



Appeal Decisions

Hearing held on 25 October 2022

Site visits made on 25 and 26 October 2022

by Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2022

Appeal A - Ref: APP/K0425/W/22/3302360

Plot 4-5, Askett Village Lane, Askett, Princes Risborough HP27 9LF

- 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 and Mrs Jason Doe against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/06255/FUL, dated 6 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is the Material Change of Use of land for stationing of caravans for residential occupation for Gypsy-Traveller site with associated development (creation/alteration of access from highway, fencing, hard standing and utility block) - part retrospective.
-

Appeal B - Ref: APP/K0425/W/22/3303409

Plot 2-3, Askett Village Lane, Askett, Princes Risborough HP27 9LF

- 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 and Mrs H Doe against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/06394/FUL, dated 17 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is the Material Change of Use of land for stationing of caravans for residential occupation for Gypsy-Traveller site with associated development (creation/alteration of access from highway, fencing, hard standing and utility block) - part retrospective.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for the Material Change of Use of land for stationing of caravans for residential occupation for Gypsy-Traveller site with associated development (creation/alteration of access from highway, fencing, hard standing and utility block) at Plot 4-5, Askett Village Lane, Askett, Princes Risborough HP27 9LF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/06255/FUL, dated 6 May 2022, subject to the conditions set out in Schedule A.
2. Appeal B is allowed and planning permission is granted for the Material Change of Use of land for stationing of caravans for residential occupation for Gypsy-Traveller site with associated development (creation/alteration of access from highway, fencing, hard standing and utility block) at Plot 2-3, Askett Village Lane, Askett, Princes Risborough HP27 9LF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/06394/FUL, dated 17 May 2022, subject to the conditions set out in Schedule B.

Preliminary Matters

3. I undertook an accompanied site visit on the day of the hearing. I was also asked to view the site in long distance views from Whiteleaf Hill, as well as from a public right of way to the south and from Lower Ickneild Way to the west. I did this on an unaccompanied basis on the day following the hearing.
4. At the hearing, the parties agreed that policy DM2 of the Delivery and Site Allocations Plan (adopted July 2013), which was referenced in the refusal reason regarding accessibility, was not relevant to the appeal scheme. I have therefore not had regard to this policy.
5. I have removed reference to "part retrospective" from both formal decisions above, as this does not describe the development applied for.
6. The Statement of Common Ground sets out that the Gypsy status of the appellants is not disputed. Based on the information before me and what I heard at the hearing, I see no reason to take a different view and I have considered the appeals on that basis.

Main Issues

7. In respect of both appeals, the main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including any effect on locally identified buffer areas,
 - Whether the location is accessible to nearby settlements and facilities, and
 - The effect of other considerations, including the need for gypsy and traveller accommodation, on the overall planning balance.

Reasons

Character and appearance

8. The two contiguous appeal sites comprise a small part of what is a larger field parcel, which itself is part of the wider, open rural area that surrounds the sites. This rural area is an expansive, generally flat stretch of countryside with only a scattering of built development present. Nonetheless, an obvious feature of the area was a large agricultural building that had been erected nearby to the south.
9. Development has already taken place, with Plot 4-5 containing a dayroom, mobile trailer with toilet facilities and four touring caravans, while plot 2-3 contains a static caravan and two touring caravans.
10. Along the adjacent road, referred to as Askett village road, there is a high degree of screening provided by the existing, mature boundary hedging. Nonetheless, views into each of the sites are possible through the vehicular access points. In these views, the developments appear incongruous and diminish the rural character of the location. However, as the Council agreed, views of the existing development are localised, and I observed that generally views are not available of the sites from the surrounding area when moving east or west along the village road.
11. My attention was drawn to distance views of the site from a location to the southeast, from Whiteleaf Hill and I visited this location following the hearing to observe these views. The vantage point from this location allows for expansive,

elevated views towards the appeal sites and over the surrounding landscape. I agree with the Council that this view is an important one and it allows for an appreciation of the vastness and openness of the landscape that surrounds the sites. However, from this distance the appearance of the appeal sites within the landscape is only a very minor element. The existing development is viewed within the context of the nearby agricultural building, equestrian buildings, and various, albeit limited in number, structures that are also part of this sprawling vista. In this context, I find that there would be very little effect on the appreciation of the landscape from this position.

