



Appeal Decisions

Hearing held and site visit made on 10 January 2020

by Tim Belcher FCII, LLB(Hons), Solicitor (Non-Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/C/19/3229060

Land to the east of New Road, Bromham, Chippenham, SN15 2JA

- 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 1990 Act").
 - The appeal is made by Douglas Ward ("the Appellant") against an Enforcement Notice issued by Wiltshire Council ("the Council").
 - The Enforcement Notice, numbered 18/00566/ENF, was issued on 16 April 2019.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the Enforcement Notice is without planning permission, the unauthorised erection of a timber building, shown as cross-hatched on the plan attached to the Enforcement Notice and as shown in the photograph also attached to the Enforcement Notice.
 - The requirements of the Enforcement Notice are: (a) Dismantle the timber building. (b) Permanently remove the resultant materials arising from (a) from the land.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is three months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in Section 174(2)(g) of the 1990 Act.
- Formal Decision:** The appeal against the Enforcement Notice was withdrawn by the Appellant at the Hearing.
-

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/W/19/3228253

Land to the east of New Road, Bromham, Chippenham, SN15 2JA

- The appeal is made under Section 78 of the 1990 Act against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by the Appellant against the decision of the Council.
- The application Ref 18/07505/FUL, dated 12 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2018.
- The development proposed as stated on the application form is the, "change of use of agricultural land to create 1 gypsy and traveller pitch, having 1 static mobile home and 1 touring caravan, a stable block with tack room and feed store, alterations to the site entrance and associated ancillary development including a 2 meter(sic) high security fence to the site boundary.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is dismissed.

Definitions

1. In my Appeal Decision I will refer to:
 - a) The land edged red on the Location Plan as "the Appeal Site".
 - b) The proposed stables as "the Stables".
 - c) The proposed static and touring caravans as "the Caravans".
 - d) The combined site, elevations, floor, entrance elevation and entrance plan (Drawing No. 18/NEW/02) submitted with the application as "the Plan".

Procedural Matters

2. Some of the details set out within the Plan were changed prior to the Hearing. No amended plan was submitted to reflect these changes. The main changes are:
 - a) The proposed solid timber gates and brick walls/piers at the entrance to the Appeal Site would be replaced by a traditional farm gated entrance (details to be agreed with the Council).
 - b) The 2m temporary fencing around the perimeter of the Appeal Site would be omitted. Initially it was proposed that the temporary fencing would remain until a non-native hedgerow had become established. The Appellant now proposes a hedgerow to be planted using native species in a position to be agreed by the Council. The newly planted hedgerow would be protected from horses (where necessary) using post and rail fencing.

Relevant Background Matters

3. On 25 August 2016 a Planning Inspector dismissed an earlier appeal made by the Appellant against the Council's decision to refuse planning permission for the change of use of agricultural land to create one gypsy and traveller pitch with associated ancillary development ("the 2016 Appeal Decision"). The gypsy and traveller pitch proposed in the 2016 Appeal Decision was within the Appeal Site but in a different part to that which is before me.
4. The Appeal Site falls within East Wiltshire Housing Market Area ("the East Housing Market Area").
5. The Appeal Site is not previously developed land or a vacant / derelict site in need of renewal.

Main Issues

6. I consider that the main planning issues in this case are the effect of the proposal on:
 - a) The character and appearance of the area.
 - b) Highway safety.

Reasons

Policy

7. The Development Plan for the area includes Policies 1, 2, 12, 47, 50, 51, 57, 60, 61 and paragraph 6.80 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy 2015 ("the Core Strategy").
8. The relevant parts of the Core Strategy explain that:
 - a) Provision should be made to help meet the accommodation needs of all of Wiltshire's communities, including the gypsy and traveller community.
 - b) Provision should be made for at least 66 permanent pitches for gypsies and travellers during the period 2011-2016. A further 42 permanent pitches should be provided over the period 2016-2021.

