



Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened on 10 October 2023

Site visit made on 10 October 2023

by Paul Dignan MSc PhD

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date 25 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A2280/C/22/3296166

The Woodlands, Hempstead Road, Hempstead, Gillingham, Kent, ME7 3QL

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. The appeal is made by Mr Robert Beck against an enforcement notice issued by Medway Council.
- The notice, numbered ENF/18/0245, was issued on 4 March 2022.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is Without the benefit of planning permission the material change of use of the Property to a mixed use for a scrap yard, vehicle breaking and repair, waste deposit, processing and transfer, residential and forestry.
- The requirements of the notice are: (i) Cease the mixed use of the Property for a scrap yard, vehicles breaking and repair, waste deposit, processing and transfer, and residential and forestry; (ii) Remove the buildings in the approximate locations marked A and B on the attached plan from the Property; (iii) Remove all hardstanding other than that outlined and hatched black on the attached plan; (iv) Remove all resultant debris and materials created from undertaking requirements (ii) and (iii) above, from the Property; (v) Remove all waste (other than clean soil already incorporated into a soil surface), scrap metal, skips, lorries, caravans, containers, porta cabins, industrial bins, plant and machinery, deposited or used in connection with the unauthorised development from the Property; (vi) Plant a mix of Oak (*Quercus robur*); Beech (*Fagus sylvatica*); Sweet Chestnut (*Castanea sativa*); Field Maple (*Acer campestre*); Silver Birch (*Betula pendula*); Hawthorn (*Crataegus Monogyna*) being of a size between 1m and 1.75m in height at a spacing of 1.5 metre between plants and rows on the land from which the Building marked A and the roadway (shown outlined with dotted line on attached plan) to that building have been removed.
- The periods for compliance with the requirements are: Requirement (i) - 3 months, Requirements (ii) to (v) - 6 months, Requirement (vi) - first planting season following compliance with (ii) to (v).
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended. The application for planning permission deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act. also falls to be considered.

Summary of Decision: The appeal succeeds in part and planning permission is granted for part of the use only. Otherwise the enforcement notice is upheld with corrections and variations in the terms, including the periods for compliance, and planning permission is refused, as set out below in the Formal Decision.

Formal Decision

1. It is directed that the enforcement notice be corrected and varied as follows:

By the substitution of the plan attached to the notice by the plan annexed to this decision.

By the deletion of Section 3 in its entirety and its replacement it with:

"Without the benefit of planning permission the material change of use of the Land to a mixed use for a scrap yard, vehicle breaking and repair, waste deposit, processing and transfer, the siting of a mobile structure for residential purposes, and equestrian use."

By the deletion of Section 5(i) in its entirety and its replacement with:

"Cease the use of the Land for a mixed use for a scrap yard, vehicle breaking and repair, waste deposit, processing and transfer, the siting of a mobile structure for residential purposes, and equestrian use."

By the deletion of Section 5(ii) in its entirety and its replacement with:

"Remove the building in the approximate location marked B on the attached plan from the Land."

By the deletion in Section 5(iv) of the word "Property" and its replacement with the word "Land".

By the deletion of Section 5(vi) in its entirety and its replacement with:

"Plant a mix of Oak (*Quercus robur*); Beech (*Fagus sylvatica*); Sweet Chestnut (*Castanea sativa*); Field Maple (*Acer campestre*); Silver Birch (*Betula pendula*); Hawthorn (*Crataegus Monogyna*), being of a size between 1m and 1.75m in height at a spacing of 1.5 metre between plants and rows, on the land shown cross-hatched black on the attached plan from which the roadway has been removed."

By the substitution of the periods for compliance with the following:
Requirement (i) - 12 months, Requirements (ii) to (v) - 15 months,
Requirement (vi) - first planting season following compliance with (ii) to (v).

2. I allow the appeal in part, insofar as it relates to the land shown hatched red on the plan annexed to this decision and I grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended, for the material change of use of the land at The Woodlands, Hempstead Road, Hempstead, Gillingham, Kent, ME7 3QL shown hatched red on the plan annexed to this decision to a mixed use for the siting of a mobile structure for residential purposes, and equestrian use, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The caravan or other mobile structure hereby permitted to be stationed on the site for the purposes of human habitation shall be occupied only by the following and his resident dependants: Simon Stevenson. No more than one caravan or mobile structure shall be stationed on the site at any time for that purpose.
- 2) When the land ceases to be occupied by those named in condition 1 above, the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, materials and equipment brought on to or erected on the land, and/or works undertaken to it in connection with the use, shall be removed and

the land shall be restored to its condition before the development took place.

- 3) The residential use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, equipment and materials brought onto the land for the purposes of such use shall be removed within 30 days of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in i) to iv) below:
 - i) Within 3 months of the date of this decision details of the internal layout of the site, including the siting of a caravan or other mobile structure for the purposes of human habitation, the means of foul drainage of the site, and proposed and existing external lighting on the boundary of and within the site shall have been submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority and the details shall include a timetable for its implementation.
 - ii) If within 11 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve the details or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State.
 - iii) If an appeal is made in pursuance of ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted details shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.
 - iv) The approved details shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable.

