



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 11 December 2023

by Neil Pope BA (HONS) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2023

Appeal A Ref: APP/Q3305/W/23/3319443

Wells Holiday Park, Haybridge Farm, Haybridge, Wells, Somerset, BA5 1AJ.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
- The appeal is made by Wells Holiday Park Ltd against the decision of Mendip District Council.
- The application ref. 2022/0191/VRC, dated 1 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 October 2022.
- The application sought planning permission for a touring caravan site, including new toilet and shower block and alterations to existing entrance without complying with a condition attached to planning permission ref. 104293/004, dated 14 June 1989.
- The condition in dispute is No. 5 which states that: *The occupation of any one caravan on the site shall not exceed 31 days with no return within the following 31 days by the previous occupiers.*
- The reason given for the condition is: *To ensure that the site is not permanently occupied which would be contrary to the policies of the Structure Plan.*

Appeal B Ref: APP/Q3305/W/23/3319451

Wells Holiday Park, Haybridge Farm, Haybridge, Wells, Somerset, BA5 1AJ.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
- The appeal is made by Wells Holiday Park Ltd against the decision of Mendip District Council.
- The application ref. 2022/0197/VRC, dated 1 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 October 2022.
- The application sought planning permission for the construction of 12 holiday lodges as phase 1 (amendments to the scale and layout of 12 holiday lodges already granted by outline planning permission 104293/013) without complying with a condition attached to planning permission ref. 2010/3129, dated 18 February 2011.
- The condition in dispute is No. 5 which states that: *The holiday lodges hereby approved shall not be occupied other than by tourists (see definition in Note 5 below) which is not their sole or main place of residence in accordance with written records of occupiers, addresses of their sole or main place of residence and purpose of occupancy that shall be made available for inspection at all reasonable times to the Local Planning Authority.*
- The reason given for the condition is: *The permanent residential use of the holiday lodges hereby approved would be contrary to Saved Policy S1 of the Mendip District Local Plan (adopted – 2002).*

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed and appeal B is allowed. Planning permission is granted for the construction of 12 holiday lodges as phase 1 (amendments to the scale and layout of 12 holiday lodges already granted by outline planning permission 104293/013) at Wells Holiday Park, Haybridge Farm, Haybridge, Wells,

Somerset, BA5 1AJ. The permission is granted in accordance with application ref. 2022/0197/VRC, dated 1 February 2022, without compliance with condition No.5 (occupation by tourists only) attached to permission ref. 2010/3129 and subject to the conditions in the Schedule attached to this decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. In April 2023, Mendip District Council was incorporated within Somerset County Council (the LPA).
3. The LPA accepts that it is unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply.
4. As part of the appeal, the appellant has submitted a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) under the provisions of section 106 of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). This includes provision for restricting the occupation of any of the caravans/mobile homes/lodges to persons over the age of 50 and no children or dependents under the age of 16. The LPA has informed me that as a consequence, its reason for refusal No.7 (education provision) falls away.

Main Issues (Both Appeals)

5. The six main issues are: firstly, the effect upon the character and appearance of the area, including the setting of Wells and whether there would be any potential coalescence of Wells and Haybridge; secondly, whether the proposal would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers; thirdly, the likely effect upon highway safety along the A371; fourthly, whether the proposal would include adequate mitigation in terms of resource efficiency and low carbon initiatives so as to help tackle climate change; fifthly, whether the proposal would assist in meeting the housing needs of the local community by providing an adequate mix of house types and an element of affordable housing and; sixthly, whether adequate public open space provision exists or could be made available to meet the recreational needs of residents/occupiers.

