Influence for the Cannock Chase SAC. The unauthorised development is the construction of a brick built two storey residential dwelling house set to the rear of the Land.
- 1.5 The “Notice” also notes that the unauthorised development is located within the designated Green Belt. Paragraphs 147 and 148 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF) make it clear that inappropriate development is by definition, harmful to the greenbelt and that ‘very special circumstances’ must exist which clearly outweigh any harm for development to be permitted. No ‘very special circumstances’ exist for the unauthorised development, and it is therefore inappropriate development contrary to policy GB1 Of the Core Strategy (2012) and the Green Belt and Open Countryside SPD (2014).
- 1.6 The “Notice” continues by noting that the unauthorised development is in a highly visible location when viewed from the access road and from views from New Road. The siting to the rear of the property amounts to back land development and is in direct conflict with the landscape setting and respected settlement form of the residential dwellings in the area which follow a linear fashion and front directly onto the roads. It has brought a substantively more suburban feel to the otherwise rural area and appears alien and awkward in its setting of detriment to the otherwise relatively undeveloped rural character and appearance of the area.
- 1.7 The “Notice” further notes that the unauthorised development is sited immediately to the rear of the garden of the neighbouring properties where first floor windows face the garden and primary outdoor amenity space of the neighbouring site.

Furthermore, the proximity of the unauthorised development to the boundary is overbearing, imposing, intrusive in its setting, and of detriment to the level of amenity reasonably anticipated for the neighbouring property. As a result, the unauthorised development is contrary to the guidance contained within Chapter 12 of the NPPF, Core Policies 3 and 4, and development policies EQ4, EQ9 and EQ11 of the Core Strategy, and the Council's Design Guide 2018.

- 1.8 It is further noted in the "Notice" that the land is within 15km radius of the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which is protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and the NPPF at paragraph 182 makes clear that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where development is likely to have a significant effect on an SAC. No Habitat Regulations Assessment has been submitted or mitigation has been provided and based on the precautionary principle the Authority cannot be satisfied that that the new dwelling will not be likely lead directly or indirectly to have a significant adverse impact on the integrity of the Cannock Chase SAC contrary to, Core Policy 2, and development Policies EQ1 and EQ2, and the Cannock Chase SAC guidance document (2022).
- 1.9 The "Notice" continues further by noting that Paragraph 8(c) of the NPPF highlights the need to improve biodiversity to achieve sustainable development. Strategic objective 4 and Core Policy 2 of the Core Strategy aims to protect, conserve, and enhance the diversity of wildlife and habitats. Further, the NPPF encourages that all new development should provide beneficial biodiversity features as part of good design and leave the natural environment in a measurably better state than it was beforehand. Paragraph 174 specifically seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment by minimising any impacts and providing net gains for biodiversity. No consideration has been given to biodiversity on the site and no mitigation or compensation has been provided.
- 1.10 The "Notice" concludes that given the substantial harm articulated above the Council do not consider that conditions could overcome the issues caused by the unauthorised development. The Council consider that planning permission should

not be given, because planning conditions could not overcome these objections to the development.

1.11 The Enforcement Notice requires the appellants "...to

- i) **Cease the use of the Building on the Plan as an independent residential dwelling house.**
- ii) **Demolish the Building including the concrete slab and footings.**
- iii) **Remove all materials and debris resulting from compliance with ii) above from the Land."**

1.12 The "Notice" states that the appellants have six months to from the date of issue to comply with the aforementioned requirements. The "Notice" was issued on the 19th May 2023 and takes effect on 22nd June 2023.

1.13 With reference to Sec.174(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act this appeal is based upon 'Ground' (a) i.e that planning permission should be granted for what is alleged in the notice.

