



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 6 August 2019

Site visits made on 5 and 6 August 2019

by Mike Worden BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/K3415/W/18/3217315

Land to the north-west of Broad Lane, Huddlesford, Lichfield.

- 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 Cher Varya Group Limited against the decision of Lichfield District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00016/FULM , dated 14 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as: Construction of 139 two, three and four bedroomed timber clad holiday and leisure lodges, layout and construction of internal site roads and parking areas, creation of play areas and internal footpaths, layout and creation of two balancing ponds, construction of a reception building with meeting space, office, fitness suite, toilets and bike hire and laying out of 2.5ha greenspace for nature conservation and leisure, including nature trail and dog walk, extensive tree planting and creation of species rich flower meadow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of 118 two, three and four bedroomed timber clad holiday and leisure lodges; layout and construction of internal footpaths; layout and creation of two balancing ponds; construction of a reception building with meeting space, office, fitness suite, toilets and bike hire; and laying out of 2.5ha for nature conservation and leisure, including nature trail and dog walk, extensive tree planting and the creation of species rich flower meadow at land to the north-west of Broad Lane, Huddlesford, Lichfield, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00016/FULM, dated 14 December 2016, subject to the conditions on the attached schedule.

Procedural Matter

2. Before the determination of the planning application, the appellant submitted revised plans to the Council. The revised plans reduced the number of lodges within the proposal from 139 to 118. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:

- The effect of the proposal on the safety of pedestrians and horse riders using the local highway and rights of way network
- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area
- Whether the appeal site would be an appropriate and accessible location for the proposal.

Highway safety

4. The proposal is for the construction of a development of 118 lodges within two fields to the north east of Lichfield. The lodges would be two storey and a mix of two, three and four bedroomed properties. The proposal would incorporate landscaping, open space, and ancillary facilities including a reception and fitness suite. The two fields are located either side of an existing private road which links Broad Lane with the Kings Orchard Marina which lies adjacent to the Coventry Canal. Although close to the outer edge of Lichfield, and the A38, the road network around the appeal site comprises minor roads which generally are narrow and are flanked by hedgerows. Broad Lane falls into that category. It is not lit and does not have pavements alongside it.
5. It is agreed between the Council and the appellant that the proposal would not cause harm to highway safety in respect of conflict between vehicles. However, the Council is concerned that the proposal would cause harm to highway safety as a result of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians and horse riders. The Council considers that this conflict would arise on the highway itself and along the public right of way which runs along the road between Broad Lane and the Marina.
6. The trip generation figures within the appellant's transport assessment are not disputed. These indicate that there would be around 97 inbound movements and around 88 outbound movements in a typical 12 hour weekday period. These figures are based on the original proposal and so the scheme the subject of the appeal could be expected to generate fewer movements. Such movements would not generally have the same peak hour focus as journeys to work or school that would be associated with residential properties as they would be more associated with leisure trips. The appellant has also provided survey count data of existing traffic using Broad Lane and other roads in the vicinity. These figures, which include around 240 movements per day in each direction along Broad Lane near to the appeal site, are not disputed. I consider that the additional traffic generated during the day would not be unduly significant.
7. From my site observations, visibility along Broad Lane in the vicinity of the site entrance is not particularly hindered as the road is generally straight, and pedestrians may move to the verge if necessary as they would do on many rural roads. On my site visits I did not observe any horses being ridden on the local highway. However there were horses in some of the nearby fields and the local residents stated that horses were commonly ridden along the local roads.

8. On the basis of the evidence before me, including the resulting additional traffic, I consider that the proposal would not lead to additional harm to the safety of pedestrians or horse riders on the local highway network.
9. The road which runs through the appeal site to the Marina is a public footpath. Whilst local residents have stated that it is used for horseriding as well as walking, the Council confirmed at the hearing that these uses should not be undertaken on a public footpath. Nevertheless, I consider that the main access road to the Marina is straight and visibility is good. Traffic speeds would be expected to be slow, as I observed on my visit and could be managed as part of the proposal. The proposal includes creating additional passing places. Whilst there would be additional vehicular movements along the road as a result of the proposed development, I consider that such movements would not lead to any additional harm to the users of that access road.
10. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposal would not cause harm to the safety of pedestrians and horseriders on the local highway and public rights of way network, and would accord with Policy T&M1 of the made *Whittington-Fisherwick Neighbourhood Plan 2018* (the Neighbourhood Plan) which seeks to ensure that new development does not cause harm to highway or pedestrian safety.

