



**Planning Appeal under Section 78 of the Town
& Country Planning Act 1990**

**Proposed Battery Energy Storage System
Bemersley Road, Staffordshire**

Appeal reference: APP/B3438/W/24/3351328

LPA reference: SMD/2022/0076

Hearing Statement Addendum

Document Control Sheet

Project Name: Ball Green, Staffordshire

Project Ref: 333133489

Report Title: Hearing Statement Addendum

Date: February 2025

	Name	Position	Signature	Date
Prepared by:	Patrick Dewhirst	Graduate Planner	<i>P.Dewhirst</i>	07/02/2025
Reviewed by:	Nick Pleasant	Planning Director	<i>N.Pleasant</i>	11/02/2025
Approved by:	Nick Pleasant	Planning Director	<i>N.Pleasant</i>	11/02/2025
For and on behalf of Stantec UK Limited				

Revision	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved
0	07/02/2025	Hearing Statement Addendum	PD	NP	NP

This report has been prepared by Stantec UK Limited ('Stantec') on behalf of its client to whom this report is addressed ('Client') in connection with the project described in this report and takes into account the Client's particular instructions and requirements. This report was prepared in accordance with the professional services appointment under which Stantec was appointed by its Client. This report is not intended for and should not be relied on by any third party (i.e. parties other than the Client). Stantec accepts no duty or responsibility (including in negligence) to any party other than the Client and disclaims all liability of any nature whatsoever to any such party in respect of this report.

Project Ref: 33313348900/01 | Rev: AA | Date: October 2024

Registered Office: Buckingham Court Kingsmead Business Park, London Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, HP11 1JU
Office Address: 2 Whitehall Quay, 4th Floor, Leeds. LS1 4HR
T: 0113 322 3420 E: Leeds.uk@stantec.com

Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Context	1
1.2	Structure of the HSA.....	1
2	Updated Planning Policy Context.....	2
2.1	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3	The Appellants Position	4
3.1	Summary position.....	4
3.2	Grey Belt.....	4
4	Conclusion	14

This page is intentionally blank

1 Introduction

1.1 Context

- 1.1.1 This Hearing Statement Addendum (HSA) has been prepared by Stantec, on behalf of Anesco Ltd (the 'Appellant') to set out the Appellant's position regarding the implications of the updated National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') as published by Government on 7th February 2025. This follows the Inspector's request for the views of both the Council and the Appellant regarding the relevance of these changes to the appeal, with particular reference to amendments to national Green Belt policy.
- 1.1.2 The Appellant considers that the NPPF revisions provide further clear support for the proposed development. In particular, the introduction of the 'Grey Belt' concept provides additional strong justification for allowing the appeal.

1.2 Structure of the HSA

- 1.2.1 The remainder of this report comprises the following chapters:
- **Section 2.0** Updated Planning Policy Context
 - **Section 3.0** The Appellants position
 - **Section 4.0** Conclusions

2 Updated National Planning Policy Framework

2.1 Context

2.1.1 The updated NPPF (December 2024 and updated February 2025), sets out the Government's planning policies. A key focus of the revisions is promoting the use of suitable land for residential, commercial, and renewable energy development, and reinforcing Government commitment to expanding renewable and low-carbon infrastructure.

2.1.2 The Appellant considers that the most relevant NPPF changes for this Appeal include those related to 'Grey Belt', including:

- Paragraph 155 regarding the approach to grey belt; and
- NPPF Glossary which defines the concept of 'Grey Belt'.

2.1.3 Also of relevance are:

- The purposes of the Green Belt (NPPF paragraph 143); and
- NPPF Footnote 7.
- Updated paragraph 168 which reinforces the importance of delivering low carbon infrastructure and meeting net zero targets.

2.1.4 These sections are considered in detail below.

2.2 Grey Belt

2.2.1 Grey Belt is defined in the NPPF Glossary as:

For the purposes of plan-making and decision-making, 'grey belt' is defined as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. 'Grey belt' excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development.

