
Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 7 September 2022

Site visit made on 7 September 2022

by Paul Freer BA (Hons) LLM PhD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P3420/C/18/3218107

Land at Boggs Cottages, Keele Road, Newcastle-under-Lyme ST5 5AB

- 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 Mr Thomas Maughan against an enforcement notice issued by Newcastle-Under-Lyme Borough Council.
- The enforcement notice was issued on 9 November 2018.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is that on 5th February 1992 the Council granted planning permission ref. N21428 ("the planning permission") for the use of a mobile home on the land as a dwelling subject to conditions. Condition 1 of the planning permission is that the permission shall enure for the benefit of Mr. Leonard Edwards and any relatives or dependants living with him.

Condition 1 has not been complied with in that the mobile home on the Land is no longer occupied by Mr. Leonard Edwards but is occupied by persons who are no relatives or dependants of Mr. Leonard Edwards.

- The requirements of the notice are:
 - a) Cease the residential occupation of the mobile home on the Land.
 - b) Remove the mobile home from the Land
 - c) Remove from the Land all material associated with the residential use of the land.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 4 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) (a), (f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
-

Summary Decision: the appeal is allowed, the enforcement is quashed and planning permission is granted in the terms set out in the Formal Decision below.

Procedural matters

1. The Council accepts that Mr Maughan and his dependants are gypsies and travellers within the definition in Annex 1 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). On the evidence before me, I see no reason to take a different view.
2. The occupiers of the neighbouring residential properties point out that the mobile home/site is often left unoccupied for long periods of time. This leads them to question whether the appeal site is genuinely used for residential purposes. However, the appellant explained that he travels for work, typically in the Blackburn area, where amongst other things he buys and sells cars, paves driveways and undertakes various odd jobs. In my view, protracted periods when the appellant is not in occupation of the appeal site are entirely consistent with a nomadic habit of life. Indeed, if anything, that pattern of

occupation reinforces my conclusion that the appellant meets the definition in Annex 1 of the PPTS.

The appeal on ground (a) and the deemed planning application

3. The ground of appeal is that, in respect of any breach of planning control which may be constituted by the matters stated in the notice, planning permission ought to be granted. The appeal site is within the Green Belt. The Council has stated one substantive reason for issuing the enforcement notice, from which the main issues raised are:
 - whether the breach of planning control alleged in the notice is inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and the PPTS
 - and
 - if the breach of planning control alleged in the notice is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

Whether the proposal is inappropriate development for the purposes of the Framework and the PPTS

4. Section 177(5) of the 1990 Act provides that where an appeal against an enforcement notice is brought under section 174 of that Act, the appellant shall be deemed to have made an application for planning permission in respect of *the matters stated in the enforcement notice as constituting a breach of planning control* (emphasis added). In this case, the matters stated in the notice are, in essence, the use of a mobile home on the land as a dwelling.
5. The appellant meets the definition of a gypsy and traveller in Annex 1 of the PPTS. It is the appellant who, together with his family, occupies the dwelling (in fact, a mobile home) and intends to continue doing so. Consequently, it seems to me that the matters stated in the notice should be regarded as use of the land as a gypsy and traveller site. Policy E of the PPTS makes it clear that traveller sites (temporary or permanent) are inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
6. The inappropriateness of the development in the Green Belt is also contrary to Policy S3 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme Local Plan (Local Plan) which provides that, within the Green Belt, there will be a presumption against any form of development, subject to a number of exceptions set out in the policy itself. The provision of traveller sites is not one of the exceptions listed in Policy S3.

Other considerations

7. A number of other considerations were advanced during the Hearing, both in support of and objection to the breach of planning control that has occurred. The main considerations are as follows.

Openness of the Green Belt

8. The appeal site comprises a former residential garden located to the rear of the side garden of No.4 Boggs Cottages, one of a terrace of four stone-built

cottages fronting Keele Road. The site is well screened from public vantage points, with lines of trees along its western and northern boundaries and shielded by the built form of Boggs Cottages in views from the east. There is also a substantial hedge along the southern boundary of the appeal site, together with a double garage.