12. In finding that the schemes would appear as incongruous elements within the rural landscape, I am conscious of the conclusions of the Inspector who considered the previous appeals¹ on the site, which were for all intents and purposes, physically identical schemes, save for the alteration of some boundary treatments. In that case, the Inspector identified that the schemes would be harmful to the area's character and appearance, and with that I agree. I do not consider that additional landscaping would be sufficient to mitigate the harmful effect.
13. Since the time of the previous appeal decision, the Princes Risborough Expansion Supplementary Planning Document (March 2021) has been published and this document includes an Urban Design Framework, of which I was provided with a copy of at the hearing, which outlines the extent and layout of the proposed extension of the nearby settlement, which is allocated within the development plan. This plan indicates that much of the countryside to the southwest of the appeal sites is to be developed as part of the settlement. While this would bring development closer to the appeal sites than currently exists, it would not be contiguous with them, as an area of open land between would remain. Consequently, the appeal sites would continue to be in the countryside and the harm that I have identified would persist. Furthermore, there is no certainty as to when, or if, the proposed expansion will take place. Until such time that it does, the context of the appeal site would not change.
14. The site is influenced by both the Princes Risborough Strategic Buffer, as well as the Longwick Rural Identity Buffer. The entirety of both appeal sites lies within the strategic buffer, which is intended to ensure that Princes Risborough, as well as its planned expansion, remains separate from other nearby settlements. Following discussion at the hearing, it was agreed that the rural identity buffer encompasses the majority of appeal site A and only a very small portion of appeal site B. This buffer is intended to ensure that the nearby settlement of Longwick retains its separate rural identity.
15. As identified within the previous appeal decisions, the sites would occupy a space that is located between a number of nearby settlements. Notwithstanding the presence of other sporadic development nearby, the appeal schemes, both individually and cumulatively, would intrude into the gap between settlements and would serve to erode the green and rural attributes of the existing separation. In my view, the scale of each of the developments is not small scale, such as is envisaged by policy. As such, the schemes would conflict with the purposes of the respective buffers.
16. Accordingly, I find that the appeal schemes, both individually and when considered together, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the

¹ APP/K0425/W/18/3212259 and APP/K0425/W/18/3212260

area, and this includes conflicting with the purposes of the designated buffers. Thus, the schemes would conflict with policies PR5, DM26 and DM32 of the Wycombe District Local Plan (adopted August 2019) (the Local Plan), as well as policy A3 of the Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Neighbourhood Plan (adopted March 2018). Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that only small scale development is permitted in the strategic buffer that protects the rural character, that proposals for Traveller sites address any adverse visual impact and that development protects and reinforces positive key characteristics of the landscape.

Accessibility

17. It is agreed between the parties that the appeal sites lie within 400 metres (m) of the edge of Askett village, and approximately 600m from the centre of the village. There is a bus stop about 1 kilometre (km) to the east, where there is a frequent service between High Wycombe and Aylesbury. The nearest train station is at Monks Risborough, around 1.3km distant, and some shops about 1.8km away.
18. Other services lie further from the sites, with Princes Risborough at about 3km distant providing a supermarket, doctors surgery and secondary school. Primary schools are approximately 1.8km and 2.2km, at Monks Risborough and Great Kimble, respectively.
19. Notwithstanding the distances outlined above, in order to access any of the limited services within walking distance, it would be necessary for residents to walk eastwards, along Askett village road. I observed that on the occasions I visited, that this was a relatively busy road, with a variety of vehicles travelling along it. Furthermore, given the straight alignment of the road within the vicinity of the site, vehicles were travelling along it at speed. While I note the comments made that the occupants of the site can and do walk along the road into the nearby village, I consider it neither safe nor attractive to all users to do so. There are no footways along the road, and while there is a verge that allows walkers refuge from passing traffic, this is not present for the entirety of the journey on foot. Moreover, walking would be particularly unappealing during the hours of darkness, given the lack of street lighting, and during inclement weather.
20. Consequently, it is highly likely in my view that occupants would be reliant on the car in order to access services, as a result of the distance to them and the lack of sustainable transport options. Accordingly, the appeal sites are not positioned at a location that is accessible to nearby settlements and facilities by sustainable means of transport. In this respect, both schemes conflict with policies DM26 and DM33 of the Local Plan, insofar as they seek to ensure that traveller sites relate well to a settlement with access to services and that development is located where there is safe and convenient access to services and facilities.

Other considerations

Local need for sites

21. The Council relies on the Aylesbury Vale, Chiltern, South Bucks and Wycombe District Councils - Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (February 2017) (the GTAA), which it considers to be the most reliable assessment currently available. This document identified that within the Wycombe District, there may be a need for up to 7 pitches. This includes the need arising from households which meet the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (the

PPTS) definition, as well as those where the status is unknown. The Council highlights 6 pitches have been granted, leaving up to one pitch being needed according to the GTAA figures.

