



Appeal Decisions

Hearing held on 12 July 2023

Site visit made on 13 July 2023

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th October 2023

Appeal A Ref: APP/M2270/C/23/3319273 &

Appeal B Ref: APP/M2270/C/23/3319274

Land at Crowbourne Orchard, Smiths Lane, Goudhurst, Kent TN17 1ET

- The appeals are made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended (the Act). The appeals are made by (A) Ms Kelly Smith and (B) Mr Charles Elliot against an enforcement notice issued by Tunbridge Wells Borough Council.
- The enforcement notice was issued on 22 February 2023.
- The breaches of planning control as alleged in the notice are:
 - (i) The unauthorised residential use of the Land including the stationing of a mobile home, structures, materials including hardstanding, a trackway and domestic equipment brought onto the Land in connection with the unauthorised use in breach of condition 1 of planning application 18/03613/FULL
 - (ii) The bringing on and stationing of additional caravan/mobile home as defined in the Caravan Sites Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 in breach of condition 3 of planning permission 18/03613/FULL.
- The conditions in question are Nos 1 and 3 which state that:
 - 1) Notwithstanding the description of the proposed development, the use of the site for residential purposes hereby permitted shall be carried on only by Mr George Smith and shall be for a limited period of four years from the date of this decision. At the end of this period the use hereby permitted shall cease and the mobile home and all structures, materials and equipment brought onto the land in connection with the use, along with the trackway, shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition in accordance with a scheme and timetable previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - 3) The existing mobile home on the site shall not be replaced with any other caravan or mobile home and there shall be no change to the existing dark stained timber external finish. No other mobile home or caravan, as defined in the Caravan Sites Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968, shall be stationed on the site.
- The requirements of the notice are to:
 - (i) Cease the residential use of the Land.
 - (ii) Remove all caravans/mobile homes from the Land (currently shown in their approximate position marked "A" and "C" on the attached plan).
 - (iii) Remove all structures from the Land, including the toilet block/day room and the stables shown in their approximate positions marked "B" and "D" on the attached plan.
 - (iv) Remove all vehicles, residential paraphernalia and equipment, from the Land.
 - (v) Remove the trackway shown in its approximate position marked between "X" and "Y" with a thick black line on the attached plan.
 - (vi) Break up and remove the hardstanding shown in its approximate location marked by hatching on the attached plan.
 - (vii) Remove all materials, rubbish and rubble arising from compliance with steps (i) to (vi) above.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is: 7 (seven) months.

- The appeals are proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Appeal C Ref: APP/M2270/W/22/3312609

Mobile Home at Crowbourn Orchard, Smiths Lane, Goudhurst, Cranbrook, Kent TN17 1EJ

- 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 Charles Elliot against the decision of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01066/FULL, dated 5 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'the change of use of the land for the accommodation of 1 gypsy/traveller family, with static home, day room, stables and touring caravan.'
-

Appeals A and B Decision

1. It is directed that the enforcement notice is varied by:
 - Deleting the time for compliance at section '6' the term "7 (seven) months" and replace with "12 (twelve) months".
2. Subject to the variation, the appeals are dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Appeal C Decision

3. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

4. The appeal site has been the subject of previous planning decisions relating to the use of the site for the stationing of a mobile home for residential purposes amongst other things. Permission was given in 2007 at appeal (Ref APP/M2270/A/06/2023638). This was subject to planning conditions requiring that the permission shall be carried out only by the appellant and also for a temporary 3 year period. Then in 2010, a further appeal allowed (Ref APP/M2270/A/11/2152658) the continuation of the use of the site subject again to conditions including the first requiring that the permission is carried on by the then appellant for a further 3 year period. In 2014 and the 2018 the Council approved the continuation of that use for further periods.
5. Prior to the hearing, the Council raised a query about the validity of 'Appeal C' because they had discovered that the appeal site may not have been in the sole ownership of Mr Elliot, as certified both on the planning application and appeal forms. At the hearing, I sought clarification about this. Mr McKay for the appellant confirmed that this was a genuine error, that Ms Smith who does own the land is Mr Elliot's partner and is fully aware of the procedures and has been involved in the process. Ms Smith did not attend the hearing.
6. I asked for views from all of the parties present as this matter had been initially raised by the Parish Council. Nobody made any suggestions that this was other than a genuine error as explained by Mr McKay. I requested that the

appellant organise for Ms Smith to provide confirmation in writing of her knowledge of the appeal and whether she was content for the proceedings to continue. This was organised during an adjournment and I explained that I would consider the matter after the hearing.