2.2.2 With regards to Green Belt, Paragraph 143 outlines the five purposes:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas,*
- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another,*
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment,*

- d. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns, and*
- e. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.*

2.2.3 It is then noted in Paragraph 155 that:

The development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should also not be regarded as inappropriate where all the following apply

- a. the development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan,*
- b. There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed,*
- c. The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework, and*
- d. Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157 below.*

2.2.4 Therefore, the development which meets the tests of NPPF paragraph 155, Very Special Circumstances for development in the Green Belt are not required to be demonstrated.

2.2.5 Other NPPF provisions regarding Green Belt are largely unchanged and therefore are not repeated in this Addendum.

3 The Appellants Position

3.1 Summary position

- 3.1.1 The Appellant considers the provisions of NPPF paragraph 155 are met, meaning the site is 'Grey Belt' and development is not inappropriate.
- 3.1.2 It is common ground that the only matter of disagreement between the parties is the perceived conflict with Green Belt purpose 143(a) (sprawl). Therefore, the assessment against the 'tests' of Grey Belt turns on whether the Inspector considers the site contributes to purpose (a). The Appellant considers the site does not strongly contribute to that purpose. It is common ground there are no other conflicts with Grey Belt policy.
- 3.1.3 Notwithstanding this, if the Inspector were to conclude the site is not Grey Belt then the Green Belt 'tests' continue to apply and Very Special Circumstances have been demonstrated in the Appellant's main Hearing Statement.

3.2 Grey Belt

- 3.2.1 Paragraph 155 sets out that *inter alia* other development in the Green Belt should not be regarded as inappropriate where the following tests apply:
- The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;
 - There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed;
 - The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF; and
 - Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157.
- 3.2.2 An assessment of each criterion is provided below.

Criterion a, part i – The development would utilise grey belt land

- 3.2.3 Grey belt is defined within the NPPF Glossary as:

"For the purposes of plan-making and decision-making, 'grey-belt' is defined as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes a, b or d in paragraph 143. 'Grey belt' excludes land where the application of the

policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development”.

3.2.4 The appellant considers the development does not contribute at all, and certainly does not *strongly contribute*, to Green Belt purposes (a), (b) or (d) in NPPF paragraph 143, those purposes being:

- a. *To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;*
- b. *To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;*
- c. ...
- d. *To preserve the setting and special character of the historic towns; and*
- e.

3.2.5 Under the Grey Belt definition, development can conflict with Green Belt purpose (c) (encroachment) and purpose (e) (recycling of derelict and other urban land) and still be considered as Grey Belt. In effect, the NPPF now accepts that development will inevitably result in encroachment but that such encroachment is acceptable in Grey Belt terms provided other Grey Belt tests are satisfied. Indeed, the Grey Belt definition also accepts that land can still contribute to the remaining purposes ((a), (b), and (d)) and be considered Grey Belt as land should not *strongly contribute* to the purposes in order to not be Grey Belt.

3.2.6 The Appellant's case accepts the site is within the Green Belt and therefore development would result in encroachment, but there is no conflict with the other purposes (with reference to the definition of Grey Belt). Encroachment does not feature in the definition of Grey Belt where it references the specific Green Belt purposes for assessment.

Purpose (a) – sprawl

3.2.7 The Council did not previously allege conflict with Purpose (a) within consultation responses to the planning application, nor within the Officer Report to Planning Committee, nor the Decision Notice, nor their Hearing Statement. Indeed, the Decision Notice specifically states there would be conflict with only one Green Belt purpose; that of encroachment. However, the Council now alleges through the Statement of Common Ground that the site not only contributes to but *strongly contributes* to preventing sprawl. This is evidently a materially different position to that presented at all points before now.

3.2.8 As set out within the Appellants Hearing Statement, the scheme does not constitute sprawl of a large built-up area. The site is visually and spatially separated from the main extent of the Stoke on Trent urban area and the smaller residential area of Ball Green by other Green Belt, hedgerows, topography, and agricultural land.

