
Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 6 September 2016

Site visit made on 6 September 2016

by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H1840/C/16/3150869

Land adjacent to the Pear Tree Inn, Smite Lane, Hindlip, Worcester WR3 8SY

- 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 Pear Tree Inn and Country House Hotel Limited against an enforcement notice issued by Wychavon District Council.
 - The Council's reference is IN/14/00299.
 - The notice was issued on 18 April 2016.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is described in the notice as: Without planning permission, the unauthorised change of use of agricultural land to a use for the siting of a marquee, the stationing of a shipping container, the stationing of a generator for the purpose of heating the marquee, stationing of a large plastic oil tank, the siting of a small touring caravan, the laying of a concrete base, the importation of hard core, the laying of pipework, cables and drainage, the formation of a footpath from the car park to the marquee to be used in connection with the business use at Pear Tree Inn, Smite Lane, Hindlip, Worcester WR3 8SY.
 - The requirements of the notice are:
 - 5.1 Permanently remove the marquee from the Land and restore the land to its former condition, that of grass land;
 - 5.2 Permanently remove the shipping container from the Land and restore the Land to its former condition, that of grass land;
 - 5.3 Permanently remove the touring caravan from the Land and restore the land to its former condition, that of grass land;
 - 5.4 Permanently remove the oil tank from the Land and restore the land to its former condition, that of grass land;
 - 5.5 Permanently remove from the Land the generator/s and any associated equipment used in connection with the generator/s and restore the land to its former condition, that of grass land;
 - 5.6 Permanently remove the concrete base and hard core from the Land and reinstate the Land to its original condition, that of grass land;
 - 5.7 Permanently remove the the block paved footpath from the car park to the marquee and reinstate the Land to its original condition, that of grass land;
 - 5.8 Permanently remove from the Land all cables, drainage and pipework that service the marquee and restore the land to its former condition, that of grass land;
 - 5.9 Permanently remove all utility services used to service the marquee and restore the Land to its original condition, that of grass land.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is: for the steps set out in paragraph 5.1 within 28 days after the notice takes effect and for the steps set out in paragraphs 5.2 to 5.9 within three calendar months of the date the notice takes effect.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
-

Decision

1. The enforcement notice is corrected and varied by:
 - i) the deletion of the words "Without planning permission, the unauthorised change of use of agricultural land to a use for the siting of" immediately before the words "a marquee" in the description of the breach at section 3 and the substitution of the words "Without planning permission, the erection of";
 - ii) The deletion of the words "the siting of a small touring caravan" from the description of the breach at section 3;
 - iii) The deletion of the requirement at section 5.3 of the notice;
 - iv) The deletion of the words "and restore the land to its former condition, that of grass land" from sections 5.1, 5.2, 5.4 and 5.5
 - v) The deletion of the words "paragraph 5.1" from section 6.1 of the notice and the insertion of the words "paragraphs 5.1, 5.2, 5.4 and 5.5";
 - vi) The deletion of the words "28 days" as the time period for compliance at section 6.1 of the notice and the substitution of the words "three months";
 - vii) The deletion of the words "paragraphs 5.2 to 5.9" from section 6.2 of the notice and the substitution with the words "paragraphs 5.6 to 5.9"; and
 - viii) The deletion of the words "within three calendar months" as the time period for compliance at section 6.2 of the notice and the substitution of the words "within 6 months".

Subject to these corrections and variations the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld, and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

Procedural Matters

2. The alleged breach of planning control, as described in the enforcement notice, refers to the *'unauthorised change of use of agricultural land to a use for the siting of a marquee, the stationing of a shipping container, the stationing of a generator for the purpose of heating the marquee, stationing of a large plastic oil tank, the siting of a small touring caravan, the laying of a concrete base, the importation of hard core, the laying of pipework, cables and drainage, the formation of a footpath from the car park to the marquee to be used in association with the business use at Pear Tree Inn'*.
3. Upon opening the Hearing I sought the parties' views on the description of the breach, particularly relating to the question of whether a material change of use had occurred and whether the marquee was considered to be a 'building operation' for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Notwithstanding the description of the alleged breach, which refers to a change of use and the 'siting' of a marquee, both parties had submitted statements that appeared to be based on the assumption that the marquee amounted to a building operation. Neither party had referred to the alleged change of use and the principal dispute between the parties, as put forward in the statements,

related to whether the structure represented inappropriate development within the Green Belt and, if so, whether very special circumstances existed to justify its retention.

