



Appeal Decisions

Inquiry opened on 22 March 2021

Site visit made on 30 March 2021

by Paul Dignan MSc PhD

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 June 2021

Appeal A: APP/Q3115/C/19/3228752

Land at The Copse, Mill Lane, Kidmore End, RG4 9HA

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Penny Holley against an enforcement notice issued by South Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The enforcement notice, numbered P19/S1691/DA, was issued on 17 April 2019.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is Without planning permission, the material change of use of the Land from a single residential dwelling house and private equestrian use to a mixed use comprising (i) A venue for the holding of wedding ceremonies, receptions and other organised events; (ii) Commercial leisure accommodation; (iii) Residential use.
 - The requirements of the notice are (i) Stop using the Land for wedding ceremonies, receptions and other types of organised events; (ii) Stop using the Land as commercial leisure accommodation; and (iii) Dismantle the "acoustic sound barrier", (shown hatched pink on the attached Plan A2).
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 6 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (b), (d), (f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. The application for planning permission deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act as amended also falls to be considered.
-

Appeal B: APP/Q3115/C/19/3228754

Land at The Copse, Mill Lane, Kidmore End, RG4 9HA

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Penny Holley against an enforcement notice issued by South Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The enforcement notice, numbered P19/S1692/DA, was issued on 17 April 2019.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is Without planning permission, operational development has taken place on the Land comprising a dining platform and timber, glass and canvas marquee structure.
 - The requirements of the notice are i) Remove the Dining Platform and marquee.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 6 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (b), (c), (f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. The application for planning permission deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act as amended also falls to be considered.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. It is directed that the enforcement notice be corrected by the deletion, in section 2, of "EG4 9HA" and its replacement by "RG4 9HA"; and by the deletion, in section 3, of the words "from a single residential dwelling house and private equestrian use"; and varied by the deletion of requirements (i) and (ii) and their replacement by the following requirement "(i) Permanently cease the mixed use comprising use as a venue for the holding of wedding ceremonies, receptions and other organised events, commercial leisure accommodation, and residential use." Subject to these corrections and variation the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld, and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

Appeal B

2. It is directed that the enforcement notice be corrected by the deletion, in section 2, of "EG4 9HA" and its replacement by "RG4 9HA". Subject to this correction the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld, and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

Application for costs

3. At the Inquiry an application for costs was made by South Oxfordshire District Council against Mrs Holley. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Appeal A – ground (b)

4. An appeal on ground (b) is that the matters alleged have not occurred. Often it is used to attack the precision of the description of the alleged breach of planning control. I should note here that the extent of the planning unit is now agreed¹ to comprise the entire 5.6ha holding, comprising the main house and gardens, a separate cottage, a manège and stables; various existing outbuildings and structures and wider paddocks and fields. It is also agreed that there is a mixed use of the planning unit. The concept of a mixed use is one of two or more primary uses existing within the same planning unit, where one is not ancillary to the other, although there may be ancillary uses associated with each primary use. In mixed use cases, the allegation should refer to all the components of the mixed use. This ground is, in effect, concerned with characterising that use.
5. Much of what is raised concerns a planning permission granted on appeal² in 2002 for replacement of existing buildings with stables and the construction of a manège. The permission was subject to a condition (No. 7) stating "The stables and menage hereby permitted shall only be used for the enjoyment of the occupiers of The Copse, Mill Lane, Kidmore End and for no commercial or business use." There was an argument under the now withdrawn ground (c) that this permission was for use falling within Use Class D2 (Assembly and

¹ Statement of Common ground, signed 22 March 2021

² Appeal ref. APP/Q3115/A/01/1071798

Leisure) of the Use Classes Order³ (UCO), and hence use for any other purpose within Class D2 would have been lawful, for example holding wedding ceremonies and receptions. That was a fanciful argument at best, not least given the Belmont⁴ judgement which rejected the argument that there is no material change if one component of a mixed use that falls within a specific use class (also Class D2 in that case) and is replaced by another use within the same Use Class. But it is argued in any case that the arrangement of certain uses into Classes in the UCO indicates that they are of the same character and give rise to similar impacts, which would go to the materiality of any change in the components of the mixed use.

