



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 26 September and 2 October 2023

Site visit made on 26 September 2023

by Mark Harbottle BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J9497/X/23/3321953

Devon Oaks Holiday Park, Bedford Bridge, Magpie, Devon PL20 7RY

- The appeal is made under section 195 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended (the Act) against a refusal to grant a certificate of lawful use or development (LDC).
 - The appeal is made by Barton Park Estates Ltd. against the decision of Dartmoor National Park Authority.
 - The application ref 0274/22, dated 6 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2023.
 - The application was made under section 192(1)(a) of the Act.
 - The use for which an LDC is sought is alteration to number of caravans from 9 residential, 18 holiday, 30 touring caravans and 16 chalets, to 18 residential, 36 holiday, 30 touring and up to 16 chalets.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Inquiry sat on 2 days, the first being in person, to hear evidence, and the second being a virtual session for closing submissions.
3. Reference has been made to whether local roads and sewers can safely accommodate the proposed numbers of caravans. Those matters would be considered if a planning application were made but this appeal must turn on whether what is proposed is lawful and therefore does not require planning permission.
4. In this decision, 'the holiday park' means the appeal site and the areas edged in blue, annotated "area 2 – eastern amenity" and "area 3 – the meadow – the 1993 permission", on the plan at page 6 of Mr Eiser's proof of evidence. The holiday park was previously called Magpie Caravan Park or Magpie Leisure Caravan Park.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the Council's decision to refuse to issue an LDC was well-founded. This turns on whether the use of the appeal site by alteration of the number of caravans from 9 residential, 18 holiday, 30 touring caravans and 16 chalets, to 18 residential, 36 holiday, 30 touring and up to 16 chalets would have been lawful if instituted on the date of the application.

6. It must therefore be determined whether the proposed alteration to the number and mix of caravans would be permitted by any relevant planning permission and not prohibited by any of its conditions.

Reasons

7. The earliest known planning record is a permission granted in 1981¹, although it is understood a holiday park operated before then. It was previously found that the permission was not implemented² and no evidence to suggest otherwise has been presented in this appeal.
8. It is therefore agreed that the authorised use of the appeal site is in accordance with a planning permission granted in 1987 ("the 1987 permission")³. This permission was for "Proposed site enhancement scheme involving an amendment of existing provision at the site to allow for 9 residential vans, 16 holiday chalets, 18 static vans & 30 touring units".
9. A letter purporting to vary condition (e) of the 1987 permission, to allow longer occupation of chalets for up to 10 months each year, was issued in 1988⁴. This letter was previously found to not have been a formal determination of the application and to have not varied condition (e). The presented evidence does not persuade me that the letter amounted to a grant of planning permission. A greater variation, to allow 11 months' holiday occupation of chalets, static caravans and use of touring pitches, was permitted in 2013 ("the 2013 permission")⁵ but the parties agree that permission was not implemented.
10. Accordingly, the temporal restriction made by condition (e) of the 1987 permission remains in effect. This is "the chalets, static holiday caravans and pitches for touring units shall only be occupied between 15th March and 15th November in each year".
11. A planning permission granted in 1993 ("the 1993 permission")⁶ permitted an extension of the holiday park subject to conditions. Condition (c) limited the use of the extension area to the siting of not more than 10 touring caravans. Condition (b) limited the total number of touring caravans at the holiday park to 30, the maximum number permitted by the 1987 permission.
12. An application for an LDC for stationing up to 80 caravans "for the purposes of human habitation" was refused in 2018 and an appeal against that decision was dismissed ("the 2020 appeal decision")⁷. A subsequent challenge failed in the Court of Appeal, where it was noted that the proposed alteration could have encompassed full residential use of all 80 units, with no holiday occupation ("the 2022 judgement")⁸. The Court held that the Inspector had applied the correct test when concluding that a change in the definable character of the use, and a material change of use, would have occurred.

¹ 3/35/0588/1981/5826/1, granted 13 July 1981.

² APP/J9497/X/18/3217988, dismissed 29 June 2020.

³ F/3.35/895/1986/5826/6, granted 10 August 1987.

⁴ 03/35/1722/87, issued 10 March 1988.

⁵ 0293/13, granted 29 July 2013.

⁶ 3/35/149/93/04, granted 29 September 1993.

