

TAUNTON DEANE BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 18 DECEMBER 2002

1. The following appeals have been lodged:-

Appellant	Date Application Considered	Proposal
Summerfield Developments Limited (46/2001/017)	26.04.2002	Erection of industrial units use classes B1 (light industry), B2 (general industry) and B8 (warehousing and distribution), land adjoining Chelston Business Park, Chelston, Wellington.
Call-in by the First Secretary of State (48/2001/028)	04.07.2002	Erection of extension to 5 screen cinema to provide an additional 3 screens at Odeon Cinema, Heron Gate, Taunton.
Lloyds TSB (38/2002/221)	25.07.2002	Change of use from A2 to A3 former Lloyds TSB premises, 25 Fore Street, Taunton.
Mr A Hines	-	Enforcement Appeal – Stationing of touring caravans on land at Knapp Lane, North Curry.
Mr D C and Mrs S E Grant (34/2002/017)	DD	Change of use of agricultural land to domestic curtilage and formation of vehicular access at Hillmeade, Rectory Road, Staplegrove.

2. The following appeal decisions have been received:-

(a) **Display of an internally illuminated sign, former SWEB site, Priorswood Road, Taunton (38/2001/384A)**

The Inspector considered the main issue was the visual impact of the display.

The Inspector noted that the sign would be fairly tall but its apparent height would be lower because of its siting on ground well below the level of the embanked road. He also noted that the sign would be brightly-coloured and internally lit and would be seen against the back of the building to which it related and would serve to announce the location to northbound traffic.

The Inspector concluded that the appeal sign would be acceptable in relation to the appeal site and its surroundings and that its display should be permitted.

The appeal was, therefore, allowed.

(b) **Conversion of barn to form holiday let and formation of residential curtilage at Higher Way, Cushuish (13/2001/005 and 13/2002/001)**

The Inspector considered the main issue in both appeals was the effect of the proposed conversion on the character and appearance of the area and in particular on the landscape of the Quantock Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Appeal A

The Inspector felt that the building and paddock did have a rural character, even though the building was a relatively recent construction. He felt that the suburban appearance of the building, once converted, and the use of the paddock for parking and manoeuvring combined with the intrusion of domestic paraphernalia would be harmful to the rural surroundings and incompatible with the landscape and character of the area.

The Inspector did accept that a holiday use would be less harmful than a permanent residential use and would bring some benefits to the rural economy. He also acknowledged the disadvantages of the building remaining empty and becoming increasingly derelict if conversion was not allowed. However, the building was in an elevated position within the AONB.

Appeal B

The Inspector acknowledged the more sympathetic conversion of the building and the reduction of the curtilage to less than half that originally proposed, but

although of greater merit, the proposed conversion of the building and change of use of part of the paddock would still be essentially residential and incompatible with the rural character and landscape of the AONB.

The Inspector concluded that the proposals in both appeals would cause clearly identifiable harm to the rural character and appearance of the site and the landscape of the Quantock Hills AONB.

The appeals were, therefore, dismissed.

(c) Erection of agricultural building and formation of access land adjoining Otterford Caravan Site, Culmhead (29/2002/002)

The Inspector considered that the existing hedgerow close to the highway edge was important to the appearance and character of the land and any significant removal or realignment would be harmful.

The Inspector considered however that, because of the evidently low level of traffic on the road and the location of the site in the Blackdown Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, a relaxation of the Highway Authority's requirements was justified in this case.

He felt that visibility from the proposed point of access was good and that only minor improvements to achieve the appropriate radii and regular trimming back of the hedge would be necessary to provide the access which would be similar to countless others in the area.

The appeal was, therefore, allowed.

(d) Erection of single storey dining room and conservatory to the rear of 3 Cedar Close, Poplar Road, Taunton (38/2002/031 and 38/2002/032)

The Inspector considered the main issue was the effect of the proposal on the character of the listed building and any features of special historic or architectural interest that it possessed.

The Inspector felt that the proposed rear extension was in conflict with the character of the listed building. He felt that the roof ridge over the proposed dining room intersected the main rear roof pitch, breaking the line of the eaves and eroding the vernacular architectural relationship between the main house and the rear outshut. The two differing elements comprised an ad-hoc assembly of small-scale, modern domestic architectural forms, which detracted from the simple form and large scale massing of the original building.