- 3.2.9 Furthermore, low-carbon developments are experienced separately from traditional built-up areas as they have an entirely different appearance and character and function very differently from traditional 'urban form' and require only limited visits meaning there is no obvious continued additional increase in activity or vehicles from the site. This does not represent an uncontrolled spread of urban development.
- 3.2.10 Critically, the Council's own assessment of the planning application and the appeal did not identify conflict with purpose (a). It must be the case that if the Council considered there to be conflict with purpose (a) then such conflict would be clearly set out within the Officer Report, Decision Notice and Hearing Statement, however, it is not and this is a clear indication the Council did not consider there to be conflict.
- 3.2.11 The Officer Report sets out "*The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of the Green Belt are their openness and permanence.*" However, this assessment replicates NPPF wording and is not an assessment against purpose (a) in its own right. Indeed, the Officer Report does not conclude that the development conflicts with Purpose (a) or that the site contributes to purpose (a).
- 3.2.12 The Decision Notice takes a similar approach to the Officer Report and cites the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy in preventing sprawl but does not identify conflict with the purpose of preventing sprawl. Again, this is a replication of the NPPF definition of Green Belt and not an assessment against purpose (a) in its own right.
- 3.2.13 The Council's Hearing Statement also follows the approach within the Officer Report and Decision Notice and does not allege conflict with Green Belt purpose (a). Instead, the key concern was encroachment, with the Council stating: "*The proposed development would visually sprawl down the hillside from Bemersley Road and, to this end, would result in a clear encroachment of built development into the countryside.*" Therefore, it is evident the Council did not consider there to be conflict with purpose (a) as if there were a conflict the Council would have clearly and specifically identifies such a conflict and included it within the application and appeal documents.
- 3.2.14 However, conflict with purpose (a) is only now alleged in the Statement of Common Ground with an inference to conflict in the Council's most recent statement on the implications of the updated. The latest statement states; "*the appeal site is located on land which makes a strong contribution towards checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.*"
- 3.2.15 The Council seeks to rely on a Green Belt Review (GBR) undertaken in 2015 to support its revised position, despite this evidence base having been available at the time of its original assessment and not being cited in the decision-making process. The GBR is a high-level

strategic document that does not assess the appeal site in isolation but instead categorises wider parcels of land.

- 3.2.16 The Appeal site is located within GBR parcel N19 which covers a very large area of land between the Stoke on Trent boundary (which in this location is itself formed of Green Belt) to the west, Brown Edge to the east and land south of Biddulph. Although the GBR considers harm from releasing this wider parcel N19, such a conclusion is unsurprising given the substantial area involved and that it would fill a gap between Stoke on Trent and Brown Edge. This generalised GBR conclusion does not assist in assessing the specific effect of the development on Green Belt purposes relevant to sprawl, nor the individual purpose of this site. The GBR's assessment of Parcel N19 does not provide detailed analysis of the appeal site's characteristics and does not consider the site-specific context, which is particularly important given the appeal site is situated at the southern tip of the parcel, visually and physically separated from the built-up area. It is though, noted by the Council, this wider parcel was assessed to not strongly contribute to other Green Belt purposes.
- 3.2.17 Additionally, it is important to recognise the GBR assesses the potential for the 'release' of Green Belt for permanent development. This is an entirely different consideration from the temporary development proposed in this case. The GBR evaluates large areas of land for their potential removal from the Green Belt, a process which involves a permanent change in land use and associated permanent effects. By contrast, the appeal site involves a temporary development within the Green Belt, which does not result in the permanent loss of Green Belt land or lead to the uncontrolled spread of urban areas. The temporary nature of the proposed development means it would not result in the same permanent encroachment or sprawl that the GBR assesses, and therefore, the conclusions of the GBR regarding land release are not directly relevant to this case.
- 3.2.18 The Council's reliance on the GBR should not be preferred to the Appellant's site specific analysis. The site's separation from the urban area remains unchanged, and the Council has presented no new site-specific evidence to justify its shift in position. The appeal site does not contribute to the unrestricted spread of the urban area; it is not part of a continuous urban expansion and does not facilitate the erosion of the Green Belt. The proposed development would not result in a sprawling or uncontrolled spread of built form.
- 3.2.19 Furthermore, the Council has failed to demonstrate the site performs strongly in preventing urban sprawl or that the development results in unrestricted sprawl as defined by Purpose (a). Its evolving stance on sprawl is inconsistent with earlier assessments, which focused on encroachment rather than sprawl, and conflates the distinct Green Belt purposes of preventing sprawl and preventing encroachment. The introduction of this new argument, unsupported by new evidence, further undermines the Council's position.