⁷ 0411/18, refused 23 November 2018, and APP/J9497/X/18/3217988, dismissed 29 June 2020.

⁸ Barton Park Estates Ltd v SSHCLG & Dartmoor NPA [2022] EWCA Civ 833.

13. An application for an LDC for use of 27 static caravans “for the purposes of human habitation as a person’s sole or main residence” was refused in 2020 and an appeal against that decision was dismissed⁹.
14. The 1987 permission is the baseline for the consideration of this appeal. The letter issued in 1988 and the 2013 permission were concerned with changes in the periods when holiday activity could be undertaken, so even if they have effect, they are of limited relevance because no such change is proposed now.

The planning unit

15. It is usually necessary to identify the appropriate planning unit to determine whether a change of use would occur and to assess the materiality of any change of use. The LDC is not sought in respect of the entire holiday park but is restricted to the part to which the 1987 permission applies. The 2020 appeal decision recorded that this was agreed to be the planning unit at that time. The Authority did not cite a mismatch between the appeal site and the planning unit as a reason for refusing the current appeal application. However, it now contends that an LDC cannot be granted for part of the planning unit if the use that is permitted is not assessed by reference to the whole planning unit.
16. The 2 areas excluded from the LDC application, but which the parties now consider to be part of the planning unit, are the eastern part of the field to the east of the access from the A386 and the area of the 1993 permission. These are the areas edged in blue on the plan at page 6 of Mr Eiser’s proof of evidence.
17. The eastern part of the field is within the red line of the 1987 permission. For that reason, and in view of the clear and detailed evidence before me, it is reasonable to consider it to form part of the planning unit. It is annotated *proposed amenity and play area for touring units* on a site layout plan submitted as part of the application that resulted in that permission. However, no condition requiring any part of the site to be used as indicated on the plan was imposed. The existing character of this part of the site must be considered as part of the baseline for assessing the proposed alteration in caravan numbers and mix.
18. The appellant states that caravans could be stationed on this area without the need for further planning permission. However, no evidence that the eastern part of the field has ever been used as part of the holiday park, or in connection with it, has been presented. Furthermore, the Authority’s reference to regular agricultural grazing on the field, which does not appear compatible with holiday park use, has not been challenged.
19. The only photographic evidence of the field before me comprises aerial images from 1999, 2006, 2010, 2015 and July 2019 and photographs taken in November 2019 and July 2023, all provided by the Authority. None of these show any activity, or evidence of past activity, in any part of the field.
20. The appellant states that the eastern part of the field “would continue to remain unoccupied”, confirming that it has not recently been in active use, which was also apparent from my inspection of the site. In view of the paucity of evidence of use of this area at any time since 1987, the existing character of this part of the site must be an open field, not used for the siting of caravans.

⁹ 0329/20, refused 27 October 2020, and APP/J9497/X/20/3263410, dismissed 9 December 2021.

21. The parties previously agreed, and it was therefore confirmed in the 2020 appeal decision, that the area of the 1993 permission was not part of the planning unit. If, as now suggested, it is part of the planning unit, I am not convinced it would make a material difference to the facts of this appeal. That is because condition (b) of the 1993 permission limits the number of touring caravans at the entire holiday park to 30, the same number the 1987 permission had specified. The 1993 permission therefore allows greater flexibility in the stationing of touring caravans across the holiday park but does not necessarily prevent all 30 being on the appeal site. Consequently, it is not a barrier to the consideration of the proposed alteration in caravan numbers and mix, in which the number of touring caravans would still be 30.
22. Nevertheless, I recognise that this area is physically and functionally related to the appeal site. Accordingly, and in view of the clear and detailed evidence in this appeal, I agree that it is part of the planning unit.
23. Accordingly, it is reasonable to determine whether the proposed alteration to the number and mix of caravans would be lawful having regard to the agreed planning unit. This means the areas currently subject to the 1987 permission¹⁰ and subject to the 1993 permission, which together comprise the holiday park.