4. The appellants confirmed that they had proceeded on the basis that the marquee was operational development. Moreover, at the Hearing, they disputed that a material change of use had taken place on the basis that the marquee and associated elements were contained within the established planning unit of the Pear Tree Inn and Hotel. In particular, they referred to the planning history of the site and a planning permission for an access drive and car park in association with the Inn that had been approved in October 2002¹. That planning application was not mentioned in the Council's analysis of the planning history of the site, as set out within its statement of case. Following an adjournment, a copy of that planning permission was produced and the 'red line' boundary for the site clearly encompassed the land upon which the marquee has been sited. The marquee is sited between the access drive, which has been constructed in accordance with that permission, and the existing buildings at the Inn. The evidence presented at the Hearing suggests that the land was grassed over but not in agricultural use prior to the erection of the marquee.
5. Having considered the details of the permission the Council accepted that the matters alleged in the notice had taken place on land that had an established use in association with the Pear Tree Inn. As such, they accepted that no material change of use had taken place. Consequently, I sought the views of the parties as to whether any prejudice would result if I were to correct the description of the breach to refer to operational development as opposed to a material change of use. Both were satisfied that no prejudice would arise and, as set out above, the respective statements had been submitted on the basis that the marquee was a building in any event.
6. It is clear to me that the marquee represents operational development for which planning permission is required. It is a substantial structure in terms of its overall dimensions, the metal framework is affixed to the concrete base, services have been provided, and the overall appearance is of a solid and permanent structure. Whilst the materials are described as lightweight, the plastic covering has a degree of rigidity when compared, for example, to a canvas covering that may commonly be used on less substantial marquees. Additionally, it is intended to remain in situ for a number of years and the size and complexity of the metal framework would make regular dismantling and re-erection impractical. The retrospective application for the retention of the structure (W/15/00628/PN) described the development as the 'erection' of a marquee structure. In view of the above, I have corrected the description of the breach to refer to the 'erection' of a marquee.
7. The small touring caravan appears to have been stored on site for a number of years prior to the erection of the marquee. The Council accepted at the Hearing that the caravan does not relate to the use of the marquee and were satisfied that it does not form part of the breach of planning control that they were seeking to remedy which relates to the marquee and associated works and development. Accordingly, I have removed reference to the caravan in the description of the alleged breach.

¹ LPA reference: W/02/01258

The Appeal on Ground (a)

8. The site is within the West Midlands Green Belt. From the information before me, the main issues in relation to the appeal on ground (a) are:
- i) Whether the development represents inappropriate in the Green Belt for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and development plan policy, such assessment to include consideration of the effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt having regard to the requirements of paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework;
 - ii) The effect on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - iii) If the development is inappropriate development, whether any harm to the Green Belt by way of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

i) Whether the development represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt, including an assessment on the effect on the openness of the Green Belt

9. Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) identifies that the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt should be considered as inappropriate, subject to a number of exceptions. The exception set out within the third bullet point relates to the extension or alteration of a building providing that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. To my mind, the marquee is a distinct entity of itself and does not represent an extension or alteration to the existing buildings at the Pear Tree Inn. It is situated beyond the car park and access drive which passes immediately to the west of the existing buildings and visually stands apart from the existing built development. Existing vegetation adds to the sense of separation between the structure and the other buildings on site.
10. I am mindful that the Courts have held that domestic outbuildings may, depending on the circumstances, be considered as extensions on the basis that they form a 'normal domestic adjunct' to residential uses². However, I am not satisfied that a marquee of the scale erected in this instance should be considered as a normal adjunct of a hotel or inn. Many such uses exist without associated buildings or the kind erected in this instance and the relationship between the Inn and the marquee is not comparable, to my mind, with a relationship between a domestic house and garage or other outbuilding. However, regardless of that point, the degree of separation is such that I do not consider that the marquee to be an extension or alteration to the existing buildings at the site.
11. The appellant also contends that the development sits within the exception identified within the sixth bullet of paragraph 89 of the Framework and considers that the development represents limited infilling or the partial redevelopment of a previously developed site. Previously developed land is defined in the Framework as land which is or was occupied by a permanent building, including the curtilage of the developed land. As noted, the area of

