

TITLE: 24/00300/VAR

Committee: Planning Committee

Date: 9 July 2024

Author: Planning Officer

Report No: Z30

Contact Officer: Rachael Forbes, Planning Officer
rachael.forbes@eastcambs.gov.uk
01353 616300
Room No 011 The Grange Ely

Site Address: Old Tiger Stables House 22A Northfield Road Soham Ely Cambridgeshire CB7 5UF

Proposal: To Remove Condition 10 (Occupancy) and Clause 2 (b) of S106 Agreement of previously approved E/91/0367/0 for 1 1/2 storey dwelling and garage for stable owner

Applicant: Mrs Webster

Parish: Soham

Ward: Soham North

Ward Councillor/s: Mark Goldsack
Keith Horgan

Date Received: 18 March 2024

Expiry Date: 16 July 2024

1.0 RECOMMENDATION

1.1 Members are recommended to REFUSE the application for the following reason:

Policy HOU 5 states that occupancy conditions related to rural workers should only be lifted where there is no longer a need for accommodation relating to the holding or for rural workers in the wider area, where marketing of the property has been undertaken for at least 12 months at a price which reflects the occupancy restrictions and where at least 3 registered social landlords have declined the opportunity to take on the dwelling as an affordable dwelling. The submitted information does not sufficiently justify the removal of the occupancy condition of E/91/0367/O. No marketing has been carried out and therefore there is no evidence that there is a lack of interest in the site with the occupancy condition in place and

the LPA cannot be certain that there is no longer a need for accommodation on the holding/business and in the local area. In addition, there is no evidence that the dwelling has been made available to at least three social landlords. For the same reasons, it is considered that the S106 obligation serves a useful purpose and should remain in place. The application is contrary to the relevant points of Policy HOU 5 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015 (as amended).

2.0 SUMMARY OF APPLICATION

2.1 The full planning application, plans and documents submitted by the Applicant can be viewed online via East Cambridgeshire District Council's Public Access online service, via the following link <http://pa.eastcambs.gov.uk/online-applications/>.

2.2 The application seeks the removal of the occupancy condition and related clause in the S106 agreement of application 91/00367/OUT which was for a '*Proposed 1 1/2 Storey Dwelling & Garage for Stable Owner.*' The occupancy condition states:

'The proposed dwelling shall be first occupied by Miss L Webster and any dependants residing with her and thereafter by a person(s) involved in the management of the adjacent livery business currently known as Old Tiger Stables'

Reason: The dwelling hereby permitted is sited in a rural area outside any established settlement where the Local Planning Authority would not normally grant consent for such a development except to fulfil an essential rural need.

Clause 2(b) of the S106 agreement states:

'That the said 1.5 storey dwelling and garage shall thereafter only be used and occupied by a person or persons wholly or mainly employed in the management of the stables and livery business carried out on the said land (including any dependants of such a person residing with her).'

The request to remove the occupancy condition and Clause 2(b) is so the dwelling can be occupied or sold as market dwelling and would not require those who occupied it to be involved in the management of the business.

2.3 The application has been called in to Planning Committee by Cllr Goldsack for the following reason:

'My call in reason is that officers state that it has to be advertised for 12 months in case there is interest in someone taking on the livery business. However, since the move, access to the then used grassland has ceased availability meaning there is nowhere near sufficient grass for a livery business! The BHA set out guidelines and these are compromised by the site as it is today.

Because of this state of the site a removal of tie and moving forward by the applicant, who has moved the business to a County Farm holding across Soham and allows further development of a much valued and respected local business.'

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 **92/00849/RMA**
Proposed Detached Dwelling
Approved
21 December 1992

96/00762/FUL
Proposed double garage, porch and study
Approved
31 October 1996

05/00129/FUL
Erection of indoor riding school arena.
Approved
1 April 2005

91/00367/OUT
Proposed 1 1/2 Storey Dwelling & Garage for Stable Owner.
Approved
4 November 1992

4.0 THE SITE AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

4.1 The application site consists of a dwelling adjacent to Northfield Road with stables, an outdoor arena, an indoor arena and other associated buildings. The application site also includes land on which two dwellings have been built (17/00291/FUL) which are not associated with the livery use of the site. The site is located outside of the development envelope and is therefore considered to be in the countryside.