Character and appearance

11. The appeal site lies in a flat area of land. It is not within any specific landscape designation within the development plan. Although the outer edge of Lichfield is relatively close, the immediate area has a rural feel. It is characterised by large fields separated by substantial hedgerows and groups of trees. The fields of the appeal site are in agricultural use, currently laid to grass. The wider area includes a number of farms. To the south, on the other side of the main west coast railway line, is the village of Whittington and to the north, across the A38 is Fradley Distribution Park. The Coventry Canal runs in a roughly north south direction close to the appeal site. The Kings Orchard Marina lies between the appeal site and the canal. It has a large basin which is used for the storage of canal boats. The Marina also has camping and caravan uses within its site. The appeal site is divided by the hard surfaced access road to the Marina. To the south of the appeal site there are tall high voltage electricity pylons and cables.
12. The proposal would introduce 118 lodges divided between the two fields. The lodges would be two storey and would vary in size. They would be timber clad with sedum roofs. The roof of each lodge would curve upwards from the rear. The lodges would be located in a green setting with the southern field also having an area of open space and a balancing pond. The lodges would be set in different size groups. Some would be detached, others in terraces of two, three or four, and all would face onto an internal access road which would run through either field. Surface biopave parking would be provided. The northern field would house a reception building which would also accommodate a fitness centre and bike hire facilities.
13. It is not disputed that the proposed development would be visible from outside of the site. The appellant considers that the sedum roofed timber clad buildings would be an attractive feature in the landscape. The substantial nature of the hedgerows and trees around the site, together with the proposed planting would mean that the lodges and the reception building in the northern field would be viewed over the tops of the hedges, rather than through them as that

field is substantially enclosed. The southern field is larger and since it is not all being used for the proposed development, would more heavily rely upon new landscaping to screen views of the lodges.

14. Along the majority of the external boundaries, the backs of the lodges would be relatively close and in some parts would form near continuous banks of built form. There would be some views through gaps between buildings. The two storey height of the lodges and their location across the site would mean that views of them from outside of the site would be mostly in the form of glimpses. In winter months the presence of the lodges would be more visible as the surrounding vegetation would be less dense. The proposed additional planting and the natural surface materials of the buildings would help to reduce visual impact.
15. At the hearing it was agreed that there could be a condition imposed to control development which could have an urbanising effect such as fences, walls, and storage facilities associated with individual lodges. The presence of parked cars would add to this urbanising effect of built form although the proposed parking areas are grouped in clusters within the inner areas of the site.
16. From my observations, I consider that the proposed development would not be unduly visible from the Coventry Canal, including from the raised bridge over the link to the marina. The users of public footpath 15 in the section between the Marina and Broad Lane, would experience a significant change in the character of the area as a result of the proposal, although the scheme would still be contained within a green setting.
17. In the immediate general landscape, the proposal would be experienced as a built form of development quite distinct from the established pattern of development around. Nevertheless the impact on the wider landscape would be somewhat limited.
18. I consider that the nature of the proposed development would for the reasons set out above be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy BE.1 of the *Lichfield Local Plan Strategy 2015* (the Local Plan) which seeks to secure high quality development including expecting it to appreciate context; Policy D2 of the Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to ensure the reflection of local character in the design of new development; and Policy D1 of the Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to ensure new development is of good design and amongst other things of scale and density appropriate to its setting.

Location

19. The appeal site is not served by local buses. The nearest railway station is Lichfield Trent Valley which is about 1.5 miles away. It would be possible for the users of the proposal to walk or cycle to the Plough public house at Huddlesford. This journey could be made by foot either along Broad Lane or via the public footpath and canal towpath. Although a number of residents at the hearing stated that there was no link between the footpath and the towpath, on the site visit it was observed that the gate could be opened and the linked path was well trodden. The public right of way could also be taken to walk to Streethay across the A38. At the hearing it was disputed what facilities were available at Roman Heights in Streethay, but my understanding is that whilst planned, local facilities associated with that housing development have not yet been built.

