



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 11 July 2017

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA

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

Decision date: 9th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/16/3165761

Land at Northwick Road, Pilning, South Gloucestershire BS35 4HA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Michael McDonagh against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref PT16/4188/F, dated 11 July 2016, was refused by the Council by notice dated 9 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is change of use of land to gypsy and traveller caravan site to facilitate the stationing of 1no mobile home, 1no touring caravan and erection of 1no amenity unit and associated works.
-

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for change of use of land to gypsy and traveller caravan site to facilitate the stationing of 1no mobile home, 1no touring caravan and erection of 1no amenity unit and associated works at Land at Northwick Road, Pilning, South Gloucestershire BS35 4HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PT16/4188/F, dated 11 July 2016, subject to conditions 1) to 18) on the attached schedule.

Application for Costs

2. At the Hearing an application for costs was made by Mr Michael McDonagh against South Gloucestershire Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. There had been an application in 2013 for what the Council describe as a 'similar scheme' (Ref; PT13/3720/F) and the subsequent appeal was dismissed in July 2015 (Ref; APP/P0119/A/14/2222812) following a Hearing. Local residents queried why the present application and Appeal should be entertained. The appellant draws attention to policy and case law changes in the meantime, and these will be addressed, but the fact is that the present case concerns a different appellant and the balance required of Green Belt decisions as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites involves consideration of matters that may apply to one appellant but not to another. In any event, the Council validated and determined the application, and the right of appeal provides for the present Appeal and Hearing to proceed. The findings of the previous Inspector are a material consideration to which reference will be made.

4. The proposal is agreed to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and the Council confirmed at the Hearing that the reason for refusal and their objections relate only to that matter, the effect on openness and on encroachment. Local residents had however raised other matters which were discussed at the Hearing and considered at the site inspection, during which the Hearing remained open for discussion.
5. The appellant made clear the order of his case; the first position being a permanent, non-personal permission; the second being a permanent personal permission; and the third being a temporary permission.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are therefore;
 - The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of the Green Belt.
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the area and the open countryside, highway safety, surface water run-off and flooding, and the living conditions of nearby residential occupiers; issues raised by local residents.
 - Whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations. If so, would this amount to the very special circumstances required to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Reasons

Policy

7. The Council's reason for refusal refers to Policy CS21 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy 2013, which is the criteria-based policy for the provision of gypsy and traveller accommodation. The preliminary paragraph with its reference to a forthcoming Development Plan Document should now be read as being only with regard to the replacement Local Plan. The policy provides for windfall sites such as the appeal proposal subject to not having unacceptable environmental effects; the site not being the subject of unacceptable levels of noise disturbance, air pollution, smell, dust or contamination; the proposal not unacceptably prejudicing the amenities of existing and new neighbouring residential occupiers; and the site having adequate provision for vehicular access, parking and manoeuvring. The Policy continues that sites should preferably be within reasonable distance of local services and facilities, and sites in the Green Belt will only be acceptable where very special circumstances can be demonstrated.
8. The Council adopted '*Development in the Green Belt (Supplementary Planning Document) 2007*' which refers to the now superseded Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 '*Green Belts*' and sets out guidance for householders and developers. A local resident also referred to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document '*Landscape Character Assessment*' and the site's location within Area 20, the Pilning Levels, described as an area of contrasts, with a largely flat, semi-enclosed to open agricultural landscape.

9. The Council's Reason for Refusal refers to the Ministerial Statement of 1 July 2013 relating to Planning and Travellers. Planning Policy for Traveller Sites of August 2015 is the most recent statement of Government policy with regard to such site provision and the introduction states the Government's overarching aim to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic way of life of travellers, while respecting the interests of the settled community. Policy E covers traveller sites in the Green Belt and paragraph 16 states that subject to the best interests of the child, personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt and any other harm so as to establish very special circumstances. This is repeated in paragraph 24 to Policy H on determining planning applications for traveller sites, which also lists issues which, amongst other relevant matters, should be considered.
10. Decisions on traveller sites should also have regard to the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework so far as relevant, and the core planning principles include conserving and enhancing the natural environment; actively managing patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling; and focusing significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable. Green Belt policy is set out in section 9 and will be referred to later in detail.