2.0 The Site and Surroundings

2.1 The appeal site comprises a detached two storey brick-built building that the Council state is being used for the purposes of an independent dwelling house. To the east of the appeal building lies Meadow View, a bungalow located on land fronting Paradise Lane. The site lies within the Green Belt, to the east of the village of Coven. The site is bordered to the south by open paddock land and this land, Meadow View and the appeal premises are in the same ownership as the host dwelling. Further to the south are open fields; to the northern and western sides are a mixture of detached two storey and single storey dwellings. The property benefits from significant private amenity space, within which the garage, which the appeal premises replaced, sat to the rear of the Meadow View. There is generous off-street parking available at the front of the property and a detached rear garage available behind the site accessed by a track between the dwelling and the new build dwelling to the northern side. Meadow View itself has been significantly extended over the

years with the addition of the northern side/rear projection and the workshop to the principal elevation which has been historically connected into the footprint of the dwelling by the utility addition. A current application seeks permission for a revised roof design for previous approval of scheme (Ref No 20/00859/FUL).

3.0 The Development

3.1 The appeal proposal consists of the retention of a brick-built two storey building for currently used for the purposes of an independent residential dwelling house.

4.0 Relevant History

4.1 Previous applications relevant to the appeal site are as follows:-

- Certificate of Lawful use for bungalow and garage approved under 1029/87 Ref. No: 10/00360/LUP Status: Application Permitted;
- Erection of a detached dwelling and garage under Ref. No: 13/00758/OUT Status: Application approved with conditions;
- Erection of a detached dwelling and garage under Ref. No: 16/00711/REM Status: Application approved with conditions;
- Erection of a detached dwelling and garage under Ref. No: 16/00711/AMEND Status: Approved;
- Erection of a detached dwelling and garage. (Conditions 3 & 5) under Ref. No: 16/00711/COND Status: Approved;
- Extensions and porch to front elevation, new brick skin provided around building and redesign of existing roof to include dormers under Ref. No: 20/00859/FUL Status: Application approved with conditions;
- Kitchen extension to rear (length beyond original rear wall 8.0m, maximum height 4.0m, eaves height 3.0m) under Ref. No: 21/00304/LHSHLD Status: Application Permitted;
- Revised roof design for previous approval of scheme (Ref No 20/00859/FUL) under Ref. No: 23/00502/FULHH Status: Pending Consideration.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1 Within the Green Belt

5.2 Adopted Core Strategy (South Staffordshire Council: Core Strategy December 2012) –

- Strategic Objective 1: To protect and maintain the Green Belt and Open Countryside in order to sustain the distinctive character of South Staffordshire
- Core Policy 1: The Spatial Strategy
- Policy GB1: Green Belt
- Policy EQ4: Protecting the Character and Appearance of the Local Landscape
- Core Policy 3: Sustainable Development and Climate Change
- Core Policy 4 Promoting High Quality Design
- Policy EQ9: Protecting Residential Amenity
- Policy EQ11: Wider Design Considerations
- Policy EQ12: Landscaping
- Core Policy 11: Sustainable Transport
- Appendix 5 Car Parking Standards
- Appendix 6 Space About Dwellings

5.3 Adopted local guidance

- Green Belt and Open Countryside Supplementary Planning Document April 2014
- South Staffordshire Design Guide (2018)
- Sustainable Development SPD (2018)

5.4 National Planning Policy Framework

- Chapter 5: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed spaces
- Chapter 13: Protecting Green Belt land
- Chapter 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
 - Chapter 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

6.0 Appeal Appraisal

6.1 The main issues are:

- Whether the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt;
- Openness and Purposes of the Green Belt;
- Whether the site represents a sustainable location for new housing development;
- The effect of the proposal on ecology, including the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation;
- Whether the development would provide an appropriate living environment for existing and future residents; and
- If the development is inappropriate, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

6.2 Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt

6.3 Paragraph 149 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that, except for a small number of exceptions, the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt should be regarded as inappropriate. Exceptions to this include (e) 'limited infilling in villages.'