The Inspector concluded that the proposal would be unacceptably detrimental to the character of the listed building, and features of special architectural interest which it possessed.

The appeals were, therefore, dismissed.

(d) **Appeal against The Taunton Deane Borough (Wellington No. 3) Tree Preservation Order 2002 - Bishop's Court, Wellington**

The Inspector considered that the tree was in reasonable health. He noted that it could be seen over much of the public car park, over a distance of approximately 60 metres, but to views beyond this area it was largely obscured by buildings.

The Inspector felt that the loss of the tree's canopy would diminish the attractiveness of the footpath to Fore Street. Along with other trees in the area it contributed to the character of part of the town centre and provided a significant soft landscape element in contrast to the buildings, walls and car park. He felt that the tree was a substantial specimen and its canopy was a significant feature of the immediate area providing considerable visual amenity.

The Inspector noted that leaves and debris from the tree were a nuisance and a potential hazard but this was only to be expected. He did not think that the effect of the tree was an unreasonable burden, but an acceptable part of the management of the buildings and its grounds.

The Inspector considered the most significant problem was the amount of loss of light to several of the apartments in Bishop's Court and the restricted outlook that resulted. The Inspector was not convinced that current light levels were so poor as to be unacceptable and such as to provide a very sound reason to remove the tree. Nor was he convinced that removal of the tree would produce a truly dramatic improvement.

The Inspector concluded that the tree had a clear public amenity value and he did not consider there were sufficiently good reasons to outweigh this amenity value such as to justify its removal.

The appeal was, therefore, dismissed.

(e) **Appeals against refusal of planning permission and service of an Enforcement Notice - Use of land to site mobile home, Mazzelsha Farm, West Buckland Hill, Wellington (46/2001/012)**

Due to the complexity of the Inspector's decision letter, a full copy is attached for the information of Members.

The appeals were allowed, and temporary planning was granted.

3. The following Public Inquiry has been arranged:-

	Site	Venue	Date
Call-in by The Secretary of State	Odeon Cinema Heron Gate	PCR	18.03.2003 for 3 days.

Contact Officer: Richard Bryant
e-mail – r.Bryant@tauntondeane.gov.uk
Telephone: 01823 356414



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2002

by **R J Tamplin BA(Hons) MRTPI Dip Cons Studies**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport,
Local Government and the Regions

The Planning Inspectorate
4/09 Kite Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372
e-mail enquiries@planning-
inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date
25 OCT 2002

Appeal Ref: APP/D3315/C/02/1092956 & 1092957

Mazzelsha Farm, West Buckland Hill, West Buckland, Wellington, Somerset

- The appeal is made under Section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs G Cleft against an enforcement notice issued by Taunton Deane Borough Council.
- The Council's reference is 46/2001/012.
- The notice was issued on 24 May 2002.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is, without planning permission, the change of use of the land for the purpose of stationing a residential mobile home.
- The requirements of the notice are:
 - (i) Stop using the land for the purpose of stationing a residential mobile home.
 - (ii) Remove from the land the mobile home and reinstate the land to its condition prior to the breach of planning control
- The period for compliance with the requirements is, in both cases, 4 weeks after the notice takes effect.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in Section 174(2)(a) of the 1990 Act.

Summary of Decision: The allegation is corrected, the appeals on ground (a) succeed, the notice is quashed and planning permission is granted for the deemed applications, subject to conditions.

Appeal Ref: APP/D3315/A/02/1092630

Mazzelsha Farm, West Buckland Hill, West Buckland, Wellington, Somerset

- 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 and Mrs Cleft against the decision of Taunton Deane Borough Council.
- The application (Ref. 46/2001/012), dated 8 May 2001, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2001.
- The development proposed is permission for retention of mobile home.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted subject to conditions.

