



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2012

by Janet L Cheesley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 February 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/E9505/A/11/2159804

Land at the end of Marsh Lane, Gillingham, Norfolk NR34 0LQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J C and Mrs P P Read against the decision of the Broads Authority.
 - The application Ref BA/2011/0107/FUL, dated 1 April 2011, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2011.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a general purpose agricultural building for the storage of farm machinery/implements and the accommodation of cattle for limited periods during the year.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.
2. The views of interested parties have been taken into account in reaching this decision.

Main Issues

3. I consider there to be two main issues:

the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding Broads landscape; and

whether a building of the size proposed is justified for the agricultural holding.

Reasons

4. *Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (PPS7)* states that: *Nationally designated areas comprising National Parks, the Broads, the New Forest Heritage Area and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, have been confirmed by the Government as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. 'The conservation of the natural beauty of the landscape and countryside should therefore be given great weight in planning policies and development control decisions in these areas.*
 5. Saved Policy B11 in the Broads Local Plan (1997) requires new development in the countryside to minimise its visual intrusion. Saved Policy C16 requires, amongst other matters, that new agricultural buildings requiring planning
-

- permission are located where possible close to groups of existing buildings and are of appropriate scale and design.
6. Policy CS1 in the Broads Core Strategy 2007-2021 (adopted in 2007) seeks to ensure that new development protects, enhances and restores the Broads distinctive landscape
 7. The appeal site is part of an agricultural holding, which has recently been restored to that of the traditional Broads landscape, and as such makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the wider Broads area.
 8. The proposed building would reach a maximum height of 6.6 metres dropping down to a lower roof height of some 3.1 metres above the cattle shed area. It would be some 22.86 metres in width and some 19.2 metres in depth. Other structures in surrounding fields are primarily of a small scale, retaining the pastoral open landscape. From my observations, I consider that the proposed building would not be in keeping with the small-scale nature of structures in surrounding fields and would appear as a dominant and unacceptably large visually intrusive building in the open pastoral landscape.
 9. The proposed building would be visible from a distance, particularly from the edge of Beccles and from nearby roads. Whilst I note that landscaping is proposed to reinforce existing landscaping, I do not accept that landscaping would overcome my concern and it would take a number of years to become established. Hiding unsuitable development does not make it acceptable.
 10. From my observations, due to the isolated location, scale and prominence of the proposed building, I consider that it would have an adverse effect on the distinct open character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 11. Designated areas such as National Parks and the Broads have restricted permitted development rights. Where agricultural development requires planning permission, it is appropriate to consider the agricultural need for the development.
 12. The proposed agricultural building would be for storage and accommodation for cattle. I understand that the cattle either graze on the agricultural holding or on common pasture and do not have use of shelter elsewhere. Machinery associated with the agricultural holding and in particular, for hay cultivation is currently left out in the open. The agricultural holding is about 13.5 acres in size. Based on the evidence before me, I do not consider that it has been demonstrated that the use of other buildings elsewhere has been fully explored or that a building of such a size is required.
 13. For the above reasons and having taken into consideration all other matters raised upon which I have not specifically commented, I conclude that the proposed building would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding Broads landscape and from the evidence before me, that such harm is not outweighed by agricultural need or any other material considerations. Thus, the proposal would not accord with PPS7, Local Plan Policies B11 and C16 and Core Strategy Policy CS1.

Janet Cheesley INSPECTOR
