

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
26th April 2012
WITHIN STATUTORY PERIOD

APPLICATION NO:	P0083.12	
WARD :	Cranham	Date Received: 21st February 2012
ADDRESS:	Folkes Farm Folkes Lane Upminster	
PROPOSAL:	Change of use of land to an Outdoor Activity Centre Revised Transport & D & A Statement received 13-04-2012	
DRAWING NO(S):	Design and Access Statement Transport Assessment 1068/01 1068/06 1068/05 1068/03 1068/02	
RECOMMENDATION :	It is recommended that planning permission be REFUSED for the reasons: given at the end of the report.	

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site comprises land and buildings at Folkes Farm, located to the east of Folkes Lane, to the north of the A127, to the west of the M25 and to the south of Woodlands Mushroom Farm. The site forms a broadly rectangular area with an existing complex of former agricultural and other buildings in use for a variety of employment-related purposes, all of which are located at the western end of the site alongside Folkes Lane, with the remainder of the site comprising open grassland. It is the open grassland, located to the north, east, and south of the complex of buildings that would experience most of the proposed development. This area of land is generally flat and visible from neighbouring properties, Folkes Lane, the M25, and the slip road connecting the A127 to the M25.

Various residential and commercial properties are located to north and west of the site, in addition to the commercial occupiers located within the complex of buildings at Folkes Farm.

The site is located in the Green Belt with the site's eastern boundary running alongside a woodland that is designated as a Borough-level Site of Nature Conservation Importance. The site is also located within the Thames Chase Community Forest and is a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

This planning application proposes the material change of use of land from agriculture to an outdoor activity centre to include a quad bike dirt track, a smaller quad bike track for children, a mini golf course, and an adventure playground. The proposal would involve engineering operations resulting in the creation of three ponds and mounding at various points along the quad bike tracks; changes to ground levels would also occur within the mini golf course. The proposal would also involve the siting of several prefabricated, portable buildings including two storage buildings, a changing room and office building; the erection of various structures within the playground; the siting of a kiosk associated with the putting greens; and the erection of post and rail fencing throughout the site, to separate the various activities being proposed.

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
26th April 2012
WITHIN STATUTORY PERIOD

The Design and Access Statement indicates that the vehicle parking would be provided in two areas: the car park associated with Timbuk2 (a popular childrens play centre) and an existing area of hardstanding. The applicants anticipate that the the proposal would attract around 34 vehicles per day although the basis of this projection is unclear.

The proposed engineering operations would comprise the creation of three ponds and seven areas of raised ground in relation to the quad bike tracks. The raised areas of earth banking would cover approximately 3585sqm of land, generally rising between 1m and 3m in height from current ground levels. The proposed ponds would cover a combined area of approximately 1776sqm, with the depths generally being between 1m and 4m. The submitted information states that the proposed earth raising would be constructed using the material excavated to form the ponds, but it is considered likely that additional material will need to be imported, as discussed later in this report.

Landscaping works are also proposed and would involve a mixture of native species, mainly around the perimeter of the site, including a 10m wide buffer between the site and the neighbouring SNCI, that would eventually go some way to screening the proposed activities from the surrounding area. The installation of bird and bat boxes is also proposed.

RELEVANT HISTORY

The wider Folkes Farm site has a long history, comprising numerous planning applications and enforcement cases. The application under consideration mainly relates to the open fields to the north, east and south of the complex of buildings located at Folkes Farm. There are no previous planning decisions relating to that area of land that are of particular relevance to this planning application, with the exception of the following enforcement cases:

Deposition of Material

An Enforcement Notice was served on the landowner on 22nd December 2011 alleging the unauthorised importation of hardcore, soils and other waste material; the formation of additional surfacing on the land; and the siting of two steel containers and plant on the land to the south of the complex of buildings at Folkes Farm. A failure to comply with the requirements of this notice is being pursued by enforcement officers.