Reasons

Planning Policy

6. The development plan includes the Mendip District Local Plan Part I: Strategy and Policies 2006-2029 (LPI) and the Mendip District Local Plan Part 2: Sites and Policies. My attention has been drawn to numerous policies. The most important policies to the determination of these appeals are: LPI policies CP1 (spatial strategy), CP4 (sustaining rural communities), CP10 (Wells City Strategy), DP1 (local identity and distinctiveness), DP4 (Mendip's landscapes), DP7 (design and amenity), DP9 (transport), DP11 (affordable housing), DP14 (housing mix and type) and DP16 (open space and green infrastructure).
7. The appeal sites lie outside the settlement limits for Wells, as defined within the development plan. For planning policy purposes, they are treated as part of the countryside. Within such areas, LPI policy CP1 provides strict control over development. The proposals would allow the sites to be used on a full-time residential (rather than leisure/recreational) basis. This would be tantamount to the provision of open market housing within the countryside and would be at odds with the provisions of LPI policies CP1 and CP4.
8. I have already noted the housing land supply position. In all likelihood, some areas of countryside would need to be released for housing in order to address

the shortfall in supply. The proposals would assist in this regard. This benefit carries considerable weight in the planning balance.

9. In determining these appeals, I have also had regard to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Planning History

10. Wells Holiday Park has a lengthy planning history. This includes a Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) for the replacement of 56 touring caravans with up to and including 40 static caravans for holiday accommodation purposes on appeal site A. This was certified in 2021 (ref. APP/Q3305/X/21/3273377).

First Main Issue - Character and Appearance

11. The appeal sites lie to the south west of the city of Wells and are adjacent to the edge of the small settlement of Haybridge. Appeal site A is surrounded on three sides by fields¹. The northern, western and southern² sides of appeal site B comprise part of the touring caravan park and the eastern boundary abuts a small ribbon of dwellings along the western side of the A371. The sites form part of a gently undulating landscape to the south west of Wells. Whilst there is some noise from motor vehicles using the A371, there is also a degree of tranquillity within this part of the countryside.
12. A development of about 200 homes has been built on land to the north east and east of the appeal sites and on the opposite side of the A371³. I also note from the development plan that much further to the south (and on the southern side of the B3139) 4.5 ha of land is allocated for housing, whilst to the north of the appeal sites land has been allocated for a new rugby club.
13. As I noted during my visit, the appeal sites can be seen from a section of the A371 to the north, as well as from the public rights of way that bisect the fields to the south and to the north, the latter forming part of the planned rugby club site. The holiday park is also visible in distant views from the north.
14. When seen from the public realm, appeal site A is more prominent within the landscape and is readily identifiable as a tourist facility beyond the settlement edge. At this time of the year, the seasonal nature of the holiday park and in particular, the 'touring caravan site' (appeal site A)⁴, comprises a somewhat low key use within this part of the countryside. The situation is likely to be different in the summer months, when more intensive use of the touring site could reasonably be expected. I am also mindful of the above noted LDC.
15. Nevertheless, tourist accommodation and caravan parks are commonplace within the countryside and established planning policies are generally supportive of such development. As in the case of Wells Holiday Park, the benefits to the rural economy, which tourist accommodation brings, are often considered to outweigh adverse environmental and/or other impacts.

¹ I note that a developer is undertaking a consultation exercise in respect of a proposed scheme of about 50 dwellings on the field to the south (Land at Newhouse Farm). I understand that a previous application for 68 dwellings on this site was refused in 2020 (ref. 2020/2217/OTS).

² A narrow strip of the touring caravan site separates the holiday lodges from the buildings at Newhouse Farm.

³ Outline permission was allowed on appeal in 2016 (ref. APP/Q3305/W/3129620). There is a sizeable area of greenspace between the western edge of this development and the A371.

⁴ This is the larger of the two appeal sites. During my visit there were numerous unoccupied pitches.

