



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2023

by A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P2114/W/22/3307079

Sunnycott Caravan Park, Rew Street, Gurnard, Isle of Wight PO31 8NN

- 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 Mrs Lynn Wildey of Sunnycott Caravan Park against the decision of Isle of Wight Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00726/FUL, dated 20 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is the extension of the holiday park to provide an additional 5 units of holiday accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the extension of the holiday park to provide an additional 5 units of holiday accommodation at Sunnycott Caravan Park, Rew Street, Gurnard, Isle of Wight PO31 8NN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00726/FUL, dated 20 April 2022, subject to the attached schedule of conditions.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised on 19 December 2023 and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Having regard to the matters that are most relevant to this appeal, there have been few substantive changes albeit that the numbering of paragraphs has changed. Hence, I am satisfied that no one will be prejudiced by the changes to the national policy context.
3. A Unilateral Undertaking (UU) dated 30 March 2023 has been provided with the appeal to make a financial contribution towards Habitat Mitigation. I will return to this later in my decision.
4. The appellant submitted a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal prepared by Woodside Tree Consultancy, dated 27 July 2022 (PEA) and a Badger Report, by Paul Creer of The Badger Action Group, dated May 2022 (BR), with their appeal. There is some dispute as to whether these documents were submitted with their planning application. Nevertheless, the Council has had the opportunity to comment on them as part of the appeal process. I have taken them into account in coming to my decision.
5. I saw on my site inspection that 2 no. caravans were stationed near to where some of proposed units of accommodation are to be located, these appeared not to be occupied or connected to services. Their locations also differ from the proposals. I have therefore determined the appeal based on the proposed plans.

6. The site location plan includes land that is said by the Council and some objectors to include part of the rear garden of a neighbouring property, The Coach House. The land is annotated on the site plan as 'land with no assigned use' and it is understood the land is in the same ownership as Sunnycott Caravan Park. The appellant has said that land has an agricultural use, and it does not have any planning permission for use as a garden. I saw on my site inspection that the area is heavily planted, and its boundaries make it separate from Sunnycott Caravan Park, it is also accessed through the rear garden of The Coach House. No development is proposed on that part of the appeal site. I have dealt with the appeal based on that land being outside of Sunnycott Caravan Park.
7. The Council has suggested there is some inconsistency on the site plan regarding the footprint size of one of the 2-bedroom units, suggesting it could be intended as a 3-bedroom unit. Whilst the size of their bases may differ, the plans clearly annotate and colour code which of the units are the 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom units, and there are different floor and elevation plans for each type. The appeal has been determined on this basis.

Main Issues

8. The main issues with this appeal are the effect of the proposal upon:
 - The character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to its siting, scale and design;
 - Highway safety, with particular regard to visibility onto Rew Street;
 - The living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to noise and disturbance;
 - Ecology and biodiversity, including protected species; and
 - The Solent Special Protection Area (SPA).

Reasons

Character and appearance

9. Sunnycott Caravan Park has 21 no. holiday units, located behind both its entrance onto Rew Street and other properties that face onto the same road. The grassed area of land where the proposed additional units are to be located is to one side of the existing holiday units and abuts a private track, separated from the appeal site by a fence. There is some established planting along parts of the opposite side of the fence and beyond, outside of the appeal site. There is also existing planting between the appeal site and some of the rear gardens of adjoining properties. The appeal site is located within the countryside.
10. Although some parts of the proposed new holiday units and their bases would be closer to Rew Street than the existing holiday units, they would be sited near to those existing holiday units, including those which are to be re-configured. Although they are closely located together with the existing units, sufficient space between them would be retained for occupiers to use the outdoor spaces. Public views of the proposed new holiday units would virtually be hidden by both the existing planting and the adjoining properties facing onto Rew Street. The well-contained siting of the proposals would ensure they would not be conspicuous from nearby public vantage points.