The number of holiday chalets

24. The 1987 permission was implemented and granted planning permission for the construction of 16 chalets. By the date of the application to which this appeal relates, 5 of those 16 chalets had been built. Section 192(2) of the Act states that an application for an LDC, and by extension this appeal, must be determined having regard to whether the development would be lawful if instituted or begun at the time of the application.
25. There is nothing in effect to prevent the erection of the 11 unbuilt chalets of the 1987 permission, so if their erection had begun on or before the date of the application, it could have resulted in there being 16 chalets on the appeal site. However, 2 of the 5 chalets that existed then have since been demolished. Because the permission for their erection is spent, the 2 demolished chalets cannot be replaced pursuant to the 1987 permission.
26. Section 192(4) of the Act requires that the lawfulness of any proposed use for which an LDC is in force "shall be conclusively presumed unless there is a material change, before the use is instituted ... in any of the matters relevant to determining such lawfulness." The demolition of the 2 chalets is a relevant matter, and is a material change since the application date, pre-dating any institution of the proposed use, should the appeal succeed. Accordingly, while I must determine the appeal with reference to the situation at the date of the application, any material change since then, such as the demolition of the 2 chalets, is a relevant matter.

Comparison of the existing and proposed uses

27. The character of the existing use of the appeal site, governed by the 1987 permission with the 1993 permission also in effect, was defined in the 2020 appeal decision. At that time, the parties agreed this was also the planning

¹⁰ Part of the land to which the 1987 permission related, The Barn, is agreed to now be a separate planning unit comprising a dwellinghouse.

unit. However, for the reasons given above, I consider the planning unit is the holiday park.

28. The caravans at the western end of the holiday park are in unrestricted residential occupancy and are akin to permanent dwellings, with domestic features including porches, fences and decking. They are sited in identifiable and well-maintained gardens with established landscape planting. The character of this part of the holiday park is shaped by grassed areas and significant tree cover. The 3 chalets I saw at the date of my site visit at the eastern end of the holiday park stand well apart from each other, with significant surrounding tree cover. The appearance of these parts of the holiday park corresponds to how they were described in the 2020 appeal decision.
29. The 2020 appeal decision recorded that the central area of the holiday park had an open and communal character, being predominantly grass, with some trees and areas of hardstanding, and no obvious permanent delineation of pitches. The evidence before me indicates that, for the most part, this area had not changed on the date the application was made. An exception is the part the Authority calls 'the southern touring side', which appears to have been levelled with a retaining wall under construction shortly after the 2020 appeal decision was issued¹¹. There is nothing before me which indicates whether planning permission for these works was required or sought.
30. The central area appears to have undergone further changes recently. Photographs taken by the Authority in July 2023, a year after the application was made, show that internal roads had been resurfaced, widened in parts, and raised kerbs installed. These changes accompanied the siting of new static caravans in what the Authority calls 'the northern static side' and 'the central touring area'. It is evident from some of these photographs that work on the internal roads was still in progress¹². Accordingly, I consider it more likely than not that these works anticipate the proposed alteration in numbers, rather than being an aspect of the use that existed when the application was made.
31. On the evidence available, it is also more likely than not that the existing character of this part of the holiday park was as set out in the 2020 appeal decision. This recorded that the central part of the appeal site had a more open and communal feel, was predominantly grass, with some trees and areas of hardstanding, and no obvious permanent delineation of pitches. The appellant has not provided detailed and substantiated evidence as to the character of this part of the holiday park at the date of the application.
32. The 2020 appeal decision further recorded that the remaining part of the appeal site consisted of 2 grassed areas of open space to the east and west of the access from the A386. The western area was levelled and surfaced, and a retaining wall was formed with gabions shortly after the 2020 appeal decision was issued¹³. As stated above it is not clear whether planning permission was required or sought for these works.
33. Photographs of this part of the holiday park taken a year after the application date show further changes, with 3 static caravans occupying the levelled ground and a roadway serving them part constructed¹⁴. While the appellant has

¹¹ Proof of evidence of James Aven appendix 13, photograph 40, dated 21 July 2020.

¹² Proof of evidence of James Aven appendix 14, photographs 41 - 54, dated 12 July 2023.

¹³ Proof of evidence of James Aven appendix 13, photographs 39 and 40, dated 21 July 2020.

¹⁴ Proof of evidence of James Aven appendix 14, photographs 55 and 56, dated 12 July 2023.

not explained when these further changes were made, they appear very new in the photographs, so they probably post-date the application. Accordingly, I do not consider these works to be part of the existing character of the use of the holiday park on the date the application was made.