16. The holiday lodges site (appeal site B) is, in effect, tucked behind the ribbon of houses along the A371 and almost immediately alongside the buildings at Newhouse Farm. In contrast, the 'touring caravan site' (appeal site A) is readily identifiable as a tourist facility beyond the settlement edge.
17. The proposals would enable both appeal sites to be used all year round by the same occupants/residents. Those living on the sites for most, if not all, of the year, would behave differently to tourists staying for short periods of time. In all likelihood, residents would have very different expectations for their homes and living environment. This would bring about a change in the character of the sites, including greater activity throughout the year, especially during the winter months and, in all probability, an increase in domestic trappings as well.
18. The ensuing overtly residential character and appearance of each site would contrast awkwardly with the largely unspoilt rural qualities of the countryside within which these sites sit. In appeal A, the proposal would be akin to a rather ungainly 'extension' of housing into the countryside. To some extent, this would degrade the quality of the local landscape and conflict with LPI policy DP4. This would not be overcome by the appellant's suggestion of attaching a planning condition to an approval that exerted some control over the external appearance of the caravans. In contrast, the smaller size of appeal site B and its relationship with the neighbouring buildings, would result in the proposal for this site being not unlike settlement 'rounding off'.
19. The proposal for appeal site A would be very much more apparent from the public realm. It would have a moderate adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding countryside. In contrast, the proposal for appeal site B would be likely to have only a very limited adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the site and surroundings. Notwithstanding the appellant's argument that there is currently no control over the appearance of the holiday lodges/caravans, the proposals would not contribute positively to the maintenance and enhancement of local identity and distinctiveness as required by LPI policy DP1.
20. I note the concerns of the Parish Council. Although the proposals may not entail any operational development, if approved, they could result in future pressure being applied on the LPA to permit more permanent structures/'bricks and mortar' dwellings on the appeal sites, which it would have difficulty resisting. In the case of appeal site A, this would, in all likelihood, accentuate the harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the site and surroundings. Whilst my decisions do not turn on this particular matter, it adds some limited weight to the argument for withholding planning permission.
21. From the evidence before me, the proposals would not intrude into any designated 'green gap' around Wells. The location of the appeal sites on the southern side of the A371 and the intervening greenspace would also avoid creating any perception of settlement coalescence. There would be no conflict with LPI policy CP10. However, for the reasons I have identified above, the proposals on their own (to varying degrees) and cumulatively, would erode the countryside qualities of the local area, including the sense of tranquillity.
22. I have not seen any detailed plans for the rugby club/sports provision to the north of the appeal sites. However, it is reasonable to expect that much of these neighbouring fields would remain open. It is also by no means certain that sports activities would occur all day/every day to the extent that it

resulted in a permanent loss of tranquillity from this part of the countryside. On the basis of the information before me, it is also very far from certain that approval would be forthcoming for the proposals at Newhouse Farm.

23. I conclude on the first main issue that the proposals (both appeals) would have adverse effects upon the character and appearance of the area.

Second Main Issue - Living Conditions

24. If the lodges/caravans were occupied by residents (as opposed to tourists / those staying on holiday) there would, in all likelihood, be a greater need for external private amenity space. Some residents are likely to want their own gardens to enjoy throughout the year and, on occasion, to relax in and possibly entertain friends or family.
25. From what I saw during my visit, the lodges on appeal site B have some private external amenity spaces, including the use of outside decking areas. Although these spaces are very modest in size, on balance, they are likely to be adequate in meeting the needs of future residents and would not give rise to any harmful overlooking of neighbouring lodges. However, this is less apparent for the caravans on appeal site A. If all of this site was occupied by residents, the scope for providing the necessary garden spaces is likely to be more limited. This could result in an inadequate living environment for some residents and create the impression of a cramped form of development.
26. I also note from the LPA's officer's report that concern was raised regarding potential sound insulation of the lodges/caravans. The materials used in this type of accommodation are different to 'bricks and mortar' type housing. However, the appellant has informed me that mobile homes are constructed to British Standard 3632: Specification for Residential Park Homes, (BS3632) and are tested for acoustic performance. There is nothing before me to demonstrate that future residents would experience harmful noise disturbance.
27. I conclude on the second main issue that the appeal scheme B would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers, but there would be inadequate external private amenity space for the occupiers of appeal site A. In appeal A, there would be conflict with the provisions of LPI policy DP7(1)(b).

Third Main Issue - Highway Safety

28. The Highway Authority (HA) has advised that the proposals would result in a material increase in traffic and an increase in demand for car parking, as well as triggering provision for some secure and covered cycle parking and electric charging facilities. The HA also considers that that if a cumulative total of 50+ residential units were provided there would be a need for a Full Travel Plan.
29. I agree with the HA and LPA that the appeal proposals (taken on their own) would be likely to result in an increase in vehicular traffic to and from the site. In particular, in comparison to tourists staying on the appeal sites, residents could reasonably be expected to make more journeys in accessing healthcare facilities, business/employment sites and more regular shopping trips. More deliveries to residents' homes could also reasonably be expected. In all likelihood, this would comprise a modest increase in traffic movements for appeal A and a very modest increase for appeal B.