9. The Courts have held that matters relevant to the openness of the Green Belt are a matter of planning judgement, and that openness can have both a spatial aspect as well as a visual aspect. In spatial terms, by reason of its size, the stationing of the mobile home on the appeal site significantly harms the openness of the Green Belt in this location. In visual terms, the harm to the openness of the Green Belt is to a large extent mitigated by the screening around the appeal site, particularly so when viewed from public vantage points on Keele Road.
10. However, the openness of the Green Belt in this location, both in spatial terms and in visual terms, is adversely affected by the presence of the double garage on the southern boundary of the appeal site. This double garage is bulky in both form and appearance, and is clearly visible from Keele Road. The garage does not have the benefit of planning permission, but there is no dispute that it has become lawful through the passage of time and is now immune from enforcement action.
11. The appellant has offered to remove that double garage in order to offset the harm to the openness of the Green Belt resulting from the stationing of the mobile home and the associated residential use of the appeal site. I am satisfied that the removal of the double garage can be secured through the imposition of a suitably worded condition.
12. In my view, the removal of the prominently sited double garage would result in a net benefit to the openness of the Green Belt compared to the retention of the mobile home (plus one touring caravan to facilitate the appellant's nomadic habit of life) in this well-screened location.

Living conditions

13. The occupiers of some of the neighbouring residential properties describe various incidents and activities which they consider have adversely affected the enjoyment of their homes as well as their well-being. These include vehicles associated with the appeal site being parked in such a way as to hinder access to their own parking spaces and/or drive, and that the appeal site has no facilities for the disposal of sewage and no water supply.
14. These matters are clearly of concern to these residents but, it seems to me, the effects take place intermittently. I am also mindful that the impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties formed no part of the reasons for issuing the enforcement notice and that the impacts described by the residents could be overcome or mitigated by the imposition of conditions. I therefore attach moderate weight to these concerns.
15. The occupiers of these properties also refer to other impacts, including the alleged dumping of rubbish and the disposal of waste, the effect on the value/saleability of their properties and not feeling secure in their homes. However, whilst again recognising the importance of these issues to the

occupiers, these are not planning considerations and are therefore matters outside of my remit.

Intentional unauthorised development

16. The Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) of December 2015 introduced a planning policy to make intentional unauthorised development a material consideration that would be weighed in the determination of planning applications and appeals. In considering whether the occupation of the appeal site by the appellant constitutes intentional unauthorised development, it is first necessary to establish the nature of the development that took place. That in turn requires that I set out the planning history in some detail.
17. In 1986, planning permission was granted on appeal for the siting of a mobile home on the site, subject to a condition restricting the occupancy of the mobile home to a Mr Edwards only and any relatives or dependents living with him (Council Ref: N14847). Planning permission was then granted in 1992 for a larger mobile home on the site and additional land, subject to the same restrictions on occupancy (Council Ref: N21428).
18. In 2007, two separate applications were submitted to remove condition 1 of planning permission N21428. Both were refused and a subsequent appeal against the refusal of the second application was dismissed on the grounds that the removal of the condition would result in a permanent dwelling in the Green Belt which would constitute inappropriate development and reduce the openness of the Green Belt which would be harmful to the purpose of the Green Belt (APP/P3420/A/07/2056015).
19. An Enforcement Notice was issued on 9 June 2016 alleging the storage of a mobile home, and requiring the removal of the mobile home and associated paraphernalia by 13 January 2017. The notice was served on Mr Edwards, amongst others, but not on the current appellant. That Enforcement Notice has not been complied with and still has effect.
20. In November 2016, a planning application was submitted by the current appellant seeking approval for the variation of condition 1 of N21248 in order to allow occupation of the mobile home by Thomas Maughan, Eileen McDonagh and their dependents. The application was refused and the subsequent appeal was dismissed (APP/P3420/W/17/3173188).
21. Notwithstanding the outcome of that appeal, the appellant purchased the site and the mobile home and took up occupation. The Council took the view that, at that point, a new breach of planning control had commenced and the Enforcement Notice that is the subject of this appeal was issued.
22. At the Hearing, Mr Maughan maintained that he did not understand the relevance of the occupancy condition imposed on planning permission N21248. That is simply not a credible position. It is apparent from the sequence of events outlined above that Mr Maughan was fully aware of the occupancy condition: he submitted a planning application seeking to have it removed and, when that was refused, lodged an appeal against that decision. That appeal failed and yet he still occupied the site. In my view, that action was a deliberate and blatant breach of planning control, and constituted intentional unauthorised development.