7. The letter from Ms Smith (Kelly Marie Smith) confirmed that they are aware of the planning application and they had no objection. Ms Smith gave their consent for the Appeals to proceed and in addition to this they are one of the people who has been served with a copy of the enforcement notice and who is a joint appellant in those appeals (Appeals A and B). As such, Ms Smith has been made aware of all of the appeals and had the opportunity to attend the hearing. No other party has expressed any concern about any injustice that could be caused as a result of the error. Given that the party who could primarily be harmed by the lack of notification is Ms Smith who is content for matters to proceed, I agree that no prejudice would occur for me to continue to determine that case. I can use my discretion in these matters and I consider that Appeal C is valid and that I can reach a decision on it.
8. The appellant confirmed at the start of the hearing that planning permission is being sought personally for Mr Elliot and for a period of 3 years.
9. In addition to the above, when I opened the hearing, I read out the details of the enforcement notice that had been supplied by the appellant and with the Council's appeal questionnaire. No concerns were raised. Notwithstanding the lack of comment at that stage however, later-on in the proceedings, it became apparent that there were differences between the notice that I had received and that to which the parties were referring. The Council and appellant could not confirm definitively at that stage, which version of the notice had been the one issued and served upon the owners and occupiers of the appeal site.
10. Both of the versions of the notice allege breaches of conditions 1 and 3 of planning permission 18/03613/FULL. Both include the same reasoning for issuing a notice. There are however differences between the requirements of both versions but the same time for compliance has been applied.
11. I adjourned the hearing having progressed to the point of considering the time for compliance under the appeal on ground 'g'. I requested that the Council and appellant discuss the circumstances about which notice had been issued formally as that could not be definitively confirmed on the day. It was then confirmed in writing in a joint letter from both main parties, that the notice that they had in the hearing was the one issued and served on site. The copy that had unfortunately been sent to the Planning Inspectorate by both main parties was a previous draft.
12. I gave the parties an opportunity to comment on these circumstances and also to make further representations about the matters that had not been completed before the hearing was adjourned. The parties were content that I had sufficient information and there was no need to reconvene the hearing. The hearing was therefore closed in writing on 27 July 2023.

Appeal A and B on ground (a) and Appeal (C)

Main issues

13. Prior to the hearing, very helpfully, a Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) was agreed between the main parties. This and what I heard at the hearing

clarified that there is no longer a dispute about the Council's ability to demonstrate a 5 year supply of Gypsy and Traveller sites. That agreement had followed the publication of a Gypsy and Traveller supply statement earlier in July that had been forwarded prior to the hearing and which relates to the position as at 1 April 2023. It was clarified by the appellant that there were reasons why they may not be accepted on the sites but it was agreed these were personal circumstances of relevance to the third main issue.

14. It was agreed therefore at the hearing that the following are the main issues:

- 1) The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area including the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB);
- 2) The effect of the development on biodiversity; and
- 3) Personal circumstances, Gypsy status and best interests of children in occupation.

15. In relation to Appeals A and B under ground (a) and the deemed planning application, I am considering these same main issues in relation to the specific conditions being enforced and will consider whether they remain reasonable and necessary. It is not open to me to review the appropriateness of the other conditions imposed on the applicable planning permission. The reason for condition 1 on the planning permission was "In the interests of the long term protection of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and wider landscape and because the site is outside any area in which residential development would normally be permitted." The reason for condition 3 was "To prevent further intensification of the use of the land and in the interests of preventing additional harm to the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and wider landscape."