- c) Permanent pitches should be distributed and phased as set out in Policy 47. Within the East Housing Market Area there is a minimum need for one additional pitch.
 - d) Preference for new gypsy pitches should generally be given to using previously developed land or a vacant / derelict site in need of renewal.
 - e) Where proposals satisfy the general criteria set out in Policy 47, they will be considered favourably. The Council consider that the following parts of the criteria are relevant:
 - i) The proposed site should be served by a safe and convenient vehicular access. The proposal should not result in significant hazards to other road users.
 - ii) The proposal will not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the landscape.
 - f) Development should protect, conserve and where possible enhance landscape character and must not have a harmful impact upon landscape character. Proposals should be informed by, and sympathetic to, the distinctive character areas identified in the relevant Landscape Character Assessments and any other relevant assessments and studies. In particular, proposals will need to demonstrate that the specified aspects of landscape character have been conserved and where possible enhanced through sensitive design, landscape mitigation and enhancement measures.
 - g) A high standard of design is required in all new developments. Development is expected to create a strong sense of place through drawing on the local context and being complementary to the locality. This includes enhancing local distinctiveness by responding to the value of the natural environment, relating positively to its landscape setting and responding to local topography by ensuring that important views into, within and out of the site are retained and enhanced.
9. I have also been referred to Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled the Kennett Landscape Conservation Strategy ("the SPG"). The SPG is referred to in the Core Strategy. The Appeal Site falls within the Bristol Avon Clay Vale ("the Vale Area"). The SPG explains, amongst other things, that:
- a) The Vale Area is dominated by a strong structure of hedgerows and trees. Field sizes are variable, being small, primarily pasture, to the south and west, and towards the eastern edge. An exception to this enclosed character is found on the lighter greensand soils to the north of the area around Bromham, which are characterised by market gardening and windblown soils in a hedge-less environment.
 - b) Enhancement priorities include encouraging the replacement of landscape structure within the horticultural landscapes around Bromham.
 - c) In the sandy soil areas around Bromham new development will be expected to contribute to the restoration of the landscape through appropriate tree and hedge planting schemes.
10. I have also been referred to:

- a) Paragraphs 4, 7, 8, 11, 109, 127, 130 and 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 ("the NPPF"), and
- b) Paragraphs 11, 13, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27 & Policies A, B, C & H of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015 ("PPTS").

11. The relevant parts of the NPPF explain:

- a) Development should only be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
- b) Planning decisions should ensure that developments:
 - (i) Will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development.
 - (ii) Are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding landscape setting.
- c) Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.
- d) Planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other things, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

12. The relevant parts of the PPTS explain:

- a) Criteria should be set to guide land supply allocations where there is an identified need. Where there is no identified need, criteria-based policies should be included to provide a basis for decisions in case applications nevertheless come forward. Criteria based policies should be fair and should facilitate the traditional and nomadic life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community.
- b) Local planning authorities should consider amongst other relevant matters when considering planning applications for traveller sites:
 - (i) The existing level of local provision and need for sites.
 - (ii) The availability (or lack) of alternative accommodation for the applicants seeking planning permission.
 - (iii) Other personal circumstances of the applicant.
- c) 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.
- d) When considering applications, local planning authorities should attach weight to specified matters, including sites being well planned or soft landscaped in such a way as to positively enhance the environment and increase its openness.
- e) If a local planning authority cannot demonstrate an up-to-date 5 year supply of deliverable sites, this should be a significant material

consideration in any subsequent planning decision when considering applications for the grant of temporary planning permission.

Character and appearance

13. The Appeal Site:

- a) Lies in the open countryside to the south of Bromham. This location is outside the limits of development for Bromham.
- b) Is situated close to a sharp bend in New Road.

14. The Appeal Site is under grass cover, and forms part of a broad sweep of open land extending around the east side of Bromham. The Appeal Site would accommodate:

- a) The Caravans.
- b) An internal access road which would run the full length of the site.
- c) Two branches off the internal access road both of which are of substantial length. One branch would be used to access the Stables and the other to access the Caravans.
- d) Parking spaces and turning areas.
- e) A hardstanding in front of the Stables.
- f) Hedgerows around or near its perimeter and a hedgerow that would divide the paddock from the areas to be used for the Caravans and the Stables.