6. But all of this, and the arguments that arise out of it, rely upon the equestrian use of the planning unit being a primary use. However, I consider that equestrian use was never a primary use of the land, but was instead a use incidental to the use of The Copse as a private residence. The only horses kept were the Holleys' own 2 horses for private recreational use, and Condition 7 of the planning permission for the stables and manège, which restricted their use to use for the enjoyment of the occupiers of The Copse, was agreed at the planning hearing. Some occasional use of the manège by friends would not take it outside of that, but I consider that the permission for the manège did not permit any use of a character that would be equivalent to, or even comparable to, a Use Class D2(e) use. Indeed the appeal Inspector was only concerned with the effect of the operational development on the character and appearance of the area rather than any change of use. Equestrian use is included in the description of the use before the alleged material change of use, but it should not be, and I can correct that without prejudice.
7. The initial use also refers to a 'single residential dwelling house', and this is also challenged as being inaccurate given the currently separate use of the former pool house as the Holley's residence, but this is tied up with the overall change of use in any case. However, since it is not essential for an enforcement notice concerned with a material change of use to describe the former use, I shall simply delete that part of the description. Again, there is no injustice.
8. Turning to the accuracy of the description of the current use, issue is taken first with the term "A venue for the holding of wedding ceremonies, receptions and other organised events" on the basis that wedding ceremonies is not a use in itself, , that there is no material difference between wedding ceremonies and receptions, and that 'other organised events' is too vague and could include activities such as book club meetings, a child's birthday tea, a sleepover or a séance. However, when read as a whole, and in the context of what has taken place on the site, I consider that it is a satisfactory description of a use and one that the recipient of the notice will easily understand. Similarly, the term "Commercial leisure accommodation" is criticised. The term was used to describe much the same use in the notice considered in the case of Moore⁵, where it was acknowledged as potentially encompassing more than had taken place, but it covered the particular use to which the property was being put in that case, holiday accommodation being

³ The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987

⁴ Belmont Riding Centre v FSS and Barnet [2003] EWHC 1895 (Admin)

⁵ Moore v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2012] EWCA Civ 1202

a form of commercial leisure accommodation, and it was agreed that the use in that case was almost identical to the use intended to be covered by the term in this notice. The Court found that the term was neither misconceived nor unintelligible, so I find that its use in this case is not an error or misdescription that requires correction. The appeal on this ground fails.

Appeal B – grounds (b) and (c)

9. Again it is the description of development that is at issue in both grounds of appeal, ground (c) being that it is not a breach of planning control. The structure attacked comprises a large area of covered decking used for wedding receptions. The appellant suggests that it appears to attack 2 separate structures, the platform and the marquee, and further that the use of the word 'dining' is incorrect since it is a verb and not itself operational development. But ultimately the description is adequate, a recipient of the notice would be in no doubt as to what was alleged and the structure attacked is clearly identifiable. Whether it was erected in a single operation or more is neither here nor there so far as this ground is concerned. The matter alleged has occurred as a matter of fact, and it requires express planning permission. Neither ground can succeed.

Appeal A – ground (d)

10. This ground is that it is too late to take enforcement action. The relevant period is 10 years, so the mixed use must have commenced at least 10 years ago and have been sustained for a continuous 10 year period. Use as a wedding venue is relatively recent, certainly within 10 years of the notice date, so what is relied upon in that respect is the contention that that is not materially different from the use of the property by various groups prior to that.
11. The Holleys bought The Copse in 2000 as a family home. It required renovation, during which Mr and Mrs Holley lived in an outbuilding housing an indoor pool for about 6 months. They moved into the main house in 2002 with their children. They travelled extensively and often had overseas guests to stay, sometimes as a house swap. The accommodation they initially used in the pool building, now referred to as The Cottage, was apparently available for holiday rental, and guests there could also use living accommodation on the upper floor of another outbuilding referred to as The Barn, now also containing a dancefloor and sound equipment on the ground floor and used for wedding receptions.
12. The children moved out between 2003 and 2005, though bedrooms were kept available for them in The Copse when they came to visit. Mr Holley has serious health problems and began to live full time in The Cottage some time in 2007 as his health deteriorated. The Copse was let out. This was usually for weekend rentals, and for a time Mrs Holley would move back in during the week. Eventually she moved full time into The Cottage with Mr Holley and managed The Copse as a holiday rental. However, the dates of key events is unclear. Mrs Holley thinks the main house, The Copse, came to be solely used for weekend letting from about 2009, she having moved fully into The Cottage in 2007-08, but she also identified the time she moved full time into the Cottage as being shortly before the indoor pool was converted to a bedroom, but this did not occur until 2013, and at that time guests in The Copse also had use of the swimming pool, and did use it. The account given