34. The area of the 1993 permission can only be used to station touring caravans. The size of this area, the upper limit of 10 touring pitches on it, and its open aspect mean that the character of its existing use, when in operation, is informal, low density and communal.
35. Under section 191(2) of the Act the proposed use is lawful if no enforcement action may be taken in respect of it and it does not contravene any requirement of any enforcement notice then in force. There is no enforcement notice relating to the proposed use in effect, so it remains to be considered whether enforcement action could be taken against it.
36. The 1987 permission was for the use of land for the stationing of caravans and operational development comprising the construction of chalets. The plan at paragraph 53 of Mr Eiser's proof of evidence shows a layout that differs significantly from how the holiday park appears to have operated, at least until after the date of the application the subject of this appeal, under the terms of the 1987 permission. It therefore appears to illustrate a theoretical existing use rather than the actual existing use when the application was made, or at any time since 1987.
37. The alteration now proposed is the addition of 27 static caravans. Of these, 9 would be occupied all year round, described as residential, and 18 would be occupied for 8 months of each year, described as holiday accommodation, doubling the number of each. A grant of full planning permission for operational development is for the construction of the number of buildings or other structures specified in the decision notice. The reference to 16 chalets in the 1987 permission is therefore definitive, just as full planning permission for 2 houses does not allow 3 to be built. However, a similar alteration in the number of caravans stationed on land would not necessarily change the use of that land, which would continue to be used for the stationing of caravans.
38. The courts have held that the grant of planning permission is permissive, while the imposition of a planning condition is restrictive¹⁵. Therefore, while the 1987 permission allowed a use of land involving the stationing of 27 static caravans (9 residential, 18 for holiday occupation), that does not, of itself, prevent a change to those numbers. No condition was imposed to limit the numbers or types of caravans that could be stationed on the land. However, it was for a specific mix of types of caravans and a mix of residential and holiday occupation. The temporal restrictions of the 1987 permission are still in effect because the 2013 permission was not implemented, a matter which the parties agree, so the holiday static caravans may be occupied for 8 months of the year. Touring caravans may each be stationed for a maximum of 3 weeks at any one time, within the same 8-month period.
39. Nevertheless, some people who have recently bought static caravans appear to be occupying them as if the 2013 permission is in effect. Mr Prynn and Mr Fice, 2 occupiers of the appeal site who gave evidence, both confirmed they occupy

¹⁵ *I'm Your Man Ltd v SSE* (1999) 77 P&CR 251 and *Cotswold Grange Country Park LLP v SSCLG & Tewkesbury DC* [2014] EWHC 1138 (Admin).

their static caravans for 11 months each year, only going elsewhere each February. That is not, however, a matter to be determined in this appeal.

40. One factor affecting how the alteration now proposed would be perceived is the doubling in the number of static caravans from 27 to 54. However, the primary consideration in determining whether the alteration would be within the scope of the 1987 permission is not a question of numbers. Rather, it is whether there would be a change in the character of the use sufficient to require a further grant of planning permission. A second factor is the type of caravans and their visual effect within the site.
41. Static caravans would become the predominant type of accommodation within the planning unit, outnumbering chalets and touring pitches combined. The current mix of one third residential and two thirds holiday accommodation in those static caravans would be maintained, albeit in different numbers. Up to 30 touring caravans would be on the planning unit and/or appeal site at any one time during the 8-month holiday period. The appellant contends that the current proposal is different from that of the 2020 appeal decision and the 2022 judgement because it would not extinguish holiday use.
42. While I understand that point, it would be too simplistic to view the continued presence of holiday accommodation as preventing there being a change in the definable character of the use in all circumstances. It is a matter of judgement whether the proposed mix of residential and holiday accommodation and of caravan types and chalets would maintain the definable character of the use or amount to a material change of use.
43. The LDC is sought for proposed development, but some works have been carried out on the appeal site since 2020, with a significant element appearing to post-date the application the subject of this appeal, as described above. Since the date of the application, there has been a noticeable increase in ground coverage by static caravans, especially in the western area, near the original residential units, and in the central area previously used by touring caravans. Static caravans are also now sited closer to the A386, on the area made level by the regrading and gabions.
44. Some of those works might have been carried out even if there had been no aspiration to alter the numbers of caravans. However, it seems unlikely that all would have been necessary if no such alteration was intended. I asked each party's witness whether any of the works are associated with the proposed alteration in caravan numbers. Their responses gave me to understand that the appeal site is now part way toward how it would look if the numbers of static caravans were altered as proposed. The works therefore give some indication of how it would appear, and how the definable character of the use might be perceived, if the proposed alterations were made.
45. Although caravans are not operational development, the use of land involving their stationing has a visual dimension, particularly when large units that rarely move are involved. The additional 27 static caravans would comprise a mix of residential and holiday accommodation, but it is not possible to tell, by observation alone, whether those recently stationed on the appeal site are occupied residentially or as holiday accommodation. Indeed, some occupiers