23. The WMS pre-dates the revised Framework, which does not include this provision. Nevertheless, the WMS has not been withdrawn and therefore remains a material consideration. The fact that the provision has not been translated into national policy in my view reduces the weight to be given to the WMS as a material consideration, but it does nevertheless attract some weight. In the particular circumstances of this case, based on my assessment of Mr Maughan's understanding of the consequences of his actions, I afford this matter significant weight.

Consistency of decision making

24. It is a fundamental principle of planning control that each case must be considered on its own merits. Nevertheless, consistency is an important aspect of decision making and in this case there has been a history of appeal decisions that are individually and collectively material considerations in this case.
25. In the first appeal, in 1986, the Inspector granted a temporary planning permission for the use of the mobile home as a dwelling (APP/P3420/A/86/049810). The permission was subject to an occupancy condition.
26. In 2007, an appeal against the refusal of an application to remove condition 1 of planning permission N21428 was dismissed (APP/P3420/A/07/2056015). The Inspector found that the creation of a permanent dwelling would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that very special circumstances did not exist to clearly outweigh the harm. Those circumstances included the personal circumstances of the (then) appellant.
27. The previous appeal by the current appellant was also dismissed (APP/P3420/W/17/3173188). The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for the variation of condition 1 of N21248 in order to allow occupation of the mobile home by Mr Maughan and his family. In that context, the material considerations then before the Inspector were broadly similar to those that are now before me. The Inspector found that the proposal would cause substantial harm to the Green Belt but that the other considerations did not clearly outweigh the totality of the harm identified.
28. The point made by the Council is that Inspectors have consistently found that the stationing of a mobile home on the appeal site causes substantial harm to the Green Belt and has not been outweighed by other considerations, including the personal circumstances of the current appellant. The Council considers that there have not been any material changes in circumstances since the previous appeal submitted by the appellant was dismissed, such that there is no reason to depart from the Inspector's conclusions in dismissing that appeal.
29. There is, however, one significant material consideration that is now before me but which was not before the Inspector in that previous appeal. This is the proposed demolition of the double garage and the consequent net improvement to the openness of the Green Belt. The appellant maintains that this was advanced as a possibility before the Inspector in the previous appeal but there is no reference to it in her decision and it clearly forms no part of her reasoning. Consequently, whilst I have had regard to the findings of the Inspectors in all the previous appeals, the case before can be distinguished from those appeals for that reason.

Accessibility of the appeal site

30. The accessibility criteria set out for traveller sites in paragraph 13 of the PPTS do not include distance from or means of transport to shops and services, but do refer to considerations which are unique to traveller site applications: for example, the provision of a settled base can reduce the need for long distance travelling and that traditional lifestyles, whereby some travellers live and work from the same location, can omit travel to work journeys and contribute to sustainability.
31. In general terms, the criteria set out in the PPTS apply to the appellant and his family. It is, however, still necessary to consider the site-specific factors and how they relate to the personal circumstances of the appellant and his family.
32. In that context, there is a convenience store and a doctors surgery located in the University campus, which is a short distance from the appeal site and served by bus stops. The walk to those facilities is primarily on pavements with street lighting. Apart from that, the nearest facilities are located in Keele, including primary and secondary schools and a church. The appellant explained that his older children use the bus to get to school, but that he drives the younger children to school. He also drives on occasion to Newcastle-under-Lyme for larger shopping trips.
33. Consequently, whilst the site is in an accessible location, occupation of its does require use of a car for some activities, albeit the journeys are relatively short. Accordingly, the sustainable location of the appeal site is qualified but in this respect does comply with Policy CSP7 of the Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent Core Spatial Strategy which, amongst other things, states that gypsy and traveller pitches provides good access to shops, education, healthcare facilities and other essentials services.