by Mrs Holley is also inconsistent with one of her booking inquiries in 2008 when the prospective visitor was told her stay in August 2008 would be in The Cottage.

13. Looking at what was occurring up until 2009, the booking and guestbook information indicates that those staying in The Copse or in The Cottage were family groups or small groups. There is really nothing to indicate or suggest a material change in the character of the use of the property. In 2009 Mrs Holley put the property on the market as a private residence because it was becoming costly to run. There was little interest, but she found that letting the main house, which she thought was now too big for her needs, would enable them to continue living on the property. She identified 2009 as probably when she started solely using the main house for letting. Prior to that she said she would have, for example, people staying in the main house when she was travelling, and she would let The Cottage at other times. The bookings evidence for the main house in 2009 started in May, so even if the character of the use from then on, living in the Cottage and using the main house just for letting, amounted to a material change of use of the planning unit as a whole, it could only achieve immunity from enforcement if that had remained the use of the planning unit for the requisite period. However, in examining the use the focus must be on the relevant use for the purposes of section 55 of the 1990 Act, which in this case is the mixed use as a whole, rather than on individual components of a mixed use. A change in components will involve a change in the mixed use itself and, subject to the question of materiality, will amount to development.
14. The single mixed use alleged in the notice includes components which did not occur until about 2016, most notably the use of the land as a venue for weddings and similar events. The appellant suggests that this was not a material change, but rather an intensification of the holiday letting use, partly it seems because some of the lettings were to people celebrating birthdays. But in my view there are considerable differences, in terms of the character of the use of the land, between letting a house for up to 18 persons, predominantly for holiday use, albeit groups staying at The Copse have on occasion had celebrations, and the holding of weddings where 100 to 150 people can gather for the day. Even allowing for traffic management that would keep a lot of the additional traffic away from the narrow single track Mill Lane, there would still be significant use of the lane by participants and caterers, florists and the like, which is likely to inconvenience other road users and possibly increase the risk to other road users by increased use of the sub-standard junction with the A4074. The use for weddings has caused disturbance to neighbours, including a statutory noise nuisance, and the need to mitigate the noise disturbance has seen the erection of the marquee structure the subject of Appeal B, not to mention the erection of a straw bale wall close to the boundary with one of the neighbouring properties. apparently for acoustic purposes. The numbers of additional people using the grounds, and the use of the manège for guest parking, also requires substantial external lighting, marshalling throughout the day, including on Mill Lane and the entrance to the manège parking from Tokers Green Lane. Even the general noise and bustle throughout the day and evening across the site would give the property a very different character to a holiday letting use, which, most of the time at least, would be unlikely to be noticeable from outside of the site. I conclude, on the balance of probability, that the use of

the land for weddings in particular, but also other events attracting substantial numbers of attendees, was a use of a distinctly different character to the prior use for holiday letting and residential purposes, having its own discernible impact on its surroundings. These are the hallmarks of a material use in planning terms. The commencement of this use, most likely in 2016, but not before, involved a material change in the character of the use of the land.

15. In order for a ground (d) appeal to be made out, the breach of planning control must amount to a material change of use abiding at the time that the enforcement notice was issued, and that use must have subsisted for a continuous period of at least ten years prior to the issue of the enforcement notice. In this case there has been a material change of use to the single mixed use alleged in the notice, and that use has not subsisted for the requisite 10-year period, so the appeal on ground (d) must fail.