16. If I were to allow the appeal, I am able to attach different conditions to replace those enforced against.

Reasons - AONB

17. The appeal site is a strip of land around 4.5ha in area located to the north-west of Goudhurst on land that slopes down dramatically from the village. Goudhurst is on a ridge which overlooks the extremely attractive Kent countryside within the AONB and which is within Character Area 3 of the Tunbridge Wells Borough Landscape Character Assessment. The countryside here is, as described therein, as an intricate rural landscape of orchards and fields which are highly visible in views over the undulating slopes of this high ridge which climbs up from the Teise Valley.

18. The site currently contains a mobile home clad in dark-brown stained timber, an amenity block and a touring caravan as well as a driveway and large parking area surfaced with chippings. A robust, high gate marks the entrance to the driveway. This is a narrow strip of land between a paddock on one side and grazing land on the other. These developments contrast substantially with the adjoining and more broadly surrounding agriculture landscape.

19. The boundaries of the site include some low, solid, timber fencing and also post and rail fencing. There is a substantial amount of woodland, including mainly deciduous trees along the northern boundary and within the field to the north-west as well as on land immediately to the east of the position of the mobile

home. Much of the site is therefore well screened from Smiths Lane although the gate is uncharacteristic of the generally lower-key, less stark boundaries and gateways that I saw along that and the other nearby roads.

20. When I carried out my site visit, I walked from Smiths Lane along footpath 'WC26A' to the north of the site, up the slope into Goudhurst, along the road through the village and back down the ridge along footpath 'WC27' to Smiths Lane. I heard at the hearing and it was confirmed by the appellant's agent that this footpath network is part of the High Weald Landscape Trail. I found that the site is in some part well-screened by the tree cover which would be lessened during seasons when those trees are not in leaf. I could see glimpses of the development on the site from footpath 'WC27' upon descending from the village. I was visiting in July when the deciduous leaf cover would be at its most robust. Those private properties within the village with a high vantage point will have views down towards the site and the development would also be noticeable from adjoining land. The crest of the rolling fields to the north-west of the site interferes with views from footpath 'WC26A'. Generally speaking though the leaf cover of the trees is critical to the screening of the development and I am satisfied that it would be far more visible during seasons when there is less cover.
21. The appellant is seeking further temporary permission and additional planting would not achieve much in the 3 years sought. Further planting with coniferous, evergreen species would also look alien in this landscape.
22. There is no dispute that the appeal site is outside of any development limit as defined within the Tunbridge Wells Borough Council Local Plan 2006 (LP). As such, LP Policy EN25 requires, amongst other things, that all development should have a minimal impact upon landscape character. LP Policy H4 which relates to Gypsy sites also includes a requirement that such sites will only be permitted if all of a number of criteria are satisfied including that they would not be located within an exposed position in the AONB. Policy 4 of the Tunbridge Wells Borough Core Strategy 2010 (CS) seeks to protect rural landscapes including the AONB which it states should be conserved and enhanced. The development plan also includes the Goudhurst Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2037 which was made in February 2022 (NP). NP Policy L1 states that development proposals in the AONB, where appropriate, make a positive contribution towards the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the designated landscape and L10 seeks to conserve important views. With respect to L10, the explanatory paragraphs confirm that the intent is to retain views within the Parish in order to conserve scenery. Table 1 of that plan includes a list of specific views which are considered important and which I considered when I carried out my site visit.
23. Although the site was relatively well screened at the time of my site visit, I consider that it would be much more exposed when the trees that provide the screening are not on leaf. The impact upon views from public viewpoints were not substantial but would be greater during different seasons. Furthermore, the character of the development is distinctly different from that around it and in particular the attractive, intricate agricultural and horticultural rural scene. As such, the development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area including the AONB which for the reasons set out above, does not comply with LP Policies EN25 and H4, CS Policy 4 or NP Policies L1 and L10. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)

states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty of areas with the highest status of protection in relation to these issues which includes AONBs. There was some agreement reached in the hearing between the main parties that there would be harm in these respects. Since the hearing, minor changes have been published to the Framework but they have not altered the parts of the advice relevant to these appeals.