30. The appeal sites are accessed from the A371 and where there is a 40 mph speed restriction in force. I recognise that my visit was undertaken during the early afternoon and in winter, when traffic flows are likely to be lower than at some other times of the day and the peak summer season. However, I noted that visibility at the site entrance was adequate for vehicles entering and leaving the site. There is no evidence before me (such as road traffic accident records) to demonstrate that either the operation of the access into the appeal sites or the section of the A371 past the site are unsafe.
31. I note the appellant's argument that there is a separate licensing process⁵ which controls the form and layout of caravan sites, including car parking provision. If the lodges/caravans were occupied by residents (as opposed to tourists) there would be a likely increase in demand for car parking. In particular, some residents may own more than one motor vehicle and unlike tourists, residents are more likely to receive visitors. Whilst mindful of the need to avoid duplicating controls, there is an element of doubt in my mind as to whether adequate space could be provided within the appeal sites to accommodate the increase in demand for car parking.
32. The situation would be unlikely to result in any harmful impact for the appeal B scheme (some existing visitor parking could potentially be made available within the adjoining 'blue' land owned/controlled by the appellant), whilst for the appeal A scheme, the likely increase in demand for car parking could result in some congestion within this site. Although the appeal scheme A would not make for a particularly satisfactory form of development, the impact would not be so great as to compromise highway safety interests.
33. I conclude on the third main issue that the proposal would not harm highway safety interests along the A371 and, in so doing, would accord with the provisions of LPI policy DP9.

Fourth Main Issue - Tackling Climate Change

34. LPI policy DP7 includes a requirement for new development to incorporate all practical measures to achieve energy efficiency through siting, layout and design. I disagree with the appellant's argument that this is an irrelevant policy consideration. However, the lawful/long-standing-use of appeal sites A and B is, in effect, a fallback position available to the appellant.
35. I also note the appellant's argument that modern mobile homes have high specifications for insulation and energy efficiency which can be equivalent to or better than traditional build methods for dwellings. I have been informed that mobile homes must achieve u-values of 0.35 W/m-K for walls and floors and 0.2 W/m-K for roofs. I also understand that the National Caravan Council operates an energy efficiency rating scheme for mobile homes.
36. It has not been demonstrated that the proposals would be inconsistent with the objectives of established national and local planning policies aimed at tackling climate change, or conflict with the provisions of LPI policy DP7(1)(d).
37. I conclude on the fourth main issue that the proposal would include adequate mitigation in terms of resource efficiency and low carbon initiatives so as to help tackle climate change.

⁵ Provided for under the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960.

Fifth Main Issue – Mix of House Types/Affordable Housing

38. There are differences in the style and size of some of caravans/lodges that are, or which could be, stationed on the appeal sites. However, these comprise a single type of house/home. Given the occupancy restrictions of the UU, the type of residential accommodation that would be provided on the appeal sites and the demographic of the occupants would be somewhat limited. The proposals could not reasonably be described as providing a mix and range of different types of residential accommodation, as required by LPI policy DP14.
39. I note from the development plan that Wells has an older age-profile than other towns within the former Mendip area, with pressure on housing affordability. Whilst appeal scheme A and the cumulative effect of both appeal schemes could result in a rather unbalanced local community, the more modest appeal scheme B would assist in meeting the demand from older people looking to move to Wells and without creating any imbalance in the local community.
40. Amongst other things, the development plan recognises a lack of affordable housing, necessary to meet the needs of the local community. In an attempt to address this, LPI policy DP11 requires housing proposals to make provision for some affordable housing. I note from the consultation response of the LPA's Housing Enabling Officer (HEO) that neither of the appeal schemes were considered to meet the policy requirement for affordable housing provision.
41. I also note from the appellant's evidence that the average house price⁶ for properties in Mendip is £394,000 and the average asking price⁷ for mobile homes on 33 caravan parks within 32 km of Wells is £150,662. The Inspector who determined appeals⁸ on a caravan park in Sussex in 2021, and where a comparison in respect of house/mobile home prices was undertaken found, "*based on the specific evidence*" before them, that mobile homes could be considered to offer an affordable route to home ownership.
42. I consider that for a few⁹ of those aged 50+ who would be looking to purchase one of the lodges or caravans on the appeal sites, this type of accommodation could provide a route to home ownership that would otherwise be unavailable to them. Whilst the overall costs of a lodge or caravan are likely to be much lower than a 'bricks and mortar' property, it is unclear to me whether any of the lodges or caravans would be made available at a price equivalent to at least 20% below market value. Without any such discount, it is difficult to see how the proposals fit within the definition of affordable housing set out in the glossary to the Framework. Moreover, there is no mechanism in place to ensure any such accommodation would remain 'affordable' for future residents.
43. I concur with the HEO that the proposals would not count towards the development plan provisions/requirements for affordable housing. As also recognised by the HEO, the proposals would offer alternative housing provision for people seeking smaller-sized residential accommodation on a permanent basis. In this regard, I am mindful of the findings in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment which, amongst other things, identified a demand for

