
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2021

by Benjamin Webb BA(Hons) MA MA MSc PGDip(UD) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/W/21/3274424

**Field opposite Rolls Court, Ryalls Lane, Cambridge, Gloucestershire
GL2 7AT**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Joseph Brennan against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.20/1461/COU, dated 19 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a basic touring caravan site, with five pitches, providing water, waste recycle bins.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used the Council's description of development in the banner heading above as it is more precise than that used on the application form.
3. The Council refused planning permission for 3 reasons relating to highway safety, flood risk and ecology. In these circumstances the purpose of lodging an appeal is to challenge the reasons for refusal, with the objective ultimately being to obtain planning permission if successful. In lodging this appeal, the appellant however stated that it was not against the Council's reasons for refusal. At final comments stage the appellant further emphasised that the Council's reasons for refusal were not contested.
4. Though the appellant nonetheless went on to present some arguments in relation to highway safety, these were not apparently directed at the Council's decision. Acceptance of the Council's reasons for refusal in relation to flood risk and ecology was otherwise confirmed. In the absence of any dispute, and given that it is not for me to construct a case for the appellant, it is clear that the appeal must therefore be dismissed.
5. The appellant states that the appeal was instead lodged as a complaint against the procedures used by the Council in determining the application, and in order to ascertain whether a further application could be submitted without paying a fee. However, as it falls outside the scope and purpose of the appeal to address such matters, I can consider them no further.

Conclusion

6. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Benjamin Webb

INSPECTOR