² Sevenoaks District Council v SSE and Dawe [1997]

land where the marquee has been erected is situated in-between the access drive to the rear car park and the main buildings at the Inn. The Council have accepted that the land forms part of the planning unit and, taking account of the layout of the site, I consider that it is reasonable to conclude that the land is within the curtilage of the Inn.

12. However, in order to meet the exception at paragraph 89, any development must not have a greater impact upon the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it. There is no evidence of any building having been situated on the site. The marquee is a substantial structure with space to accommodate up to 600 wedding guests³. The floor area is estimated to be 1350m² by the appellant and the height to ridge is approximately 7 metres. Given that no buildings existed on the site previously, the construction of the building and the siting of the smaller ancillary elements, has had a significant impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.
13. That impact on openness is noticeable from a number of vantage points in the local area, including certain aspects on Smite Lane, in the vicinity of the site entrance, and from residential properties and the public footpath to the west. Thus, given its size and prominence the marquee has had a significant effect upon the openness of the Green Belt and the breach of planning control represents the encroachment of built development into the countryside, contrary to one of the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt identified at paragraph 80 of the Framework.
14. In view of the above, the development does not satisfy the requirements of any of the exceptions listed at paragraph 89 of the Framework. None of the exceptions listed at paragraph 90 of the Framework are applicable. Consequently, it represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt and would cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

ii) The effect on the character and appearance of the area

15. The marquee is visible at close quarters in the local area, particularly from vantage points along Smite Lane and from the public footpath and a limited number of residential properties to the west. From those vantage points, the appearance of the marquee is at odds with the prevailing character of the area which is of a rural nature, with predominantly brick built traditional buildings interspersed amongst agricultural land. In particular, the bright white exterior of the marquee stands out against the green foreground and the more traditional materials of the Pear Tree Inn to the rear.
16. The building is set down slightly in the landscape and that helps to reduce its apparent scale. Whilst it is undoubtedly a substantial structure it does not appear disproportionately large when compared to the buildings at the Inn. However, the white plastic covering draws the eye to the building and emphasises its scale. A building of the same size constructed from a more neutral palette of materials would be far less conspicuous. The local impact was off-set at the time of my visit as a result of mature vegetation surrounding the site, such that views of the structure were only available from a limited number of vantage points. That screening would no doubt be less effective during the winter months when trees and hedgerow plants have lost their foliage.

³ Taken from the letter from Mr Gurmail Gakhil, Director of The Pear Tree Inn and Country House, produced at Appendix 1 of the appellant's statement

17. I also noted that the marquee is set down below the ridgeline of a hill which runs a short distance to the north. The land falls away relatively sharply as one progresses in a northerly direction and the local topography prevents any significant views of the marquee from the north, including from the footpath which passes a short distance beyond the northern perimeter of the site.
18. Consequently, I consider that the development has caused some harm to the character and appearance of the area by virtue of its scale and the use of the bright white plastic covering. That harm to the character and appearance of the local landscape is relatively localised but, nonetheless, is such that the development fails to accord with the aims of policy SWDP25 A(ii) of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (2016) and one of the core principles set out at paragraph 17 of the Framework which is that planning should take account of the character or different areas and recognise the intrinsic beauty of the countryside.

iii) Whether any harm to the Green Belt by way of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development