⁶ November 2022.

⁷ December 2022. I also note the comments of the HEO that it is unclear if this price includes the costs of ground rent, upkeep, sales commissions or other service charges.

⁸ APP/C3810/C/19/3222033 & APP/C3810/W/18/3214487.

⁹ In all probability, the majority of those looking to purchase a lodge or caravan would be seeking to 'down-size' on 'bricks and mortar' homes that they already own.

bungalows. Whilst the proposals conflict with the provisions of LPI policy DP11 they would provide some benefit in the form of smaller-sized residential accommodation that would add to the overall choice of available housing.

44. Nevertheless, I conclude on the fifth main issue that the proposals would not assist in meeting the housing needs of the local community.

Sixth Main Issue - Public Open Space

45. Most future residents of the lodges or caravans could reasonably be expected to have a need to access public open space. LPI policy DP16, includes a requirement for residential development to make a contribution towards the provision of new open space. This can either be on-site, where appropriate, or provided elsewhere by way of a financial contribution.
46. At present, there is 0.21 ha of open/amenity space provided within the overall holiday/caravan park. This includes a seating area and two boules pistes. Whilst this space may be adequate for tourists, it is unlikely to be sufficient in meeting the recreational/leisure needs of all of those residents that could occupy appeal site A. However, both appeal sites are in close proximity to greenspace on the opposite side of the A371 with convenient access to public rights of way. On balance, the on-site deficiency in open space would not be so great as to justify withholding permission in appeal B but does weigh against an approval in appeal A. There is no mechanism in place to address this.
47. I conclude on the sixth main issue that adequate public open space provision exists to meet the recreational needs of occupiers in appeal B but not in appeal A. The appeal A scheme conflicts with the provisions of LPI policy DP16.

Other Matters

48. The LPA has drawn my attention to appeal decisions on other sites with a Wells postal address and which involved holiday occupancy restrictions (refs. APP/Q3305/W/19/3229927 & APP/Q3305/W/22/3307642). Whilst noting the findings of those Inspectors, both sites were found to be in areas where accessing services and facilities on foot or bicycle would be problematic. In the latter appeal, the site was found to be remote. This is different to the situation before me, where Wells Holiday Park is served by tarmacked footways and is in close proximity to bus stops. It is not remote from services. Each case must be determined on its own merits and these other cases are materially different to what is before me. They do not set a precedent that I am bound to follow.
49. The appeal site lies within the hydrological/fluvial catchment and the Impact Risk Zone of the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar Site and Special Protection Area (SPA). Amongst other things, this extensive area of lowland wet grassland supports an assemblage of rare aquatic invertebrates.
50. Natural England has identified poor water quality, due to nutrient enrichment from elevated levels of phosphorus, as a cause in the loss of biodiversity¹⁰ within these protected areas. This has led to these areas being classified in an 'unfavourable condition'. Given the current use of the appeal sites/fallback position, I agree with the LPA that the proposals would be most unlikely to increase phosphate loading into the river catchment, Ramsar Site and SPA.

¹⁰ I understand that, amongst other things, aquatic invertebrate communities are suffering the effects of hyper-eutrophication, caused by excessive levels of phosphates.