Reasons - biodiversity

24. The site has been in its current condition for a number of years given the history of temporary and personal planning permissions being granted in the past including the outbuildings and use of the driveway and parking area. There is no dispute that the Council have control over the site due to the planning conditions being enforced and that no additional harm has been caused due to the breach of the conditions. Biodiversity was not a reason for issuing the enforcement notice.
25. The Council also largely accepts the findings of an ecological appraisal and roost assessment submitted with the appeal. The Council confirmed at the hearing that the dispute on this main issue relates to a lack of detail to demonstrate that biodiversity net gains can be achieved. The report specifies some opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. Improving planting with further native trees, hedgerows, shrubs and grassland would help a number of species including birds and badgers. Additional boxes for roosting and foraging areas for bats are recommended as are new refuges for amphibians, reptiles as well as invertebrates. The planning application did not explicitly request only a temporary period.
26. Some beneficial gains as outlined in the report may well be achievable within the 3-year period now sought such as additional bat roosts which could be effective shortly after being installed as could grassland planting. A significant amount of land is in the same ownership as the appeal site and there seems to be scope for additional proposals although it is not clear to me whether this other land was included in the study area. At the hearing this matter was discussed and it was agreed that the wider land could potentially be brought into a schemes sought through a planning condition requiring the submission of a planting scheme and management plan.
27. The LP Policies EN1 and EN25 require that there should be no significant adverse effects nor unsympathetic change to nature conservation. Similarly, CS Policy 4 requires the prevention of a net loss of biodiversity. These policies are not conflicted-with because they aim to prevent harm rather than requiring enhancement.
28. NP Policy L6 however requires that all development should contribute to a net gain in biodiversity. The Council also draws attention to their emerging policy EN9 of the Tunbridge Wells Pre-submission Local Plan (PSLP). It was explained to me and is not disputed by the appellant that this policy was not proposed for any suggested changes by the Planning Inspector who held a hearing into the plan. The policy states that development will only be permitted where a number of criteria are met. This includes where it can be demonstrated that a measurable net gain is achieved for area and linear habitats (by applying Defra Biodiversity Metrics). That can incorporate provision on or adjacent to the site with the percentage net gain required being a minimum of 10%. This policy is

consistent with paragraph 174 of the Framework which requires that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the local environment in a number of ways, including provision of net gain for biodiversity. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) defines it as works which deliver “measurable improvements for biodiversity by creating or enhancing habitats in association with development. Biodiversity gain can be achieved on-site, off-site or through a combination of on-site or off-site measures”.

29. PSLP Policy EN9 does not attract the full weight of a development plan policy but in my view should be given substantial weight given that, from the information discussed, it is likely to be adopted in a similar form. NP Policy L6 does require biodiversity net gain. In relation to this main issue, although it may be possible to provide biodiversity net gain across the land in the same ownership as the appeal site, it has not been demonstrated how that could be achieved in a measurable manner within 3 years. NP Policy L6, PSLP Policy EN9 and the advice of the Framework would not be complied with.

Personal circumstances, status and best interests of children

30. There is no dispute that Mr Elliot fulfils the definition of a gypsy and traveller within the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). There are 4 children in the family including 2 who live at the appeal site with the appellant, a 16 year old and a 13 year old. However, his partner Ms Smith, whose late father had previously been the occupant of the site, has a registered house in Frittenden which has 3 bedrooms. She lives at the house with 2 children and is expecting another baby in October. She sometimes stays at the appeal site and also occasionally travels to traditional horse fairs, as do all of the family children. The house is socially-rented. It seems from this that Ms Smith is largely settled and has given up travelling. However, even though she has ceased to travel, she is not claimed to be anything other than an occasional resident at the appeal site. Ms Smith did not appear at the hearing to enable me to ask her any questions directly.
31. Whilst I accept that the dwelling in Frittenden has limited space for a large family, I have been presented with very little detail about it and the information that I have been given was not clear at the hearing. It was confirmed after the hearing in writing, following my further request, that the house has 3 bedrooms. If the appeals were dismissed and the enforcement notice upheld, whilst I was told that Ms Smith’s house would be cramped if all of the children went to live there that is sometimes not unusual until older children progress to adulthood and eventually find their own accommodation. I was presented with no evidence about the availability of alternative socially rented accommodation or any likelihood that the family could be offered a larger property.
32. I accept that Mr Elliot’s aversion to bricks and mortar would mean that he would find it difficult to live at the house. The Council suggested that a touring caravan could be accommodated in the garden at the house but it is not clear that this could be the case or acceptable in other respects. In these circumstances, Mr Elliot at least would potentially be losing his home and this would therefore lead to an interference with Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA) which states that everyone has a right to respect for private and family life, their home and correspondence. This is however a qualified right

