



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 26 September 2023

Site visit made on 27 September 2023

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X0360/W/23/3320780

Land opposite 130-144 Wargrave Road, Twyford RG10 9PN

- 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 J Smith against the decision of Wokingham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 230310, dated 7 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is siting of a mobile home on equestrian land to provide residential accommodation for a romany gypsy/traveller family and conversion of a stables to provide a day room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed change of use of land to a single Gypsy and Traveller pitch with the siting of 1 no. mobile home and conversion of the existing stables to a day room, plus associated parking, landscaping and gate at Land opposite 130-144 Wargrave Road, Twyford RG10 9PN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 230310, dated 7 February 2023, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. A new National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 5 September 2023. However, the only substantive changes made to the Framework relate to national policy for onshore wind development and they are not therefore relevant to the proposal.
3. At the hearing, the Council advised that the Twyford Neighbourhood Plan was made on 20 July 2023 and that it should now be given full weight. In response, the appellant stated that it should not be given full weight noting that it was not referred to in any of the reasons for refusal. Whilst noting the view of the appellant, as the Neighbourhood Plan has now been made, it forms part of the development plan for the area and carries full weight. In determining the appeal I have therefore have regard to it where relevant.
4. The description of development used in the heading above has been taken from the application form. However, in allowing the appeal I have used the description provided on the decision notice and as agreed in the Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) as this more accurately describes the proposal. At the hearing I queried with the parties whether the description ought to also refer to the touring caravan however, both felt this was not necessary and in any event, I am imposing a condition specifying the number and type of caravans permitted.

5. The agreed SOCG states that “the appellant and the appellant’s family has a GRT background and it is assumed that they comply with the relevant definitions in the PPTS (Planning policy for traveller sites)”. The application was submitted on the basis that the appellant is a Romany Gypsy/Traveller and at the hearing, the Council stated that it accepts that the appellant and his family meet both the 2015 PPTS definition of “gypsies and travellers” and the 2012 PPTS definition. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis that the appellant meets the 2015 PPTS definition as I have not seen or heard any evidence to the contrary. Both parties have referred to the Lisa Smith judgement¹ and the findings made in relation to the 2015 PPTS definition. Whilst I note and have had regard to this judgement, given that the Gypsy and Traveller status of the appellant and his family is not in dispute and that they appear to follow a nomadic way of life, no discrimination results from an application of the 2015 PPTS and the definitions used within it.
6. At the time that the application was determined, and the appeal was submitted, the most up to date Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) was dated 2017. However, a new GTAA was published in August 2023, prior to the hearing. The appellant has had the opportunity to comment on the 2023 GTAA and in reaching my decision, I have had regard to it and any comments received from the parties in relation to it.
7. A previous application for costs made by the appellant was withdrawn at the hearing.

Main Issues

8. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the PPTS, the Framework and any relevant development plan policies;
 - The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt and on the purposes of including land in the Green Belt;
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
 - Whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

9. The appeal site comprises a piece of relatively flat land enclosed by roads. Planning permission was granted for it to be used for equestrian purposes including the erection of a stable building in 2021². At the time of my visit, it appeared that the previous permission had been implemented and a timber stable building is positioned on the site, with existing access off Wargrave Road to the east. At the hearing, a local resident cast some doubt as to whether the appeal site has or is being used for equestrian purposes. However, in the absence of any evidence to support this claim and given the agreement between the parties in the SOCG as to the current status of the land, for the

¹ Smith v SSLUHC & Ors [2022] EWCA Civ 1391

² Application Number 211880 approved subject to conditions 16 August 2021.

purposes of the appeal I consider it to be in equestrian use. I was provided with a copy of the 2021 permission at the hearing³.

10. After the hearing, the Council advised that it is considering taking enforcement action requiring the removal of the stable building as it now states that the equestrian use has ceased. The appellant refutes this. Whilst I note the apparent change in the Council's stance in respect of this matter, in the absence of any substantive evidence regarding the alleged cessation of use or of the serving of an enforcement notice, it does not alter my consideration of the existing status of the land and the stable building for the purposes of this appeal.
11. The proposal includes the stable building being retained and converted for use as a day room, a new static caravan with surrounding paved patio and a gravel driveway and parking area including space for a touring caravan. A submitted Landscape Strategy Plan shows the retention of some existing planting and the provision of new planting both within the site and along the site boundaries.