11. The scale of the proposed development would be subservient to that of the existing caravan park and the total number of holiday units would not be disproportionately greater than those currently on the appeal site. Furthermore, the individual proposed holiday units are modest in their size, being quite narrow and rectangular in shape, they are also single storey, feature shallow roof pitches and have a simple design. This, together with their close association with the existing holiday units that are of a similar appearance, and the surrounding built form and planting, would ensure that they would not be prominent in the landscape or urbanise the area.
12. Whilst parts of the proposed development including related outside paraphernalia could be visible from some neighbouring gardens, such views would be partly disrupted by intervening planting and in the context of the existing caravan park. I do acknowledge that at the time of my site inspection the trees and planting were in leaf, and in the winter months the proposed holiday units could be more visible. Even so, their limited impact on the wider area would not be harmful to its appearance or materially different to the existing situation.
13. Although the proposed colour of the external cladded sides and shingle roofs is unclear, this could be the subject of a condition to ensure appropriate colours to protect the character and appearance of the area.
14. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would relate well to the character and appearance of the area. In doing so, I find the proposal would comply with the relevant parts of Policies DM2 of the Island Plan, Isle of Wight Core Strategy (including waste and minerals) and Development Management, Development Plan Document, dated March 2012 (IP) which amongst other things requires development to be high quality, attractive, functional, with a sense of place, and complement the surrounding area. The proposal would also comply with paragraphs 135 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that require development to function well and add to the overall quality of an area, be sympathetic to local character, and contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment.
15. In addition, I also found the proposal to be consistent with the relevant key aims of the Isle of Wight's Gurnard Neighbourhood Development Plan, made on 11 September 2017 (NP) which amongst other things requires development to safeguard and enhance Gurnard's valued landscape.

Highway safety

16. I understand the visibility splays were partly obscured by hedges and a fence. However, these have since been removed. Whilst I note the earlier concerns about the previously measured visibility distances, across the full extent of the carriageway, and the suggested conflict with Manual for Streets Guidance. Those previous concerns have mainly been overtaken by the changes to the available on-site visibility splays.
17. This existing access onto Rew Street is wide and allows two cars to pass one another, its reasonable width also helps with visibility for drivers in both directions. I saw that there was reasonably good visibility in either direction at the access point. This section of Rew Street is narrow in part, with no footpaths along it, there were also some nearby gentle bends along the road. These combined factors along with its 30mph speed restriction meant vehicle speeds

were restricted when they passed the entrance to the appeal site. This, together with the good visibility would likely allow drivers adequate time to see any approaching vehicles before turning into Rew Street in either direction and allow the safe operation of the access and not be harmful to highway safety.

18. The existing access to the appeal site already serves 21 no. holiday units and I have no information before me of any existing condition requiring a certain visibility splay. The proposed increase of 5 no. holiday units, is said to likely create an increase of 20 daily movements, which is estimated to create an additional 24% of daily movements into and out of the existing access. In view of this relatively low number of additional movements, there being no recorded accidents in the vicinity of the site within the last 3 years, and given my site observations, there is no substantive evidence that the proposal would be harmful to highway safety, or its cumulative effects would be severe upon the road network. As such, I find a condition securing the visibility splays would be unnecessary.
19. The proposal includes adequate parking for the proposals, and conditions are required relating to parking and turning facilities to protect highway safety.
20. I therefore conclude the proposed development would not be harmful to highway safety and would comply with the relevant parts of Policy DM2 of the IP which amongst other things require development to be accessible and safe. The proposal would not conflict with paragraph 115 of the Framework, which states development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
21. The Council stated that the proposal conflicted with Policy DM17 of the IP. That policy is mainly concerned with sustainable travel methods other than by car. As a result, it does not relate to highway safety. There would be no conflict with this policy.

Living conditions

22. The proposed holiday units would be sited near to the existing holiday units, on a grassed area, which is mostly available for recreational use by existing residents of Sunnycott Caravan Park. With the exception of The Coach House, the proposed new units and access road would all have a generous separation from the rear side and gardens of adjoining properties that face onto Rew Street. In addition, further planting is proposed to supplement the planting between the appeal site and some of the rear gardens of those adjoining properties.
23. There is also a likelihood of increased noise and disturbance from occupiers of the proposed holiday units using the areas outside of the units for recreational use. However, the considerable separation distances in this case would ensure that the proposals in combination with the existing holiday units would be unlikely to create unacceptable noise and disturbance that would be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. In coming to the view, I have also taken into account noise and disturbance from outdoor activities such as barbeques or games, and from the operations of water and drainage tanks. Nor would the proposals have an overbearing effect, or cause a significant loss of privacy for the occupiers of those properties or their rear gardens.