The need for gypsy and traveller sites

34. Policy B of the PPTS states that local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites against their locally set targets. The Council concedes that it cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites and that there is a need for further sites for gypsies and travellers nationally, regionally and locally.
35. The Final Report of the Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showperson Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) produced for the Council was published in September 2020 identified a shortfall of 5 pitches over the next five years and a need for 14 pitches to 2037. It is evident that there is a local need for gypsy and traveller pitches.
36. Nevertheless, Policy E of the PPTS makes it clear that, subject to the best interests of the child, personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt and any other harm so as to establish very special circumstances. That is repeated in Policy H of the PPTS. For that reason, I attach only limited weight to the unmet need identified in the GTAA.

Alternative sites

37. The Council accepts that it cannot point to any suitable sites that are available to the appellant to move onto. The corollary is that, in the event that the

notice is upheld, it is likely that the appellant and his family would be forced to return to living on the roadside. This would adversely affect the health and well-being of the appellant and his family. That is a consideration to which I attach significant weight.

Personal circumstances of the appellant and his family

38. The appellant and his wife live on the site with their five children. The family are generally in good health, although Mrs Maughan regularly attends a doctor's surgery in the town centre where she is receiving treatment for mental health issues. Their eldest child is home educated, having stopped attending school due to concerns about being continually moved on from previous schools. Their other children either are now, or will imminently be, attending schools in the local area. Those children that are already attending school are doing well, having made friends with children in the settled community.
39. The Council has questioned the appellant's evidence in relation to their children's education, having never witnessed the appellant or his family being present on the site during the course of several visits. The Council did contact the school, which had no record of pupils being registered under the appellant's surname.
40. In response, the appellant has provided a letter from a previous school attended by the appellant's children, described by the school itself as being a 'Base School', in which it stated that the children have attended five other schools during the 2016-2016 academic year. The letter goes on to state that the children are working far below age related expectations and the school puts this down to the family being constantly moved on. In another letter, from a different school and dating to November 2019, it is confirmed that two children from the appellant's family joined the school in September of that year and have settled extremely well. That is consistent with the evidence given by the appellant at the Hearing.
41. There is an element of conflict between the evidence of the appellant and the observations of the Council and local residents in this respect. The evidence of the latter is that the appellant and his family are rarely at the appeal site which, I accept, does bring into question the verbal evidence of the appellant. Furthermore, the written evidence is now at least three years old and there is no documentary evidence to show that the initial good attendance of the children at the school has continued (making allowance for any non-attendance due to the Coronavirus pandemic).
42. In seeking to reconcile that conflict, I am mindful that the appellant and his family have a nomadic habit of life and that periods of absence from the appeal site are consistent with that. The written evidence, although somewhat dated, does show that the appellant's children have attended various schools in different locations. On balance, I am therefore prepared to accept the appellant's evidence. Policy E of the PPTS makes it clear that, subject to the best interests of the child, personal circumstances are unlikely to clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt and any other harm so as to establish very special circumstances. In this case, the provision of a stable base from which to access education is clearly in the best interest of the appellant's children. The best interest of these children is a primary consideration, and inherently carries as much weight as any other consideration.