Vehicle Parking Area

An Enforcement Notice was served on 7th October 2010 alleging the unauthorised use of land for the parking and storage of commercial vehicles, including the construction of a hardstanding, at the southern end of the complex of buildings. The landowners appealed against this notice, however, the appeal was dismissed on 29th July 2011 for the following reasons:

- i) The use was deemed to be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land in the Green Belt, and therefore constituted inappropriate development in the Green Belt;
- ii) The use of the land as an extensive parking area was deemed to be detrimental to the rural character of the area;
- iii) The unauthorised use was deemed to be harmful to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance.

Timbuk2 Carpark

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
26th April 2012
WITHIN STATUTORY PERIOD

An Enforcement Notice was served on 1st April 2010 alleging the unauthorised laying of a hardstanding and its use as a car park in relation to Timbuk2, at the northern end of the complex of buildings at Folkes Farm. The landowners appealed against this notice and the appeal was allowed on 27th October 2010 on the grounds that the additional car parking was required to service what is a popular play centre, and that it would result in a reduction in the number of vehicles being parked in the highway, to the detriment of highway safety.

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Notification letters were sent to 79 neighbouring properties; a site notice was placed in the vicinity of the site and advertisements have been placed in the local press.

64 objections have been received to date from local residential and commercial occupiers, on the following grounds:

- a) The proposal would be detrimental to the Green Belt;
- b) Adverse noise impacts over and above the noise already arising from the M25 and A127, will result in residents being unable to have their windows open during the summer months and would cause disruption to companies located at Folkes Farm who conduct much of their business by telephone;
- c) The proposal would result in an intensification of the use of Folkes Lane, which has insufficient capacity considering the businesses already located at Folkes Farm and other existing uses;
- d) Insufficient vehicle parking would be provided;
- e) The proposal would result in a distraction to users of the motorway;
- f) There would be an increase in local air pollution;
- g) The storage of fuel at the site would be hazardous;
- h) The proposal would give rise to highway safety issues;
- i) There would be insufficient staff available to monitor the proposed use and maintain safety;
- j) The site is not accessible by public transport;
- k) There are other, more suitable sites where the proposal could take place;
- l) There is insufficient demand for the proposal;
- m) The proposal would be harmful to wildlife in the local area;
- n) There would be an adverse impact on local property prices.

Comments have been received from the following consultees:

Essex and Suffolk Water - No objections.

Thames Water - No objections.

Natural England - No objections.

Environmental Health (Contaminated Land) - No objections; conditions recommended.

Environmental Health (Noise) - Additional information and mitigation required.

Highways - No objections.

Greater London Authority - No objections.

Transport for London - No objections.

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
26th April 2012
WITHIN STATUTORY PERIOD

Environmental Agency - No objections.

Highways Agency - No objections.

RELEVANT POLICIES

The following policies of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD ("the LDF") are of relevance:

CP13 - Minerals Extraction
DC22 - Thames Chase Community Forest
DC33 - Car Parking
DC45 - Appropriate Development in the Green Belt
DC55 - Noise
DC58 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity
DC61 - Urban Design
DC63 - Delivering Safer Places

The London Plan

Policy 7.16 - Green Belt

National Planning Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework ("the NPPF")

STAFF COMMENTS

This application is brought before Members as it has been called-in by two Councillors. Councillor Gillian Ford has called the application in on the grounds of Green Belt impact, concerns over noise impacts, increased traffic, and a lack of parking facilities. Councillor Barry Tebbutt has also called in the application in the event that it is recommended for refusal.

The application is also brought before Members on the basis of its sensitivity, having received, at the time of writing, 64 objections from local residential and commercial occupiers.

The main issues in this application are considered to be the principle of development, the impact upon the character of the area, impact upon neighbouring occupiers, Highway and access arrangements, and other considerations.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The site is located in the Green Belt and numerous objections have been received stating that the proposal would be detrimental to the Green Belt.

This planning application proposes the change of use of land, engineering, and building operations in the Green Belt. Policy DC45 of the LDF states that planning permission will only be granted for development in the Green Belt that is for given purposes, including outdoor recreation, and that new buildings in the Green Belt will only be approved where they are essential to the identified uses.