Whether inappropriate development

12. Both parties agree that the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Paragraph 16 of the PPTS states that Traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development and I concur with the position of the main parties.

Effect on openness and Green Belt purposes

13. A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy, as set out in paragraph 137 of the Framework, is to keep land permanently open.
14. The existing stable building is modest in size, height and appearance. Its position close to the boundary with Wargrave Road means that whilst there are some views of it from that road to the east and from the west through gaps in the existing landscaping, it is not prominent.
15. The proposal would result in an increase in development on the site. Whilst existing and proposed landscaping together with the modest height of the proposed static caravan would minimise the effect of the proposal on the visual aspect of openness, the increased amount of development on the site would lead to a moderate loss of openness having regard to its spatial dimension. I therefore conclude that the proposal would lead to moderate harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
16. Paragraph 139 of the Framework states that the Green Belt serves five purposes. These include safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Residential development on the site would contribute to extending the settlement of Twyford further northwards and would result in encroachment into the countryside. Whilst the effect of this would be mitigated to some extent by the presence of residential development to the east and a plant nursery to the west, the proposal would nevertheless conflict with one of the Green Belt purposes. I note that this finding is consistent with that of the Inspector who determined a recent appeal for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation to the north of the appeal site⁴.

³ Hearing Document 1

⁴ APP/X0360/W/21/3288874 Land opposite 136 – 144 Wargrave Road. Allowed 17 October 2022.

Summary of Green Belt Harm

17. The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It would result in a moderate loss of openness and would conflict with one of the Green Belt purposes. Paragraph 148 of the Framework states that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt.
18. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy⁵, Policy TB01 of the MDD Plan⁶, relevant paragraphs of section 13 of the Framework and relevant policies in the PPTS. These policies state, amongst other things, that planning permission will not be granted for inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and will only be permitted where development maintains openness and does not conflict with Green Belt purposes.

Character and appearance

19. As stated, the appeal site comprises a piece of land in equestrian use surrounded by roads. It is largely grassed and undeveloped but does include a modest stable building and an access point, with existing landscaping to the site boundaries. The site is located beyond the settlement boundary of Twyford, within an open countryside location between Twyford and the settlement of Wargrave to the north. Whilst the Council refer to the appeal site being in a "settlement gap" between Twyford and Wargrave, at the hearing, it confirmed that this is a description of the site location rather than reference to a specific policy designation. The site is also located within a Green Route Enhancement Area but at the hearing the Council acknowledged that the second reason for refusal makes no reference to the associated CS Policy CC03.
20. The southern boundary of the site is adjacent to the busy A4, with the site being close to the roundabout linking the A4 and the A321. A number of large, detached residential properties set in spacious grounds are located to the east of the site along Wargrave Road, a plant nursery is located to the west to the other side of the A321, with the settlement of Twyford located to the other side of the A4. In addition, a Gypsy and Traveller pitch is located immediately to the north of the site. This has temporary planning permission following an appeal in 2022⁷.
21. The appeal site falls within the Landscape Character Area H1: Arable Chalk Lowlands of Wokingham Borough Landscape Character Assessment November 2019, but is not subject to any specific landscape designations.
22. At present, the site is rural in character, albeit it is located adjacent to roads and some residential and commercial development. The proposed residential development, which includes the provision of hard surfacing and the siting of caravans together with residential activity and domestic paraphernalia associated with the use, would result in an urbanisation of the site and a change to its character and appearance. This is notwithstanding the proposed landscaping indicated on the submitted Landscape Strategy Plan. However, the particular location of the site means that the proposal would be viewed in the context of surrounding development, some of which extends further

⁵ Wokingham Borough Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document January 2010

⁶ Wokingham Borough Development Plan Adopted Managing Development Delivery Local Plan February 2014

⁷ APP/X0360/W/21/3288874 Land opposite 136 – 144 Wargrave Road. Allowed 17 October 2022.

northwards towards Wargrave than the appeal site. Consequently, the proposal would not diminish the “settlement gap” between Twyford and Wargrave.