Green Belt

11. Paragraph 79 of the Framework states that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts; the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
12. The previous Inspector writing in 2015 came to the conclusion that *'overall the loss of openness would be quite limited'* and went on to state that *'having regard to the provisions of paragraph 88 of the Framework, I nevertheless attach some weight to it'*. The appellant draws attention to the more recent Court of Appeal case of *Turner v SSCLG & East Dorset Council* [2016] EWCA Civ 466 and the visual dimension to the Green Belt. That judgment also confirmed that it was not irrational for an Inspector to determine that the impact on openness of moveable development such as caravans and mobile homes is less than the impact of an equivalent permanent structure.
13. The site is open land, albeit with a bank of trees and hedgerow to the long side furthest from the road. The short east side is less distinct as a boundary since the overgrown nature of the site extends over into the adjoining land. The long, and in part curving, roadside boundary completes the perimeter with sporadic hedging and some trees. A tree on the south corner is a distinctive feature of the site. In addition, there is a well-developed and substantial bank of vegetation on the south-west, opposite, side of the road which further constrains through views. Whilst part of a predominantly level and wide landscape to the north, identified as the Pilning Levels in the landscape character assessment, the site is closely associated visually and in terms of its constrained openness with the more developed linear group of houses along this part of Northwick Road
14. The proposal is limited in extent, the appellant having drawn the red-line boundary tightly around the intended pitch with room allowed also for the drainage system and landscaping, but leaving blue-edged areas of land not

covered by the application. Whilst having regard to the flooding issue raised by residents, it would be desirable to control the extent to which the mobile home and utility building project above the surrounding ground levels through a levels condition, even though the site at present displays a raised area, said to be as a result of unauthorised tipping of hardcore.

15. As a matter of fact, there would be an adverse effect on openness due to the proposal adding structures to a presently open site. However, having regard to the 'Turner' judgement, and the findings of the previous Inspector prior to that, but particularly observations at the site inspection on the constraints on through views, the effect on openness would be limited.
16. Turning to the purposes of including land in the Green Belt, as set out at paragraph 80 of the Framework, whilst it was stated that the Bristol/Bath Green Belt as a whole serves the purposes of preventing the two cities and other settlements from sprawling and merging, and no doubt it has a role to play in the setting of historic towns, the concern in this case is that of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
17. To the extent that the site is undeveloped, the limited physical features to be brought onto the land would encroach into the countryside. But the contained nature of the site through existing vegetation and development along and near to the boundaries limit this to causing little harm. Nevertheless paragraph 88 of the Framework states that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt.

The Extent of Any Other Harm

18. The concerns of local residents are clearly strongly held and with the aid of their appointed professional planning consultant, were fully aired at the Hearing. They are addressed in turn as follows.

The character and appearance of the area and the open countryside: The site is within the countryside for policy purposes and that is regarded as 'open countryside' since no other type is identified. The Planning Policy for Traveller Sites states at paragraph 25 that local planning authorities should very strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan. It continues; local planning authorities should ensure that sites in rural areas respect the scale of, and do not dominate, the nearest settled community, and avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure. Clearly sites may be permitted in the countryside as here. The appeal site is not allocated, but it is not 'away' from the existing settlement, being in very close proximity to Pilning and its services. Whilst the effect on the immediately local community will be considered later, the small size and limited occupancy of the proposed development would not dominate the community of Pilning generally. The previous Inspector found that whilst some visual harm would be caused initially due to the open frontage, landscaping would be capable of providing significant mitigation, such that the '*harm to the character and appearance of the area would be quite small, accordingly I give it some small weight in my Decision*'. There was discussion at the present appeal Hearing over the need for the proposed bund and whether it would provide suitable ground conditions for planting. In this Green Belt location, it would add an unnatural raised feature and should not be proceeded with. The landscape is not a 'valued' one as referred to in paragraph 19 of the Framework and having regard to the

acceptability of a countryside location close to facilities in both the Framework and in Local Plan Policy CS21, the weight to be afforded the visual effect of the current proposal is very limited.