- have bought holiday static caravans as their main residence and hope to be able to live in them all year round¹⁶ despite the current temporal restriction.
46. Occupation on that basis would make the personalisation of each pitch more likely. This could include hard and soft landscaping, external lighting, small ancillary structures and domestic paraphernalia, comparable to what may be expected with permanent residential occupation.
47. Many of the new static caravans I saw are twin units¹⁷. The newly formed pitches, whether occupied or not, do not appear to have been designed with movement of touring caravans in mind, because they are largely behind recently formed raised kerbs. While temporary arrangements can be made to overcome this when a static caravan needs to be delivered or removed, it would not be practicable for the much more frequent movement of touring caravans towed by their owners. Accordingly, I do not share Mr Eiser's view that a management decision has been taken that touring caravans would be stationed on a hardstanding rather than grass. The facts I saw indicate that pitches are being remodelled in a way that is not suitable for touring use.
48. It is apparent from the plan at paragraph 68 of Mr Eiser's proof of evidence that the proposed growth in static caravan numbers would be accompanied by changes to the holiday park layout. Although that plan does not appear to include any twin-unit static caravans, which are currently on site, the size and greater number of static caravans is likely to result in a denser layout and fewer areas where touring caravans might be sited. As such, the plan appears to under-estimate the density of layout necessary to accommodate the proposed 27 static caravans in addition to what is already permitted.
49. Historic photographs and aerial images confirm that the holiday park has operated with a relatively informal layout, in which residential units, grassed touring areas, and holiday caravans and chalets share a parkland setting. This began to change with the commencement of the works described above, which appear to be intended to facilitate an alteration in caravan numbers. The current 'part way' layout of the site and the appellant's illustrative plan¹⁸ show the sort of changes that would need to be made to accommodate the proposed additional 27 static caravans, including a noticeable increase in on-site infrastructure. They point to a significant change in the character of the use of the holiday park in visual terms through a more formal layout, with units sited uniformly close together along the internal roads.
50. It might be argued, contrary to what I gathered from the witnesses, that the works carried out so far should not be considered to facilitate the proposed use, because the alteration in caravan numbers has not happened. However, no alternative explanation has been provided for the works and it is difficult to imagine another reason for going to the trouble of carrying them out.
51. In addition, it seems clear that the practicality of accommodating an additional 27 static caravans within the holiday park will require areas that were unused for the siting of caravans, or only used informally, to become formalised. It appears unavoidable that this will bring caravans much closer to the A386, where they will be far more prominent in public views. This would be a

¹⁶ Oral evidence of Brian Prynne and Kerry Fice.

¹⁷ Defined by section 13(2) of the Caravan Sites Act 1968 as being up to 20 m long, up to 6.8 m wide, and with a maximum internal floor to ceiling height of 3.05 m.

¹⁸ Proof of evidence of Ben Eiser, paragraph 68.

significant change in the way the holiday park is perceived and in the defined character of its use.