22. However, it was accepted by the Council at the hearing that the GTAA is likely to be an underestimate of need and that need in the area has risen since the GTAA was published. In this respect, it was accepted that the GTAA is not reflective of current need. The appellant estimated that there was a need for between 20 and 30 pitches and based on the discussion at the hearing, I find that this is likely.
23. While I appreciate that the Council is in the process of scoping a new GTAA in order to support a new development plan, this is at a very early stage and no work has yet been commissioned on this.

Personal circumstances

Appeal A

24. Plot 4-5 is occupied by the appellants and their extended family, which includes their children, grandchildren and one of the parents of the appellants. The family occupy three units within the appeal site; four persons within each. The circumstances of the occupiers include two individuals with health conditions, which are potentially serious in nature. Having a settled base means that these individuals are able to access regular and reliable treatment.
25. I was informed that one of the elder of the appellant's children regularly attends college and is undertaking a Masters degree, as well as working part time in High Wycombe. One of the caravans would be occupied by another of the appellant's children, together with their partner and young children, some of whom attend the local primary school. One of the other children residing on the appeal site is home schooled. Residing at the site facilitates access to educational services and facilities for these individuals. Thus, having to vacate the site would likely disrupt the currently stable education of the individuals concerned.
26. The occupants have no other site to move to and should they have to leave the site would be forced to resort to living on the roadside, effectively meaning that they would all be homeless, and they would be deprived of their home.

Appeal B

27. Plot 2-3 is occupied by the appellants and their son and partner. Each of the appellants suffer from a number of health conditions, which are again potentially serious. Being resident at the site allows for them to receive regular and dependable treatment for their conditions.
28. As above, the occupants of the site currently have no other site which they can move to and would be forced to live at the roadside should they be unable to continue to occupy the appeal site. This would result in homelessness and would dispossess the occupants of their current home.

Best interests of the children

29. I am conscious that there are children living at the site of Appeal A, who are of school age. The best interests of these children are a primary consideration in the determination of this appeal. Should I be minded to dismiss Appeal A, the children would be adversely affected, through the loss of their current home, as well as it being likely that there would be a disruption to their schooling, both in terms of

potentially not being able to attend the local primary school, as well as it being difficult to home school a child when living on the roadside.

Other Matters

30. I have had regard to comments received from interested parties in respect of the potential for the developments to deter investment in the wider area, the noise from the presence of dogs, vehicles and construction activities, as well as odours from bonfires and the presence of litter. On the basis of what is before me, I find that there is no substantive evidence of unacceptable harm being caused in these respects. Moreover, I have no reason to find that any occupants contribute towards anti-social behaviour in the area.
31. There is also reference to the visual harm caused by the developments, resulting in harm to the countryside, as well as the effect of vehicles parked within the sites. I have had regard to the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area, including these matters, in my consideration of the main issues above. My findings in this respect are reflected in the planning balance below. There is also mention of the site being in the Green Belt, which it is not.
32. Interested parties have raised that to allow development would set a precedent for further pitches at this location and there is potential for 40 pitches to be developed on the remainder of the site. However, I have assessed the schemes on the basis of the information that is before me and on their individual merits. The balance of considerations would inevitably be different for any future schemes that come forward and as such my decision in these cases would not set any precedent for unacceptable development.
33. In respect of integration with the local community, while I note some assertion that this is lacking, I am also conscious that a representation was received at the hearing from a local resident attesting to occupiers at the site being very much part of the local community. As such, this is not a matter that weighs against the appeals.
34. I am aware that following the dismissal of the previous appeals on the sites that the Council has pursued legal action against the occupants, in the form of injunctions. While this is noted, I have assessed the schemes before me on their individual merits, based on the information that has been presented to me. While some of my findings may therefore differ from the previous Inspector, this has been on the basis of the clarification of certain matters, as well as specific changes to material circumstances.

Planning Balance

35. The development of the appeal sites as proposed would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Albeit, that this would be mitigated to some degree in that the effect would be localised, with any impact diminishing as distance from the site increases. Nonetheless, there would be some intrusion into the locally identified buffer areas. I have also identified that harm would result from the reliance on the use of the private car. However, the acceptance that gypsy traveller sites can be located in the countryside, reduces the weight that I attach to harm in this respect. Thus, I accord moderate weight to the collective harms that would result from the developments.
36. There are factors in favour of the proposals which must be balanced against this harm. I find that there is a need for sites as I set out above. This in my view

carries modest weight in favour of the proposals. I have had regard to the personal circumstances of the occupants currently residing on the appeal sites. In both cases, I find that there would likely be severe consequences for the individuals involved if they were required to relocate from the sites. In light of the Council accepting that there are currently no alternative sites available to the appellants, being unable to occupy the appeal sites would make them homeless, having to resort to roadside living. I do not find this to be an acceptable alternative and thus I accord the personal circumstances of the appellants, in both appeals, significant weight.