Appeals A and B– ground (a) and the deemed planning applications

16. This ground is that planning permission should be granted for the matters alleged in the notice/s. I deal with the two together because the operational development the subject of Appeal B is integral to the material change of use.

Main issues

17. The main issues in Appeal A are the effect on the character and appearance of the area, the effect on the living conditions of neighbours in terms of noise and disturbance, and the effect on highway safety, and in Appeal B it is the effect on character and appearance and the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. In both appeals I will also consider whether to attach weight to the unauthorised nature of the development.

Planning Policy

18. The South Oxfordshire District Council Local Plan 2035 (LP) has been adopted since the notice was issued and its policies replace the development plan policies stated in the notice. LP Policy STRAT1 sets out the overall strategy, including protecting and enhancing the countryside, particularly within the AONB, by ensuring that outside of the towns and villages any change relates to very specific needs such as agriculture and enhancement of the environment. LP Policy EMP10 supports sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside, while LP Policy EMP11 supports small scale development outside of built-up areas where they are in keeping with the scale and character of the locality. LP Policy ENV1 provides the highest level of protection to the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB and requires that development preserve or enhance its character and natural beauty, while LP Policy ENV12 requires, among other things, consideration of the impact of factors such as noise and artificial light on local amenity. LP Policy DES1 encourages high quality design, with LP Policy DES2 setting out an expectation that new development should be designed to reflect the positive features that make up the character of the local area. LP Policy DES6 expects development proposals to demonstrate that they will not result in significant adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring uses, while LP Policy TRANS5 expects development to be served by an adequate road network which can accommodate traffic without creating traffic hazards or damage to the environment. LP Policy ENV1 also states that the Chilterns

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2019–2024 (AONBMP) is a material consideration. AONBMP Policies DP2 and DP8 aim respectively to avoid harm to tranquility and to keep skies dark at night. Kidmore End Neighbourhood Plan is in development, but it has yet to reach the stage where its policies can be given significant weight.

Character and appearance

19. Despite the presence of the A4074, the area is attractive and tranquil gently rolling countryside with scattered residential development. The lie of the land is such that there are public limited viewpoints of The Copse, the main ones being the garden of the Packhorse public house on the A4074 and passing the site on Mill Lane, though recent felling of woodland may open up views from the public footpath running along a ridgeway to the south.
20. The holding of large events at The Copse is likely to adversely affect tranquility by increasing traffic on the rural lanes serving the site, much of which will arrive and leave in surges, by the generation of noise, particularly late in the day, and by the use of external lighting around the grounds and the manège when it is used for parking. The use of the manège for parking, which involves cars traversing the field adjoining Tokely Green Lane, will also introduce a discordant feature in the landscape, regardless of public visibility. At present there is limited visibility of the manège, though this may change depending on forestry works, but when in use at night in particular it is likely to be more visible from Tokely Green Lane, from where it is likely to appear as an incongruous and evident feature in the landscape.
21. The marquee structure alongside Mill Lane also appears incongruous and visually intrusive, due to its proximity to Mill Lane and its siting on elevated ground, and is likely to be more so if lit up in the evenings. Indeed the character of the Lane itself, particularly as experienced by pedestrians, cyclists and riders, is likely to be significantly adversely affected throughout the day by the presence of the marquee structure when large events are taking place only metres away. The impact of some decking, balcony and steps at The Cottage recently granted permission is not even remotely comparable.
22. While I accept that there is no intention to allow The Copse to be used as a 'Party House', though it has happened apparently inadvertently, I consider that the holding of large events such as weddings, part of the mixed use, and the erection of the marquee structure to facilitate such events, causes harm to the characteristic tranquility of the area and adversely affects the character and natural beauty of the AONB. As such it conflicts with LP policies STRAT1, ENV1 and DES2 and with the guidance in AONBMP Policies DP2 and DP8.