52. Another potentially significant outcome is implied in the appellant's illustrative plan¹⁹. It suggests that reconfiguring the site to accommodate 27 more static caravans could require rearrangement of the western part, which is currently occupied by residential caravans in a low-density layout. Their replacement with a greater number of caravans would erode the existing open and communal character of this part of the holiday park. In reaching this view I am mindful that I was told that the existing residential units are privately owned, so their redevelopment would not be a simple task for the site operator. Therefore, if the uplift in static caravans had to be achieved without replacement of those residential units, pitches would either expand into other areas that are currently open or require a denser layout than illustrated in the centre of the holiday park. Either way, it would bring about a significant change in the definable character of the appeal site and the planning unit.
53. Overall, the proposed increase in static caravans for residential and holiday accommodation would result in a distinct urban character in the layout and use of the holiday park, resembling a suburban housing estate, significantly different from the defined character of the currently permitted use. There would also inevitably be an upturn in activity at the holiday park when the 27 additional caravans are occupied, whether permanently or as holiday accommodation.
54. Furthermore, no evidence has been presented to confirm that any of the works described above are required by the conditions of a site licence in force under the provisions of the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960. Accordingly, it has not been shown that they are permitted development²⁰ and do not require an express grant of planning permission.
55. The emerging changes and the space requirements of 27 additional static caravans are likely to reduce the scope for touring caravans to contribute to the defined character of the use of the holiday park. This is significant because the touring activity is central to the informality of the existing character of the use, similar to what was recorded in the 2020 appeal decision, albeit for a smaller planning unit. As noted, the newly formed pitches do not appear suitable for touring use and there are few remaining areas that could be used in that more informal way.
56. The eastern amenity area, next to the A386, could also be used for stationing of static caravans, although the land is currently uneven and rises as it approaches the road. Re-grading this area to make it usable in the manner shown in the appellant's illustrative plans would be likely to require operational development like the hardstanding and retaining walls described above. I recognise the appellant's argument that this land is part of the permitted holiday park and could therefore be used to station caravans. However, no explanation was offered as to why that should occur unless space needed to be found for an increase in caravans. Due to the topography of that area of land it cannot be used as such without significant works of regrading and therefore would remain devoid of caravans until the relevant works were undertaken.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ By reason of Article 3 and Schedule 2, Part 5, Paragraph B, of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

57. It is therefore probable that the retention of touring activity would either be limited by the increase in static caravans or would further formalise or extend into areas that have not been previously used for the stationing of caravans outside the appeal site area but within the planning unit. This would be due to the limited space available and the necessity to have such caravans near one another, and thereby urbanise the character of the proposed use.
58. The future prospect for touring activity has further significance for the definable character of the use because it tends to peak in summer and decline in winter and is prohibited entirely from mid-November to mid-March. Consequently, there is a significant seasonal variation in touring caravan numbers and activity across the holiday park, which contributes to the definable character of the use. In contrast, and despite the same seasonal prohibition on the occupation of most static caravans, they would be present all year round.
59. These findings indicate that the proposed alteration in static caravan numbers, and thus the mix of units, would result in the changes described above and would bring about a substantial and fundamental change in the definable character of the use of the holiday park. While the holiday park is the planning unit, there would be an equally substantial and fundamental change in the definable character of the use of the appeal site. Both would be beyond the scope of the 1987 permission. I therefore find that there would be a material change of use of the planning unit, and thus the appeal site, because of what is proposed.

Conclusion

60. For the reasons given above I find that the proposed alteration to the number of caravans from 9 residential, 18 holiday, 30 touring caravans and 16 chalets, to 18 residential, 36 holiday, 30 touring and up to 16 chalets is not provided for by the 1987 permission. Rather, it would amount to a material change of the use of the planning unit and thus the appeal site, for which planning permission would be required. On that basis the requested certificate that such a use would be lawful cannot be granted.
61. I therefore conclude that the Authority's refusal to grant an LDC in respect of the proposed alteration was well-founded, and that the appeal should fail. I will exercise accordingly the powers transferred to me in section 195(3) of the Act.

Mark Harbottle BSc MRTPI

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Andrew Fraser-Urquhart KC

He called

Ben Eiser BSc (Hons)
PG Dip MA MRTPI

Director, Eiser Planning & Development
Consultancy Services Limited

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Timothy Leader

He called

James Keith Aven BSc
MRTPI MRICS

Deputy Head of Development
Management, Dartmoor National Park
Authority

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Brian Pryn

Kerry Fice

Jim Garside

Dennis Kelly

Local resident

Local resident

Local resident

Local resident

Documents submitted at the Inquiry

- 1 The Authority's press notice giving details of the Inquiry.
- 2 Signed statement of common ground.
- 3 Representation by Jonathan Purchase, local resident, submitted via the Authority.
- 4 Extract from the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).