20. The future users of the proposed development would for the most part rely upon a private motor vehicle to access their holiday lodge, to access local services and to access visitor facilities in the local area. The appeal site is well placed to access a number of acknowledged visitor attractions in the local area and in the Midlands. However such journeys would for the most part require reliance upon the car. The appellant considers that without specific measures introduced around 95% of visitors would arrive at the proposed development by car and a similar number would use their car for leisure trips from the site. If, through a condition or obligation, the measures set out in the submitted Travel Plan were implemented, then these figures could reduce, but not significantly.
21. The appeal site is not adjacent to or associated with a major visitor attraction such as the examples of Alton Towers or Drayton Manor mentioned at the hearing by representators. Whilst the canal is close by for walking and cycling, and a meadow area would be provided on site, the majority of holiday visitors would travel by car to undertake leisure activity off site. Indeed in order to realise the economic benefits in the wider area, visitors would have to make leisure trips during their stay, and for the most part these would have to be by car.
22. For these reasons I consider that the location of the proposal is poorly accessed and the proposal would place reliance on the use of motor vehicles. I consider that this would be contrary to the final bullet point of Policy BE1 of the Local Plan which seeks to ensure that new development should be located in areas which have good safe access to public transport to reduce the need to travel by private car and should optimise choices of sustainable travel. It would also be contrary to Core Policy 5 of the Local Plan which seeks to promote sustainable transport and ensure that new development is well served by an attractive choice of transport modes.

Other considerations

23. The economic benefits of the proposal are not disputed by the Council although some of the local residents consider that they would not be realised. The occupation of 118 units would help to create significant overnight and visitor spend. Whilst the site is not directly connected to a tourist destination, the location of the proposal would provide a suitable geographical base from which to visit tourist destinations in the district and in the wider Midlands area.
24. The proposal would create employment for around 30 full time equivalent (FTE) temporary jobs in construction and around 7 FTE jobs in management, maintenance and servicing. It would lead to increased spending in the local economy and have a multiplier effect. The appellant's statement of case indicates that this would be around £1.5M -£2.0M per annum, although the Planning and Economic Statement submitted with the application suggests a figure of around £1.8M based on the original 139 units. Nevertheless the figures are not disputed by the Council and the benefits to the local economy of the proposal are set out in the Council's officer report to Planning Committee. Even though the value of the benefits may be less than originally calculated at the time of submission due to the reduced numbers of lodges, the proposal would bring great benefit to the local and wider area economy, and is a consideration to which I afford significant weight.

Other matters

25. The parties agree that on the basis of the additional submitted ecological assessments, and subject to the imposition of a condition which secures ecological mitigation, the proposal would not cause harm to biodiversity on the site. The planning obligation also seeks to secure a financial contribution, as mitigation, to the improvement of the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation, in accordance with Policy NR7 of the Local Plan.
26. I have no evidence before me that the future occupiers of the proposed development would be subject to harm as a result of noise from the A38, or from the nearby electricity pylons. I have no evidence that harm would be caused by flood risk subject to the imposition of conditions agreed by the parties and I note that the relevant agencies do not object on that basis. I also have no evidence that the HS2 project, the line of which would run nearby, would adversely affect the proposal.
27. At the hearing reference was made to applications elsewhere for change to use of holiday properties to residential and numerous concerns from local residents about this matter have been raised. I do not have specific details of those applications or circumstances before me, but I fully understand the concerns of the residents on this point. The Council and the appellant have agreed that if the appeal were to be allowed, a condition could be imposed to prevent the use of the lodges for residential purposes, and that this could also be the subject of the legal agreement. Without such controls, the proposal would not be acceptable in planning terms.