Living conditions

23. Leaving aside the most notable 'Party House' incident associated with the letting of the main house and which undoubtedly caused considerable disturbance to residents along Mill Lane, there can be little dispute that the use of The Copse for the holding of large events such as weddings has caused harm to the living conditions of neighbours through increased noise and disturbance. Mr Stigwood's characterised recordings as revealing what he called "a general cacophony of voices drawing attention due to their

increased volume, character pitch and content” with “prolonged periods of impact with unpredictable periods of greater intensity”, and some nearby residents attested to the negative impact on their living conditions of noise disturbance during events, added to which is the sensory effect of increased lighting, vehicle headlights and general people movement around the property.

24. The main question that arises here is whether the events can be managed in such a way as to avoid disturbing neighbours using noise mitigation measures and event management measures such as marshalling. The erection of the marquee structure with sound insulation and noise containment sound equipment in The Barn are measures that have already been introduced, as has some marshalling and management of traffic and directing attendees to certain parts of the site in the evening. No doubt there has been some mitigation of noise impacts from the site through the use of the marquee, some marshalling and the use of a sound limiter in The Barn. However, this involves reliance on unauthorised operational development, and it is entirely possible that reducing noise impacts to an acceptable level could require further measures such as enclosed walkways, which could involve further operational development, between buildings to help address one of the more difficult areas of control, that of people outside.
25. The idea is to try to move people quickly between enclosed areas, and where people wish to congregate outside they would be directed to parts of the grounds that are away from the nearest residential properties. However, in the context of celebratory events attended by relatively large numbers, whether consuming alcohol or not, I consider that even with the best will in the world noise will be generated that will be audible at some of the neighbouring residential properties, and that occasionally that will be at volumes and/or frequencies that will cause disturbance and harm to living conditions. Reliance on the unauthorised marquee structure to contain noise from speeches and so on is also a matter of concern given it is the subject of an enforcement notice requiring its removal, and I have already found that it conflicts with development plan policies due to its impact on local character and the AONB
26. Overall, on the evidence available I consider that there remains too much doubt about the ability to control noise generation from the site to leave it to be controlled by condition. I conclude accordingly that the proposal would fail to protect the living conditions of neighbours in terms of noise and disturbance, contrary to LP Policies ENV12 and DES6.

Highway safety

27. The Highway Authority has objected on the basis that there would be increased traffic, arriving and leaving in ‘surges’ and much of it unfamiliar with the area, using a part of the local highway network that it considers to fall well below current standards of highway design, and where there is no provision for non-motorised transport modes, walking and cycling. There is little dispute that Mill Lane, being narrow single track for the most part and poorly maintained with no footways or lighting and limited forward visibility for much of its length, is entirely unsuited to the arrival in a short space of time of numerous vehicles, be they private or taxis, and the junction with the A4074 appears to me to be quite hazardous.

28. No doubt in recognition of the unsuitability of Mill Lane, much of the event day traffic is now to be directed to a field gate on Tokely Green Lane from where a long cross-field track is used to access the manège for parking. The cross-field track does not appear to be all-weather, and rises quite steeply to the manège, so it may not be a suitable alternative to Mill Lane for all events. However, while Tokely Green Lane is less unsuited to additional through traffic, being better surfaced and aligned, and slightly wider for the most part, it remains a narrow rural lane without footways or lighting where additional traffic unfamiliar with the roads is likely to constitute a hazard to road users. It links to the A4074 via Rokeby Drive, whose junction with the A4074 also has sub-standard visibility.
29. Given the location of The Copse it is likely that most guests would arrive by private vehicle, and there are few alternatives since there does not appear to be access by public transport or safe walking routes to nearby bus stops, nor are there safe and convenient routes for cyclists and pedestrians. The use of the Tokely Green Lane would be preferable to using Mill Lane for much of the extra traffic, but some would still have to use Mill Lane, and Tokely Green Lane is itself unsuited to increased traffic. In short, The Copse is not served by an adequate road network which can accommodate the additional traffic likely to be generated by the event holding element of the mixed use without creating traffic hazards. As such it conflicts with LP Policy TRANS5.