National planning guidance is also a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. In terms of the guidance contained in the NPPF, the preliminary assessment when

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
26th April 2012
WITHIN STATUTORY PERIOD

considering proposals for development in the Green Belt is as follows:-

- a) It must be determined whether or not the development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The NPPF and the LDF set out the categories of development not deemed to be inappropriate.
- b) If the development is considered not to be inappropriate, the application should be determined on its own merits.
- c) If the development is inappropriate, the presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt applies.

In terms of Green Belt policy, this application proposes the material change of use land, along with engineering and building operations.

Paragraph 90 of the NPPF states that "certain other forms of development", that are separate from building operations, may also constitute appropriate development in the Green Belt providing they preserve the openness of and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. These include engineering operations. As discussed, the proposed engineering operations would comprise the creation of three ponds and seven areas of raised ground in relation to the quad bike tracks. The raised areas of earth banking would cover approximately 3585sqm, generally rising between 1m and 3m in height from current ground levels. The proposed ponds would cover a combined area of approximately 1776sqm, with the depths generally being between 1m and 4m. It is considered that the proposed ponds would not be detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt or conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. However, it is considered that the scale of the proposed earth banking, particularly their height and overall bulk and massing, would be detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt. These works would appear as man-made features of significant scale, appearing above the prevalent lie of the land.

Paragraph 89 of the NPPF states that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt, except in given case, which include the provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, providing they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. The proposed buildings in this case include two quad bike storage buildings with room inside for up to 20 quad bikes; a changing room, office and store; a kiosk in relation to the putting greens; and various structures associated with the adventure playground. Specific details concerning the proposed playground structures are lacking but could be approved by condition. The proposed post and rail fencing throughout the site could be limited in height by condition.

No evidence has been submitted to indicate that the numerous existing buildings at Folkes Farm could not be used to accommodate the proposed facilities. In the absence of this information it is difficult to determine whether the proposed buildings are genuinely essential to the proposed use. Were it the case that the proposed use could not be served by the existing buildings, then it would be considered that the scale and nature of the proposed buildings would make them necessary to enable the proposed activities to take place, although whether the buildings are necessary or essential is only one of the tests to be applied in relation to their acceptability.

Even where such facilities are essential to the operation of the activity they may, in themselves, harm the openness of the Green Belt or conflict with the purposes of including land within it and each case has to be assessed on its merits and in terms of its impact within that particular location. Again, it is unclear whether the buildings in this case are essential to the proposed use

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
26th April 2012
WITHIN STATUTORY PERIOD

as no evidence has been submitted to indicate that one or more of the numerous existing buildings at Folkes Farm could not be used instead. But even if this were not the case, the proposed structures and buildings in this case, when taken together, are of such a scale, intensity and visibility that they would fail to preserve the openness of the Green Belt. It is considered that the erection of two storage buildings, a combined office, store, and changing facilities, a kiosk, and playground structures, would cumulatively be detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt. That there are existing, large scale buildings located at Folkes Farm is not a reason to allow additional building operations in the Green Belt where they would be detrimental to its openness.

The NPPF, in relation to material changes of use in the Green Belt, states that material changes of use constitute inappropriate development. It is considered that the proposed change of use, although it would result in an outdoor recreation use would be detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt. Its overall scale and intensity, involving two quad bike tracks that would be in frequent use by noisy vehicles, a putting course and adventure playground, supported by four buildings and extensive engineering operations, would be detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt. Moreover, it is considered that the proposal would conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt owing to its urbanising effect and that it would undermine the potential regeneration of non-Green Belt, brownfield sites that might otherwise accommodate the proposal, if not in Havering, then in surrounding boroughs.

Moreover, the proposed car parking for the site would also constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and is likely to require further expansion in the future. The proposed car parking areas include two areas. One is located at the northern end of the existing buildings, relating to Timbuk2, which is unlikely, given its current use by existing activities, to have capacity to serve the proposed uses. The other area comprises a hardstanding at the southern end of the existing buildings, which has been used as a vehicle parking area. That vehicle parking area was the subject of an enforcement notice that was appealed. The appeal was dismissed by the Inspector, who concluded that the proposed vehicle parking area would be detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt and would conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. It is therefore considered that the use of this land as a car park in relation to the proposed use would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Furthermore, given that the proposed car park is unlikely to provide sufficient capacity to service the proposed uses (as discussed later in this report), it is envisaged that further applications would be required in the future to allow additional parking areas in the Green Belt.