19. *Highway safety:* The new access would not be where an existing field gate is located, and would be away from the bend on the straight part of the road. The numbers of vehicles and occupiers would be limited, and good visibility can be secured over the appellant's land towards the bend where approaching vehicles would be on the near side of the road. To the south the road is straight and the bend over the bridge and the junction there would limit speeds at the point where vehicles would be first seen. The footway provides sightlines over highway land. It was agreed at the Hearing, with the residents' consultant, that a condition would address the concerns.

Surface water run-off and flooding: It is noted that this was raised at the previous appeal, the Inspector concluding after a substantial section of reasoning over Flood Zones and flood risk, that construction-related conditions could address the risk. Local residents remain adamant that the standing water that they experience in their front gardens, and which was shown in photographs, did not occur until the unauthorised tipping took place on the site. The area where development is proposed is within Flood Zone 1, although it is the case that another area and properties on the far side of the road are in Zone 3. Whilst the evidence of the standing water in gardens to the west is clear, it is less clear how it gets there. The road alongside the site slopes to the north and has a camber that runs round the bend with a cutting to the nearby watercourse. For water running off the site to reach the lower levels of the affected front gardens it would need to be of sufficient quantity and depth to overcome the camber notwithstanding its tendency to run northwards in the nearside channel. Be that as it may, the Council appears doubtful whether the tipping can now be addressed as an enforcement case, whilst development of the site would provide the framework, through a condition, for rectification of the problem, if indeed the nature of the site ground conditions is the cause. The appellant put this forward as a benefit of the proposal, and there are doubts how else the problem can be addressed. Nevertheless, the finding of the previous Inspector is concurred with and neutral weight attaches to this matter.

20. *The living conditions of nearby residential occupiers:* Two concerns in particular were discussed at the Hearing, relating to the occupiers of *Fairfield* and *Turville*.

The occupiers of *Fairfield* clearly enjoy the location and their garden, and in part the matter of standing water already adversely affects that enjoyment. They say that they chose the house for its location and the certainty that Green Belt land provides that nothing would be built there. They refer to their view being adversely affected. Whilst the Framework states the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy as being to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, paragraph 89 lists a number of exceptions of what could amount to significant built form being considered not-inappropriate development, and hence being capable to being built in the Green Belt, subject to other Development Plan policies. Of possible pertinence to this site is the exception of buildings for agriculture or forestry. An invited inspection of the front of their land showed limited outward views of the site and the area to be occupied would not feature in the view along the driveway and through the gap

in the vegetation. Views as such are not protected as planning considerations and the outlook from the house and land would not be so altered as to be considered '*unacceptably prejudicing the amenities of existing and new neighbouring residential occupiers*', the wording of Policy CS21.

The occupiers of *Turville* explained the particular circumstances of their adult son and daughter who live with them. Whilst the offer of written medical reports was not taken up, there is no doubt as to the challenges that the family experience and the steps that they take to provide a safe and attractive environment. The large garden and its setting is clearly seen as contributing to this, and conversely, the thought of the appeal development going ahead has caused stress. However, and again with the benefit of the invited visit, the front garden that forms a significant part of their outdoor area is enclosed and the view over the solid front gate or even through it when open would not show the site, much less the occupied part of it. Whilst their real apprehension is acknowledged, the planning considerations indicate that the effect would not reach the level sought to be avoided in Policy CS21.