15. The majority of the Appeal Site would be retained as a paddock for horses to use.

16. The proposal would undoubtedly introduce urban elements into an open, undeveloped, rural and exposed location.

17. There is some development along that part of New Road which leads to the centre of Bromham. This development is also beyond the development limits of Bromham. Much of this comprises small ribbon development comprising dwelling-houses.

18. The proposal would be distinct from the existing groups of development along New Road, and it would encroach into the open tract of land in an exposed position on this side of Bromham.

19. The Appellant has explained that the side elevation of the Stables (the side closest to New Road) would be built and set back from New Road and would broadly align with the front elevation of the nearest dwelling-house to the north of the Appeal Site.

20. I accept that it is not necessary or acceptable to hide the proposal from public view. What is necessary is that the proposed development and ancillary changes that would result from the change of use need to be assimilated within the landscape without causing material harm.

21. I do not accept that the proposed hedge around or near the Appeal Site's perimeter would assist in the proposal's assimilation. Generally, the areas of

land where the development would be carried out are sited on land at a lower level than the height of the highway along New Road.

22. I am aware that the Plan shows a new hedge being planted to the south of the Caravans so as to mitigate the visual harm that they would cause but given the difference in levels between the highway and the Appeal Site it would, in my experience, take many years to grow a hedge to a height that would help to assimilate the Caravans into the landscape. Where hedges are used as boundary treatment to residential dwellings in the area they are kept at a low height. Accordingly, a high hedge on the Appeal Site would look completely out of context within this landscape. Accordingly, I am of the view that the Caravans would appear as an alien, unattractive and harmful feature within this area of countryside which is currently very attractive.
23. I am also of the view that the significant area of internal accesses, hardstanding and turning areas would create unpleasant scars within this landscape and these would remain highly visible for many years.
24. The hedgerow around or near the perimeter of the Appeal Site are suggested as mitigation for the harm caused by the proposal. There is a short length of conifer hedge to the north of the Appeal Site. This is an odd feature in itself as it contains no obvious native species and has been planted in front of open agricultural land similar in appearance to the Appeal Site.
25. Most of the agricultural land alongside New Road and near the Appeal Site is devoid of hedges. The absence of hedges creates a special character and appearance for this area. There is no evidence before me that the Appeal Site or nearby agricultural land was ever enclosed by hedges. This is not a case where hedges have been ripped out to the detriment of the landscape character of the area and where you might expect the Council to be seeking replacement hedgerows.
26. Residential frontages in the vicinity are generally open or marked using low hedges, planted shrubs, planted flower borders, low walls or walls with railings. There are hardly any examples of houses being enclosed by high hedges. Given the limited presence of hedgerows in the immediate vicinity, I do not consider that the proposed planting of new hedgerows would represent an effective means of assimilating the proposal into its surroundings.
27. The majority of agricultural fields near the Appeal Site are used for market gardening. I acknowledge that the SPG suggests that hedgerow planting is appropriate and the SPG supports their establishment around Bromham as part of measures to repair the landscape. However, for reasons explained above, I do not have any evidence before me that the Appeal Site or nearby agricultural land has been damaged by the removal of hedgerows.
28. I am of the view that even after the proposed hedgerows had become established the proximity of urban features resulting from the proposal and the inevitable domestic paraphernalia that would accompany such residential development e.g. children's play equipment, parking of cars, clothes lines, security lighting and the general domestication of parts of the land within the Appeal Site for use as garden within this swathe of open countryside would cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the landscape. Accordingly, the proposed development would not relate positively to its

landscape setting, contrary to the relevant parts of the Core Strategy as explained above.

29. The Appellant explained that there is no planning control over what type of hedgerows he could plant within the Appeal Site and that the planting of inappropriate species would cause considerable harm whereas approval of the proposed development would allow the Council to control the planting of indigenous hedgerows. Whilst in theory the Appellant is correct, I do not consider that this amounts to a realistic fallback position. Why would the Appellant plant wholly inappropriate hedgerows when his only lawful use of the land is agricultural, including grazing by his horse.
30. The Appeal Site is in a prominent location by the elevated roadside. There are also two Public Rights of Way that adjoin New Road at the aforementioned bend. I viewed the Appeal Site from these Public Rights of Way. Parts of the Caravans would, for reasons already explained, be highly visible in views from the Public Rights of Way.
31. It is likely that the Council would only permit hedgerows using native species; consequently, after leaf fall the Caravans and associated residential paraphernalia would be even more exposed detracting from the rural scene during a substantial part of the year.
32. I therefore conclude, for the reasons explained above, that the proposed development would have a serious adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to the relevant parts of the Core Strategy.