23. Existing boundary landscaping means that whilst there are some views into the site from surrounding roads, these are close range, localised views. The provision of additional landscaping would add to the existing landscaping and would help to mitigate the urbanising effect of the proposal and to minimise its effect on the appearance of the area. Nevertheless, as stated above, the proposal would result in increased development on and a consequent urbanisation of the site and this would result in moderate harm to the character and appearance of the area. At the hearing, the appellant accepted that there would be some harm to the character and appearance of the area but considered that this would be limited.
24. In reaching my decision, I note the willingness of the appellant to accept the imposition of conditions controlling parking area surface material and modifying the proposed landscape scheme. However, whilst this would serve to address some of the Council’s concerns regarding the proposal, the conditions would not fully overcome the harm resulting from the proposal.
25. Taking the above matters into consideration, the proposal is contrary to policies CP1, CP2 and CP11 of the Core Strategy, policies TB10 and TB21 of the MDD Plan and to relevant paragraphs of section 15 of the Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, to maintain the quality of the environment, to restrict excessive encroachment, to ensure that Gypsy and Traveller proposals are located either within or close to development limits of settlements and that proposals have regard to Landscape Character Areas and retain the condition, character and features that contribute to the landscape. Though Core Strategy Policy CP12 was referred to in the Council’s second reason for refusal, this relates to the Green Belt and so is not directly related to this issue. At the hearing, the Council accepted that MDD Plan Policy TB03 is not relevant to the proposal.

Other Considerations

Need for Gypsy and Traveller Pitches

26. As stated, the Council published a new GTAA in 2023, after the determination of the application and the submission of the appeal. At the hearing, the appellant confirmed acceptance of the methodology used for the 2023 GTAA and of the total need figure of 86 pitches for the period 2022/23 to 2039/40 and a 5 year need figure of 35 pitches. At the time of the determination of the application and based on the previous GTAA, the Council considered that it had a five year supply of pitches. However, the Council now accepts that it cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable pitches against the new assessment of need.
27. Whilst acknowledging its current lack of supply, in evidence, the Council points towards potential sources of future supply in the form of the unauthorised occupation of pitches by non-Gypsy and Travellers and through the granting of permanent permission for suitable temporary pitches. These potential sources of supply were explored further at the hearing, and it became apparent that neither are in any way guaranteed to address the current shortfall in supply, much less to address it in the near future.

28. At the hearing the Council referred to the fact that the emerging Local Plan (ELP) will have site allocations for Gypsy and Traveller pitches and that a number of sites have already been identified and have come forward through a call for sites process. Be that as it may, at the present time, it appears that the ELP is still at the preparation stage, and it has not been submitted for examination. Consequently, it is not clear how the unmet need for pitches will be met, other than through the planning application process in the form of windfall sites. The Council's previous track record of providing pitches whilst noted, does not alter the current under-provision.
29. Although the proposal is for one pitch, noting the extent of the level of unmet need, I attach significant weight to the fact that it would contribute to meeting the unmet need for pitches.

Personal Circumstances of the Appellant

30. At the time of the hearing, Mr Smith and his family were living at his sisters farm in Buckinghamshire. At the hearing Mr Smith stated that they have been living there since around 2012, with a period of 18 months living at the appeal site around 2017 (a previous planning appeal at the appeal site was dismissed in 2017 with a linked enforcement appeal being successful in part⁸). There are 3 lawful pitches at his sisters farm, Mr Smith and his family previously lived on one of them but have recently had to vacate that due to it being required by his sisters grown up children. He and his family are currently unlawfully residing in 2 touring caravans at the farm. Planning permission was recently sought for an additional pitch at Mr Smith's sisters farm, but was not granted.⁹
31. Mr Smith has 5 children, 3 of whom are currently in education. Two children are tutored twice a week near where they live, and the youngest child attends a local primary school. I was advised that if the appeal is allowed then the 2 older children would continue to be tutored remotely and the youngest child would move to a primary school near to the appeal site. If the appeal is dismissed, then Mr Smith stated then he did not know what would happen to the family or to the children's education as they have nowhere else to go.
32. Mr Smith advised that the family is registered with a GP in Buckinghamshire and would change to a local GP if the appeal were allowed. Mr Smith has a brother who lives nearby in Wargrave.
33. Given the overcrowding at and uncertainty surrounding the accommodation of Mr Smith and his family, the availability of a settled base from which to access education and health facilities would clearly be in the best interests of the children, particularly the child currently attending primary school. I attach significant weight to this consideration.