and interference may be justified in the public interest with the concept of proportionality being crucial. I return to this in the overall balance.

33. It was accepted by the appellant that the Council can demonstrate a 5-year supply of sites which was a significant change of stance since the submission of the appeal by the appellant. He stated at the hearing that there were however problems with trying to be accepted onto existing sites if you are not connected to people or the established community already on any site. I accept this at face value.
34. It is incumbent on me to have due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in the Equality Act 2010, which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and to advance equality of opportunity. The Act recognises that race constitutes a relevant protected characteristic for the purposes of PSED. Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers are ethnic minorities and have the protected characteristic of race.
35. I was told that the appellant along with Ms Smith and all of the children want to find an alternative site where they could live altogether as a family which is an understandable aspiration. In the context of this appeal, it would seem that the family could potentially be accommodated together in an existing house. Mr Elliot would find that very difficult due to his cultural and family background. It would also be extremely difficult for the appellant to demonstrate that they could not be accommodated on any of the available sites.
36. I am also mindful that Article 3(1) of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child provides that the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration in all actions by public authorities concerning children. There are 2 children who occupy the appeal site and I have been made aware of some particular educational needs.
37. One of those at the date of the hearing, was almost 16 years old and is currently at secondary school which is 13 miles from the site but only 6 miles from Ms Smith's house in Frittenden and so the prospect of living at that address would potentially be better than remaining at the site. This same child is considering entering courses at sixth form college but will be at the present school until July 2024. The details of the potential college or course were not available by the close of the hearing. I am also mindful that there are some special educational needs to consider which would benefit from a stable family home-base.
38. The other child living at the site is 13 years old and therefore has at least 3 more years of secondary education. A 3-year temporary permission is being sought partly at least for this reason. Having to move from the appeal site whilst undertaking this stage of education would potentially interrupt this child's studies. However, again the family does have alternative accommodation which would not be in a worse location than the appeal site and which it is not clear from evidence presented would be any more over-crowded than if the family were to move entirely to the appeal site.
39. Some of the family children are already living at the house in Frittenden with Ms Smith including her soon to be born baby. That dwelling would seem from the evidence presented to be a potential alternative stable base from where all of the children could access health-care and education. However, it would be advantageous for the whole family and in particular for the best interest of all

of the children to all live together in a stable unit with both parents where they could also access those services. That would only be possible at the appeal site. Refusing planning permission would therefore adversely affect the interests of the children living at the site and the wider family. In these circumstances I give significant weight to these personal family circumstances and further significant weight to the best interest of the children.