5.0 RESPONSES FROM CONSULTEES

5.1 Responses were received from the following consultees and these are summarised below. The full responses are available on the Council's web site.

Local Highways Authority - 23 April 2024

'Recommendation

On behalf of the Local Highway Authority, I raise no objections to the proposals.

Comments

None of the proposals included within this application will have any material impact on the public highway.'

Soham Town Council - 1 May 2024

Soham Town Council has the following comments to make on the above-named application: -

The Council has no objections to the removal of Condition 10 (occupancy). The Council is unable to comment on Clause 2 (b) of the s106 Agreement of previously approved E/91/0367/0 as insufficient information is available and inaccessible from the ECDC planning portal.

Environmental Health – 27 March 2024

'The Covering Letter advises –

“The Old Tiger Stables, as a livery yard and riding school does still exist, but no longer in the location of where the restricted house is located. Another equine business will struggle to operate from this site as there is not enough land to be able to run a successful equine business, and this was the direct reasoning behind the stables needing to relocate in the first place.”

I acknowledge that Condition 10 was not attached for amenity purposes but without knowing what the surrounding land will be used for it is difficult to comment on whether any future occupier could be impacted if Condition 10 is removed.'

Waste Strategy (ECDC) – 29 May 2024

'East Cambs District Council will not enter private property to collect waste or recycling, therefore it would be the responsibility of the owners/residents to take any sacks/bins to the public highway boundary on the relevant collection day and this should be made clear to any prospective purchasers in advance, this is especially the case where bins would need to be moved over long distances; the RECAP Waste Management Design Guide defines the maximum distance a resident should have to take a wheeled bin to the collection point as 30 metres (assuming a level smooth surface).

• Under Section 46 of The Environmental Protection Act 1990, East Cambridgeshire District Council as a Waste Collection Authority is permitted to make a charge for the provision (delivery and administration) of waste collection receptacles, this power being re-enforced in the Local Government Acts of 1972, 2000, and 2003, as well as the Localism Act of 2011.'

Ward Councillors – 4th June 2024

See paragraph 2.2 of this report

The Ely Group Of Internal Drainage Board -

No Comments Received

CCC Growth & Development -

No Comments Received

Consultee For Other Wards In Parish -

No Comments Received

- 5.2 A site notice was displayed near the site on 27 March 2024.
- 5.3 Neighbours – five neighbouring properties were notified. Three responses have been received, one in support and two objecting. The responses received are summarised below. A full copy of the responses are available on the Council’s website.

Objector 1:

- Investigation of a breach in planning consent relating to the drainage of properties granted under 17/00291/FUL is currently taking place.
- For this reason, the land is legally contested.
- The current tenants renting the property are doing so in breach of the S106 agreement.
- Statements within the application appear to be incorrect, questioning the validity of the arguments.
- The application withholds information on the plans for the remaining stable land.

Objector 2:

- Lack of information relating to future use of the land and therefore oppose the removal of the restrictions.
- 22A Northfield Road has been rented to non-stable associated occupants for at least 18 months in violation of the occupancy condition.
- There is an ongoing dispute over adherence to planning conditions in relation to waste and storm water drainage.

Supporter 1:

- No objections to the removal of condition 10 and clause 2(b) of the S106 agreement.

6.0 **THE PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT**

6.1 *East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 (as amended 2023)*

GROWTH 2	Locational strategy
GROWTH 5	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
HOU 5	Dwellings for rural workers
ENV 2	Design
ENV 9	Pollution
COM 7	Transport Impact

6.2 *Soham and Barway Neighbourhood Plan*

The last consultation on the Soham and Barway Neighbourhood Plan has now finished and the plan is currently going through an independent examination. A referendum on the plan is likely in the Autumn. Given the current status of the plan, it is now considered to have moderate weight.

6.3 *National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023)*

- 2 Achieving sustainable development
- 4 Decision-making
- 5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- 6 Building a strong, competitive economy
- 9 Promoting sustainable transport

6.4 Planning Practice Guidance

7.0 PLANNING COMMENTS

7.1 Policy requirements

7.1.1 Policy GROWTH 2 of the ECLP states that outside of the development envelopes, development will be strictly controlled, having regard to the need to protect the countryside and the setting of towns and villages and to direct growth to sustainable locations within the development envelope. Outside of the development envelope, development is restricted to the categories listed in the policy, one of which is HOU 5, dwellings for rural workers.