Availability of Alternative Accommodation

34. The 2023 GTAA identifies 25 pitches on 2 Council managed sites in the Borough. At the hearing the Council confirmed that there are currently no vacant pitches on either of these sites and that there is a waiting list but that the length of that is unknown. The Council acknowledged that there is a very low turnover of pitches at these sites. Mr Smith advised that he has applied twice for these sites in the last 15 years but has never had a response from the

⁸ APP/X0360/C/17/3174822 & APP/X0360/W/17/3174161

⁹ 21/07099/FUL

Council. He also stated that the pitches tend to be passed between family members and that he has no connections with anyone on these sites. The Council advised that it was aware of an allocation policy to accommodate existing families and their relations. Mr Smith advised that he has also previously applied for Council pitches in Oxford and Buckinghamshire but has also been unsuccessful there.

35. In evidence the Council has identified a number of alternative sites that it considers would be available to Mr Smith. These were discussed at the hearing. Of all the alternative sites referred to by the Council, on the basis of the evidence before me, none appear to be suitable or available to Mr Smith and his family. This is either because they have intended occupiers (ref 203626); have no capacity (ref 192012); are not available for sale or rent (23a Nine Mile Ride) or due to issues between Mr Smith and the occupiers of the sites which make them unsuitable and unavailable to him (ref 173022, 192174, 180072 and Highfield Park).
36. I note that the Inspector considering the appeal on land to the north of the appeal site¹⁰ considered that it had not been demonstrated that there were no available, less harmful, alternative sites in that case. However, that decision was taken over a year ago and I am not aware of the specific evidence presented to the Inspector regarding alternative sites. Moreover, the circumstances of each of the appellants is unique to them. Consequently, whilst I note the findings of my fellow Inspector, I have assessed the proposal on its own merits and on the basis of the evidence before me.

Ecological Enhancements

37. The submitted Landscape Strategy Plan states that it is intended to increase the value of the site for wildlife and ecological benefit. This would be achieved by the planting of wildlife friendly species. The submitted ecological report also recommends a number of biodiversity enhancements. Neither of the parties have sought to quantify the level of benefit of these enhancements and in the absence of this and based on the evidence before me, I afford them moderate weight.

Green Belt Balance

38. Paragraph 147 of the Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 148 states that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt and very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
39. The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It would lead to a moderate loss of openness and would conflict with one of the Green Belt purposes. The proposal would also result in moderate harm to the character and appearance of the area.
40. The evidence suggests that no alternative accommodation is available to the appellant, and I attach significant weight to the fact that the proposal would contribute to meeting the unmet need for pitches and would provide the

¹⁰ APP/X0360/W/21/3288874

appellant and his family with a settled base from which to access education and healthcare provision. This would be in the best interests of the children. The proposal would also result in some moderate ecological benefits should the recommended measures be carried out.

41. However, I consider that these other considerations, including the extent of interference with the appellant's rights under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, do not clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and the other harm in this case. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist. This finding is consistent with paragraph 16 of the PPTS.
42. This balance changes significantly however, when considering a temporary planning permission. This would not involve permanent harm to the Green Belt or to the character and appearance of the area and would allow the family to have a more settled base from which the children could continue their education. It would also allow for alternative sites to come forward through the ELP process. This approach is a proportionate response in view of the appellant's rights under Article 8 of the European Convention of Human Rights, the Public Sector Equality Duty, and the best interests of the children.
43. A temporary permission would still result in harm to the openness of the Green Belt and to the character and appearance of the area for a limited period. However, in this case, I consider that this is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In reaching this decision, I have not given weight to the ecological benefits and as an other consideration, given the temporary nature of the proposal.
44. I therefore conclude that very special circumstances exist to justify a grant of a temporary planning permission. This would not conflict with Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy, Policy TB01 of the MDD Plan, or guidance in the Framework and PPTS relating to Green Belts.
45. Whilst I note that some of my findings differ to those of the Inspector dealing with the 2017 appeal at the site, the two proposals differ and in reaching my findings, I have had regard to the evidence before me now.