Any Other Harm and Other Considerations

19. The Pear Tree Inn benefits from an extant planning permission for a substantial extension to incorporate additional bedrooms, leisure facilities and a swimming pool⁴. The scale of the extension approved in relation to that proposal is greater, in terms of footprint and height, than the marquee and associated infrastructure. The appellant has put forward a 'fall-back' argument on the basis that the extant extension could be erected if permission was refused and the enforcement notice upheld in relation to the marquee.
20. However, whilst it is clear that the permission relating to the extension remains extant, the information provided by the appellant casts doubt on the likelihood of the development being implemented in the short term. According to the appellant's statement, a crucial element of the business case for the marquee is for it to generate the funds needed to construct the extension. They suggest that the current value of the hotel when set against outstanding loans is such that additional borrowing from external sources is not a viable option. Therefore, if the enforcement notice was upheld and the marquee removed, it seems unlikely that the extension would be constructed in the short term. The weight that I give to the suggested fall-back scenario, in terms of any positive benefit to the Green Belt, is therefore limited.
21. It appears to me that the case presented by the appellant is not one of a genuine fall-back but of an enabling argument in terms of the suggestion that funds generated through the marquee would be channelled towards the construction of the permanent extension, thereby securing additional future jobs at the site. Whilst I note those intentions, little information has been provided in terms of financial information to support the suggested link between revenue raised from the marquee and potential funding for the proposed extension. The appellants anticipate that the marquee would accommodate 50 weddings per year, each of which with 600 guests, generating a turnover of £1.2million, 70-75% of which is suggested would be

⁴ LPA reference: W/97/00879/OU & W/01/00554/RM

- profit. The appellant contends that the profits over a three year period would go a long way to paying for the estimated £3million cost of the extension.
22. Those figures are based on a letter from Mr Gurmail Gakhal, a director of The Pear Tree Inn and Country Hotel, produced at appendix 1 of the appellant's statement. The number of guests anticipated at each wedding is substantial and the projection is for almost one event per week with that number of occupants. In the absence of any supporting information as to how the figures are derived it is difficult to gauge how realistic the projections are and whether there is sufficient demand for that number of large wedding events. Similarly, without an understanding of overall costs set against turn-over it is not clear how the anticipated profit levels of 75% have been calculated. Consequently, in the absence of more detailed information it is difficult to attach any significant weight to the appellant's projections.
23. Moreover, the Business Plan for the marquee submitted in relation to application W/15/00628 identified the business as 'Jewels Marquee Limited'. That is a separate registered company to The Pear Tree Inn and Country House Hotel. The directors and shareholders are listed as Mr Gakhal, who is also a director of The Pear Tree Inn and Country House Hotel, and Mr Rajinder Singh who is not. The appellants maintain that it is not unusual practice for separate accounts to be kept for related enterprises and suggest that the reason for the accounts being separate is that Mr Singh is not a director of the Pear Tree Hotel and also to enable the costs and sales for that enterprise to be clearly seen.
24. As one of the directors of Jewels Marquee Limited has no formal association with The Pear Tree Inn and Country House Limited, it is not clear why all of the profits from that enterprise would be redirected towards the extension of the hotel. To my mind, it would appear unusual for Mr Singh to allow his share of any profit to be directed towards a business to which he has no apparent connection. Therefore, in addition to the uncertainties regarding the veracity of the financial projections, there are significant uncertainties regarding the relationship between Jewels Marquee Limited and The Pear Tree Inn and Country House Limited. There is little certainty that any profit would be directed towards the development of the extension at the hotel and, accordingly, the weight that I can attach to the enabling argument put forward by the appellant is limited.
25. Moreover, given that the marquee is detached from the existing buildings at the site it represents a different form of development to the proposed extension. It is not for me to review the merits of the extant consent but the extension would be more closely associated with the existing buildings and constructed from a more traditional palette of materials. Therefore, the presence of that consent does not, to my mind, represent justification for an alternative development, in the form of the marquee and associated works.
26. It is also possible that the extension could be developed alongside the marquee; the overlap between the footprint of the two elements is marginal and would only require minor alterations to either element to enable both to be accommodated at the same time. Therefore, given the uncertainties regarding the financial links between the hotel and the marquee, and the fact that the extension and marquee represent different forms of development, I consider that the marquee and associated works should be assessed on their own individual merits.