Other Considerations

21. The Framework states that inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances which will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
22. The appellant draws attention to a previous Appeal Decision in the Council area, at Pucklechurch (Ref; APP/P0119/W/15/3065767 dated 10 February 2016) and considers that many of the non-personal matters put forward now remain as then. It is not necessary to rehearse the various issues determined then and in many ways the Council's case to this Appeal is not contrary to those findings, but seeks to argue that the totality of weight afforded them should not outweigh the harm identified.
23. The following matters were put forward by the appellant and discussed at the Hearing.
24. *Need:* There is unmet need in the Council area, as set out in the '*South Gloucestershire Council and The City of Bristol Council Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment*' (January 2014). A refresh of the survey findings leading to an updated assessment is in progress but is not to hand, and there does appear to have been some slippage and change of intention regarding the Development Plan Document since 2016. The conclusion remains that there is unmet need that is unlikely to be fully met in the near future, and this is afforded significant weight.
25. *Lack of available, suitable, acceptable, affordable alternative sites:* The appellant and his family are not living on a suitable alternative site and are effectively homeless. There do not appear to be sites in the South Gloucestershire area for gypsies and travellers generally, and the two Council sites are full with waiting lists. The appellant's family have at one time sought to be on a waiting list but with no result. As stated in paragraph 24b of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites the availability (or lack) of alternative accommodation for the applicants is a relevant matter to be considered, and significant weight attaches to this matter, subject to consideration of the reference to paragraph 16 contained in the policy.

26. *Failure of policy:* The Pucklechurch Decision sets out the arguments and concludes that there has been a failure of policy as a distinct and separable consideration. The previous Decision on this appeal site, in 2015, was cited then in concluding that '*the general need for sites in the District was a significant factor weighing in favour of the appeal proposal*'. Since that time and since the 2016 Pucklechurch appeal, there has been limited, if any, tangible progress. A finding of a failure of policy to deliver sites remains and significant weight attaches to this.
27. *Lack of a five year supply of sites:* It is an agreed position that the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply in respect of gypsy and traveller sites, as sought in paragraph 10 of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Paragraph 27 goes on to state that this is a significant material consideration in any planning decision for the grant of temporary permission, but further states the exception where the site is on Green Belt land, as here. However, the application is for permanent use as the appellant's first and second positions, and the consideration of very special circumstances remains as set out in both the Framework and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. The effect of the stated exception in the Green Belt is over the weight to be applied, now advised to be less than significant, and moderate weight is afforded this matter here.
28. *The likely location of sites:* Some 25% only of the Council's area is outside the Green Belt or areas that are otherwise constrained. Whilst this is mainly to the north, where access to services was stated by the appellant to be less convenient, it was also stated by the Ward Councillor that non-Green Belt areas near Thornbury do have ready access to a choice of schools and other services. However, it is also the fact that the sites proposed to be put forward under the now abandoned Development Plan Document were in the Green Belt. The intention there was to remove each site from the Green Belt as an exceptional circumstance provided for in paragraph 83 of the Framework. There does therefore appear to be a reasonable likelihood of Green Belt land being needed for the provision of sites, but not a certainty, so that moderate weight only is attached.
29. *Personal circumstances:* This is a significant change from the case put before the Inspector considering this site in 2015, since in that proposal it was accepted that the children of that appellant could reside with their mother elsewhere. In the present case the appellant and his partner have three children who live with them both and who are presently, along with their parents, homeless. The appellant clearly wishes the children to attend school regularly, a situation that would not be possible if the family were moving from one temporary location to another. Whilst some local residents expressed the view that this is what being a gypsy entails, it is the fact that having a settled base from which an adult member of the family can travel to seek work is acceptable and is supported by Government policy.

Article 3(1) of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child provides that the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration in all actions by public authorities concerning children, meaning that no other consideration can be inherently more important than the best interests of the child. They must properly be afforded an importance or weight as great as any other material consideration prior to examination of the circumstances of the case. This will be considered further in the planning balance that follows.

