



# Appeal Decisions

Inquiry held on 2 & 3 September & 25 & 26 November 2008

Site visits made on 3 September and 26 November 2008

by **Claire Sherratt** DipURP MRTPI

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

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

Decision date:  
12 January 2009

---

## Notice A – Appeal Ref: APP/B3220/C/07/2060815 & 2060816 Land at Karuna, Picklescott, Church Stretton, Shropshire SY6 6NT

- 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 James & Mrs Merav Wheelhouse against an enforcement notice issued by Shrewsbury & Atcham Borough Council.
- The Council's reference is MF/07/0143/ENF.
- The notice was issued on 17 October 2007.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the unauthorised stationing of a metal container.
- The requirements of the notice are to remove the metal storage container from the land.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is 16 weeks from the date the notice takes effect.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) (a), (c), (f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
- An application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under S177 (5) of the Act as amended.

---

## Notice B – Appeal Ref: APP/B3220/C/08/2063851 & 2063852 Land at Karuna, Picklescott, Church Stretton, Shropshire SY6 6NT

- 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 & Mrs J & M Wheelhouse against an enforcement notice issued by Shrewsbury & Atcham Borough Council.
  - The Council's reference is MF/07/0222/ENF.
  - The notice was issued on 17 October 2007.
  - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, change of use of land from agricultural use to a mixed use for agriculture and use for residential purposes by siting two caravans in the approximate locations indicated on the plan attached to the notice.
  - The requirements of the notice are (i) to cease the use of the land for residential purposes; and (ii) remove from the land two caravans and any other equipment brought onto the land for the purposes of the residential use.
  - The period for compliance with the requirements is 16 weeks from the date the notice takes effect.
  - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) (a), (b), (c), (f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
  - An application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under S177 (5) of the Act as amended.
-

**Appeal C – Ref: APP/B3220/A/08/2064925**

**Land at Karuna, Picklescott, Church Stretton, Shropshire SY6 6NT**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under a development order.
  - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs J & M Wheelhouse against the decision of Shrewsbury & Atcham Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 07/0804/AGR, dated 31 May 2007, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2008.
  - The development proposed is a polytunnel.
- 

**Preliminary Matters**

1. Notice B makes no reference to any alleged material change of use of land to include educational courses. The appellants refer to a number of educational courses that they have held related to permaculture techniques. I consider the number and size of courses to date would simply be ancillary to the agricultural use of the site. I have determined the ground (a) appeal relating to Notice B accordingly and having regard to the level of activity applicable prior to and at the time the notice was served.

**Planning Policy**

2. The appeal site is situated outside the settlement boundaries defined on the proposals map of the Shrewsbury and Atcham Local Plan (LP) in an area of open countryside. It is within an area designated as the Shropshire Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) where both national and local policies give priority to the protection of the special landscape qualities of the area. Development will not be permitted if it would have an adverse effect, directly or indirectly, on the special landscape character of the AONB. Development within the AONB will only be permitted if, amongst others, it is for agriculture or forestry purposes. AONBs, along with other nationally designated areas, enjoy the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.
  3. Sustainable development is the core principle underpinning land use planning and the Government's overarching planning policies on the delivery of sustainable development are set out in Planning Policy Statement 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'. In facilitating and promoting sustainable and inclusive patterns of both urban and rural development, it is necessary to protect and enhance the natural and historic environment, the quality and character of the countryside and existing communities. The government has also produced 'Planning and Climate Change' as a supplement to PPS1. Tackling climate change is a key Government priority for the planning system. The key planning objectives include delivering patterns of urban growth and sustainable rural developments that help secure the fullest possible use of sustainable transport for moving freight, public transport, cycling and walking; and, which overall, reduce the need to travel, especially by car; secure new development and shape places that minimise vulnerability, and provide
-

resilience, to climate change; in ways that are consistent with social cohesion and inclusion.