3.2.20 In this regard, the Appellants site specific and fine grain evidence is appropriate, and it robustly demonstrates the site does not strongly contribute to preventing sprawl.

3.2.21 Not only does the site not contribute to preventing sprawl it also not a fundamentally important site in this regard and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.

Purpose (b) – merging

3.2.22 The Council does not allege conflict with Purpose (b), and it is common ground there is no conflict with purpose (b). Therefore, it is evident that the development will not result in the merging of settlements.

3.2.23 As set out within the Appellants Hearing Statement, the scheme does not result in the merging of settlements. The site is not located between two settlements, nor does it contribute to any form of coalescence. The development is contained within its defined boundaries and does not extend or link existing built-up areas.

3.2.24 Not only does the site not contribute to preventing merging it also not a fundamentally important site in this regard and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan

Purpose (d) – historic towns

3.2.25 The Council does not allege conflict with Purpose (d), and it is common ground the site does not contribute to preserving the setting and special character of historic towns. There is no conflict with purpose (d).

3.2.26 As set out within the Appellant's Hearing Statement, Purpose (d) is not engaged. There are no nearby historic towns, and the site does not contribute to the setting or special character of any such towns. The development would have no impact on heritage assets or their surroundings, as agreed with the Council.

3.2.27 Not only does the site not contribute to preserving the setting of a historic town it also not a fundamentally important site in this regard and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan

Footnote 7 tests

3.2.28 It is common ground with the Council that Footnote 7 is not engaged aside from the site being within the Green Belt.

- 3.2.29 The definition of Grey Belt states that Grey belt excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development. Footnote 7 states:

The policies referred to are those in this Framework (rather than those in development plans) relating to: habitats sites (and those sites listed in paragraph 189) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, a National Landscape, a National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or defined as Heritage Coast; irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets (and other heritage assets of archaeological interest referred to in footnote 75); and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change.

- 3.2.30 The NPPF definition of Grey Belt is clear that for the purposes of decision making in the context of Grey Belt that Green Belt is expressly excluded as a Footnote 7 asset.
- 3.2.31 The site is not a habitat site or designated Site of Special Scientific Interest, nor is the site a Local Green Space, or National Landscape, or a National Park or defined as Heritage Coast; nor is it an irreplaceable habitat or designated heritage asset; nor of archaeological interest; and is not an area at risk of flooding or coastal change.
- 3.2.32 As the site does not fall within any of these categories, it does not conflict with Footnote 7, and there is no strong reason for refusing or restricting development.

Criterion a part ii – The development would not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan

- 3.2.33 It is common ground with the Council that the site would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.
- 3.2.34 The site does not contribute to Green Belt purposes a, b or d, and the Development would not conflict with those purposes. To assess whether the Appeal Development would fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan, an assessment is made against all 5 purposes of the Green Belt. An assessment against the remaining purposes, which are purposes c (to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment) and e (to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land) is provided below, as an assessment against purposes (a), (b), and (d) is provided above.

Purpose (c) – to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

- 3.2.35 The assessment is set in the context it is common ground with the Council that the development would not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.