Planning Balance

28. I have found that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and would be in a location that would cause undue reliance upon the private car contrary to the interests of sustainable transport. I have not found any harm to the safety of pedestrians and horse riders.
29. The proposal would bring great economic benefits to the area which would extend to attractions in the wider area to the benefit of the Midlands economy. I attach significant weight to these benefits.
30. The appellant considers that even with travel plan measures in place, around 85% of journeys would be made by private car, for both journeys to the site and to visitor attractions. Whilst there would be some activities on site and from the site, and the quality of the accommodation would be high which would facilitate visitors to stay on site, I consider that in the main, most visitors would travel out to tourist attractions in the Midlands during their stay and also have to travel to buy food and provisions etc. The vast majority of such journeys would be by private car given the poor access to public transport options.
31. The appellant states that the proposal should be seen as one that relies upon private car use because that is the nature of such holiday villages in rural areas. The attractiveness of the proposal for short and longer stays relies upon its remote countryside location and the concept of the scheme is one of lodges set within an area of countryside. The proposal would enable enjoyment of the countryside by the nature of the scheme and its location. If the proposal was attached to an existing visitor attraction such as the examples given at the

hearing, then journeys reliant upon the car would arguably be less but not necessarily so. However, there is no sequential test required by any policy submitted to me, and moreover the scheme is the one before me, at this location. I have given considerable weight to the specific nature of the proposal and its general need for a countryside location for it to be attractive to overnight visitors and consequently deliver its associated economic benefits to the area.

32. Core Policy 9 of the Local Plan seeks to support the growth of tourism in Lichfield District and amongst other things encourages a variety of additional overnight accommodation to increase overnight visitor capacity and enabling longer tourist stays. The Council's officer report to Planning Committee highlighted that there is a shortage of overnight accommodation in the area although this point was disputed at the hearing by some of the representatives. The Council's statement of case however does not contradict its officer's report on this point. The Council's *Rural Development Supplementary Planning Document* (the SPD) sets out guidance in relation to development in rural areas of the district. It recognises, at paragraph 4.23 that holiday accommodation in rural areas can help drive up overnight tourist spend and can support local businesses. I attach some weight to this consideration.
33. I have found harm, but overall I conclude that this harm is clearly outweighed by the benefits of the scheme to which I have attached significant weight. The proposal would be contrary to some policies of the development plan but accord with others. On balance I consider that the appeal should succeed.

Planning Obligations

34. The appellant has submitted planning obligations in the form of a signed Unilateral Undertaking. This seeks to require a travel plan, require a financial contribution towards travel plan monitoring, restrict occupancy of the lodges and to make a financial contribution towards the Cannock Chase SAC.
35. The SAC contribution is to meet the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and to avoid and mitigate any impact that the proposal may have on the SAC. The Council does not disagree with the principle or level of financial contribution, but it considers that it should be the subject of a separate legal obligation. However, I consider that the Unilateral Undertaking as submitted does adequately separate out the requirements of the different legislations.
36. The parties agree on most other elements of the submitted obligation but there are differences of opinion on some nuances. Nevertheless, overall, I consider that the submitted planning obligations meet the necessary tests, including the requirements of the CIL regulations and the obligations are necessary to mitigate impacts. As such they are justified to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms. They are also directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to it. Accordingly the deed meets the tests set out in paragraph 56 of the Framework and in regulation 122 of the CIL regulations 2010. I have taken the submitted planning obligations into account in reaching my decision.

Planning Conditions

37. The Council and the appellant have agreed a list of suggested conditions, although some minor wording detail amendments were discussed at the hearing. I have considered the suggested conditions in relation to Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework.
38. In addition to the standard condition relating to the time period for the implementation of the permission, there is a need for a condition specifying the permission to which the permission relates, in the interests of certainty.
39. There is a need for a condition requiring a construction management plan in the interests of amenity and the environment. There is also a need for a condition requiring a scheme of archaeological investigation in the interests of heritage given the potential for archaeological interest in the area.
40. Conditions are required in relation to detailed materials, external illumination and landscaping, in the interests of character and appearance. Conditions are also required in relation to details of drainage and surface water schemes in the interests of the environment and a condition to secure compliance with the submitted flood risk assessment in the interests of minimising the risk of flooding. Conditions are also required in order for the local planning authority to approve details of tree protection measures in the interests of the environment and to require the replacement of any landscaping which is planted but fails.
41. Conditions are necessary to require submissions of a Construction Environment Management Plan and a Habitat Management Plan in the interests of the environment and ecology. In the interests of ecology also, a condition is imposed to require adherence to the submitted updated ecological appraisal.
42. A condition is imposed to restrict development within an area to the west of the appeal site in order to enable access to the nearby watercourse for maintenance purposes.
43. Conditions are also imposed to restrict the use of the lodges for holiday purposes, to restrict the use of the reception building to ancillary uses and to restrict the number of days in the year when the lodges can be used by particular person or persons including a requirement for the keeping of registers. These conditions are necessary in the interests of planning to prevent the lodges being used for non-holiday purposes. A condition is also necessary in this particular case to prevent means of enclosure around the individual lodges in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

44. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Mike Worden

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Hugh Lufton	Lufton Associates
Leigh Ibbotson	Cher Varya
Dave Haslam	Haslam Ecology
Michael Bradbury	Mike Bradbury Design
Tim Willis	Shoosmiths

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Michael Brereton	Lichfield District Council
Hannah Hayes	Lichfield District Council

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Councillor David Leytham	Local Councillor
Juliette Barlow	Local resident
Philip Sharpe	Inland Waterways Association
Tom Cope	Landowner
Andrew Cope	Landowner
Councillor Harry Warburton	Local Councillor

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Public rights of way plan submitted by appellant
- 2 Cannock Chase SAC planning guidance

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: 1806 -P01A Location Plan; 1806-P23 Landscape Masterplan; 1806-P19C Landscape Plan (North); 1806-P20D Landscape Plan (South); 1806-17E Proposed North Site; 1806-P18C Proposed South Site Plan; 1806-P21A Tree Constraints North Site; 1806-P22A Tree Constraints South Site; 1806-P21 Sustainable Design; 1806-P08C 2 bedroomed bungalow Type A; 1806-P14A Reception Building Elevations; 1806-P20C North Site Elevations/Sections; 1806-P21C North Site Elevations/Section; 1806-P22C; 1806-P23C South Site Elevations/Sections; 1806-P24C South Site Elevations/Sections; 1806-P25C South Site Elevations/Sections; 1804-P10 3 bedroom lodge Type C; 1806-P11 4 bedroom lodge Type D; 1806-P09 2 bedroomed lodge Type B; 1806-P03A Proposed North Site; 1806-P01A; 16-03101b Topographic Survey; 02_01A_2016_TS Tree Survey; 02_01B_2016_TS Tree Survey; 02_01C_2016_TS Tree Survey.

3. Notwithstanding any description/details in the application documents, before the development hereby approved is commenced, details of all external materials of any buildings and structures and areas of hardstanding to be used in the construction of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

4. Before the development hereby approved is commenced, full details of the surface and foul water drainage, including surface water drainage strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage strategy shall include the following details and mitigation measures:

- i. the ability to accommodate surface water run-off on-site up to the critical 1 in 100 year event plus an appropriate allowance for climate change, based upon submitted drainage calculations;
- ii. the limitation of surface water run-off to equivalent greenfield rates;
- iii. the utilisation of holding sustainable drainage techniques with the incorporation of treatment trains to help improve water quality;
- iv. finished floor levels are set no lower than 150mm above local ground levels;
- v. the responsibility for the future maintenance of drainage features;

The approved drainage scheme shall be fully implemented before any part of the development is first brought into use/occupied and subsequently maintained, in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

5. Before the development hereby approved is commenced, a written scheme of archaeological investigation ('the Scheme') shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Scheme shall provide details of the programme of archaeological works to be carried out within the site, including post-excavation reporting and appropriate publication and interpretation. The programme of works shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

6. Before the development hereby approved, including any site clearance works, are commenced, a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Management Plan shall include the following details:

- i. Arrangements for the parking of site operatives and visitors;
- ii. Loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- iii. Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- iv. Construction hours;
- v. Pedestrian and cyclist protection;
- vi. Proposed temporary traffic restrictions;
- vii. Arrangements for turning vehicles;
- viii. Noise Control devices (Silencers, smart reversing alarms etc.);
- ix. Delivery routing and hours;
- x. The erection and maintenance of security hoarding;

- xi. Wheel washing facilities and methods of prevention of mud being carried onto the highway,
- Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction; and
- xii. A scheme for the recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.