6.4 Policy GB of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (December 2012) sets out the types of new build development which will normally be permitted within the Green Belt. These include limited infilling and limited extensions, alterations or replacement of an existing building where the extension(s) or alterations are not disproportionate to the size of the original building, and in the case of a replacement building, the building is not materially larger than the building it replaces.

6.5 This policy goes on to define limited infilling as the filling of small gaps (1 or 2 buildings) within a built-up frontage of development which would not exceed the height of the existing buildings, not lead to a major increase in the developed proportion of the site, or have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it. Further guidance is provided within the

Council's Green Belt and Open Countryside Supplementary Planning Document (April 2014) (SPD).

- 6.6 The aims of CS Policy GB1 broadly reflect that of Green Belt policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, it is contended that the policy is not entirely consistent with the approach or terminology at paragraph 149 e) of the Framework as it omits the requirement for limited infilling to occur in villages, thus it is less restrictive. This consequently should limit the weight attached to CS Policy GB1 in this regard. Please note that this approach was followed by Inspector Hannah Ellison when deciding an appeal in July 2022 (Appeal Reference: APP/C3430/W/22/3290217 Appeal site: Oak Tree View, Paradise Lane, Slade Heath).
- 6.7 The application site is situated in Paradise Lane, Slade Heath, a dispersed cluster of residential properties and other uses to the east of Coven and north-west of Featherstone. Slade Heath is not identified in Core Policy 1 of the Core Strategy (CS) as a settlement/village within the Council Settlement Hierarchy. Similarly, it is not listed as a defined settlement within the Council Site Allocations Document (SAD); however, this does not appear to identify the extent of all villages/hamlets in the District, especially those which are not identified for growth in the CS.
- 6.8 It is therefore contended that this cluster of predominately residential development along both sides of Paradise Lane forms part of the wider community of Slades Heath. And whilst it is acknowledged that the structure and layout of development in the wider settling does not have a traditional village core or the facilities and functions which may indicate that it forms part of a village (i.e. church, vicarage, village green etc) it should be noted that villages clearly differ greatly in their spatial form and do not necessarily have an 'active' church, a village hall / parish hall, an open public house or a functioning telephone box. In fact the Oxford Dictionary defines a village as a group of houses and associated buildings, larger than a hamlet and smaller than a town situated in a rural area. it is, therefore, considered that the appeal site lies within part of the village of Slades Heath. As such, I conclude that the proposal would represent limited infilling in a village as set out in paragraph 149 (e) of the Framework.

- 6.9 Openness and Purpose of the Green Belt
- 6.10 Paragraph 137 of the Framework advises that a 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.
- 6.11 The appeal site is located to the rear of part of a largely built-up frontage along Paradise Lane thus the proposal would not result in conflict with any of the five purposes of the Green Belt in paragraph 138 of the Framework. The site is also well screened from public vantage points due to the fencing, mature trees and hedging. The proposal would not therefore have a significant visual impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.
- 6.12 Whether the site represents a sustainable location for new housing development
- 6.13 Core Policy 1 of the CS states that growth throughout the District will be located within the most accessible and sustainable locations in line with the Settlement Hierarchy contained within the Policy. Core Policy 1 sets out that the Green Belt will be protected from inappropriate development and proposals will be considered in the light of other local planning policies and the policy restrictions relating to Green Belt in the Framework, however the Council will consider favorably sustainable development which accords with this Spatial Strategy. It also confirms that development proposals will be expected to make efficient use of land in sustainable locations, provided it is not of high environmental value, whilst safeguarding the character of existing residential areas.
- 6.14 The appeal site is not located in a settlement identified in either Core Policy 1 of the CS and would therefore conflict with the development plan in this regard. Paragraphs 78 and 79 of the Framework seek to promote sustainable development in rural areas, confirming that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Planning policies and decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless certain circumstances apply (those cited are not relevant to this specific case).