- 3.2.36 It is acknowledged the site prevents encroachment into the countryside, which is to be expected as the site is currently undeveloped land. Development would therefore introduce built form into an undeveloped Green Belt site, resulting in some degree of encroachment. However, this impact is demonstrably limited and reversible, as the development is restricted to a 40-year operational period, after which the land will be fully restored to its existing condition. The temporary nature of the scheme is a key consideration in assessing its impact on the Green Belt.
- 3.2.37 Additionally, the site is highly contained, benefiting from established screening on all sides, including mature vegetation and topographical features that reduce visual exposure. The proposed enhanced landscaping will further reinforce these natural buffers, ensuring that any perceived encroachment is minimal in both spatial and visual terms.
- 3.2.38 Crucially, while the development introduces built form, it does not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. The site's location, containment, and reversibility ensure that it does not contribute to the progressive urbanisation of the countryside or set a precedent for unrestricted development. Instead, it aligns with the NPPF's objective of balancing sustainable development with Green Belt protections.
- 3.2.39 In the context of the overall Staffordshire Moorlands Green Belt, which covers an area of 17,420ha (as outlined in the GBR), the Appeal site represents a very small proportion of the Green Belt being approximately 0.01% of the total area of the Green Belt within Staffordshire Moorlands. When considering the broader context of the North Staffordshire Green Belt, which encompasses an area of approximately 43,836 hectares, the appeal site constitutes an even smaller fraction, further emphasising its limited scale and effect within the wider Green Belt.
- 3.2.40 This limited scale of the development in the context of a far larger area of Green Belt means the development does not significantly undermine the broader objectives of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The site is not located in an area of the Green Belt that is key to maintaining the integrity of larger open spaces or the overall Green Belt structure. The effect of the proposed development in the context of the entire Staffordshire Moorlands Green Belt is negligible and the change is imperceptible. Furthermore, the development does not result in the erosion of a wider, continuous rural area or contribute to the cumulative loss of Green Belt land.
- 3.2.41 The site's tightly bound visual envelope significantly reduces its wider impact. It is highly contained, with existing screening on all sides. The addition of further landscaping will reinforce these natural buffers, ensuring that the development remains visually unobtrusive. As a result, the development is not readily visible from the surrounding area, and any perceived encroachment is localised and does not affect the wider countryside.

- 3.2.42 The temporary nature of the development further minimises its impact on the Green Belt. With a defined operational period of 40 years, the development will be fully restored to its original condition at the end of that period, ensuring that there is no permanent loss of Green Belt land. This temporary encroachment does not set a precedent for permanent development in the Green Belt and is fully reversible.
- 3.2.43 Overall, the encroachment resulting from the proposed development is extremely limited both in terms of size and visual impact. The small scale of the site, its containment by natural features, and the fact that it does not set a precedent for future development ensure that it does not conflict with the wider purposes of the Green Belt. The development's impact is contained, reversible, and does not result in significant harm to the openness or countryside character of the Green Belt.

Purpose (e) – to assist in urban regeneration

- 3.2.44 The assessment is set in the context it is common ground with the Council that the development would not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. Specifically, development in this location would not undermine wider urban regeneration efforts nor the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- 3.2.45 As set out in the Hearing Statement, the development could assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and urban land. If the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) were located on brownfield land in the urban area, it would prevent other uses, such as housing or employment, from being developed on that land. This would increase the pressure on non-urban land for these uses.
- 3.2.46 By locating the development in this Green Belt location, the scheme enables other land within the authority to be used for more permanent urban development.
- 3.2.47 The submitted Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) is also relevant in this regard, notwithstanding there is no requirement to undertake an ASA. The ASA considered a robust area of search utilising the agreed grid connection, and it is accepted in a range of recent Appeal decisions that access to the grid and proximity to the grid connection is of fundamental importance. The ASA demonstrates there are no alternative sites and this conclusion also considers brownfield opportunities and such sites have been suggested by any party at the Appeal to date. The absence of an alternative site reinforces there would be no conflict with Purpose e.
- 3.2.48 Indeed, using brownfield land for the proposed BESS for a temporary period would prevent other higher value permanent uses (such as housing and commercial uses) on that site. In that eventuality other sites would be needed for those uses and that may include Green Belt

or greenfield land. Therefore, it is arguable the proposed development actively supports the wider ambition of purpose (e)