Given the scale and intense nature of the proposed change of use, and the urbanising effect it would have, in addition to the cumulative impact of the associated building operations and the scale and massing of the engineering operations along with the proposed car parking area, it is considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt, and therefore would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The proposal is therefore considered to be unacceptable in principle.

This does not mean that the proposal would not be acceptable at other sites in other parts of the borough, or indeed, on appropriate sites in neighbouring boroughs. For instance, there may be previously developed land outside of the Green Belt, or even previously developed sites within the Green Belt, that could more appropriately accommodate the proposed development. However, in the current case, it is considered that the nature of the proposal and the site, which is a highly visible greenfield site within the Green Belt, are such that the proposal would constitute inappropriate Green Belt development. As discussed later in this report, no very special circumstances have been submitted that overcome the proposed harm to the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness and other harm, and no evidence has been provided to

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
26th April 2012
WITHIN STATUTORY PERIOD

demonstrate that there are not more appropriate sites elsewhere in the borough or the surrounding area.

The site is located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area. Policy CP13 of the LDF states that planning permission for non-mineral development in such locations will not be granted unless given circumstances can be demonstrated. The site has not been identified as part of the Council's draft Minerals DPD and officers are unaware of any expressions of interest from mineral operators in relation to the potential for mineral extraction at the site. Moreover, the nature of the proposed development, comprising temporary buildings and engineering operations, is such that it is unlikely that any mineral resources would be permanently sterilised by the proposal should extraction become viable in the future. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy CP13 of the LDF.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The site is located in the Green Belt. Neighbouring occupiers have objected to the proposal on the grounds that it would have an adverse visual impact.

Policy DC61 states that planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area.

It is considered that the proposed change of use and associated building and engineering operations would be detrimental to the open character of the Green Belt. It is considered that the intense nature of the proposed development, including two quad bike tracks, a putting course, and an adventure park, in addition to a vehicle parking area, would result in an urbanising effect in an area having a generally rural character. The proposed landscaping scheme, which would be extensive, would go some way to screening the proposal along with the existing buildings, however, it would be a number of years before the proposed planting had grown sufficiently to properly screen the proposal from the surrounding area.

Given the nature of the proposal, in particular, the height, bulk, and massing of the proposed earth raising operations, along with the siting of numerous temporary buildings, it is considered that it would have a significant adverse impact on the visual amenities of the Green Belt and the rural character of the area, and that it would therefore be contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Policy DC55 of the LDF states that planning permission will not be granted if it would result in a development causing exposure to noise or vibrations above acceptable levels affecting a noise sensitive development such as all forms of residential accommodation. Policy DC61 of the LDF states that planning permission will not be granted for proposals that would significantly diminish local and residential amenity.

Neighbouring residential and commercial occupiers have objected to the proposal on the grounds that the proposed use of quad bikes at the site would give rise to unacceptable noise and air pollution impacts. In terms of contaminated land and air pollution, the Council's Environmental Health officers have raised no objections, although conditions have been recommended in relation to contaminated land.

At the site under consideration, the nearest commercial occupiers to the proposal, located at Folkes Farm, would be located approximately 28m from the proposed quad bike tracks, whilst commercial occupiers at neighbouring properties are located approximately 38m to the north west. The nearest dwellings to the proposal would be located between approximately 44m and

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
26th April 2012
WITHIN STATUTORY PERIOD

86m of the proposed quad bike track. The nearest of these is in the ownership of the applicant. Two other dwellings, located to the west, would be located between approximately 75m and 86m from the proposed track, although the boundaries of these residential properties are located approximately 50m away.