Preliminary Matters

1. The mobile home subject of these appeals is a direct replacement for one that was destroyed by fire and which had been granted planning permission by the Council in February 1998. That permission had been subject to conditions, including one which limited its duration to two years. Because this period had expired before the application subject of the planning appeal was made, that application was made under Section 73A(2)(b) of the 1990 Act as amended, for permission for development already carried out in accordance with a

permission granted for a limited period. In effect that application was for a new planning permission. Although the application form said that the proposal was the retention of the mobile home, such development is a use of land and not operational development. Therefore the planning appeal will be determined as if it had been made for the use of the land for the stationing of the mobile home.

2. The development subject of the enforcement and planning appeals is thus one and the same. Accordingly the enforcement appeals on ground (a), the deemed applications for planning permission, and the planning appeal will be considered together.

The Appeal Site and Surroundings

3. Mazzelsha Farm lies some 5km south-east of Wellington, on the crest of the Blackdown Hills. It has a total area of about 5.2ha, most of which is in a long narrow strip of open level ground with the remainder consisting of around 1.5ha of deciduous woodland on the steep northern face of the hill. From the access onto a minor road, a stony track leads westwards alongside an overgrown beech hedge forming the southern boundary of the site, to the mobile home. This stands roughly in the centre of the site within a fenced compound about 15m square which also contains a small garden area and car parking space. Two cars and a tractor were parked here at the time of the inspection. The mobile home, of modern appearance and coloured brown and white, is adjoined by a large shiplap shed or store on its eastern side, and a large open timber porch or verandah, roofed with corrugated plastic, on its western side. There is another shed to the rear of the porch alongside the mobile home.
4. West of the mobile home is a fenced paddock in which were two horses and a foal at the time of the inspection. Nearby is a wire mesh enclosure containing timber kennels and in which were two alsatian dogs. North of the paddock the land bounds the wooded scarp slope and on this area, which has been heavily poached, were several metal pig arks and weaner pens. A number of pigs and their young were running on this land.
5. To the east of the mobile home, and at a slightly lower level, stands a generator and a pair of monopitch buildings flanking a central concrete yard. The building on the northern side of this yard is split into several pens in which were a number of young calves and at one end a stack of straw. The front part of the southern building is also split into separate pens, most of which held several young pigs, one was empty and one is used as a store. The rear part of this building houses cattle overnight and during bad weather. A small paddock to the east of these buildings held nine Jersey cows and two young calves; a third, smaller, timber building with a small concrete forecourt adjoins this paddock and is used for shelter for the calves on the main eastern field which lies between the buildings and the access.

The Allegation Subject of the Notice

6. As drafted the allegation refers only to the use for stationing the mobile home, whereas it is evident that the land affected, which is the unit of occupation, namely the holding, is now in a mixed use, for the purposes of agriculture and for the stationing of the mobile home. Though the use for agriculture is not development for the purposes of the 1990 Act, it is nonetheless one of the actual uses which is taking place on the site, and for clarity should be referred to in the allegation. Consideration has therefore been given to whether this defect is capable of correction. It is clear that the appellants have not been misled by the reference

only to the mobile home, and that the Council would not suffer injustice if the allegation were to be corrected to refer to the mixed use. Hence because it is concluded that it would be within the available powers to correct the notice in that way, this will be done.

The Enforcement Appeals on Ground (a), the Deemed Applications for Planning Permission, and the Planning Appeal

Planning Policy Context

7. The statutory development plan for this area consists of the Somerset & Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan Review 1991-2011, adopted in April 2000, and the West Deane Local Plan, adopted in May 1997. Structure Plan Policy STR6 says that development outside towns, rural centres and villages should be strictly controlled and restricted to that which benefits economic activity, maintains or enhances the environment and does not foster growth in the need to travel. Local Plan Policy WD/HO/1 seeks to ensure that dwellings for agricultural or forestry workers will only be permitted outside the limits of settlements where:
 - (A) there is a proven need for the dwelling on the holding;
 - (B) the scale, design and materials of the dwelling and associated ancillary activities are in keeping with the local vernacular and the rural character of the area;
 - (C) the siting of the dwelling minimises impact on the surrounding landscape; and
 - (D) an appropriate landscaping scheme is proposed.
8. The Taunton Deane Local Plan Revised Deposit was approved by the Council in October 2000 and is currently the subject of an inquiry into objections. Draft Policies S8 and H14 have a similar thrust to those of the Structure and Local Plan policies noted above. Accordingly, some weight is to be attached to the aims of these emerging policies. Planning Policy Guidance Note No 7 (PPG7) of 1997, and particularly Annex I, gives advice on the handling of applications for agricultural workers' dwellings. The Blackdown Hills, including the appeal site, were designated an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) in 1996. Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 imposes a duty on any Minister of the Crown to have regard to the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area in exercising any function in relation to land in an AONB. That duty therefore applies to this decision. In June 2000 the Government announced that it now considered that the landscape qualities of National Parks and AONBs were equivalent and that the latter share the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. This advice has also been taken into account in this decision.