The development and works associated thereto shall thereafter be undertaken in accordance with the details contained within the approved Construction Management Plan, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

7. Prior to its installation the details of any external illumination within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme of illumination shall thereafter be provided in accordance with the approved details.
8. Notwithstanding the submitted details, before the development hereby approved is first brought into use, full details of the refuse and recycling compounds shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved refuse and recycling compounds shall be erected and made available for use prior to the first use / occupation of the development and shall thereafter be maintained for the life of the development.
9. Notwithstanding any submitted details or details shown within the approved plans, before the development hereby approved is commenced, a detailed landscape and planting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved landscape and planting scheme shall thereafter be implemented within eight months of the development being first brought into use, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
10. Before the development hereby approved is commenced or any equipment, machinery or materials is brought onto site, full details of protective fencing and/or other protective measures to safeguard existing trees and/or hedgerows on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed tree / hedge protection measures shall thereafter be provided in accordance with the approved details British Standard 5837: 2012 and retained for the duration of construction (including any demolition and / or site clearance works). No fires, excavation, change in levels, storage of materials, vehicles or plant, cement or cement mixing, discharge of liquids, site facilities or passage of vehicles, plant or pedestrians, shall occur within the protected areas. The approved scheme shall be kept in place until all parts of the development have been completed, and all equipment; machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site.
11. Before any construction works hereby approved are commenced, a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) and Habitat Management Plan (HMP) detailing, in full, measures to protect existing habitat during construction works and the formation of new habitat to secure a habitat compensation value of no less than 20.29 Biodiversity Units, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Within the CEMP/HMP document the following information shall be provided:

- i. Current soil conditions of any areas designated for habitat creation and detailing of what conditioning must occur to the soil prior to the commencement of habitat creation works (for example, lowering of soil pH via application of elemental sulphur);
- ii. Descriptions and mapping of all exclusion zones (both vehicular and for storage of materials) to be enforced during construction to avoid any unnecessary soil compaction on area to be utilised for habitat creation;
- iii. Details of both species composition and abundance where planting is to occur;
- iv. Proposed management prescriptions for all habitats for a period of no less than 25 years;
- v. Assurances of achievability;
- vi. Timetable of delivery for all habitats; and
- vii. A timetable of future ecological monitoring to ensure that all habitats achieve their proposed management condition as well as description of a feed-back mechanism by which the management prescriptions can be amended should the monitoring deem it necessary. All ecological monitoring and all recommendations for the maintenance/amendment of future management shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The development shall be undertaken and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved CEMP and HMP.

12. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment dated 13/09/2017 (Version 3.0 RAB: 1726).

13. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with all recommendations and methods of working detailed within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal produced by Haslam Ecology, dated 5 July 2019 Report Reference HE05/08/15.

14. The use of the site shall be limited to holiday lodges only. The site shall not be used to accommodate caravans.

15. The holiday lodges shall be occupied as holiday accommodation only and shall not be occupied either continuously or cumulatively by any particular person or persons for a period exceeding 120 days in any twelve month period, the details of which shall be kept in a log and shall be made available to the Local Planning Authority upon request.

16. Any tree, hedge or shrub planted as part of the approved landscape and planting scheme (or replacement tree/hedge) on the site and which dies or is lost through any cause during a period of 5 years from the date of first planting shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

17. No development shall take place within the 8m easement / exclusion zone to the west of the site as shown on drawings 1806 P20 rev D and 1806 P19 rev D. This area shall be maintained free of development for the life of the development.

18. The reception building hereby approved shall only be used ancillary to the holiday and leisure lodges complex development hereby approved; and for no other purpose, including any other purpose in Class D1 of the schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) (or any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

19 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no fences, gates, walls or other means of enclosure shall be erected around any of the buildings hereby permitted or their curtilages.