37. I am acutely aware that in the consideration of the previous appeals on the sites, the Inspector considered that the benefits that would accrue to the occupiers carried no more than moderate weight in the planning balance. This was predominantly due to the fact that the occupation of the appeal sites was brought about by deliberate unauthorised development. The Inspector at that time concluded that the decision to move to the sites, without first having the benefit of planning permission, was not forced on the appellants but was theirs alone. In such circumstances, it was decided that this tempered the weight attached to personal circumstances. While this is noted, I am also conscious that the appellants have clarified that initially occupation of one of the sites was driven by the health problems of two of the occupants. To my mind, while this does not mean unauthorised occupation is excusable, it is at least understandable. In such circumstances, bearing in mind that this matter has been clarified since the Inspector made the previous decisions, and given that both sites are occupied by an extended family, I consider that this does not significantly weaken the existing personal circumstances of the appellants.
38. As such, on the one hand there is harm to the character and appearance of the area, together with a lack of accessibility by sustainable transport modes. These matters are afforded moderate weight. On the other, there are the personal circumstances of the existing occupants, not least the best interests of the children that are present and the resulting homelessness for all involved. I also find that there is a moderate need for sites in the area. I accord these matters considerable weight, sufficient to outweigh the harm.
39. A significant part of the weight I accord to the personal circumstances in each of these cases relies on the consequences to the occupiers of there being no available alternative site that they are currently able to move to. I am aware that the current Buckinghamshire Council has been formed from the merger of a number of former district authorities and as a result is required to produce and adopt a new development plan by April 2025. This will necessitate the production of a new GTAA to assess the current need for pitches within the authority area, or discrete parts of it, as well as producing policies and possibly allocations for the provision of new gypsy traveller sites. As such, I find that there is a realistic potential for the situation in respect of pitch provision to change in the foreseeable future. As a result of this change, I find there to be a prospect of alternative sites becoming available.
40. Consequently, in these two cases, having regard to the balance of harms versus benefits, I find that it would be both reasonable and appropriate to grant a temporary planning permission. Given the period within which the plan is envisaged to be adopted, together with allowing an appropriate amount of time for the appellants to identify and secure alternative site provision, I consider that a temporary permission for a duration of 4 years would be appropriate.

Conditions

41. As I have had specific regard to the personal circumstances of the site occupiers, I find that a condition specifying a personal permission is necessary and I also find it necessary to limit occupation to gypsy travellers more generally. The Council have suggested that, if planning permission is to be granted, it should be subject to a condition limiting occupation of the site to Gypsies and Travellers as defined in Annex A of the PPTS. However, the Court of Appeal in *Smith* held that the exclusion of Travellers who have ceased to travel permanently is discriminatory and has no legitimate aim.
42. There is no foretelling as to whether any occupiers might be forced to cease travelling permanently during the anticipated lifetime of the permission. Imposing the suggested condition could result in unlawful discrimination, with members of the family being unable to live on this site. I shall therefore grant planning permission in each case subject to a condition which restricts occupation to Gypsies and Travellers, defined so as to not exclude those who have ceased travelling permanently.
43. Furthermore, the permissions should be for a temporary period of up to 4 years, with a requirement to re-instate the sites afterwards. I have also included a plans condition to define the extent of the permissions.
44. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have included conditions to limit the number of caravans that can be located in each of the sites, to prevent commercial uses taking place and limiting the size of vehicles that can be parked on the sites. For the same reason, I have included a condition preventing external lighting and any additional means of enclosure, other than in accordance with agreed details.
45. Power at the appeal sites is provided through the use of on-site generators. I am aware of some concern over the level of noise that these produce. Accordingly, I have included a condition requiring details of noise mitigation to be submitted for approval. A condition has been recommended in respect of the laying out of the parking and turning areas within the site, which I consider to be necessary. A further condition is suggested in relation to the laying out of the vehicular access. I noted however that the accesses were already existing, afforded appropriate access and egress, with adequate visibility, as well as there being no sign of loose material being carried on to the highway. As such, I find that the condition in this respect is not necessary.

Conclusion

46. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeals should succeed, and that temporary planning permission should be granted in respect of both appeals.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE A – CONDITIONS IN RESPECT OF APPEAL A

- 1) The use hereby permitted shall be carried on only by the following:

- Mr Jason and Mrs Jane Bull,
- Jason Bull,
- Jimmy Bull,
- Garry Bull,
- Janey Bull,
- Amos Bull,
- Mrs Jean Bull,
- Mr John and Mrs Lisa Doe, and
- any resident dependants,

and shall be for a limited period being the period of 4 years from the date of this decision, or the period during which the premises are occupied by them, whichever is the shorter.