4. Both national and local policies seek to resist new residential development in open countryside locations. New building development in the open countryside away from existing settlements, or outside areas allocated for development in development plans, should be strictly controlled in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 3 'Housing' (PPS3); the Government's overall aim is to protect the countryside for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and so it may be enjoyed by all.
5. Isolated new houses in the countryside require special justification for planning permission to be granted. One of the few circumstances in which isolated residential development may be justified is when accommodation is required to enable agriculture, forestry and certain other full time workers to live at their place of work because the nature and demands of the work concerned make it essential for one or more people engaged in the enterprise to do so. It is clear in Planning Policy Statement 7 'Sustainable Development in Rural Areas' (PPS7) that whether or not it is essential to live on the site will depend on the needs of the enterprise concerned and not on the personal preferences or circumstances of any of the individuals involved.

### **Reasons**

6. The appeal site comprises some 18 acres of agricultural land situated within open countryside on the edge of Picklescott, a small rural hamlet which is not identified in the LP as a suitable location for new development. The site is bounded by mature hedgerows and a public footpath crosses the site. The land slopes and there is an open sided timber barn situated in the lower part of the site.

### ***Notice A - The container***

#### Ground (c)

7. The container enforced against is situated in an elevated part of the site some distance from the barn. It is painted green, incorporating a landscape scene. The container has a solid and substantial form which would not be readily dismantled or easily moved. It is intended to provide long term storage accommodation and has an air of permanence. As a matter of fact and degree, I conclude that the container is operational development.
8. Class A, Part 6 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (GPDO) sets out the agricultural buildings and operations that are permitted development, not requiring planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in A.2. A.2(2) requires that the developer shall, before beginning the development, apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the

prior approval of the authority will be required for the siting, design and external appearance of the building. The appellant did not apply to the local planning authority for such a determination. The conditions set out in A.2 (2) have not been satisfied. Development that is carried out in breach of a planning condition is unlawful. The container is not therefore permitted development irrespective of whether it would satisfy Class A of Part 6 in all other respects.

9. The appeal on ground (c) therefore fails.

Ground (a)

10. I consider the main issue is the effect of the development (i.e. the container) on the character and appearance of the area designated as an AONB. Views of the container are limited from outside the site. However, it is clearly visible from the public footpath through various gaps in the hedge. The container is of a stark appearance better suited to an industrial location and is wholly inappropriate in an AONB where policies require development to be of a particularly high design and quality. The harm caused due to poor design is clearly demonstrated by the other examples of unsightly development I was referred to. The fact that a structure can be screened in time or other unsightly development can be viewed in the area is not sufficient justification to allow a development that is clearly at odds with policies relative to the AONB.
11. Furthermore the container is situated in an area of the site visually and functionally unrelated to the existing barn, resulting in a proliferation of development on the site. I accept that it provides the appellants with a convenient store close to the main horticultural area and that the barn is not so well located. As such they would prefer to keep it. Nevertheless, I did not find the barn to be so far removed from the main horticultural area that it would not provide adequate, albeit less convenient, daily storage facilities. The barn is of traditional materials and of a form and appearance not unexpected in a countryside location. I take the view that there is no overriding need that may outweigh the visual harm that I have identified. I have considered the appellants' suggestion that the container could be painted or additional planting carried out. However the container would remain an alien feature of industrial character in the AONB and the harm would not be sufficiently mitigated to justify granting planning permission.
12. I conclude that the container unduly harms the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside designated an AONB. I find conflict with the development plan, in particular Policy LNC9 and GP10 of the LP. The appeal on ground (a) therefore fails.

Ground (f)

13. In deciding to take enforcement action, a local planning authority may choose either to seek a remedy to the breach of control or to specify steps for overcoming the injury to amenity if they consider it appropriate to under-enforce. In this case the Council has sought to remedy the breach and may not require additional works to be carried out. The removal of

the container is necessary to remedy the breach. The appeal on ground (f) therefore fails.

*Ground (g)*

14. Bearing in mind the harm caused by the container and the works that would be involved in complying with the notice, I consider 16 weeks is ample time to prepare and arrange for the removal of the container. The appeal on ground (g) therefore fails.

**Conclusion**

15. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeals relating to Notice A should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice and refuse to grant planning permission on the deemed application.