- 6.15 The appeal site is located towards the end of a loose and dispersed cluster of development on Paradise Lane. Notwithstanding the aforementioned comments on the schemes Green Belt impact, it is contended that in relation to paragraphs 78 and 79 of the Framework, the appeal site is not physically isolated. Similarly, although there are no services or amenities in the immediate area, it is around 1.9 kilometres from the village of Coven and the range of services and facilities it has to offer. As such, there is a case to be made that the development would not introduce isolated homes in the countryside.
- 6.16 Ecology
- 6.17 The Framework seeks to minimise impacts and provide net gains in biodiversity. This is echoed within Policy EQ1 (Protecting, Enhancing and Expanding Natural Assets) which states that permission will be granted for development that does not cause significant harm to sites or habitats of nature conservation.
- 6.18 The appeal site was previously the garage accommodation associated with Meadow View. Therefore, given the previous nature of the land, it is not considered that the proposed new dwelling would have an adverse impact on biodiversity. In this regard, it would accord with Policy EQ1 of the CS and the Framework.
- 6.19 SAC
- 6.20 The site lies outside the 0-8 kilometre but within the 0-15-kilometre zone of influence of the Cannock Chase Special Area Conservation (SAC) where any application which involves a 'net dwelling increase' is required to provide a contribution towards mitigation measures to off-set the impact of the development on the SAC.
- 6.21 It is noted that South Staffordshire Council (SSC) will require a payment for each net new home created through development within 15km of Cannock Chase SAC. It is noted that the Council require the developer to enter into either a S106 agreement or a Unilateral Undertaking in order to secure the contribution and it

should be noted that the appellants are happy to enter into a Unilateral Agreement so as off-set the impact of the development on the SAC.

6.22 Residential amenity

6.23 The appeal dwelling house is located adjacent to the rear boundary of the appeal site, some significant distance from both Meadow View and the adjacent property. Given the relationship between these properties, the intervening boundary treatment and the height of the new unit, it is contended that the appeal dwelling house does not adversely impact on the amenities of the adjacent occupiers, with particular regard to outlook, privacy or daylight/sunlight. The dwelling is sufficiently distant from other neighbouring dwellings to the east to ensure that there would be no material impact on their living conditions.

6.24 Taking account of the above considerations, I find that the development would provide an acceptable living environment for both existing and prospective occupiers. Consequently, the scheme would accord with Policy EQ9 and EQ11 of the CS and the Framework objective, to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

6.25 Very Special Circumstances

6.26 Paragraph 147 of the Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 148 states that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt and very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

6.27 There are no 'very special circumstances' that could be advanced in this case to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by virtue of the scheme's inappropriateness and any other identified harm as it is considered that the appeal proposal is appropriate development in the Green Belt

7.0 Conclusion

- 7.1 The appeal proposal demonstrates that planning solutions can unlock the development potential of this site, meet local needs and deliver development where it is sustainable to do so, without adversity outweighing the positive merits. For the reasons set out above, the proposal represents appropriate development in the Green Belt and as such residential development is entirely appropriate. It is not of detriment to the environment or to the amenity of existing or future occupants of the development. It makes the best and most efficient use of the appeal site.
- 7.2 At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and accordingly, sustainable development should be approved without delay. The location, type and scale of the proposed development represents sustainable development having regard to the current use and wider character of the site.
- 7.3 There are no adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme rather, the development as proposed will contribute towards enhancing and promoting the image of the area through the creation of a high quality and positive development. There are no policies in the NPPF which mitigate against this development being approved.
- 7.4 The appeal proposal has been fully assessed against national and local planning policy and is in accordance with the principles and objectives of these frameworks. It represents a truly sustainable development that is deliverable and provides a solution to address key planning issues. It would not be at jeopardy with or set precedencies that conflict with the Council's spatial strategy given the function of the site.
- 7.5 In these circumstances the Inspector is most respectfully requested to allow this appeal.