7.1.2 The dwelling is located outside of the development envelope in a countryside location where unrestricted market dwellings are not supported. For that reason, the initial approval for the dwelling (E/91/0367/O) placed a condition on the permission requiring that the dwelling was first occupied by the applicant (Miss L Webster) and then a person(s) involved in the management of the adjacent livery business. A S106 agreement was also put in place with Clause 2(b) requiring the occupation of the dwelling by a person wholly or mainly employed in the management of the stables and livery business. Given the age of the original application, there is no officer report, however there are some files notes which state that the reason for the condition was that 'The dwelling hereby permitted is situated in a rural area outside of any established settlement where the LPA would not normally grant permission for such development and this permission is granted solely to fulfil an essential need for a rural activity.'

7.1.3 Policy HOU 5 also gives scope for an occupancy condition to be removed. Paragraph 4.6.4 of the ECLP states that proposals to remove an occupancy condition will be considered on the basis of whether a need remains for the accommodation for other rural workers and that this will involve the marketing of property, a demonstration of a general lack of need in the area and that the dwelling has been made available to three Registered Social Landlords and that this option has been refused.

7.1.4 Policy HOU 5 states that applications for the removal of an occupancy condition related to rural workers will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that:

- There is no longer a need for accommodation on the holding/business and in the local area.

- The property has been marketed for a reasonable period (at least 1 year) and at a price which reflects the existence of the occupancy condition; and
- The dwelling has been made available to a minimum of three Registered Social Landlords operating locally on terms which would prioritise its occupation by a rural worker as an affordable dwelling - and that option has been refused.

7.1.5 *Policy criterion 1 – There is no longer a need for accommodation*

7.1.6 The cover letter submitted with the application sets out that The Old Tiger Stables have outgrown the site at Northfield Road and have therefore relocated to a bigger site at North Angle Farm. It goes on to say that the planning condition and S106 agreement clearly link the occupancy of the house with the livery yard and stables and that given the relocation of the stables, it is now impossible for anyone to comply with the conditions and the restriction. It goes on to say that the wording of the occupancy condition is very specifically linked to the livery yard, known as Old Tiger Stables, which although it does still exist cannot operate from the site, as insufficient land was owned to allow for exercise and grazing of horses associated with the business.

7.1.7 In respect of the wording of the condition, the Local Planning Authority considers that someone else could operate a business from the site within the confines of the condition. The condition states that the house can be occupied by a persons employed in the management of the adjacent livery business ‘currently known as Old Tiger Stables’. In addition, the condition could be varied to allow an alternative rural worker (such as someone employed in agriculture) to occupy the dwelling and, given the aims of policies GROWTH 2 and HOU 5 it would be expected that this option was explored prior to applying to remove the condition. Whether there was somebody who required the dwelling for an alternative rural worker use could have been ascertained through a marketing exercise, which has not been carried out – this will be discussed further in the relevant section of this report.

7.1.8 The application as originally made stated that another equine business would struggle to operate from the site as there is not enough land to run a successful equine business, however, the case officer questioned that conclusion on the basis that the Old Tiger Stables has operated successfully at the site for over 30 years (1987-2022) before moving to a larger premises.

7.1.9 In response to the case officer’s view, information was provided by the applicant which explained that additional land necessary for grazing the horses was rented by the applicant and that as this rental agreement has ended, no business could currently operate from the site.

7.1.10 The additional information sets out that there is variety of types of livery that can be offered but most liveries have to offer grazing. The information sets out that the house and stables subject of this application amounts to 2.5 acres and most of this is covered by built form and garden land and therefore there is one modest turn out paddock which may amount to an acre. It then goes on to state that the British Horse Society guidelines on pasture management recommend 1-1.5 acres per horse. Letters from Rosssdales Veterinary practice and from the Association of British Riding Schools, Livery Yards and Equestrian Centres (ABRS+) have been submitted as part of the additional information. The letters set out that there is an issue with the ‘very

limited grass turnout available to the yard', the grazing needs and the difficulties that equine enterprises are facing in the present economic climate. The letter from ABRS+ states that the site has 30 stables. That letter also states that due to the lack of pasture the retention of the site as a riding school, livery yard or equestrian centre is non-viable. The information further states that when the stables were being run from this location, the applicant rented additional land (between 10 and 11.5 acres) and it is difficult to build a business when you are dependent on others in order for it function. They conclude that without grazing, the site cannot operate as a livery yard.