24. The access into the site runs along the side boundary of The Coach House, which has its own driveway, garage and tall boundary hedging between it and the access road. In view of this arrangement and the modest additional use of this track and its passing places, which would likely be at slow speeds, movements along the track would not be harmful to the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers. Whilst the rear boundary of The Coach House is close to the existing recycling area and parking areas, and whether or not its rear garden includes the land included within the appeal site, there would be some considerable distance between Sunnycott Caravan Park and its rear elevation and most of its garden. To the extent that any additional noise and disturbance from the additional use would not be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of The Coach House.
25. I therefore conclude the proposal would ensure that there would be acceptable living conditions for the occupiers of neighbouring properties, and comply with Policy DM2 of the IP that amongst other things, seeks new development to have an inclusive design that protects existing environments and provides an attractive setting for the development that integrates with its surroundings. The proposal also complies with paragraph 135 of the Framework which requires a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Biodiversity and ecology

26. The PEA identified badger activity nearby, as a result the BR was undertaken. Although there is a suggestion of badger activity in a nearby garden, the BR did not identify the appeal site as being used by badgers but noted that there are tracks near to one side of the appeal site. Both the PEA and BR concluded that there would be no impact upon the local badger social group. It was however, recommended that the appeal site retains permeability to and from the neighbouring access track to allow access for badgers, together with planting within the appeal site to provide cover for them and other mammals.
27. The Council has queried whether planting is possible along the boundary with the access track, as the proposed holiday units would be positioned so close to it. However, there is already significant planting along that boundary on the opposite side of the fence. Even so, whilst 2 no. holiday units would be positioned alongside that boundary and 2 no. units would each have one of their corners near to it, there would still be space for some planting along that boundary. As such, the recommendations of the PEA for that boundary to be permeable with further planting within the appeal site could be undertaken, based on the proposed layout of the holiday units.
28. The PEA recommends mitigation in regard to bats that could be roosting in nearby trees with suggested tree protection measures. It is also recommended that any tree works, or site clearance is undertaken outside of certain times to protect breeding birds. Mitigation is also recommended regarding new planting, enhancements for slow worms, and for any excavated trenches to be covered outside of construction times. These issues can be addressed by a suitably worded condition. No harm was identified regarding great crested newts, reptiles, invertebrates and dormice. Further recommendations were made regarding the Solent SPA, which I shall return to later in my decision.
29. I therefore conclude that subject to conditions, the proposal would protect and enhance biodiversity and ecology. It would comply with the requirements of Policies SP5 and DM12 of the IP that amongst other things require

development to protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity and natural environments. In addition, the proposal would comply with paragraph 186 of the Framework as no significant harm to protected species has been identified. In addition, the proposal would be consistent with Policy E2 of the NP, that states all development proposals should protect and enhance biodiversity, including protected species.

Effect on the Solent Special Protection Area (SPA)

30. The site is located within the specified 5.6km zone of influence of the coast and water environments of the SPA, a European site designated to protect important habitat for bird species. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the Habitats Regulations) requires me as the competent authority in the context of this appeal to undertake a Habitat Regulation Assessment to establish whether there are likely significant effects from the proposal, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects upon the SPA.
31. The qualifying features of this European site most likely to be affected by the proposal, include over-wintering birds, namely; branta bernicla bernicla (dark-bellied brent goose); anas crecca (eurasian teal); charadrius hiaticula (ringed plover); limosa limosa islandica (black-tailed godwit); larus melanocephalus (mediterranean gull); sterna sandvicensis (sandwich tern); sterna dougallii (roseate tern); sterna hirundo (common tern); and sterna albifrons (little tern).
32. This SPA has an important recreational use, and it is likely that users of the proposed development would visit it for recreational purposes causing disturbance to this area. In this regard, and considering the evidence before me, it is clear that the proposal, when combined with other development in the area, would likely have significant effects upon the qualifying features of the SPA. In addition, increased nitrates from foul wastewater associated with the proposed development could also have likely significant effects in combination with other development upon the SPA, if they enter the Solent as they would exacerbate eutrophication, causing an increase in some nutrients. Therefore, in the event I allow the appeal, I am required to undertake an appropriate assessment in accordance with the Habitats Regulations.

Appropriate assessment

33. The Council in consultation with Natural England (NE) has adopted the Solent Recreation Mitigation Strategy December 2017 (SRMS). The SRMS requires a financial contribution towards strategic access management and monitoring measures to control recreational activity in the SPA, including suitable alternative natural greenspace for residents to use. The Council has provided a detailed explanation of the SRMS and the basis on which the mitigation is sought. This includes justification for the respective levels of tariffs and the administrative arrangements for receipt and effective and timely use of financial contributions for these purposes.
34. NE as the Statutory Nature Conservation Body (SNCB) has been consulted on this proposal and provided a response. They require a financial payment in accordance with the SRMS to mitigate the recreational effects of the proposed development on the integrity of the SPA. The Council has also confirmed that the relevant provisions of the appellant's UU to make a combined payment as required by the SRMS are acceptable.