Other matters and overall planning balance

40. There have been a series of temporary and personal planning permissions granted on this site including the permission with the conditions being enforced (18/03613/FULL). I heard that the circumstances leading to those previous permissions were very specific, hence the need to not only limit the time the permission could be enjoyed but also the person who could use the site.
41. According to the previous appeal decisions, there was an accepted need for 8 to 12 pitches in 2007 and at least 5 or 6 pitches in 2011. The previous occupier was in poor health, particularly by the time of the second appeal and was under the care of a surgery nearby in Goudhurst. He also had friends nearby who visited him and a sister in Tunbridge Wells. The intended occupiers, although related to the previous occupant, do not have those same personal circumstances.
42. I am however again being asked to grant planning permission temporarily and on a personal basis. Planning conditions are suggested and were discussed to achieve those ends and the 6 tests for planning conditions as set out in the Framework need to be considered if I am minded to allow the appeals. The PPG provides further advice including that temporary planning permission may be appropriate where it is expected that planning circumstances will change in a particular way at the end of that period. It also states that it will rarely be justifiable to grant a second temporary permission unless there is a clear rationale.
43. With respect to the request for personal planning permission the PPG states that permission normally runs with the land and that it is rarely appropriate to provide otherwise. However, it is sometimes necessary to restrict occupation to Gypsy and travellers as a group. The circumstances presented to me do not provide similar justification as was the case in the previous appeals.
44. This development does not conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB which weighs heavily against it because the Framework advises that I need to give great weight to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. AONBs have the highest status of protection in relation to those matters. Furthermore, due to the inability to demonstrate net biodiversity gains, NP Policy L6 is not complied with, which has full weight as a development plan policy and neither is emerging PSLP Policy EN9 which also weighs against the development.
45. I give significant weight to the personal family circumstances and further significant weight to the best interest of the children. The benefits and lack of harm in other respects do not outweigh the harm in relation to the first and second main issues. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development does not comply with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations that outweigh that harm. With respect to Appeals A and B, the conditions enforced remain reasonable and necessary.

46. The appeal on ground (a) in Appeals A and B is dismissed and Appeal C is also dismissed.

Appeal (A & B) on ground (g)

47. The appeal on this ground is that any period specified in the notice falls short of what should reasonably be allowed. The notice allows for 7 months from the notice coming into effect. Due to the problems with having 2 notices in front of me, the arguments on this ground were submitted in writing following the adjournment although as is often the case, matters concerning this ground were partly covered under other parts of the discussion.

48. The appellant confirmed that the physical requirements of the notice could be undertaken within 7 months. They also said that extending the life of the existing mobile home would be difficult as it is in poor repair and they had applied for planning permission afresh, rather than attempting to extend the temporary period because they wanted the whole permission reviewed. I have considered that the development in Appeal C, as proposed, is unacceptable and in relation to the other appeals, that the conditions being enforced on the notice remain necessary.

49. I have however also considered the details all of the personal circumstances. The resident children on the site will have their best interests harmed as a result of what is required, it would be far more disruptive if they were required to comply during a school term. By the start of the 2024 Autumn school term, the elder of the Children on site will be moving on from secondary education. The younger child will be starting a new school-year but will have had more chance to become settled before the terms starts. In my view, a 12-month compliance period would strike a more proportionate balance between achieving compliance in the interests of development plan policies and other material considerations, set against what is more reasonable for the occupiers of the site. It would also enable a more in-depth search of sites to be undertaken by the appellant to try and find a suitable alternative for him or preferably for his whole family unit.

50. The Council considered that 7 months was sufficient to achieve these aims and they have powers to extend informally or formally periods for compliance. However, based upon the evidence that I considered, a 12-month period for compliance would provide a more reasonable and proportionate balance.

51. The appeal on ground (g) therefore succeeds to that extent.

Conclusion

52. For the reasons given above, apart from success on ground (g), I conclude that the appeals should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice with a variation and refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

53. For the reasons given above, I conclude that Appeal C should not succeed and planning permission is refused.

Andy Harwood

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr McKay Planning Consultant

Mr Elliot Appellant

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Moysey Principal Planning Officer

Mr Sculley Landscape and Biodiversity Officer

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Mr Broom Goudhurst Parish Council

Mr Harris Goudhurst Parish Council

Mr Bushrod Member of the Goudhurst Neighbourhood Group

Sarah Blamire

Pippa Lane

DOCUMENTS

- (i) The High Weald AONB Management Plan 2019-2024
- (ii) Table 1 'List of views' and 'figure 12 map of views' from the NP
- (iii) Letter dated and signed 12 July 2023 from Ms Smith as landowner
- (iv) Additional enforcement notice (subsequently confirmed and agreed by both main parties as the notice that I need to consider)
- (v) Further written submissions in writing by the appellant dated 24 July
- (vi) Confirmation that the Council has not further comments dated 25 July