During the appeal relating to the vehicle storage and parking area, the Inspector concluded that the parking of commercial vehicles in that area would have a significant adverse noise impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, and dismissed the appeal, in part, on that basis. Whilst that area is now proposed as a car parking area, rather than a commercial vehicles parking area, it is considered that the parking of cars, and the likely parking of vans, would still result in a significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, particularly when combined with the noise arising from the quad bike tracks.

No information has been submitted with the application to indicate the anticipated noise levels arising from the development. The Council's Environmental Health officers have been consulted and stated that the proposal would give rise to additional noise impacts on neighbouring occupiers. It is also stated that the applicant should submit a noise impact assessment so that the noise impact can be properly assessed and that noise mitigation measures, such as an acoustic screen should be employed. Given the scale and appearance of any acoustic screen that would be effective in mitigating the noise impacts, it is considered that such a structure would be considered detrimental to the openness and visual amenities of the Green Belt and would therefore be considered unacceptable, particularly in the absence of sufficient very special circumstances as is the case in this instance. In any case, in the absence of a noise impact assessment to suggest otherwise, it is considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse noise impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Given the nature of the proposal, in particular, the use of quad motor bikes and the siting of the proposal in relation to neighbouring occupiers, it is considered that there would be significant adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, and that the proposal would be contrary to Policies DC55 and DC61 of the LDF.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

Neighbouring occupiers have objected to the proposal stating that there would be insufficient vehicle parking provided and that it would result in an intensification of the use of Folkes Lane. It is also stated that the proposal would result in a distraction to users of the M25. The Council's Highway officers, the Highways Agency, and Transport for London have all been consulted about the proposal with no objections being raised.

The proposed development would be accessed through existing access points at Folkes Farm and vehicle parking is proposed within two existing parking areas. The submitted information indicates that the proposal would attract around 34 vehicles per day. It is considered unlikely that the proposed development, which would include a putting course, an adventure playground, and quad bike tracks would attract such a low number of visitors.

The site is poorly accessed by public transport and is located in a relatively remote location where visitors are likely to depend on the use of cars and other vehicles. The proposal would include storage for up to 20 quad bikes to be kept on site, and it is considered likely that some people would take their own quad or motor bikes in vans. The submitted transport assessment does not provide any evidence to support the conclusion that only 34 vehicles would visit the site on a daily basis. In the absence of sufficient supporting information, including details in relation to vehicle movements at similar sites elsewhere, the submitted information is considered to be

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
26th April 2012
WITHIN STATUTORY PERIOD

unconvincing. It is considered likely that the daily vehicle movements associated with the proposed development would be significantly higher than suggested in the submitted information.

The proposed parking areas include an existing car park associated with Timbuk2, which was granted at appeal, and an area of hardstanding that was being used as a vehicle parking area, but which was found to be unacceptable at appeal, and which is the subject of enforcement action. The Inspector who considered the proposed parking area associated with Timbuk2 concluded that that proposal was acceptable as it would help to prevent the parking of vehicles along Folkes Lane, which it was considered was having an adverse impact on highway safety. The parking area approved at appeal, in the Green Belt, was the minimum amount considered necessary to accommodate the vehicle parking required by Timbuk2. It is therefore considered unlikely that that car park would provide the necessary spare capacity to accommodate vehicle parking associated with the uses under consideration. That would only leave the aforementioned area of hardstanding to accommodate all of the vehicle parking required. It is considered likely that this area would be insufficient to accommodate all of the vehicle parking required and that vehicle parking would be likely to spill out into the highway. It is considered that this would be detrimental to highway safety and could only be remedied by the future approval of additional parking areas in the Green Belt, with resultant harm to openness and visual amenity.

It is therefore considered, in the absence of any supporting information to the contrary, that the proposal would be detrimental to highway safety and amenity.

OTHER ISSUES

Nature Conservation

In terms of nature conservation considerations, the site is located alongside an ancient woodland known as Codham Hall Wood West, which is a Borough grade Site of Nature Conservation Importance. Neighbouring occupiers have objected to the proposal on the grounds that it would be harmful to local wildlife. Policy DC58 of the LDF states that the biodiversity and geodiversity of SNCIs will be protected and enhanced. Natural England were consulted about the proposal but raised no objections. The applicants propose the creation of a 10m buffer zone of native tree planting between the proposed quad bike tracks and the SNCI, which would include the installation of bat and bird boxes. It is considered that the proposal would not be contrary to Policy DC58 of the LDF.