Criterion b – There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed

- 3.2.49 It is common ground with the Council there is a clear demonstrable need for the type of development proposed.
- 3.2.50 The NPPF (paragraph 168(b)) is clear that applicants are not required to demonstrate the overall need for renewable or low carbon energy. It is reasonable conclude this is due to the clear requirement to consent and deliver new low carbon energy projects in order to achieve legally binding climate change targets. The clear necessity for a significant number of additional battery energy storage projects is further established in the NESO Report Clean Power 2030 which reinforces the clear direction of travel in various National Policy Statements and Government Papers such as the Powering Up Britain Plans.
- 3.2.51 There is evidently a local and national unmet need, notwithstanding there is no policy requirement to demonstrate need. In this context, the Appellant has set out the development responds directly to significant unmet needs as per the Appellant's Hearing Statement. This need has been amplified in the recent NESO documents which expressly set out the clear need for BESS development by 2030.
- 3.2.52 The project has an agreed grid connection to the only one substation within the area with available capacity, and each part of the country must contribute with the transition to low carbon energy.
- 3.2.53 The Appellant sets out there is a considerable unmet need for low carbon energy projects, and the development is wholly aligned with this Grey Belt. This conclusion sits firmly square with very recent Inspector conclusions on such matters, such as the recent consent for a BESS development in the Walsall Green Belt (Appeal Decision APP/V4630/W/24/3347424) where paragraphs 34 to 38 of that decision identify the clear need for such development.

Criterion c – The development would be in a sustainable location, with reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF

- 3.2.54 It is common ground with the Council the development accords with criterion (c).
- 3.2.55 Criterion (c) requires the development to be in a sustainable location, with reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF. Paragraph 110 states that significant development should be focused on locations that are or can be made sustainable by limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. While the Appeal Development will not generate significant daily vehicle movements, its location minimises the need for

unnecessary travel, with only infrequent maintenance visits required once operational. Given the nature of the development, alternative transport modes are not relevant beyond construction-related access.

- 3.2.56 Paragraph 115 requires that sustainable transport modes be prioritised where appropriate, that safe access can be achieved, and that any significant impacts on the transport network are mitigated. The Local Highway Authority has raised no objections, confirming that the Site can be accessed safely. A Construction Traffic Management Plan will be implemented to ensure that vehicle movements during the temporary construction phase are controlled, minimising any impact on the surrounding highway network.
- 3.2.57 Beyond transport considerations, the Site is sustainably located in a broader sense. It is not within a flood risk area, being designated as Flood Zone 1, and is at very low risk of surface water flooding. The Site is also free from ecological or landscape designations and does not contain areas of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
- 3.2.58 Additionally, the development supports wider sustainability objectives, as it will facilitate the delivery of low-carbon energy infrastructure in a location with an agreed grid connection approximately 615m to the southwest.
- 3.2.59 Accordingly, the development is in a sustainable location, and Criterion (c) is satisfied.

Criterion d – Where applicable the development proposed meets the ‘Golden Rules’ requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157.

- 3.2.60 The ‘Golden Rules’ relate to housing and are not relevant or applicable. This is agreed with the Council.

Summary

- 3.2.61 The is Grey Belt, and the Appeal Development satisfies all the criteria set out in Paragraph 155 of the NPPF. Accordingly, the development is not inappropriate within the Green Belt.
- 3.2.62 Even if the Inspector were to conclude that the site is not Grey Belt, the Appellant has demonstrated that Very Special Circumstances exist, justifying the development. In the absence of other reasons for refusal, planning permission should be granted.

4 Conclusion

- 4.1.1 The Appellant considers that the recent changes to the NPPF further reinforce the acceptability of the development, with the introduction of the 'Grey Belt' concept providing strong additional justification for allowing the Appeal.
- 4.1.2 Having considered the NPPF, it is evident the site comprises Grey Belt as defined at NPPF paragraph 155. The site does not contribute to the Green Belt purposes contained in the NPPF definition of Grey Belt and there would be no conflict with these purposes. Even if contribution were found, it would not '*strongly contribute*' as per in the NPPF definition of Grey Belt. Footnote 55 is clear that development on Grey Belt land is not inappropriate.
- 4.1.3 Therefore, under paragraph 155, the proposals are appropriate and there is no requirement to demonstrate Very Special Circumstances. The reasons for refusing the development relating to Green Belt are no longer relevant.
- 4.1.4 Notwithstanding that, if the Inspector were to conclude the site is not Grey then the Green Belt 'tests' continue to apply and Very Special Circumstances have been demonstrated as reinforced in the evidence already before the Inspector.
- 4.1.5 We conclude the Appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.