Highway safety

33. I have explained that when the appeal proposal was before the Council it was proposed that a 2m high temporary fence would be erected around the Appeal Site's perimeter ("the Fence"). The Plan illustrated that the Fence would have hedging growing on either side of it.
34. In my judgement the Fence would cause problems for drivers using New Road when travelling around the sharp bend in the road. The Fence would interfere with inter-visibility between drivers approaching the bend in different directions. The road is relatively narrow, and care has to be taken if two cars are travelling in opposite directions if they reach the bend at the same time.
35. However, as explained above the Appellant has indicated that he no longer requires the Fence and the position of any hedging can be agreed with the Council to avoid the problem identified above.
36. At the site visit it was demonstrated that visibility splays can be achieved on either side of the entrance to the Appeal Site. These visibility splays would comply with the standards set out in Manual for Streets for roads having a 30-mph limit. I am aware that the Appellant does not own the land to the east of the entrance, but the requisite visibility splay appears to fall within the land that already forms part of the highway.
37. I therefore conclude, for the reasons explained above, that the proposed development:
 - a) Would be served by a safe and convenient vehicular access.

b) Would not result in significant hazard to other road users.

Accordingly, there would be no conflict with the relevant part of the Development Plan.

Temporary planning permission

38. I discussed the possibility of the grant of a temporary planning permission. The Council suggested a period of three years in the event that I considered a temporary planning permission was appropriate. The Appellant's agent agreed with that. Clearly the harm resulting from a temporary use of the Appeal Site would be less than that of a permanent permission. However, the fact that the substantial harm would only last for three years does not make it acceptable especially as the proposal involves significant changes to the site e.g. the laying of extensive areas of hardstanding by reason of internal roads etc.

Overall Conclusions on the Main Planning Issues

39. Whilst I have explained that there are no highway safety reasons to withhold consent for the proposed development this does not outweigh the significant harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the landscape within which the proposed development would sit. I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to the Core Strategy and advice in the NPPF.

Other material considerations

The general need for traveller accommodation

40. The Wiltshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment ("the GTAA") was published in December 2014. It concludes that within the East Housing Market Area no additional pitches are required in the period up to 2029 to address the needs of identifiable households. The Appellant pointed out that the GTAA had not been subject to any public scrutiny through examination.
41. In summary the Core Strategy suggests a need for one pitch in the East Housing Market Area; the GTAA concludes that no further pitches are required, and the Appellant and family currently occupy an unauthorised pitch within part of the Appeal Site.
42. The Inspector concluded in the 2016 Appeal Decision on the information that was before him that there was likely to be a modest need for additional pitches in the East Housing Market Area. There is no evidence before me that the situation relating to general need has materially changed, and it continues to carry moderate weight in favour of this appeal.

Possible Alternative Sites for the Appellant and His Family

43. The 2016 Appeal Decision details the situation that applied at that time. This is recorded in paragraphs 18 to 21 and need not be repeated here. The Inspector who determined the 2016 Appeal Decision concluded that there was currently no alternative site available for the Appellant and his family and that this carried moderate weight in the light of the circumstances concerning the extension and allocation of pitches at Greenacres Mobile Park.
44. The Appellant's father is the owner of Greenacres Mobile Park. Since the 2016 Appeal Decision the Council granted planning permission in January 2018 to