- 7.1.11 It is accepted that additional off-site turn-out land is required in order to run a commercial livery on the site. However, the site has managed to operate as a commercial livery for decades in the absence of such land being present on site, apparently via rental agreements with neighbouring landowners.
- 7.1.12 While the application has demonstrated that such turn-out land is required for the operation of livery, what it has not done is provide any significant information or evidence as to the location of the previously rented land, why that rental agreement ended and what efforts were made to secure access to other land in the area. It appears entirely possible that a new agreement between a new livery business owner and neighbouring landowner may be able to be negotiated and/or agreements with landowners investigated and established which would allow a livery business to continue to operate from the site in a similar way to how it has done for the last 35 years. The application has failed to address this issue and had marketing been carried out, as required by the policy and discussed in more detail below, potential buyers could have explored and established whether land could have been rented on terms that would have allowed a livery use on the site to continue. The lack of this marketing exercise leaves this possibility entirely unaddressed.
- 7.1.13 On that basis, the application is considered to have failed to establish that there is no longer a need for accommodation on the site which is a requirement of policy HOU 5.
- 7.1.14 ***Policy criterion 2 – The property has been marketed for a reasonable period***
- 7.1.12 Policy HOU 5 requires marketing to be carried out for a reasonable period of at least 1 year and at a price which reflects the existence of the occupancy condition. The cover letter states that as the condition and S106 restriction are very clearly linking the house and this particular business 'so a marketing campaign trying to sell a property with such a worded condition would be pointless, as no one is going to be able to run a business from this house.' An appeal decision has been referenced where an Inspector determined that marketing was not required on a horticultural business as the business was considered to be unviable.
- 7.1.13 As no marketing has been carried out, it has not been evidenced that there is no longer a need for accommodation either on the holding/business or in the local area. The appeal decision reference is not sufficient justification for allowing no marketing and it is not an identical situation. In that appeal decision, the Council and appellant both agreed that the business was not viable and was performing poorly. The Old Tiger Stables has been successful and has outgrown the site. There has been no actual evidence submitted that the operation of a business from the site would be unviable and as noted in the above section, there has been no attempt to vary the

condition or explain why another rental agreement for turnout land would not be possible. Furthermore, there are several appeal decisions (APP/F4410/W/20/3256234, APP/N2535/W/21/3281142, APP/B9506/W/20/3258005, APP/X1118/W/23/3327842) in which the Inspector considers that a lack of marketing prevents them from assessing whether there is a lack of need and that a lack of marketing means there is no evidence that there is no interest in the site.

- 7.1.14 The additional information submitted by the applicant also states, 'it is difficult to build a business when you are dependent on others in order for it to function as it needs to.' However, the applicant ran a business successfully from the site for 35 years and has now moved to a larger site. The letter from Rosssdales Veterinary practice also states that during their last visit the stables had fallen into a state of disrepair and numerous areas of the riding school were only just acceptable for the licence to be renewed and that the yard would need significant refurbishment. Because no marketing has been carried out, the LPA cannot be certain that someone would not come forward who would look to refurbish it.
- 7.1.15 The application provides no information as to whether options for renting grazing land remain or why a new owner could not take off where the previous one ended, renting turnout land from a local landowner and if the site were marketed for a significant period as required by policy, interested parties could explore those options with local landowners and may be able to come to an agreement with one sufficient to service the livery use.
- 7.1.16 Furthermore, in order to address policy HOU 5, marketing ought not to exclusively focus on the use as a livery but on residential accommodation for other rural uses in the area. While the existing occupancy condition would need to be varied to allow residential occupation in association with an alternative rural use, given the aims of the policy GROWTH 2 and HOU 5 which exceptionally provides support for rural accommodation for full-time workers in agriculture, horticulture, forestry, stud and other rural activities, this should be considered as an exception to the normal policies of restraint in the countryside.
- 7.1.17 Even if the applicant had demonstrated that there was no option to secure rented land for equine use, all of the available options for rural use of the dwelling have not been explored prior to applying to completely remove the occupancy condition.
- 7.1.18 As a result, the application is not considered to have adequately addressed criterion 2 of policy HOU 5 or aims of that aspect of the policy.
- 7.1.19 ***Policy criterion 3 – The dwelling has been made available to three Registered Social Landlords***
- 7.1.20 There is no information submitted to address the third point of the policy that the dwelling has been made available to a minimum of three Registered Social Landlords to establish whether it could be suitable for occupation by a rural worker as an affordable dwelling.
- 7.1.21 The pre-amble to policy HOU 5 is clear that applicants need to demonstrate a lack of general need in an area and that as part of that approach, they will need to

demonstrate that the dwelling has been made available to a minimum of three Registered Social Landlords operating locally and that such an option has been refused.