Human Rights and the Public Sector Equality Duty

43. Paragraph 3 of the PPTS states that the Government's overarching aim is to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers, in a way that facilitates the traditional and nomadic way of life for travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community. In that regard, interference with rights held under the European Convention of Human Rights, as incorporated into domestic law by the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA), is a key consideration. In this case, there is interference with rights under Article 8 (right for respect for private and family life, home and correspondence). That is a qualified right, and interference with it may be justified where it is in accordance with the law and it is necessary in a democratic society.
44. In this case, the interference with the appellant's Article 8 rights arises from an enforcement notice issued under section 171 of the 1990 Act. The interference with the appellant's Article 8 rights is therefore lawful. The protection of the Green Belt is a legitimate and well-established planning policy aim and, as set out in the Framework, is a key element of national planning policy. The protection of the Green Belt is therefore in the public interest. In this case, the demolition of the double garage would result in a net improvement to the openness of the Green Belt. There is some harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of Boggs Cottages. I am also mindful that occupation of the appeal site by the appellant and his family was an act of intentional unauthorised development.
45. Against this harm, the Council cannot point to a five-year supply of sites. There are no suitable alternative sites available. Upholding the notice would therefore result in the appellant and his family losing their home and, in all likelihood, would oblige the appellant to return to a roadside existence, with all the implications that would bring. I also have the best interests of the children residing on the site at the forefront of my mind.
46. Balancing all these factors, I consider that the interference with the Article 8 rights held by the appellant and his family would be significant, but would be both necessary and proportionate in the event that the notice is upheld or in refusing to grant a permanent planning permission. However, I am also mindful that the policy objective could be achieved by means that interfere less with the appellant's rights, specifically a temporary and/or a personal permission. Either or both of those would ensure that the openness of the Green Belt is restored at the end of the finite period.
47. The appellants and his family share the protected characteristic of race for the purposes of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. Upholding the notice or refusing to grant a permanent permission would impact negatively on the appellant's nomadic habit of life and would reduce the opportunities available to him and his family. It would also deny or reduce the opportunities available to Mr Maughan and his family to foster good relations with the settled community, including those of the children at their school. Furthermore, a more positive outcome in respect of the aims of PSED exists in the form of a temporary and/or personal planning permission.
48. I am of course mindful that local residents have rights under the HRA, and I have taken those rights into account in reaching my conclusions below.

Conditions

49. I have considered whether suitably worded conditions could make the development acceptable in planning terms. The Council provided a list of conditions that it favoured in the event that I was minded to allow the appeal. Those suggested conditions, and others, were discussed at the Hearing.
50. The first point to make is that, in order to secure the net improvement to the openness of the Green Belt, it would be necessary to impose a condition that required the demolition of the double garage. All of my reasoning below is predicated on such a condition being imposed.
51. A condition restricting the site to the provision of a single pitch, comprising one static and one touring caravan, would be necessary and reasonable. Given the proximity of the neighbouring residential properties, conditions preventing commercial activities taking place on the appeal site and the parking of commercial vehicles on the site would also be necessary and reasonable.
52. There was discussion as to whether a personal and/or temporary planning permission would be appropriate. The voluntary demolition of the double garage, that would otherwise be lawful in planning terms and immune from enforcement action, would be a significant concession on the part of the appellant. It would therefore be unreasonable to require that as part of temporary planning permission.
53. Requiring the demolition of the double garage would, however, be reasonable in the context a planning permission that was not limited by time but was personal to the appellant and his family. Moreover, if I am to afford weight to the personal circumstances of the appellant and his family, including in relation to the best interests to the children living on the site, then a condition limiting occupation specifically to them is necessary.
54. In the event that a personal permission is appropriate, a condition requiring the submission of a scheme for the development of the site would be necessary. In view of the evidence of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties, any such scheme would need to include parking arrangements and the provision of facilities for water and sewerage. A scheme requiring the removal of the mobile home and the full restoration of the land when the appellants cease occupation of the site would also be necessary.

Green Belt balancing exercise and conclusion on the ground (a) appeal

55. In accordance with paragraph 148 of the Framework, I attach substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt by reason of the inappropriate nature of the development as defined in Policy E of the PPTS. However, the net improvement to the openness of the Green Belt that would result from the removal of the double garage is a material consideration to which I also attach substantial weight.
56. The use of the appeal site by Mr Maughan and his family also harms the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring residential properties. I am mindful that granting planning permission would enable conditions to be imposed that could overcome and/or mitigate some of the concerns raised by the occupiers of those properties, which hereto has not been possible. That is a factor that weighs in support of granting planning permission.

57. I am satisfied that the occupation of the appeal site by the appellant does constitute intentional unauthorised development for the purposes of the WMS, a matter to which I attach significant weight.
58. Against this, it is evident that there is a local need for gypsy and traveller pitches. For the reasons set out above, I attach only limited weight to that unmet need. It is also evident there are no suitable and available alternative sites, a consideration to which I attach significant weight. I attach moderate weight to the accessibility of the site.
59. The personal circumstances of the appellant and his family are a matter to which I attach significant weight. The best interests of the children residing on the site are a primary consideration which attracts substantial weight.