- increase the number of pitches at Greenacres Mobile Park to 14. Each pitch provides for one static caravan and a touring caravan.
45. The Appellant disputed that there were 14 pitches at Greenacres Mobile Park, but it is clear from the planning permission and the approved site and location plan that permission exists for 14 pitches. No evidence was provided that the Greenacres Mobile Park could no longer accommodate the permitted 14 pitches or that there was any other impediment to achieving that. The Appellant simply said there weren't 14 pitches at Greenacres Mobile Park.
 46. The Appellant's Design & Access Statement which accompanied the planning application stated that the Appellant and his family were living at Greenacres Mobile Park albeit this was described as being cramped.
 47. The Appellant's Statement of Case stated that the Appeal Site would be occupied by the Appellant, his wife and his son. No mention was made of a daughter occupying the Appeal Site.
 48. I was advised that there had been a dispute between the Appellant and his father and that he could no longer live at Greenacres Mobile Park. I was not provided with any details as to what the dispute was about or whether it was reconcilable.
 49. By July 2018 the Appellant and family (but not including his daughter) were living at the Appeal Site albeit not in that part of the Appeal Site now proposed for residential use.
 50. In November 2018 the Council issued an Enforcement Notice relating to the Appeal Site alleging, amongst other things, the residential use of the Appeal Site. The Enforcement Notice requires, amongst other things, the residential use to cease and for the caravans to be removed. That Enforcement Notice was not appealed. Planning permission for the residential use of the Appeal Site had been refused by the date the Enforcement Notice was issued. The appeal against the refusal of planning permission was not made until almost 6-months after the date of the refusal.
 51. Local residents claimed that the mobile home on the Appeal Site had not been occupied during most of 2019. The Appellant explained that he and his family were away travelling but they have come back to the Appeal Site during that period from time to time and that another relative attended the Appeal Site to look after the Appellant's horse.
 52. There is no clear evidence that the Appellant and his family have an alternative lawful site to reside at. However, there is significant confusion over the number of lawful pitches at Greenacres Mobile Park and the Appellant's ability to seek his father's permission to return there. Accordingly, this matter carries moderate weight in favour of the appeal.

Personal Circumstances

53. As stated above, at the time the appeal was made it was stated the Appellant, his wife and their son would occupy the Appeal Site. I am aware of the personal circumstances relating to these persons as set out at paragraph 5.33 of the Appellant's Statement of Case. I also heard further submissions at the Hearing mainly relating to the Appellant's wife. Letters from doctors were read

out at the Hearing and copies of those letters were provided after the Hearing had closed.

54. I was also informed at the Hearing and for the first time that the Appellant's daughter had also moved from Greenacres Mobile Park to the Appeal Site. I understand that this occurred a short time before the Hearing date but no advance information of this change of circumstances was provided. The Appellant's daughter is due to give birth to a child in about July 2020.
55. I was not provided with any information as to:
- a) Why she had left Greenacres Mobile Park.
 - b) Whether she intended or was able to return to Greenacres Mobile Park.
 - c) Whether her move to the Appeal Site was permanent or temporary.
56. I have taken all these personal circumstances into account, especially the chronic pain which the Appellant's wife is constantly in.
57. I have explained above the situation regarding the number of lawful pitches at Greenacres Mobile Park. If the Appellant was able to reconcile his differences with his father and if there was a pitch available for him, I consider that his wife would be able to access the same levels of care that she would be able to get if she lived at the Appeal Site.
58. Notwithstanding this, I consider that the personal circumstances of the occupiers of the Appeal Site carries considerable weight in favour of the appeal.

The Human Rights of the Appellant and other Proposed Occupiers of the Appeal Site

59. In considering this proposal, I have considered the human rights of the Appellant and his family especially those under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights as embodied in the Human Rights Act 1998. Dismissal of the appeal would prevent them using the Appeal Site as a permanent settled base on which to live and station the Caravans. This would represent an interference with their rights under Article 8. However, considering all material considerations, I am satisfied that the legitimate aim of protecting the countryside can only be adequately safeguarded in this case by the dismissal of the appeal, and interference with the human rights of the Appellant and his family is, therefore, necessary and proportionate.
60. I am also very much aware of Article 3 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. I have explained above that the Appellant's daughter has only very recently moved to the Appeal Site and the lack of information provided about this matter.
61. The rights of her unborn child are my primary consideration. Other than being informed when and where her child is to be born, I have no further information. There was no evidence before me that the child's health, welfare and future education could not be provided for at Greenacres Mobile Park.