35. In terms of recreational impacts upon the SPA, I am content that the UU is necessary, directly related to the development and fair and reasonable in scale and kind. As such they accord with the provisions of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (Regulations) and the tests within paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) for planning obligations. As the competent authority in this appeal, I am also satisfied that with regard to recreational impacts, they would secure suitable mitigation to protect the integrity of the SPA and I will take them into account in coming to my decision.
36. Regarding the drainage of foul water, the Council has adopted the Isle of Wight Position Statement: Nitrogen neutral housing development January 2023 (PS) following input from NE. Amongst other things, the PS sets out that provided foul wastewater from residential development on the Island enters the English Channel, not the Solent, then there would be no likely adverse effect on the SPA, and no mitigation required. In this case, the proposal is for foul water to be drained to Sandown Wastewater Treatment Works (SWTW), which discharges into the English Channel. Both Southern Water and the Council have stated that the appeal site would drain to the SWTW.
37. I have imposed a condition that requires the foul water from the proposed development only drains to the SWTW, consistent with the specified conditions contained in the PS. On this basis the Council considers that the proposal would comply with the PS and not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA. I am also satisfied that subject to the imposition of the condition referred to above, there would be no likely significant effects on the SPA arising from additional nitrates and no mitigation required.

Conclusion

38. For the reasons set out above, and taking account of the mitigation measures proposed, the proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA. Consequently, the proposal would comply with Policies DM2 and DM12 of the Island Plan, Isle of Wight Core Strategy (including waste and minerals) and Development Management, Development Plan Document, dated March 2012 (IP), which amongst other things, require development to protect and conserve the environment and avoid adverse effects on the integrity of designated biodiversity sites. The proposal would also be consistent with paragraph 186 a) of the Framework that requires significant harm to biodiversity to be adequately mitigated.

Other Matters

39. The principle of the proposal at the appeal site is broadly supported by Policies SP1 and SP4 of the IP, and there is support within the IP for year-round tourism, which would likely contribute towards the local economy. Regarding nearby caravan parks, I have not been made aware of why the proposal could not satisfactorily co-exist with them. The Council did not find the location of the site in principle to be unsuitable for expansion, and I see no reason to disagree.
40. Whether the existing holiday units are long or short-term holiday lets is not a matter before me for consideration, and it is unclear if there is a bed and breakfast being operated from the site or how such a use would affect this proposal. The street lighting of the area is noted but I am not aware that this

would make the proposed expansion of this existing caravan park unacceptable.

41. The appellant has suggested they would incorporate sustainable drainage methods with their appeal in order to manage flood risk and surface water run-off. Although I have limited evidence that the ground conditions at the site would be conducive to such forms of drainage. However, this matter can be dealt with through a planning condition.
42. The objections raised regarding property value loss; the position of electricity cables on the site; and possible pollution are noted. Again, this proposal is for a relatively modest increase from 21no. holiday units to 26no. holiday units, and I am not persuaded that the proposal would give rise to unacceptable pollution effects. Property ownership matters are a private matter between the relevant parties and not within my jurisdiction, and whether any electricity cables would need to be relocated is not a matter for me to determine.
43. The suggestion of inaccuracies in the application form and submitted documents are noted. Although, I am content that there has been sufficient information provided to assess the planning merits of the appeal scheme.
44. It has been said that a tree has been cleared from the site already, I have no details of that, or whether that tree had any protection. Furthermore, comments have been made regarding alleged decking on the appeal site that does not have planning permission. Be that as it may, this does not alter my view of the planning merits of the proposals, these are unrelated issues that could be raised separately with the Council.
45. One objector has raised the effect of the proposal upon safety of their young children in their rear garden, as a result of the proposed development. It is unclear how the safety of the use of neighbouring gardens would be at any greater risk as a result of the proposed development, consequently this does not alter my conclusions on the appeal scheme.

Conditions

46. A standard implementation condition, along with a condition listing the approved plans to provide certainty over what has been approved, are necessary. A condition is also necessary to ensure the holiday units are removed from the site when they are no longer required, given that they are not permanent buildings. As this is not specified, a condition is necessary regarding the colour of the external cladded and shingle roofs of the holiday units to protect the character and appearance of the area.
47. To ensure adequate space is provided for both on-site parking and passing places, in the interests of highway safety and the safe movement and parking of vehicles, a condition is necessary. Also, in the interests of highway safety, a condition is also necessary for details of the measures for service vehicles to turn within the site to ensure vehicles can access and leave the site in a forward gear, which could comprise a new internal loop system. As there are no changes to the existing access onto Rew Street, it was not necessary to condition that aspect. For the reasons outlined above, a visibility splay condition for the existing access was not reasonable given its existing use and modest increase.