- 2) The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than Gypsies and Travellers, defined as persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.
- 3) The use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, equipment and materials brought onto the land for the purposes of such use shall be removed within 60 days of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in i) to iv) below:
- i) Within 3 months of the date of this decision a scheme for
- the restoration of the site to its condition before the development took place, (or as otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority) at the end of the period for which planning permission is granted for the use, or the site is occupied by those permitted to do so,
 - external lighting, and
 - noise mitigation in respect of any onsite generators,
- (hereafter referred to as the site development scheme) shall have been submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority and the scheme shall include a timetable for its implementation.
- ii) If within 9 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve the scheme or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State.
- iii) If an appeal is made in pursuance of ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.
- iv) The approved scheme shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable.
- v) Upon implementation of the approved scheme specified in this condition, that scheme in respect of external lighting and noise mitigation shall thereafter be retained.

In the event of a legal challenge to this decision, or to a decision made pursuant to the procedure set out in this condition, the operation of the time limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

- 4) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, the hardstanding for the parking (and turning) of vehicles shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with that shown on the approved plans and therefore retained.
- 5) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - 1:2500 scale location plan,
 - Proposed site layout plan,
 - Proposed Timber Post and Rail Fence, and
 - Proposed Utility Blocks plan.
- 6) No more than 6 caravans, as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 as amended (of which no more than 3 shall be static caravans) shall be stationed on the site at any time.
- 7) No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials.
- 8) No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on this site.
- 9) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any other order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modifications), no walls, fences or other means of enclosure other than those shown on the approved plans shall be erected on the site unless details of their size, materials and location shall have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

SCHEDULE B – CONDITIONS IN RESPECT OF APPEAL B

- 1) The use hereby permitted shall be carried on only by the following:
 - Mr Henry and Mrs Emily Doe,
 - Mr Henry Doe (Jr) and Ms Bonny Farhat, and
 - any resident dependants,and shall be for a limited period being the period of 4 years from the date of this decision, or the period during which the premises are occupied by them, whichever is the shorter.
- 2) The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than Gypsies and Travellers, defined as persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.
- 3) The use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, equipment and materials brought onto the land for the purposes of such use

shall be removed within 60 days of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in i) to iv) below:

- i) Within 3 months of the date of this decision a scheme for
 - the restoration of the site to its condition before the development took place, (or as otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority) at the end of the period for which planning permission is granted for the use, or the site is occupied by those permitted to do so,
 - external lighting, and
 - noise mitigation in respect of any onsite generators,(hereafter referred to as the site development scheme) shall have been submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority and the scheme shall include a timetable for its implementation.
- ii) If within 9 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve the scheme or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State.
- iii) If an appeal is made in pursuance of ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.
- iv) The approved scheme shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable.
- v) Upon implementation of the approved scheme specified in this condition, that scheme in respect of external lighting and noise mitigation shall thereafter be retained.

In the event of a legal challenge to this decision, or to a decision made pursuant to the procedure set out in this condition, the operation of the time limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

- 4) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, the hardstanding for the parking (and turning) of vehicles shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with that shown on the approved plans and therefore retained.
- 5) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - 1:2500 scale location plan,
 - Proposed site layout plan,
 - Proposed Timber Post and Rail Fence, and
 - Proposed Utility Blocks plan.
- 6) No more than 3 caravans, as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 as amended (of which no more than 1 shall be a static caravan) shall be stationed on the site at any time.
- 7) No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials.
- 8) No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on this site.

- 9) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any other order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modifications), no walls, fences or other means of enclosure other than those shown on the approved plans shall be erected on the site unless details of their size, materials and location shall have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

End of Conditions

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Alison Heine	Appellant's agent
Sham Uddin	Barrister
Tahseen Choudhry	Solicitor
Jason and Jane Doe	Appellants, Appeal A
Henry and Emily Doe	Appellants, Appeal B

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Philippa Jarvis BSc (Hons), DipTP, MRTPI	Planning Consultant, instructed by Buckinghamshire Council
Maria Whyte	Planning Enforcement Officer, Buckinghamshire Council

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

1. Copy of plan showing planned expansion – Princes Risborough Expansion Supplementary Planning Document, March 2021
2. Letter of support

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOLLOWING CLOSE OF HEARING

1. Additional Highways conditions
2. Medical information in respect of Henry and Emily Doe