27. The use of the marquee would, of itself, generate income in the local area and create employment at the site. The appellant's estimate that the use of the marquee would generate approximately 12 full-time jobs and 25 part-time jobs, depending on the success of the business. In that regard, my concerns regarding the lack of evidence to under-pin the financial projections also apply to the estimates of job creation. Clearly, a wedding for 600 guests would need a significant temporary workforce in terms of catering, bar staff, additional hotel staff etc. No doubt a significant amount of work also goes into planning and preparing for the weddings in advance.
28. However, in the absence of more robust data to explain whether the projected frequency of weddings of that scale is realistic it is difficult to conclude with any certainty on the likely number of jobs that would be created. I appreciate that the anticipated success of any business venture must be based on estimates at its outset but the evidence presented does not outline any detail as to any market research that has been undertaken or provide comparative evidence from similar ventures elsewhere. Consequently, whilst I consider that the marquee would have undoubted benefits to the rural economy, as supported by section 3 of the Framework, the weight that I attach to those benefits is moderate.
29. The development is proposed for a temporary period of three years. Compared to a permanent extension of the same size, the long term effects on the openness of the Green Belt and the character of the area would be less harmful. However, the effects would remain harmful for that period and the fact that the development would be removed after three years does not represent a positive material consideration that weighs in favour of granting planning permission. Paragraph 89 of the Framework does not distinguish between permanent and temporary development and the suggested three year consent does not affect my conclusion that the development is 'inappropriate development' within the Green Belt.
30. The appellant has also referred to a potential fall-back scenario whereby temporary marquees could be erected for up to 28 days per calendar year under permitted development rights set out in Class B, Part 4 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015. As set out above, the present marquee is a substantial structure and the breach of planning control includes the creation of a hardstanding and the provision of underground services. It is intended to remain in situ for a period of three years and is not of a scale that could readily be taken down and re-erected frequently. Consequently, I consider it unlikely that a temporary marquee of anywhere near the same size and solidity would be erected under the temporary permission granted through the GPDO and the potential fall-back in that regard is not a matter that weighs heavily in support of the development.
31. I have also had regard to the appeal decisions and other examples of marquees that have been approved elsewhere. With regard to the appeal decisions submitted by the appellant each was determined in relation to the individual circumstances of the case. Only one of the decisions appears to relate to the construction of a marquee within the Green Belt⁵ and, in that instance, the Inspector treated the marquee as an extension to the public house on account

⁵ APP/A4710/A/12/2188618

of the fact that the entrance lobby physically connected to the associated building. That is not the case in this instance for the reasons set out above. Therefore, I am not satisfied that the appeal decisions relate to proposals that are directly comparable and they do not add any weight, in terms of precedent, in favour of the development. Similarly, I have been referred to a marquee associated with Worcester Rugby Club that is situated within the Green Belt. However, I have not been provided with full details of that development and cannot be certain that the relevant material considerations and the weight afforded to them were comparable to the case before me.

32. A number of interested parties have referred to the level of noise resulting from the use of the marquee at wedding events. A noise assessment has been submitted by the appellant and the Council's Regulatory Services team did not object to the planning application for the retention of the structure on the basis that any noise could be successfully managed through noise control provisions under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. In addition, were I minded to grant planning permission, I am satisfied that conditions could be attached to limit the hours of operation and to prevent amplified music being played beyond unreasonable hours such that the impact upon the living conditions of local residents would be acceptable.
33. Similarly, whilst I note that traffic levels are likely to peak substantially as people arrive for events, the frequency of those events is not anticipated to be more than once a week. No objection has been received from the local highway authority and, on that basis, I conclude that the effect on highway safety is not a matter that weighs against the development.