51. I also understand that the appeal sites lie within Band B (risk impact bat consultation zone) of the North Somerset and Mendip Bat Special Area of Conservation¹¹, which comprises component Sites of Special Scientific Interest¹². Whilst I have found above that the proposals would result in an increase in activity in and around the site, this would not be so great as to result in a likely adverse effect upon features important to bats. The LPA appears to have reached a similar finding when it determined the applications.
52. Notwithstanding new and planned housing growth in and around Wells, as well as the restrictions that occurred during the COVID pandemic, there is no cogent evidence before me to demonstrate that the current tourist use of the appeal sites is unviable.

Planning Conditions and the Unilateral Undertaking (UU)

53. If either of the appeals were to be allowed the effect would be the creation of a new permission(s) and the 'standard' start date condition would be necessary. For the avoidance of doubt, it would be necessary to specify the approved plan and the permitted number of residential units.
54. In appeal B, I have noted the other conditions that were attached to the planning permission dated 18 February 2011. It is unclear to me if the bund/acoustic fence was provided and/or remains. On the assumption that it does, it would be necessary for this (and the other boundary treatment) to be retained in order to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring residents. Conditions would also be necessary to ensure adequate car parking and turning within the site, as well as ensuring adequate drainage. A condition controlling noise emissions would be unnecessary. To safeguard the character and appearance of the site and the living conditions of neighbouring residents, a condition would be necessary controlling external lighting on the lodges.
55. If planning permission was granted for both of the appeal schemes the cumulative transport/traffic impacts of the proposals would, having regard to highway safety matters and the need to encourage transport by more sustainable modes to the motor car, trigger the need for the submission of a Travel Plan. However, the appeal schemes on their own would not trigger this.
56. If future residents of the lodges sought to have lodges with a different external appearance to those currently on site, this could accentuate the adverse impact of these units upon the local landscape that I have found above. I agree with the appellant's suggestion that a planning condition controlling this matter would therefore be necessary.
57. The evidence before me, including the comments of Somerset County Council Education Authority, indicates that unfettered residential occupancy of either of the appeal sites would be likely to result in a harmful increase in pressure upon educational infrastructure. The provisions of the UU satisfy the tests set out in paragraph 57 of the Framework and Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. I have therefore taken it into account.

¹¹ Designated because of its importance for Greater and Lesser Horseshoe Bats.

¹² These include areas of bat maternity and/or hibernation roosts.

Planning Balance/Overall Conclusions

58. LPI policy DP1(3) includes a requirement for the impacts of a proposal to be balanced with the wider benefits. The housing land supply position requires this to be a 'tilted balance'.
59. When the necessary balancing exercise is undertaken, I find, in respect of appeal A, that the adverse impacts that I have identified (conflict with countryside protection policies, harm to the character and appearance of the area, inadequate external private amenity space, imbalance in the local population, a failure to help address housing need and deficient open space provision) would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This proposal would therefore conflict with the provisions of LPI policy DP1(3) and the overall provisions of the development plan and the Framework.
60. When the same balancing exercise is undertaken in respect of appeal B, I find that the adverse impacts (conflict with countryside protection policies, limited harm to the character and appearance of the area, and the failure to help address housing need) would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This proposal would accord with LPI policy DP1(3) and the overall provisions of the development plan and the Framework. I would have reached the same conclusion in respect of this appeal regardless of the 'tilted' balance.
61. Given the above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that appeal A should be dismissed and appeal B should succeed.

Neil Pope

Inspector

SCHEDULE OF PLANNING CONDITIONS – APPEAL B

1. The development hereby permitted shall commence within three years of the date of this decision.
2. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved 1:1,250 scale site plan ref. 1530-00002-01.
3. The development hereby permitted is limited to 12 lodges, which shall be single storey in height.
4. Any new/replacement lodges shall match the external appearance (including materials and colour) of the existing lodges on the site.
5. The existing boundary treatments (including any bunding and acoustic fence) shall be retained, as well as the existing car parking and turning arrangements, and the foul and surface water drainage arrangements.
6. No external lighting shall be erected on any of the lodges or elsewhere within the site unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.