Green Belt - Very Special Circumstances

Inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. It is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted and very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations (NPPF, paragraph 88).

Given the scale and intense nature of the proposed development and the urbanising effect it would have, including the use of land by quad motor bikes, the scale and massing of the associated engineering operations, and the associated buildings and vehicle parking, it is considered that the proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

The submitted information states that the proposal should be deemed appropriate development in the Green Belt as it is an outdoor recreation use in a "primarily industrial area" and that the

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
26th April 2012
WITHIN STATUTORY PERIOD

proposed landscaping and wildlife enhancements would be beneficial to the environment. As discussed earlier in this report, uses of land for outdoor recreation do not automatically constitute appropriate development in the Green Belt, and the associated development needs to be considered in terms of the impacts on openness and the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. It is preposterous to suggest that the site, or the general area it is located within, is "primarily industrial." The setting of the site is rural in character with scattered clusters of mainly agricultural and residential development. Whilst the proposed landscaping and installation of bird and bat boxes would result in environmental benefits, these are not considered to be sufficient to clearly outweigh the identified harm to the Green Belt.

It is therefore concluded that very special circumstances have not been submitted in this case that would overcome the harm to the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness and other harm, including the impact on the visual amenities of the Green Belt and the noise impacts on local occupiers. No information has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development is genuinely required in this Green Belt location and that there are not more suitable sites, such as brownfield sites, either within the borough of Havering or the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the guidance contained in the NPPF.

Other Considerations

The submitted information indicates that the land raising operations would be undertaken using the material excavated from the ponds only, and the applicant has stated that no material would need to be imported to the site. Given the proposed level changes and the areas of land to be the subject of engineering operations, it is considered unlikely that the proposed land raising could be undertaken without the need to import material to the site. Should Members be minded to approve the application, then it is recommended that conditions be imposed to control the impacts likely to arise from the importation of waste.

Neighbouring occupiers have objected to the proposal on the grounds that it would be detrimental to local property prices; that the storage of fuels would be hazardous; and on the grounds that there would not be sufficient demand for the proposed site. These matters are not considered to constitute material planning considerations and are not therefore considered any further in this report.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The application proposes inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which it is considered would also be detrimental to the visual amenities of the Green Belt and the applicant has not submitted very special circumstances to overcome the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, as required by the guidance contained in the NPPF. It is also considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential and commercial occupiers in terms of noise and that insufficient vehicle parking would be provided.

The application under consideration has been assessed in accordance with planning policy and guidance, and has had regard to recent appeal decisions for similar development in the Green Belt.

The proposed development is considered to be unacceptable having had regard to Policies CP13, DC22, DC33, DC45, DC55, DC58, DC61, and DC63 of the LDF, and all other material considerations.

REGULATORY SERVICES COMMITTEE
26th April 2012
WITHIN STATUTORY PERIOD

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the reasons:

1. Refusal non standard Condition

It is considered that the proposed development, including the use of the land and the associated building and engineering operations, would have a significant adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt and conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. It is considered that the proposal, owing to its intensity, scale and nature, would have an urbanising effect on, and encroach upon, the countryside and the Green Belt, and inhibit the regeneration of more appropriate derelict and other urban land. Very special circumstances, that clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm, have not been demonstrated in this case. The proposal is therefore contrary to the guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DC45 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

2. Refusal non standard condition

It is considered that the proposed use of the site and associated building and engineering operations, would have a significant adverse impact on the visual amenities of the Green Belt and the generally rural character of the site and surrounding area. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies DC45 and DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

3. Refusal non standard condition

It is considered that the proposed development would give rise to noise that would have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential and commercial occupiers, contrary to Policies DC55 and DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

4. Refusal non standard condition

It is considered that the proposed development would provide insufficient capacity for vehicle parking, which is likely to result in vehicles being parked along the highway, to the detriment of highway safety. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.