Planning History of the Site

9. In December 1995 planning permission was granted for the erection of an agricultural building for storage of hay and straw and for the erection of a livestock building on the appeal site. At the inspection it was confirmed that these are the buildings flanking the concrete yard. In February 1998 permission was granted for the continued use of land for the stationing of a mobile home, subject to an agricultural occupancy condition and time-limited to two years. Permission was granted in April 1998 for the retention of a general stock shed (the small calf shelter) and to erect a hay and straw barn and two polytunnels. The latter does not appear to have been implemented. In April and July 1999 permission was refused for the

use of the existing and permitted buildings for kennels for dogs used by the local harriers and for a variation of the occupancy condition on the mobile home.

Main Issues

10. It is considered that the main issues in this case are the effects of the mobile home on the aims of policies seeking to restrict development in the open countryside and to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB and, if harm is caused to those aims, whether it is outweighed by any agricultural need for the mobile home.

Inspector's Reasons

11. Although Mazzelsha Farm lies at one of the highest points of the Blackdown ridge, it is all but invisible from its surroundings due to the woodland on the northern scarp and the tall, overgrown hedges which surround the holding on all the other sides. The only point from which any of the land can be seen is the entrance gateway, and from here the eastern field, the paddock and the agricultural buildings, which are set down in the land, look much like any other smallholding in this area. The mobile home itself remains out of sight from that point, screened by the trees along the southern boundary. Nevertheless, many local residents say that the noise of the generator and of barking dogs is a continual annoyance, out of keeping with the otherwise peaceful countryside, and that at night there are security lights which can be seen from a long distance on this skyline.
12. There is no reason to doubt the appellants' contention that the security lights were erected by the previous occupiers, although their use at night appears to conflict with the claim that the generator is switched off at that time. Even though the lights and generator may be used mainly for the servicing and protection of the animals, the residential use of the mobile home consolidates and adds to the need for these facilities. The glare of these lights is out of keeping with what should be a dark nocturnal landscape and is an alien and discordant intrusion. Though the noise of the generator does not affect the appearance of the countryside, it does undermine and detract from its peaceful character, a quality which is very apparent in this high, remote tableland. The noise of dogs, though no doubt annoying to those affected, appears to come from only a few animals. It is thus not considered to be so severe as to be out of place in this rural area such that it weighs against permission. Nonetheless, harm is caused by the security lights and generator to both the character and appearance of the landscape of this part of the AONB, contrary to the aims of designation and to Government policy seeking to protect its outstanding qualities.
13. Furthermore, as paragraph 3.21 of PPG7 points out, the fact that a single house on a particular site would be unobtrusive is not by itself a good argument; it could be repeated too often. Thus in this case the invisibility of the mobile home from public vantage points adds little weight to the argument for permission. In arriving at that conclusion account has also been taken that the surrounding trees and hedges may be vulnerable to reduction in height or removal, either of which might expose the development to distant views. Accordingly it is concluded that the mobile home causes serious harm to the aims of policies seeking to protect the countryside from development and to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB.