Green Belt and Planning Balance

30. Harm has been found by reason of this being inappropriate development in the Green Belt; to openness, but tempered by the temporary nature of the mobile home; and to the purpose of protecting the countryside from encroachment. As stated, substantial weight attaches to this harm to the Green Belt. The best interest of the child as a primary consideration should similarly be afforded substantial weight. Very limited harm has been found to the character and appearance of the area, with the possibility of further mitigation of the effect through landscaping. No harm attaches to the other matters raised by residents, again with conditions able to address flood risk and highway safety.
31. With regard to Policy CS21, the proposal accords with each of the criteria on not having an unacceptable environmental effect; not being subject to unacceptable levels of noise disturbance, air pollution, smell, dust or contamination; not unacceptably prejudicing the amenities of existing and new neighbouring residential occupiers; and by making adequate provision for vehicular access, parking and manoeuvring. The site is within reasonable distance of services and facilities. The remaining requirement of the policy is the demonstration of very special circumstances.
32. Having taken all matters into account, the other considerations put forward fail to clearly outweigh the harm identified, in relation to the establishment of a permanent, non-personal use of the land for the stationing of caravans. That decision recognises the great importance given to Green Belts in the Framework and the substantial weight to be attached to any harm to the Green Belt and is consistent with the findings of the previous Inspector, even allowing for the later judgement in the Turner case and the other changes since that time referred to by the appellant. It acknowledges the statements in paragraphs 16 and 24 of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites as to the balance to be applied.
33. However, with the best interests of the child, and in this case three children, the balance alters in favour of a grant of a permanent personal permission. The permanent nature of the permission would provide for effective landscaping in order to address the limited effect on the character and appearance of the area, and the personal nature is necessary in view of the personal circumstances of the appellant and his family being the deciding factor. A personal temporary permission would not be appropriate in view of the doubts over the delivery of sites through the Local Plan process as now proposed, and the risk of short-term landscaping not being effective.
34. It is concluded that the points raised, including as they do considerations as to the best interest of children, are sufficient to clearly outweigh the harm identified so that very special circumstances exist, provided that the use is restricted to the appellant and his family.

Conditions

35. The Council suggested conditions and these were discussed, amended and agreed at the Hearing. The use of the land has not commenced and hence it is appropriate not only to include the 3 year commencement condition, but also pre-commencement conditions seeking a landscaping scheme and maintenance schedule, refuse storage, access details, slab levels and drainage. There was discussion in particular on the matter of drainage in view of the alleged source

of the standing water, and a scheme is an appropriate way of addressing this matter. With regard to the provision of the day room, details should be provided but only prior to that part of the development being commenced.

36. The reasoning that leads to this Decision is based clearly on personal circumstances justifying a grant of permission, and hence conditions are required so that the use is restricted to the appellant and his family. It is reasonable to control commercial activities, outside storage and the parking of commercial vehicles and the standard conditions are required stating the numbers of caravans. Exterior lighting should be controlled in view of the site location within the countryside and the Green Belt. It is reasonable and necessary to limit the location of the mobile home even though the site is limited in size, to allow consideration to be given to any proposed change later. It is however not reasonable to seek details of the mobile home and this Decision has taken account of what may be permissible as such an item. An archaeological condition is required in view of the representation made to the original application.
37. Lastly, a condition is required detailing the drawings to which this permission relates, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of the proper planning of the area. In view of the finding against the need or desirability for a bund, drawing number 004 is omitted from the list.

Conclusions

38. There is harm by reason of this being inappropriate development in the Green Belt, with limited harm to openness and little harm to the purpose of the Green Belt in preventing encroachment. Nevertheless, substantial weight is afforded harm to the Green Belt. The only other planning harm identified is a very limited adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, reducing as landscaping matures, and this can be secured by condition. As provided for in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, the circumstances of the children and their present homeless position carries substantial weight also.
39. The other matters identified in addition, result in these other considerations clearly outweighing the harm identified, such that very special circumstances exist, but only in favour of a personal permission in view of the best interest of the child being a determining consideration. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should be allowed.