- 7.1.22 As a result of the lack of information that this has been addressed, the Council cannot be convinced that the dwelling could not be repurposed for general rural worker accommodation and the application is therefore not considered to have adequately addressed criterion 3 of policy HOU 5.
- 7.1.23 ***Removal of Clause 2(b) of the S106 agreement***
- 7.1.24 Clause 2(b) of the S106 agreement states: 'That the said 1.5 storey dwelling and garage shall thereafter only be used and occupied by a person or persons wholly or mainly employed in the management of the stables and livery business carried out on the said land (including any dependants of such a person residing with her).'
- 7.1.25 In respect of the S106, it is necessary to consider whether the obligation serves a useful purpose.
- 7.1.26 The cover letter for the application sets out that the Old Tiger Stables, as a livery yard and riding school does still exist, but no longer in the location of where the restricted house is located and 'another equine business will struggle to operate from this site as there is not enough land to be able to run a successful equine business, and this was the direct reasoning behind the stables needing to relocate in the first place.'
- 7.1.27 The additional information submitted states that to say that the planning circumstances of the area have not changed is simply not true, as the two dwellings approved under 17/00291/FUL, neither of which have an agricultural tie on them and on determining that application at Planning Committee, members confirmed that this area should be seen as a sustainable location due to its close proximity to the built up area of Soham. The information states that this is absolutely relevant in proving that the tie no longer serves a useful purpose and that dwellings in this area no longer need to have a tie on controlling their use.
- 7.1.28 The LPA consider that the obligation is serving a useful purpose. The planning circumstances of the area have not changed since the imposition of the condition – the site is still outside of the development envelope, where residential development is not permitted unless it meets one of the exceptions of GROWTH 2. Further to this, it has not been evidenced that the obligation no longer meets a useful purpose as it has not been evidenced that there is no interest in the site due to the lack of marketing. The same lack of explanation regarding the lapsing of the agreement to rent grazing land and the lack of exploration of that as an ongoing possibility via a new agreement also apply to the request to remove the obligation.
- 7.1.29 The application referred to, 17/00291/FUL, was approved at a time when the Council could not demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and housing applications outside of the development envelope were assessed using the presumption in favour of sustainable development. While this did change the planning circumstances at the time of that application, at the present time the Council can demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and would not support a market dwelling in the countryside in

principle and it would need to meet one of the exceptions set out in Policy GROWTH 2.

7.1.30 ***Conclusion on principle of development***

7.1.31 The LPA consider that there is no justification for the removal of the condition and cannot be certain that there is no longer a need for accommodation on the holding/business and in the local area due to a lack of marketing. In addition, there is no evidence that the dwelling has been made available to three social landlords. For the same reasons, it is considered that the S106 obligation serves a useful purpose and should remain in place.

7.1.32 Policy SBNP1 of the Soham and Barway Neighbourhood Plan is relevant insofar as it sets out the spatial strategy and the development envelope boundaries. This site remains outside of the development envelope and the policy states that development may be permitted as an exception in accordance with Policy GROWTH 2 of the Local Plan.

7.1.33 Therefore, the application does not comply with any of the relevant points of Policy HOU 5 of the East Cambridgeshire Local Plan, 2015 (as amended).

7.2 **Other Material Matters**

7.2.1 ***Highway Safety***

7.2.2 The Local Highway Authority have raised no objections to the proposal as it concludes that none of the proposals included in the application would materially impact the public highway.

7.2.3 ***Town Council Comments***

7.2.4 Soham Town Council have commented that they have no objections to the removal of the occupancy condition but are unable to comment on Clause 2(b) of the S106 agreement as insufficient information is available and inaccessible from the ECDC planning portal. The Town Council's comments are noted although the relevant s106 clause was quoted in the agent's cover letter underneath the condition wording.