14. In the light of this conclusion consideration has been given to the arguments on the claimed agricultural need for the mobile home. The essence of these arguments is that, on the one hand, the appellants maintain that the agricultural appraisal which they have commissioned shows that there is a functional need for a residential presence on site and that the financial viability of the business is proven by its continued existence. On the other hand, the Council say that their report, which examines the appellants' appraisal, concludes that the business is unsustainable at the production levels proposed so that financial test of Annex I to PPG7 is not met. The appellants challenge this conclusion and point out that the author of the Council's report wrote the appraisal of the business in 1997, when a mobile home was first put on site, in which he concluded that a calf rearing business was viable. They say that because that report led to the 1998 permission to continue the use of the site for a mobile home for a two year period, and there is no essential difference between the farming systems proposed then and now, the appeals should be allowed and planning permission granted.
15. Paragraph I14 of PPG7 says that if a new dwelling is essential to support a new farming activity, whether on a newly-created holding or on an established one, it should normally, for the first three years be provided by a caravan, a wooden structure which can be easily dismantled, or other temporary accommodation. In this case the farming activity appears to be new even though it is an intensive calf rearing system as was that previously on the land. However, the present system uses eight or nine Jersey suckler cows to rear 21 calves per cow per year, whereas the previous enterprise was contract calf rearing of 120 calves per batch in about three or four batches per year. Not only is the annual throughput different for the two systems, but so too is their nature. The former enterprise rested on the use of the pens within the buildings in which the calves were reared on a hand-fed bucket basis, while that subject of these appeals involves the calves grazing intensively fertilised grass during the summer and being fed on silage/straw and concentrates in the winter. It is therefore appropriate to consider the application as being for a new farming activity within the terms of paragraph I14 of PPG7.
16. In terms of the five criteria of paragraph I14, it is accepted firstly that the activity now taking place on the land, in respect of the number and type of stock, the new fencing and the investment in the tractor and milking machine seen on site, constitute clear evidence of a firm intention and ability to develop the enterprise. Secondly, at any time on the holding there would be about 21 calves, eight or nine suckler cows which are central to the system, and eight or ten breeding sows with young. This number of animals, and the need to bring the cows into the calves in the buildings two or three times a day, points to there being a functional need for someone to be on hand at all times to operate the system effectively, to provide essential care and to be on hand in case of emergencies out of hours. Though the total labour requirement is somewhat low at 1930 hours per year, it is not so unreasonable when considered at the average of 37 hours per week, that it could be seen as more appropriate to a hobby than to a full-time job. Hence, if the enterprise is run at this degree of intensity, which looks to be the case since the appellants occupied the holding, there is no reason to suppose that permission would result in an abuse of the planning system.
17. The evidence of the financial basis of the enterprise shows that with a farm gross margin of £10,659 and overheads of £2,825 the management profit would be some £7,834. The Council's consultant queried several figures which go towards these totals, and though the appellants' consultant answered most of these points it remains the case that viability is fragile when the minimum agricultural wage is £9,277 a year and, as all parties

acknowledge, agriculture is in a parlous state. The appellants' appraisal recognises that to obtain even a modest living on this small holding it is essential that some kind of intensive enterprise is involved and that all resources are used to the full. Therefore any unforeseen circumstances such as serious illness or accidents to the stock or affecting the appellants themselves, large fluctuations in input or output prices, or prolonged adverse weather on this high ground could affect the enterprise in a much more damaging way than in a case where there were comfortable profit margins to absorb such eventualities.

18. This is therefore a very marginal case where it is by no means clear that the enterprise will be sustainable in the longer term. But the purpose of a temporary permission in agricultural cases is to test that very point. In this case the commitment of the appellants to the running of the enterprise on the holding is evident, and there is no claim that the functional need for someone to live full time on the land could be met by any existing suitable and available accommodation in the area. Nor is there any dispute that other normal planning requirements, such as siting and access, are satisfied in this case. Thus the crux of these appeals is the financial viability of the holding in the light of the advice in Annex I of PPG7. The judgement in the case of *Peter and Harris v SSE and Chichester DC [CoA 1999, EPL 5-163.25]* establishes that the financial viability test is only relevant in the determination of whether the grant of planning permission would, because of the uncertain future of the agricultural activity, threaten to produce in future a non-conforming residential use that would pass with the land. But here that threat would not materialise because the appellants are asking only that the mobile home be allowed to remain for a period of no more than three years so that they can prove themselves.
19. Accordingly, were permission to be granted in the terms sought, it would be for the appellants to use their best endeavours to ensure that during that temporary period they were able to show that the enterprise is sustainable and thus that the criteria in paragraph I5 of PPG7 are met. Should that not be demonstrated then they could not expect to receive either permission for a permanent dwelling or a further temporary permission. As matters stand at the time of this decision, the appellants have demonstrated sufficient need for a continuous residential presence on site, and that, on balance, there is some prospect that the farming enterprise will be able to show that it is sustainable in the long term. The residential presence requested by the appellants is a temporary one, so that no permanent harm would result from permission in these cases. Therefore it is concluded that these factors are sufficient to outweigh the harm that the mobile home causes to the aims of planning policies seeking to protect the countryside from development and to conserve the natural beauty of the AONB. All the other arguments advanced by the Council in support of its case have been taken into account, but none is so cogent as to affect that conclusion.
20. It follows that the appeals against the enforcement notice on ground (a) succeed so that the notice will be quashed. For similar reasons planning permission will be granted for the deemed applications, and the appeal against the refusal to grant planning permission also succeeds.
21. In granting permission account has been taken of the conditions suggested by the parties and of the length of time that the appellants have already been on site and operating the farming system considered in this decision. The evidence is that the appellants bought the land in September 2000 and their consultant's appraisal was prepared in March 2001. To date they have therefore had two seasons in which to establish the business, a not inconsiderable time