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

A Joseph	South Gloucestershire Council
L Price	South Gloucestershire Council
S Jarman	Opinion Research Services

FOR THE APPELLANT:

M Green	Green Planning Studio
M McDonagh	Appellant

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Cllr R Griffin	Ward Councillor
R Duff	Earlsfield Town Planning on behalf of local residents
A & G Heming	Residents <i>Turville</i>
D Crampton	Family member of residents <i>Fairfield</i>

DOCUMENTS

Document	1	Updated witness statement from appellant with appendices submitted by appellant
Document	2	Revised draft, but not agreed, Statement of Common Ground submitted by Council
Document	3	Photographs of surface water runoff localised flooding submitted by Earlsfield Town Planning
Document	4	Main Modifications 12 June 2017 submitted by Earlsfield Town Planning
Document	5	Proposed Submission: Policies, Sites and Places Plan submitted by Earlsfield Town Planning
Document	6	Proposed condition 17b submitted by Earlsfield Town Planning

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:16_785_001, 002, 003, and 005.
- 3) The occupation of the site hereby permitted shall be carried on only by Mr Michael McDonagh, and his wife, Teresa, and their resident dependants.
- 4) When the land ceases to be occupied by those named in condition 3) above the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, materials and equipment brought on to or erected on the land, and/or works undertaken to it in connection with the use, shall be removed and the land shall be restored to its condition before the development took place.

- 5) No more than 2 caravans, as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 as amended (of which no more than 1 shall be a static caravan) shall be stationed on the site at any time.
- 6) No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials.
- 7) No vehicle over 3.5t shall be stationed, parked or stored on this site.
- 8) The mobile home shall be sited in accordance with plan no. 16_785_001 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 9) Prior to the commencement of development a scheme of landscaping, which shall include details of all existing trees and hedgerows on the site and details of proposed planting (and times of planting) along the boundaries shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority. Specific details must also be provided (size, type, number) of all new planting and boundary treatments. Development shall be carried out in accordance with these agreed details.
- 10) Prior to the commencement of development, a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years, including specific details of all boundary treatments, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation. The landscaping shall be maintained in accordance with the approved schedule.
- 11) Prior to the commencement of development of the amenity/dayroom hereby permitted, samples of the roofing and external facing materials proposed to be used for the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.
- 12) Prior to the commencement of development, details of the refuse collection and storage facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall accord with these approved details and they shall be retained thereafter.
- 13) Prior to the commencement of development, details of the site entry shown on drawing 16_785_003 together with sightlines shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the provision of a bound surface for the first 6m of the entry. The development shall accord with these approved details and they shall be retained thereafter.
- 14) Prior to the commencement of development details of the surface and foul water drainage scheme (including Sustainable Drainage Systems e.g. soakaways if ground conditions are satisfactory), and other measures for the remediation and prevention of surface water run-off and flooding; the control of pollution and environmental protection, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be in place and operational prior to residential occupation of the site.
- 15) Prior to the commencement of development, details of the slab levels of the hardstanding, utility/dayroom and the floor level of the mobile home shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning

Authority. The development and stationing of the mobile home shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 16) Prior to the commencement of development a programme of archaeological investigation and recording for the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the approved programme shall be implemented in all respects, unless the Local Planning Authority agrees in writing to any variation.
- 17) The hours of working on site during the period of construction shall be restricted to 07:30 to 18.00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays with no working permitted on Sundays or Bank or Public Holidays. The term 'working' shall for the purpose of clarification of this condition include: the use of any plant or machinery (mechanical or other), the carrying out of any maintenance/cleaning work on any plant or machinery, deliveries to the site and the movement of vehicles within the curtilage of site.
- 18) No external lighting shall be installed on the site other than that for which details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.