***Notice B - The Caravans***

*Ground (b)*

16. There are two caravans on the site that are subject to the enforcement notice. There is no dispute between the main parties that the larger of the two is used for residential purposes by the family. The smaller of the two caravans contains one single space comprising seating / bed combined, storage cupboards, a stove and sink although I was told that the water pump was not working at the time. The Council refer to bedding, candles and play equipment being observed in the smaller caravan prior to the notice being served. In my opinion, children's play equipment and candles in particular would be rather unexpected if the caravan were being used primarily as an agricultural restroom and for the preparation of drinks and snacks for groups of visitors. I heard that it is occasionally used as overnight accommodation for visitors and has in the past, been used by the family to stay on the site at weekends.
17. There was no such play equipment / toys in the caravan at the time of my visit. There was bedding in the caravan and indeed it had been used overnight by the appellants' advocate prior to the start of the inquiry.
18. It seems to me, based on the evidence before me and what I saw, that the caravan has been used for a variety of purposes including additional living accommodation. Certainly it was used by Mr Wheelhouse to stay overnight on the land initially, prior to the notice being served. I conclude, as a matter of fact and degree, that the matters alleged in the notice have occurred.

*Ground (c)*

19. In respect of the ground (c) appeal, it is again only the use of the smaller of the two caravans that is in dispute. Under the provisions of Section 55(2) (e) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) the use of land for agricultural purposes, and the use of any building occupied together with land so used, are excluded from the definition of development. There is no dispute between the parties that the site is used for agricultural purposes. The effect of s55 (2) (e) is that structures

may be placed on agricultural land, provided no operational development is involved, since there would have been no change of use. It is for the appellant to demonstrate that it has been used solely for purposes ancillary to the agricultural use of the site. I am not satisfied based on the evidence before me, that on the balance of probability, the smaller of the two caravans has been used solely for purposes ancillary to the lawful agricultural use of the land, but rather in association with the mixed use of the site including residential use. The appeal under ground (c) therefore fails.

*Ground (a) and the deemed application*

20. A temporary planning permission for the siting of the caravans for residential purposes is sought for 3 years. I consider the main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside, designated as an AONB and whether the needs of the enterprise concerned justify residential development on the site.

*Character and Appearance of the countryside*

21. The caravans are sited on an elevated part of the site. The smaller caravan is sited adjacent to a hedge, painted green with camouflage netting over it. The larger caravan has been painted green and occupies a more central position adjacent to the main horticultural area. Both caravans are generally well screened from views outside the site.
22. The caravans can be viewed from the public footpath through some of the substantial gaps in the hedge. Adjacent areas have been planted with trees and will, in time, help to screen the caravans from the public footpath. Nevertheless, I do not accept the appellant's assertion that they visually enhance the AONB. AONBs should be afforded the highest protection and the caravans appear incongruous in this nationally recognised attractive countryside setting. I consider that the caravans together with other domestic paraphernalia associated with a residential use of the site seriously harm the character and appearance of the surrounding AONB.

Whether there is need for the appellants to live on the site.

23. It is necessary to consider whether the nature and demands of the work concerned make it essential for one or more people engaged in the enterprise to reside on site. It is clear in Planning Policy Statement 7 'Sustainable Development in Rural Areas' (PPS7) that whether or not it is essential to live on the site will depend on the needs of the enterprise concerned and not on the personal preferences or circumstances of any of the individuals involved.
24. The site is being worked and occupied by the appellants following permaculture techniques. I was referred to a definition of permaculture that had been accepted in another appeal<sup>1</sup>, namely '*the conscious design and maintenance of agriculturally productive eco-systems which have the*

---

<sup>1</sup> Appeal decisions APP/K1128/C/06/2032148, APP/K1128/C/07/2039820 & APP/K1128/A/06/2018778 (The 'Landmatters' appeal decision)

*diversity, stability and resilience of natural eco-systems ... the harmonious integration of landscape and people, providing their food, energy, shelter and other material and non-material needs in a sustainable way*'. The underlying objective of the venture is to live a sustainable and ultimately self-sufficient lifestyle, through the production of food, harnessing energy and water conservation techniques. The appellant emphasised it requires a holistic approach with various elements inter-related.