given their request for a three year permission. If that were to be granted today it would mean that by the date the suggested time limit expires, in all they would have had five years on site. That would be more than was requested by their consultant in March 2001 and substantially longer than is advised by Annex I of PPG7. It is accepted that the outbreak of foot and mouth disease in 2001 would have seriously affected the appellants' efforts to develop the business in that year, but it would also have given them time for other development work to be undertaken. Moreover, this was not a business being started on bare land, but one where substantial buildings, as well as the mobile home, already existed. In these circumstances it is considered that a time-limiting condition of two, rather than three, years is warranted.

22. The agricultural occupancy condition advised by Circular 11/95 will also be imposed, because, without the agricultural justification in this case, permission would have been refused. The permission for the planning appeal, because it arises from an application under Section 73A(2)(b) of the 1990 Act as amended, will be backdated to the time when the previous temporary permission expired.

Formal Decisions

23. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby determine these appeals as follows:

A. Enforcement Appeals Ref APP/D3315/C/02/1092956 & 1092957

- (i) I direct that the allegation in paragraph 3 of the notice be corrected by the deletion of all the words in lower case type in that paragraph and their replacement by the words "Without planning permission, the change of use of the land from agriculture to a mixed use for agriculture and for the stationing of a residential mobile home."
- (ii) Subject to that correction, I allow the appeals, direct that the enforcement notice as corrected be quashed, and grant planning permission for the applications deemed to have been made under Section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended for the use of the land for the stationing of a residential mobile home at Mazzelsha Farm, West Buckland Hill, West Buckland, Wellington, Somerset, subject to the following conditions:
- (a) The use hereby permitted, which shall be limited to one mobile home only, shall be discontinued and the land restored to its former condition on or before the expiry of two years from the date of this decision;
- (b) The occupation of the mobile home shall be limited to a person solely or mainly working, or last working, in the locality in agriculture or in forestry, or a widow or widower of such a person, and to any resident dependants.

B. Planning Appeal Ref APP/D3315/A/02/1092630

I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for the use of the land for the stationing of a residential mobile home at Mazzelsha Farm, West Buckland Hill, West Buckland, Wellington, Somerset, in accordance with the terms of the application (ref 46/2001/012) dated 8 May 2001 and the plans submitted therewith, and subject to the following conditions:

- (a) The use hereby permitted, which shall be limited to one mobile home only, shall be discontinued and the land restored to its former condition on or before the expiry of two years from the date of this decision;

(b) The occupation of the mobile home shall be limited to a person solely or mainly working, or last working, in the locality in agriculture or in forestry, or a widow or widower of such a person, and to any resident dependants.

Note: (i) This permission shall take effect from 12 February 2000.

(ii) This decision does not convey any approval or consent which may be required under any enactment, byelaw, order or regulation other than Section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

Right of Appeal Against the Decisions

24. These decisions are the determinations of the appeals before me. Particulars of the rights of appeal against these decisions to the High Court are enclosed for those concerned.



Inspector