48. To protect the health of the existing trees that contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area and because of their biodiversity value, a pre-commencement condition is imposed requiring measures to protect their root protection areas is in place before any construction works commence.
49. A condition is necessary to protect and enhance the local ecology and biodiversity on and near to the appeal site and to adhere to the recommendations and conclusions of the appellants PEA. Given that some of these mitigation measures are affected by construction works, this condition needed to be a pre-commencement condition. As one of the recommendations related to new planting, it was not necessary for a separate landscaping condition. Although the appellant has provided a planting schedule, it is not clear that their proposals would fulfil the requirements of the recommendations of the PEA consequently it is necessary to condition the precise species and planting details.
50. A condition is necessary to ensure foul water drainage is drained to SWTW, to prevent harmful impacts on the Solent and Southampton Water SPA.
51. The Council requested a surface water drainage condition as a pre-commencement condition. However, in the circumstances of this being an extension to the existing holiday park, this can be addressed as prior to occupation of the new holiday units. Even though the appellant has submitted possible sustainable surface water drainage details within their sustainability statement, there is no confirmation that infiltration is a suitable method on the appeal site. I have conditioned that the precise details are provided to demonstrate such methods can be undertaken to ensure the site can be effectively drained.
52. A condition is necessary to restrict the use to holiday use as other uses, such as residential, may have different effects to that considered for the proposed holiday use. Although, I did not regard the Council's suggested condition requiring the names and addresses of the occupiers of such accommodation be maintained for 10 years as reasonable or necessary as a planning condition, particularly given the aforementioned condition that would adequately ensure they can be used for holiday use only.
53. An external lighting condition is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area.
54. The recommended condition requiring access for the Council's Archaeologist is not reasonable or necessary in this case given the limited ground works proposed.
55. In some cases, I have amended the wording of the conditions suggested by the Council in the interests of clarity.

Conclusion

56. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing no. 397/01 – site location plan; Plan- SC 03 - planning main drawing, dated 9/4/23; Plan - SC 03A Services, dated 9/4/23; Plan - SC 04 Planting Scheme, dated 9/4/23; Plans- SC 07 Caravan Dimensions - elevations, floor plans and base details; and drawing no. AS/LW/0221.
- 3) Notwithstanding the submitted planting details, the development hereby approved shall be undertaken in accordance with the mitigation measures contained in section 4.2 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, prepared by Woodside Tree Consultancy, dated 27th July 2022, and the precise of which, including a planting scheme, and a timetable for the implementation of all the mitigation measures, shall all be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. The mitigation measures shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved development and the timetable. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.
- 4) Prior to the first occupation of any of the 5 no. holiday units hereby approved, details of all new parking and passing places together with a timetable for their implementation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be undertaken in accordance with those approved details and those spaces shall be retained in perpetuity and not used for any other purpose.
- 5) No site preparation or clearance shall begin, and no equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought onto the site for the purposes of the development hereby permitted, until the protective fencing for existing trees to be protected, as shown on drawing no. AS/LW/0221 TSCP (Tree Survey and Constraints Plan) has been erected in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include a plan showing the location of trees to be retained and the positions of protective fencing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the protective fencing shall be erected prior to work commencing on site and will be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials related to the construction of the development have been removed from the site.
- 6) Prior to the first holiday unit being brought to its approved location the exact colour(s) of the external surfaces of all of the holiday units the subject of this permission shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and retained in accordance with the approved details.

- 7) No external lighting shall be installed at the development hereby approved, unless the precise details of such lighting have first been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken and maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- 8) Notwithstanding the information submitted with the application, none of the 5 no. holiday units hereby approved shall be occupied until surface water drainage works shall have been implemented in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Before any details are submitted to the Local Planning Authority an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system, having regard to Defra's non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (or any subsequent version), and the results of the assessment shall have been provided to the Local Planning Authority. Where a sustainable drainage scheme is to be provided, the submitted details shall:
 - provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
 - include a timetable for its implementation; and,
 - provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.The development shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved details and timetable.
- 9) The 5 no. holiday units hereby approved shall not be occupied until space has been laid out and surfaced within the site in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for service vehicles to be loaded and unloaded, including provision for vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details and the approved spaces shall not thereafter be used for any purpose other than that approved in accordance with this condition.
- 10) Foul drainage from this development shall be connected to the public sewer and shall only be served by the Southern Water Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) at Sandown.
- 11) The 5 no. holiday units hereby approved shall not be used for any purpose other than as holiday accommodation.
- 12) If any, or all of the 5 no. holiday units hereby approved are no longer required, they shall be permanently removed from the site.