25. Some 6,000 trees have been planted on the site to provide shelter belts and orchards. I saw, during my first visit, that some of the apple trees were already bearing fruit. Areas are planted with vegetables, herbs and the like. I saw potatoes that had been grown and were being stored. The site contains a pond and at the time of my site visit there were about 10 ducks roaming freely on the site which are housed overnight in a structure and enclosed run. One bee-hive was in situ although it contained no bees. It is hoped to increase the number of ducks and bee-hives overtime.
26. There are solar panels connected to both caravans and a wind turbine was in place adjacent to the larger of the caravans. Rainwater is collected, stored and recycled and other waste recycling / reduction initiatives were in place. There is a composting toilet. In addition, I heard that the appellants have run a number of educational courses on the site relating to permaculture, forest gardening and there have been school visits to the site.
27. The underlying aim of the tests set out in PPS7 is to thoroughly scrutinise proposals for dwellings in the countryside to detect attempts to abuse the concession made for dwellings in the countryside. Annex A of PPS7 confirms that even temporary accommodation should satisfy a number of criteria. These include evidence of a firm intention and ability to develop the enterprise concerned; a functional need; and clear evidence that the proposed enterprise has been planned on a sound financial basis.
28. The appellant suggested a number of circumstances that he considered would require someone to be permanently on site, such as looking after livestock, to deal with the outbreak of fires, to provide on-site security, to protect against other livestock getting into the site and causing damage, to care for young trees and to receive visitors. I consider that taken individually, none of the circumstances referred to or the activities taking place or proposed would require someone to live on site. The ducks are housed in a structure with an enclosed run overnight, which is situated some distance from the residential caravan in any event. I heard that the appellants already lived on site when there was an incident of damage caused by a vehicle breaking through a gate and entering the site. The boundary hedges appeared to be well maintained and I saw little opportunity for livestock easily gaining access to the site. In any event this could be reasonably prevented through the regular maintenance of boundaries around the perimeter of the site. I am not persuaded that fires are likely to be a significant threat or the young trees need 24 hour attention. I find little support, even taking the various elements cumulatively, for any functional need to live on site. In the absence of

any functional need being demonstrated, it is not normally necessary to consider the financial viability of the proposal, although a business plan was presented to the inquiry.

29. The functional and financial tests associated with PPS7 are primarily aimed to assess conventional agricultural and forestry practises and it has been recognised in a number of appeal decisions relating to permaculture projects that the nature of the operation and its needs are far removed from those of more conventional farming operations that advice in PPS7 seeks to address. That is not to say that PPS7 or the Council's policies are not relevant in this case, but rather that they should be addressed in the context of the particular proposal.
30. I have no doubt that the appellants are genuine in their endeavours. Considerable time and effort has been invested in the site to date. They are clearly prepared to live a more frugal existence than most to work towards a self sufficient way of living and happy to share their experience and knowledge with others through the various courses run from the site. I recognise that to travel to and from the site on a daily basis would clearly be against the permaculture ethos adopted by the appellants; particularly given that this would potentially involve travelling from the nearest built-up area some 12 miles distant.
31. I have serious misgivings, based on the business plan, about whether the project could support the self sufficient existence intended. I consider the appellants would continue to be reliant on outside sources of income. Overall, both national and local policies are restrictive in respect of new residential development in the countryside. One of the few concessions that are made is where there is an essential need for someone to live on site. In this case the requirement to live on site is due to the appellants' desire to live in a sustainable and self-sufficient manner and as commendable as that is, I am not persuaded that it has been planned on a sound financial basis.
32. The educational and global benefits are small scale and the enterprise would not, in my view, add significant value as a pioneering project to an extent that it may justify setting aside stringent countryside policies. Balancing all these considerations, I consider that the scheme is not of sufficient benefit overall to outweigh the harm.
33. I have had regard to the other appeal decisions that I have been referred to also relating to permaculture enterprises. In the appeal made by Landmatters Co-operative Ltd at Allaleigh (APP/K1128/A/06/2018778 and others), the site was situated in a locally designated area of great landscape value rather than a nationally designated area. The harm to the countryside was found to be minimal. In that case the notice related to a mixed use of agriculture, forestry, residential and an educational element. The notices were framed in such a way that if upheld only the residential component of the use of land would be required to cease. Accordingly the educational and ancillary rural enterprise elements of the permaculture holding represented the fall back position together with the continuation of agriculture and forestry. The Inspector considered the