Very Special Circumstances

34. Paragraph 87 of the Framework notes that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 88 states that, in considering planning applications, substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt and 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
35. Therefore, the breach of planning control represents 'inappropriate development'. By definition, such development is harmful to the Green Belt and I must attach substantial weight to that harm, regardless of the fact that the development is proposed for a temporary period of three years. I have also found that the development causes harm to the character and appearance of the local landscape and I attach moderate weight to that harm, given that the impact would be relatively localised in extent.
36. I attach moderate weight to the economic benefits to the rural economy that would arise through the use of the marquee for the reasons set out above but find that limited weight should be attached to the enabling argument put forward with regard to funding the proposed extension to the Pear Tree Inn. No realistic fall-back scenario has been put forward that leads me to alter my conclusions on the harm that has been caused by the development or to affect balance of material considerations. Noise could adequately be controlled through the use of conditions and no significant highway safety impacts are likely to arise. Nonetheless, the absence of harm in relation to those matters does not represent positive benefit in support of the development.

37. When taken in the round I am clear that the moderate economic benefits of the development do not clearly outweigh the substantial harm to the Green Belt and moderate harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, very special circumstances do not exist to justify the development and planning permission should not be granted, having regard to paragraph 88 of the Framework and all material considerations. Accordingly, the appeal on ground (a) fails.

The Appeal on Ground (g)

38. The notice requires that the marquee is removed from the land within 28 days and the remainder of the requirements at sections 5.2 to 5.9 are undertaken within three calendar months of the date the notice takes effect. The appellant contends that 6 months would be a more appropriate period on account of the fact that specialist contractors will be required; that any items that are being rented would need to be collected by the owners which is out of the control of the appellant; and that a period of one month to remove the marquee would have a devastating effect on the livelihood of employees working within or connected to the suite.
39. On the latter point, the appellant noted at the Hearing that no weddings have been booked due to the uncertainties surrounding the marquee and the fact that they did not want to be in a position to cancel any events, thereby upsetting customers. No evidence that anyone is directly employed solely in relation to the marquee has been provided. Once contractors are on site I consider that it would not be an unduly lengthy operation to dismantle and remove the marquee; a small number of days would be likely be sufficient. However, I am mindful of the need to arrange for the contractors to be on site and the time of year when my decision will be issued when inclement weather and shorter daylight hours are available. Therefore, I consider that a period of 3 months is a reasonable period for the removal of the marquee. I can see no reason why the associated container, oil tank and generator should take any longer to remove and find that three months is also a reasonable period in relation to those elements.
40. Given the fact that groundworks will be required to remove the concrete base, hard core, footpath link and underground services, and having account of the time of year, I find that a six month period, as requested by the appellant is reasonable. That would also enable the site to be grassed over at a suitable time of year.
41. I also note that each of the requirements listed at paragraphs 5.1 to 5.9 include the restoration of the land to its former condition, that of grass land. However, it is clear that the grassed area could not be re-instated until the concrete base, hard core and associated services have been removed. In other words, the grass could not be re-instated immediately following the removal of the items listed at paragraphs 5.1, 5.2, 5.4 and 5.5. Accordingly, I have varied the terms of the notice to remove the requirement to "restore the land to its former condition that of grass land" from those particular paragraphs. I have retained the wording in relation to paragraphs 5.6 to 5.9 to require that the land is grassed over within 6 months.
42. In those respects, the appeal on ground (g) succeeds and I shall vary the requirements of the notice accordingly.

Overall Conclusion

43. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice and refuse to grant planning permission on the deemed application.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Rarooq Rafiq	Inspire Planning
Mr Gurmail Gakhal	Director, Pear Tree Inn and Country House Limited
Mr Michael Pique	General Manager, Pear Tree Inn and Country House
Mr Gulraiz Siddique	Architect, Architecture Design Studio

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Grahame Duerden	Senior Planning Officer
--------------------	-------------------------

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mrs Barbara Meddings	Deputy Chair, Hindlip, Martin Hussingtree and Salwarpe Parish Council
Mrs Lynda Duffy	Local ward member
Mr Alan Thawley	Local resident

Documents Handed in at the Hearing

- 1) Overhead photographs of the site.
- 2) Plans relating to application 01/0554.
- 3) Planning decision notice and associated site plan relating to application W/02/01258