

<b>Agenda Item</b> A15	<b>Committee Date</b> 8 June 2009	<b>Application Number</b> 09/00280/CU
<b>Application Site</b> Cockerham Boers Field North Of Tarn Farm Gulf Lane Cockerham	<b>Proposal</b> Siting of a temporary mobile home to be used as a dwelling for Agricultural workers	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Mrs S Peacock	<b>Name of Agent</b> Rural Futures (North West) Ltd	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 26 May 2009	<b>Reason For Delay</b>	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr Martin Culbert	
<b>Departure</b>	no	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Refuse	

### **1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

- 1.1 This site is within an agricultural holding of 9.45 ha (23 acres) located in a large area of flat, open agricultural land, on the north side of Gulf Lane, to the west of Great Crimbles. The surrounding land is mainly down to pasture and divided by hedges and drainage dykes. There is no neighbouring development and no tree cover. The site presently contains a single, modestly sized, agricultural building erected in 2000. and a static caravan, recently placed on site without consent.

### **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 This proposal is a full application for the temporary siting of the caravan as a mobile home for agricultural workers to serve the above holding.
- The above holding has been operated by the applicant since 2000 and specialises in the rearing of Goats principally for meat. The herd presently comprises 80 Boer goats and 30 cashmere goats with 180-190 kids being produced per year. It is anticipated that the number of kids born this year will increase to 200-210. on average 45% of kiddings require assistance. The applicant also rents 4-6 ha (10-15 acres) of grazing land at Forton on an informal basis. The applicant presently occupies a bungalow at Moss Side Racing Stables on a verbal short-hold tenancy subject to six months notice. However, they claim that this does not offer the long term security they require to continue to expand the business or the security needed to prevent the rustling of livestock.

### **3.0 Site History**

- 3.1 No relevant site history.

## **4.0 Consultation Responses**

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory consultees:

<b>Statutory Consultee</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>County Land Agent</b>	<b>Does not support</b>
<b>County Highway</b>	<b>No Objections</b>
<b>County Ecologist</b>	<b>No objections</b>
<b>Environmental Health Services</b>	<b>No objections</b>
<b>Environment Agency</b>	<b>No objections subject to conditions</b>
<b>Parish Council</b>	<b>No objection</b>

## **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 One letter of support received from local resident.

## **6.0 Principal Development Plan Policies**

6.1 Policies SC1 (Sustainability), SC3 (Rural Communities) and E1 (Environmental Capital) of the Core Strategy to the Lancaster Local Development Framework and Saved Policies H8 (Housing in the Countryside) and E4 (The Countryside Area) of the Lancaster District Local Plan.

## **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The County Land Agent reports that DEFRA advises that goats require 20 hours of labour per head per year. and his would equate in respect of this enterprise to one full time worker being required at all times. However they are also of the opinion that rearing of goats for meat would be akin to a beef breeding and fattening enterprise, with a lower labour requirement than that for a milking herd. The CLA therefore concludes that even taking into account assisted kiddings, the labour requirement for this enterprise could not equate to one full time worker. The income and expenditure figures submitted do not show a net profit and do not carry over to the submitted financial projections. The CLA therefore also has concerns about the future viability of the enterprise. Finally, while there is uncertainty regarding the occupation of the applicant's current property, they claim they have lived there for five years and at the present time continue to do so. It is also self evident that the property remains available and sufficiently close to the holding to satisfy its functional needs, even if a full person need had been demonstrated.

## **8.0 Conclusions**

8.1 This proposal conflicts with Policies SC1, SC3 and E1 of the Core Strategy to the Lancaster Local Development Framework and Saved Policies H8 and E4 of the Lancaster District Local Plan and be detrimental to the Character and appearance of the area.

The County Land Agent concludes therefore that the proposal can not be justified in terms of agricultural need and members are advised that this proposed should not be supported.

## **Recommendation**

That Planning Permission **BE REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The use of this isolated site in the countryside for the siting of a residential caravan would conflict with Policy SC3 (Rural Communities) of the Core Strategy to the Lancaster Local Development Framework and with Saved Policy H8 (Housing in the Countryside) of the Lancaster District Local Plan. These policies indicate that new residential units in the countryside will be limited to those which are essential to the needs of agriculture or other uses appropriate in the rural area. It is not considered that such need has been demonstrated in this case.
2. The use of this isolated site in the countryside for the siting of an unnecessary static caravan would be detrimental to the rural character and appearance of the locality and conflict with Policies SC1 (Sustainability) and E1 (Environmental Capital) of the Core Strategy to the Lancaster Local Development Framework and Saved Policy E4 (The Countryside Area) of the Lancaster District Local Plan.
3. The creation of an unnecessary residential unit on this isolated site in the rural area would contribute to the incidence of sporadic development in the countryside away from existing settlements where community facilities are available contrary the requirements of Policy SC1 (Sustainability) of the Core Strategy to the Lancaster Local Development Framework. The gradual accretion of such development engenders fundamental change in the countryside and leads to increased vehicle journeys, which is detrimental to its character and appearance and contrary to the proper planning of the area and the interests of sustainability.

## **Human Rights Act**

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this report, the issues arising do not appear to be of such magnitude to override the responsibility of the City Council to regulate land use for the benefit of the community as a whole, in accordance with national law.

## **Background Papers**

1. None