ground (a) appeal against this significant fall back position. Furthermore, the Inspector considered that if value were to be attributed to that particular project, then it must be justified in terms of its experimental role in developing, understanding and teaching sustainable methods of agriculture and ways of living. The proposals were considered to facilitate the advancement of permaculture to a meaningful extent. Eight dwellings were stationed on the holding providing homes for ten adults and three children in the form of temporary accommodation.

34. In the case at Steward Wood in the Dartmoor National Park (APP/J9497/C/01/1067412), it was accepted that the development would result in serious harm to the character and appearance of the National Park. However it was considered that this would be outweighed by the educational value of such a practical centre for the development and propagation of the principles of the Rio Declaration and Agenda 21. It was viewed as an experiment in sustainable living and working practices.
35. Quicken Wood (APP/C1435/C/03/1114412) related to two couples living in double decker buses in an AONB. The Inspector found that the buses were not prominent features in the landscape. Furthermore it was demonstrated how the project might produce sufficient income to cover the appellants' living costs with a small profit at the end of year 3. Although in an AONB, the site was situated on the opposite side of a road that forms the settlement boundary of a built-up area. A comprehensive business plan was also produced at the Huggets Wood Farm appeal (APP/C1435/C/00/1050705) which estimated that within 4 years the business would be totally self financing. No material harm was identified to the appearance of the countryside in that case.
36. I consider there are a number of differences that can be highlighted between these cases and the current appeal. The experimental value of the current appeal is not of the same scale as the first two cases that relate to small communities and or involve a co-operative rather than one family. The business plan does not demonstrate that the appellants living costs could be met solely from the enterprise within any reasonable timescale such that I have serious doubts about whether the project has been planned on any sound financial basis. In some cases referred to the harm to the countryside was not found to be significant.
37. I have also had regard to the medical condition of Mrs Wheelhouse. However, it is not essential for Mrs Wheelhouse to live on this site and I do not find these personal circumstances so compelling to justify an otherwise unacceptable development.
38. To conclude, I consider the environmental benefits that arise from the appellants' commitment and attempts to live in a sustainable and self sufficient manner are not sufficient in this case to outweigh the significant harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the AONB by reason of the residential use of the site. The development is contrary to national and local policies, including Policy LNC9 of the LP. The appeal under ground (a) therefore fails.

Ground (g)

39. The appellant argues that to require the appellants to leave their home would be a disproportionate response to the low level of environmental harm alleged. It is not suggested what lesser steps may be taken to comply with the requirements of the notice in this respect. It nevertheless seems to me that as the residential use of the site is unacceptable then the only effective requirement is to require the residential use of the site to cease and the caravans to be removed. I therefore conclude that the requirements of the notice are not excessive. The appeal under ground (g) therefore fails.

Ground (f)

40. The Council specify a period of 16 weeks for compliance with the notice. I consider this is too short. The appellants, in the grounds of appeal, suggest a period of 2 years would be more reasonable as the effect of the notice would be to make the family homeless. In response to my questions at the inquiry, Mr Wheelhouse suggested a minimum period of 18 months. It is further suggested that re-homing may be difficult given Mrs Wheelhouse's medical condition.

41. I appreciate that the appellants would prefer to maintain the lifestyle they have at Karuna and that moving would be stressful for the family. However, the appellants moved on to the site without the benefit of planning permission and left a rented property. The harm arising is in my view significant. The AONB is a nationally designated area afforded the highest protection. I do not consider that the requirement to cease the residential use of the site to be disproportionate. However, I consider a period of 12 months would be a reasonable period of time and a proportionate response for the family to find alternative accommodation.