Conclusion on Green Belt balancing exercise

60. I conclude that the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, is not clearly outweighed by other considerations, such that the very special circumstances necessary to justify a permanent and unrestricted planning permission do not exist. These harms could not be overcome by the imposition of suitably worded conditions. Given that the protection of the Green Belt is a key strand of national planning policy and in the wider public interest, I am satisfied the interference with the appellant's Article 8 rights would be necessary and proportionate. In reaching this conclusion, I have also taken into account my responsibilities under the PSED.
61. I further conclude that the use of the land as a traveller site would be contrary to policies in the development plan. In relation to a permanent planning permission, I have not been advised of any material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate that determination should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
62. The balance does, however, shift when a personal planning permission is considered. In those circumstances, the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, although no less severe, would only be for a finite period. The site would be required to be restored at the end of that period and, with the double garage having been removed, this would result in an improvement in the openness of the Green Belt.
63. A personal planning permission would enable planning conditions to be imposed that would overcome or at least mitigate the concerns expressed by local residents. This would safeguard their living conditions.
64. A personal planning permission would retain a settled base from which the appellant's children could attend the same school as at present on a regular basis. It would avoid the appellant and his family returning to a roadside existence, with all the disadvantages that would bring. A temporary planning permission would be in the best interests of the children residing on the site, as well as for Mrs Maughan in relation to her mental health.

Conclusion on the appeal on ground (a) and the deemed planning application

65. I conclude that personal permission would accord with the development plan when read as whole, as well as with the Framework and the PPTS. I therefore conclude that planning permission ought to be granted for the matters stated in the notice, subject to conditions.

Conclusion

66. I conclude that the appeal should succeed on ground (a) and the enforcement notice should be quashed. I shall grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made for the change of use previously permitted without complying with the condition enforced against but subject to new conditions. As a consequence, the appeals on grounds (f) and (g) do not fall to be considered.

Formal Decision

67. The appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed and planning permission is granted in accordance with section 177(5) and section 177(1)(a) of the 1990 Act for the use of a mobile home on the land as a dwelling without complying with Condition 1 of planning permission N21428, subject to the following conditions:

1. The site shall not be occupied other than by Mr Thomas Maughan and Mrs Eileen Maughan, and their dependants. When the premises cease to be occupied those named above, the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, buildings, structures, materials and equipment brought on to the land, or works undertaken to it in connection with the use, shall be removed and the land restored to its condition agreed in writing by the local planning authority in accordance with condition 3 below.
2. Within two months of this Decision, the existing double garage on the site shall be completely demolished and any resultant debris/materials removed from the land.
3. Within three months of this Decision, a development scheme shall be submitted to the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of the size, position and construction of a drainage scheme, provisions for facilities for water and sewerage, and the provision of parking spaces. The scheme thereby approved shall be implemented and thereafter maintained in accordance with approved details.
4. Within three months of the date of this decision, a scheme to restore the land to its condition before the development took place (or such other restoration as agreed in writing by the local planning authority) at the end of the period that the site is occupied by those permitted to do so, shall be submitted in writing to the local planning authority. These details shall include an implementation programme. The restoration works shall be carried out in accordance with the details approved by the local planning authority.
5. There shall be no more than one pitch on the site and on this pitch no more than two (2) 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 one (1) shall be a static caravan) shall be stationed on the site at any time.
6. No commercial vehicle shall be kept on the land.

7. No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials.

Paul Freer
INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

For the appellant

Mr Thomas Maughan

Appellant

Mrs Eileen Maughan

Dr Phillip Brown

Planning Consultant

For the Local Planning Authority

Mr Nick Bromley

Senior Planning Officer

Interested Persons

Mr Graham Bibby

Chair, Keele Parish Council

Mr Martin Jones

Local resident

Mr Nigel Kowalczyk

Local resident