7.2.5 ***Environmental Health***

7.2.6 The Council's Environmental Health Officer (EHO) initially commented that although Condition 10 was not attached for amenity purposes, without knowing what the surrounding land will be used for it was difficult to comment on whether any future occupier could be impacted if Condition 10 is removed.

7.2.7 Having reviewed the site pictures, the EHO has commented that after seeing the proximity of the stable block to the dwelling (subject of this application), he does have some concerns about noise, odour and lighting if the stable business is to remain. The EHO has commented 'The closest part of the dwelling to the stable block appears to be a garage but it is unknown what is above it. If this includes an amenity space such as a bedroom or relaxation space then this has the potential to be impacted. In addition to this the garden appears to straddle the length of the stables which may

also impact upon amenity.’ He has concluded that at this time he does not wish to raise an objection but the concerns remain and the applicants should be advised that planning permission does not confer immunity from action under statutory nuisance, either by local authority or a private individual.

7.2.8 It is considered that if the occupancy condition were to be removed that anyone purchasing the dwelling would be aware that there is a stables/livery next door and while it is not in operation at present, could become operational at any time and if operating within the scope of the planning permission, would not require further planning permission.

7.2.9 ***Neighbour comments***

7.2.10 Owners of two neighbouring properties have raised a number of concerns. The first is that ECDC are investigating a potential breach of planning consent for another development that relates to the installation of drainage in respect of two properties that reside both on adjacent land and land associated with the Old Tiger Stables and that for this reason, the land associated with the property in the application is legally contested.

7.2.11 The legal status of the land is a civil matter. The drainage issues at the property are separate to this application and cannot be addressed or resolved as part of this application.

7.2.12 It has also been raised that there is no information relating to the future use of the land. As above, if the occupancy condition were to be removed the change it would be granting would be that the dwelling did not have to be occupied by someone involved in the management of the livery/stables. The livery/stables would remain in this use and if someone wanted an alternative use for the land, they would need to apply for planning permission and that proposal would be assessed on its own merits.

7.3 **Planning Balance**

7.3.1 The application does not demonstrate that there is no longer a need for a rural worker dwelling on the holding/business nor in the local area, no marketing has been carried out and there is no evidence submitted that the dwelling has been made available to a minimum of three Registered Social Landlords. There is no substantive evidence submitted to demonstrate lack of need or lack of interest in the site and therefore the Local Planning Authority cannot be certain that there is no interest in the site. Further to this, there has been no substantive information submitted about the land that has been rented previously and why that arrangement ended. There has also been no attempt to vary the condition to allow for a rural worker to occupy the dwelling. There are no material considerations which would outweigh the lack of compliance with Policy HOU 5 and therefore the application is recommended for refusal.

8.0 **COSTS**

8.1.1 An appeal can be lodged against a refusal of planning permission or a condition imposed upon a planning permission. If a local planning authority is found to have acted unreasonably and this has incurred costs for the applicant (referred to as

appellant through the appeal process) then a cost award can be made against the Council.

- 8.1.2 Unreasonable behaviour can be either procedural ie relating to the way a matter has been dealt with or substantive ie relating to the issues at appeal and whether a local planning authority has been able to provide evidence to justify a refusal reason or a condition.
- 8.13 Members do not have to follow an officer recommendation indeed they can legitimately decide to give a different weight to a material consideration than officers. However, it is often these cases where an appellant submits a claim for costs. The Committee therefore needs to consider and document its reasons for going against an officer recommendation very carefully.

9.0 APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – 91/00367/OUT decision notice

Appendix 2 – 91/00367/OUT S106 agreement

Appendix 3 – appeal decision APP/F4410/W/20/3256234

Appendix 4 – appeal decision APP/N2535/W/21/3281142

Appendix 5 – appeal decision APP/B9506/W/20/3258005

Appendix 6 – appeal decision APP/X1118/W/23/3327842

Background Documents

24/00300/VAR
92/00849/RMA
96/00762/FUL
05/00129/FUL
91/00367/OUT

National Planning Policy Framework -

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf

East Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2015 -

<http://www.eastcamb.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Local%20Plan%20April%202015%20-%20front%20cover%20and%20inside%20front%20cover.pdf>