**Conclusion**

42. For the reasons given above I conclude that a reasonable period for compliance with the notice would be 12 months, and I am varying the enforcement notice accordingly, prior to upholding it. The appeal under ground (g) succeeds to that extent.

***Appeal C - The Polytunnel***

43. The main issue is the effect of the siting, design and external appearance of the polytunnel on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside. The key concern of the Council, as reflected in its reason for refusal, is that the location of the proposed polytunnel would be visually prominent from the south and remote from the existing barn structure.

44. The polytunnel would be located in a relatively elevated part of the site close to the container and caravans also subject to these appeals. It would be unrelated to the existing barn. This would clearly conflict with Policy GP10 of the LP. In my view the proliferation of development generally across the site related to the agricultural use would

unacceptably detract from the qualities of the AONB, afforded the highest protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.

### **Conclusion**

45. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

### **Decisions**

#### **Notice A – Appeal Ref: APP/B3220/C/07/2060815 & 2060816**

46. I dismiss the appeal and uphold the enforcement notice. I refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

#### **Notice B – Appeal Ref: APP/B3220/C/08/2063851 & 2063852**

47. I allow the appeal on ground (g), and direct that the enforcement notice be varied by the deletion of 16 weeks and the substitution of 12 months as the period for compliance.

48. Subject to these variations I uphold the enforcement notice.

#### **Appeal C – Ref: APP/B3220/A/08/2064925**

49. I dismiss the appeal.

*Claire Sherratt*

INSPECTOR

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr B Cox	Solicitor instructed by the appellants.
He called	
Mr A Goldring	Coordinator of the Permaculture Association.
Mr I C Trueman	Emeritus Professor of Plant Ecology at the University of Wolverhampton.
David Finney	Energy Surveyor for Light Foot Community Interest Company.
Jaise Kuriakose	Engineer for the Centre for Alternative Technology.
James (Janta) Wheelhouse	The Appellant.
Merav Wheelhouse	The Appellant.

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Williams	Of Counsel instructed by Shrewsbury and Atcham Borough Council Solicitor.
He called	
Mr M T Farmer	Senior Enforcement Officer for Shrewsbury and Atcham Borough Council.
Mr I D Williams	Consultant in Agriculture and Rural Land Use.

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Reverend S Lockett	The Vicarage, Madley, Herefordshire HR2 9LP.
Barbara Staples	7 Esher Road, Kingstanding, Birmingham, B44 9QJ.
Claire Rhydwen	2 Tan y Coed, Pantperthog, Machynlleth SY20 9AT.
Mr Jacobs	Longnor Parish Council footpath warden.
Allan Day	24 Parris Lane, Bayston Hill, Shrewsbury.
Chris Bolton	Teacher

## DOCUMENTS

- 1 Bundle of appeal decisions submitted by the Appellants.
- 2 Bundle of representations in support of the appeal.
- 3 Statement of Common Ground.
- 4 Bundle of photographs showing appeal site.
- 5 Copy of agricultural notification application relating to polytunnel.
- 6 Agreed statement relating to financial benefits and allowances awarded to the Appellants and associated correspondence.
- 7 Photographs of Shropshire Organic Gardeners visit to appeal site.
- 8 Petition in support of the 'Karuna Project'.
- 9 Ordnance Survey Maps showing site and surrounding area.
- 10 The Land is Ours - Fifteen Criteria for Developments Associated with Sustainable Land-based Rural Activities.

- 11 Letter from Longmeadow C.E. Primary & Nursery School.
- 12 Letter from Neil and Sandy Fullwood.
- 13 Statement of Merav Wheelhouse.
14. Statement of Barbara Staples.
15. Plan showing location of other sites Inspector requested to visit.
16. List of suggested conditions.
17. Closing submissions on behalf of Shrewsbury & Atcham Borough Council.
18. Closing submissions on behalf of the Appellants.
19. Shropshire Hills AONB Partnership Leaflet.

#### PLANS

- |          |  |
|----------|--|
| A        | Enforcement Notice A Plan.                   |
| B        | Enforcement Notice B Plan.                   |
| Bundle C | Agricultural notification application plans. |