Other Matters

46. In reaching my decision, I have had regard to a number of other issues raised by interested parties.
47. Given the scale of the proposed residential development, the siting and orientation of the caravans and the relative distance between the appeal site and surrounding residential development, any noise and disturbance generated is not likely to be significant or harmful to the living conditions of nearby occupiers. Similarly, given the above, there would be no material loss of privacy.
48. Any increase in traffic flow would not be significant given that only one pitch is proposed and a condition restricting commercial activity and vehicle size is being imposed. Therefore, any use of nearby roads including by pedestrians and cyclists using the nearby Chiltern Cycle Way would not be materially affected. I note that no objections were raised by the Highway Authority, subject to the imposition of conditions.

49. I am aware of the existence of another Gypsy and Traveller pitch to the north of the site and I have had regard to the cumulative effect of that pitch together with the proposal. Any concerns raised regarding how that development has been carried out is not a matter for me in considering the proposal but is a matter for the Council. Whilst I consider that the proposal is harmful to the Green Belt and to the character and appearance of the area, for the reasons stated, a temporary permission is justified in this case.
50. Whilst the proposal would increase the amount of development and result in the urbanisation of the site, the site is privately owned and is not available to the wider public. Therefore, whilst there would be some visual loss of greenspace, this would be mitigated by the temporary nature of the permission and by any landscaping carried out at the site as required by condition.
51. No objection was raised by the Council's Ecologist, and I have seen no evidence to suggest that there would be any adverse ecological effects resulting from the proposal.
52. The appeal site is located close to the settlement boundary of Twyford. The Council raised no objections to the proposal on the basis of its accessibility to services and facilities and I note that the Inspector who determined the appeal relating to the site to the north stated that it was very near to the settlement of Twyford. At my site visit I noted the presence of a school, garden centre, petrol filling station, cycle way and road network nearby. Given this, the sites position relative to Twyford and having regard to the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the appeal site has access to a range of services and facilities.
53. Whilst I note that some concerns have been raised regarding flooding, I saw no evidence of this at my site visit and note that the parties agree that the site is in Flood Zone 1, an area at low risk from flooding. No objections were raised to the proposal by Thames Water or by the Council's Drainage Officer and on this basis and noting that drainage details are required by condition, I am satisfied that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of flood risk and drainage.

Conditions

54. I have had regard to the list of conditions suggested by the Council. These were discussed at the hearing. Where necessary, the wording of the conditions have been amended for precision and clarity. Some conditions have been amended more significantly and where this has occurred or where I have imposed additional conditions not suggested, the parties have been given the opportunity to provide comments and I have had regard to these.
55. As permission is being granted for a temporary period, I have not imposed an implementation condition but have imposed conditions specifying a time period and requiring future restoration of the site (the latter to incorporate the requirements of the 2 restoration conditions suggested by the Council). The Council suggested a temporary period of 3 years, but I have imposed a restriction of 5 years as suggested by the appellant to account for any delays to the ELP, and the need for any identified sites to gain planning permission and to be constructed. The time period condition also restricts the occupancy of the site to the appellant and their family. This is necessary given that I have attached significant weight to the family's circumstances in this case. I have not imposed the suggested condition restricting occupation to those meeting the definition of Gypsies and Travellers as this is not necessary given the

appellant's Gypsy and Traveller status and the imposition of the personal restriction.

56. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans for certainty. I have not referred to the submitted Landscape Strategy Plan as part of this condition. This was not specified by the Council and given that permission is being granted for a limited period and that the plan proposes ecological enhancements as well as landscaping, I consider it more appropriate to impose a condition requiring a landscape scheme to be submitted and approved, as suggested by the Council. I have separated out the tree protection element of the suggested landscaping condition as to be effective, tree protection measures are required to be submitted prior to any development commencing on site. Similarly, drainage details are required in advance of any development given the nature of the requirements of such a condition. These conditions are necessary to ensure adequate landscaping and drainage of the site. Whilst I appreciate that they may delay the appellant occupying the site, I consider them to be necessary.
57. Further conditions are necessary and have been imposed regarding the number and type of caravans, any external lighting at the site, restricting commercial activities and the weight of vehicles. These are in order to protect the character and appearance of the site. I have not imposed the suggested condition regarding future changes to the position of the mobile home as its position is shown on the approved plans, so this condition is not necessary.
58. Finally I have imposed conditions regarding parking, the surfacing of the vehicular access and the proposed gate in the interests of ensuring suitable parking and access arrangements. I have not imposed the suggested cycle parking condition as I do not consider that this is necessary having regard to the nature and scale of the proposal.

Conclusion

59. The proposal is for inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it would reduce the openness of the Green Belt and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. However, whilst the other considerations in this case do not clearly outweigh the harm when considering a permanent permission, they do when considering a temporary one.
60. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and a temporary 5 year personal permission granted.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Alan Masters of Counsel

Mr Tony White – White Planning

Mr James Smith – Appellant

Mrs K Smith – Appellant's sister

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Benjamin Hindle – Principal Planning Officer

James McCabe – Principal Planning Policy Officer

Helen Maynard – Team Leader Development Management and Enforcement

Dr Michael Bullock – Arc4

Bridget Crafer – Landscape

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Charles Wickenden – Twyford Parish Council

Cllr Lindsay Ferris – Borough Councillor for Planning and Ward Member

Margaret Denham – Local Resident

DOCUMENTS:

H1 – Copy of planning permission reference 211880

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1. The use hereby permitted shall be carried on only by Mr Jim Smith and/or Mrs Martina Smith, and their resident dependants, and shall be for a limited period of 5 years from the date of this permission, or the period during which the land is occupied by them, whichever is the shorter.
2. Either when the land ceases to be occupied by Mr Jim Smith and/or Mrs Martina Smith and their dependent children, or at the end of the specified 5 years, whichever occurs first, then the use hereby permitted shall cease and all structures, caravans, equipment and materials brought onto the land in connection with the use hereby permitted shall be removed. Following cessation of the use, within 6 months the land shall be restored in accordance with a scheme previously submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:

Location Plan 1/1250 - un-numbered
Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations – GP/02/22
Proposed Two Bedroom Mobile Home – GP/03/22 Rev B
Proposed Block Plan - drawing number GP/04/22
Proposed 5 Bar Field Timber Gate – GP/05/22
4. No development shall take place until a scheme for the protection of existing trees and landscape features shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
5. No development shall take place until full details of the drainage system for the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development and shall be thereafter maintained for the lifetime of the development.
6. Prior to the occupation of the site for residential purposes, the vehicle parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the approved plans. The spaces shall be maintained and remain available for the parking of vehicles for the lifetime of the development.
7. Prior to the occupation of the site for residential purposes, the vehicular access shall be surfaced with a permeable and bonded material across the entire width of the access for a distance of 10 metres measured from the carriageway edge.
8. Prior to the occupation of the site for residential purposes, the gate shown on drawing number GP/05/22 shall be erected across the site access. It shall open away from the highway and be positioned to ensure that vehicles waiting for the gate to open do not obstruct the highway.

9. Within 3 months of the date of the implementation of this permission, there shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping to include both hard and soft landscaping. This shall specify species, planting sizes, spacing and numbers of trees/shrubs to be planted and all existing landscape saplings to be retained.

Planting shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details in the first planting and seeding seasons following approval. Any trees or plants which within the period of the consent, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

10. There shall be no more than 1 (one) pitch on the site. No more than 2 (two) caravans, as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 as amended (of which no more than 1 [one] shall be a static caravan) shall be stationed on the pitch at any time.
11. No additional external lighting shall be installed on the site without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
12. No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials and no vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on the site.

END.