Intentional unauthorised development

30. It is government planning policy that intentional unauthorised development is a material consideration that should be weighed in the determination of planning applications and appeals. The written ministerial statement explaining this policy expressed concern that where the development of land has been undertaken in advance of obtaining planning permission there is no opportunity to appropriately limit or mitigate the harm that may have been caused. So far as the material change of use is concerned, the way this came about was not necessarily as an intentional breach of planning control, but the same cannot be said of the marquee structure. The erection of the structure deprived the Council of, among other things, assessing its impact on the Mill Lane hedgerow running alongside. This is an important consideration in my view and I give it significant weight.

Planning Balance

31. The development, including the marquee structure, conflicts with development plan policies aimed at protecting the character and natural beauty of the AONB and local character, and the use adversely affects the amenity of neighbouring uses and highway safety. There is some policy support for development that supports rural tourism and leisure and the visitor economy outside of the built-up areas, but that is predicated on the development respecting the character of the countryside and the locality, which the proposals do not do in my view. I acknowledge that getting some income from the overall property is important insofar as it enables Mr Holley to continue to live there, but this does not outweigh the more general planning considerations. I find accordingly that the developments, that is the material change of use of the land and the erection of the marquee structure which partly facilitates the mixed use, are contrary to the development plan

read as a whole, and there are not material considerations to indicate that the appeals should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeals on this ground fail accordingly and planning permission is refused on the deemed applications.

Appeals A and B- ground (f)

32. An appeal on ground (f) is that the requirements of the notice exceed what is necessary to remedy the breach of planning control or the injury to amenity caused by the alleged development. From the notice it is clear that the purpose of both notices in this case is to remedy the breach of planning control, by discontinuing the use in the case of Appeal A, and by restoring the land to its condition before the breach took place in the case of Appeal B.
33. In neither case are lesser steps put forward that would remedy the breach, so the appeals on this ground cannot succeed. I will however vary the requirements in Appeal A so that it is the mixed use that is required to cease rather than individual components. No prejudice arises since the last lawful use can be resumed in any case. In Appeal B, where operational development is concerned and it is required to be demolished or dismantled, it is usual also to require removal from the land of the resulting material, waste and debris. The notice does not include that requirement, but that does not mean, as has been suggested, that the structure could then be erected elsewhere on the land. I should note that I have not dealt with the 'acoustic sound barrier' comprised of hay bales under ground (a) since it is no longer required and is partly demolished. Some remains however and so the requirement to remove it remains appropriate.

Appeals A and B- ground (g)

34. An appeal on ground (g) is that the period specified in the notice falls short of what should be reasonably allowed. The last booked wedding event should finish on 2 October 2021, and many of those scheduled for this year are postponements from 2020 due to Covid. Extended compliance periods were sought to enable those commitments to be met, but as it happens, since the compliance period starts when the notice is upheld, there is sufficient time in any case.

Paul Dignan

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Sarah Clover

Of Counsel

She called

Penney Holley

Appellant

Peter Rogers

Noise Consultant

Ben Temple

Planning Consultant

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Cain Ormondroyd

Of Counsel

He called

Mike Stigwood

Noise Consultant

Madeline Palmer

Planning Officer - Enforcement

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Heather Watson

Charlotte Moore

Marihelen Esam

Stuart Handley

Caroline Lamsdale

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

- 1 Appellant's opening submissions
- 2 Statement of Common Ground - signed
- 3 Email exchange regarding 'lighting, swings, bales, bookings.'
- 4 Planning application - Heritage, design and access statement for Rear garden room, porch extension, alterations with rear decking extension, Hunters Lodge.
- 5 Planning approval ref. P18/S0332/FUL – demolish barn and erect new dwelling, The Coach House, Tokers Green Lane.
- 6 Planning Approval ref P19/S1704/HH - 2 story (sic) oak framed deck with small enclosed porch to southern elevation of cottage, The Copse.
- 7 Government press release 20 March 2021 - New raft of measures to prepare our high streets and seaside resorts for summer
- 8 List of conditions
- 9 Council's proposed noise condition with decibel level boundary map
- 10 Council's closing submissions
- 11 Appellant's closing submissions

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE INQUIRY

- 11 Council's costs application

- 12 Agreed additional noise conditions
- 13 Appellant's costs response
- 14 Council's response to the appellant's costs response