Public Sector Equality Duty

62. My understanding is that the Appellant and his family are Irish Travellers and Irish Travellers are a distinct racial group. Race is a protected characteristic

for the purposes of the Equality Act 2010. I have had regard to the public sector equality duty contained in the said Act. The current need for pitches may indicate an inequality in housing opportunities for Irish Travellers in the East Housing Market Area. Whilst this matter lends further support to the appeal proposal, it is not sufficient to outweigh the serious harm to the character and appearance of the area which the proposal would cause.

Overall Conclusions

63. I have explained that I consider that serious and significant harm to the character and appearance of the area would result from this proposed development. I have explained above all of the other material considerations that have been brought to my attention. None of these individually or cumulatively outweigh the harm caused by the proposed development.
64. I have also considered the suggested conditions in the Statement of Common Ground and others which I am familiar with, but these would not overcome the fundamental objection to the appeal proposal.
65. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Formal Decision

66. The appeal is dismissed.

Tim Belcher

Inspector

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

Philip Brown BA(Hons), MRTPI of Philip Brown Associates
The Appellant
The Appellant's wife

FOR WILTSHIRE COUNCIL

Morgan Jones BSc(Hons), MSc, MRTPI – Senior Planning Officer
Mark Goodwin BA(Hons) BLA CMLI - Senior Landscape Officer
Henning Totz – Senior Spatial Planning Officer
Stephen Jenkins – Planning Enforcement Officer

INTERESTED PERSONS

Ben Pearce BSc(Hons), MA(T&CP), FRICS, LMRTPI of Land Development & Planning Consultants representing the Parish Council
Anna Cuthbert BSc(Hons) – Local Councillor
Jim Butler - Bromham Farmers & Growers Group
John Cartlidge – Local Resident
Peter Smith – Local Resident
Debbie Smith – Local Resident
Joe Vick – Local Resident
Sonia Davis – Local Resident
Tyrone Lohrenz – Local Resident
Simon Dicks – Local Resident
Lesley Eacopo – Local Resident
Peter Davey – Local Resident
Peter Wilson – Local Resident
Chris Wilson – Local Resident
Joy Shell – Local Resident

DOCUMENTS

- Document 1 – Statement of Common Ground dated 8 January 2020.
- Document 2 – Letter dated 2 September 2019 from Dr. Claire Rigby.
- Document 3 – Letter dated 12 August 2019 from Dr. James Pearson to Wiltshire Council.
- Document 4 – Referral letter dated 2 September 2019.
- Document 5 – Conditional temporary planning permission dated 31 July 2008 - Ref 07/03870/FUL – change of use to private caravan site for three pitches, eight caravans for single extended family with associated works (hardstanding, drainage, fencing and utility buildings) and associated keeping of horses, for occupation by travellers (part retrospective). Land adjacent to West Wiltshire Crematorium – now known as Greenacres Mobile Park, Symington.
- Document 6 – Appeal Decision dated 24 February 2012 – Conditional planning permission for change of use to small private gypsy & traveller site for 3 pitches for 8 caravans and associated

- ancillary works and development (including hardstanding and drainage) – Greenacres Mobile Park.
- Document 7 – Conditional planning permission dated 22 April 2015 - Ref 14/10797/FUL – change of use of agricultural land to create 6 additional gypsy and traveller pitches with associated ancillary development. Greenacres Mobile Park.
- Document 8 – Conditional planning permission dated 22 January 2018 - Ref 17/10025/FUL – change of use to provide 5 additional gypsy and traveller pitches (14 in total each with 1 static caravan and 1 touring caravan) and associated ancillary works including landscaped amenity areas. This is in lieu of the 3 pitches and 8 caravans approved under permission W/11/01206/FUL and the further 6 pitches and 12 caravans approved under permission 14/10797/FUL. Retention of the existing dayroom approved under 14/04110/FUL. Retrospective approval for stone walled entrance to site. Greenacres Mobile Park.
- Document 9 – Case Officer’s Report – Application 17/10025/FUL.