Upon implementation of the approved details specified in this condition, the details shall thereafter be maintained.

In the event of a legal challenge to this decision, or to a decision made pursuant to the procedure set out in this condition, the operation of the time limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

- 4) The building in the approximate position marked A on the Plan attached to the enforcement notice shall be used for private equestrian purposes only.
3. Subject to these corrections and variations, and the grant of planning permission for the material change of use of the land to a mixed use for the siting of a mobile structure for residential purposes and equestrian use, the enforcement notice is upheld and planning permission is refused.

Preliminary Matters

4. The appellant owns two adjoining parcels of land, The Woodlands (TW) and Great Knox Farm (GKF). The Beck family bought The Woodlands in 2005 and have lived there since. Initially it comprised a dwelling fronting on to Hempstead Road and open land extending about 250m back from the road. The dwelling was replaced and is now set within its own gardens close to Hempstead Road. To the rear of the dwelling a former mobile home which the family initially occupied has been extended beyond the definition of a caravan and now appears to be a separate dwelling contained within its own compound. Great Knox Farm was bought in 2017. It comprised a mix of woodland, paddocks, a dwelling now converted to 2 dwellings with gardens, and some buildings. It also has an access onto Hempstead Road. The land the subject of the enforcement notice as issued comprises all of The Woodland aside from the

2 dwellings and their enclosed land, and much of Great Knox Farm, the dwellings and some paddock land being the notable exclusions. The two properties are now separated by metal palisade fencing, but a narrow strip of Great Knox Farm has been incorporated into The Woodlands to accommodate a new access to the rear non-residential portion of The Woodlands, running alongside but separate to, the access to the two dwellings.

5. A site visit conducted before the enforcement notice was issued noted use of Great Knox Farm by some vehicles liveried as Robert Beck and Sons Ltd, which was operating the scrap yard at The Woodlands. In addition, part of the palisade fence separating the properties had been taken down, an informal pathway was evident between the properties through the fence opening, some items associated with the scrap yard use, skips and a shipping container, were placed on the Great Knox Farm side of the fence, along with deposits of waste material within the woodland considered likely to have come from the Skip and Go waste transfer operation based at The Woodlands. At that time the view was taken by the Council that some activities were not confined to either property, such that the appropriate planning unit upon which to base an allegation of a material change of use would include parts of both. However, after hearing the evidence for the appellant the Council invited me to amend the notice so as to focus on activities on The Woodlands and on the part of the woodland on Great Knox Farm where waste appears to have been deposited. The appellant accepted that amending the notice in this way would not cause him injustice. For my part, notwithstanding that the strip of woodland on Great Knox Farm and The Woodlands site following the construction of the non-residential access are separated by palisade fencing, the use of the strip of woodland for activities otherwise confined to or associated with The Woodlands justifies its inclusion in the relevant planning unit for the purposes of the enforcement notice, and I have determined the appeal on the basis of the amended plan.
6. Amending the plan to exclude most of Great Knox Farm means that the occupiers of the workshop building and compound, who were the subject of the appeal on ground (e), are no longer affected by the notice, hence this ground is no longer pursued. Similarly, since the appeal on ground (c) was primarily concerned with the dwellinghouses on Great Knox Farm, which are no longer within the land enforced against, the appellant confirmed that there was no longer considered to be any merit in pursuing the ground (c) appeal.

Ground (b)

7. An appeal on ground (b) is that the matters alleged in the notice to comprise a breach of planning control have not occurred. With the enforcement notice plan, and the land affected, amended as set out above, what is argued on this ground is that the land still comprises two planning units, one being The Woodlands, where it is accepted that scrap yard, waste deposit, processing and transfer and a residential use have all occurred, and part of Great Knox Farm, where it is argued that the only material use on the part of the land included in the notice has been forestry. I have explained above that I consider that the land included in the notice can be considered as a single planning unit. All that the strip of woodland has been used for was for purposes associated with the scrap yard and waste uses on The Woodlands, being waste deposit and storage of scrap bins and a shipping container. So far as forestry is concerned, the mere fact that there are trees growing on land does not mean that it is forestry

use. It is clear that the woodland is not being managed for any productive purpose, nor does it appear to have any particular non-productive use that might be considered to be forestry. Notwithstanding that the land could be used for forestry as a single use without planning permission, it is not currently a primary use of the land that needs to be included in the description of the mixed use.

8. While the waste deposit use of that land is claimed to be no more than *de minimus*, any waste deposit is development, and in this case there are also significant planning impacts in terms of the risk of degradation of Ancient Woodland, an irreplaceable habitat. I am satisfied that it occurred and should be included in the description of the mixed use.
9. When the site was visited in July 2021 a number of motor vehicles not associated with the waste or scrap uses were being repaired in Building A, a large barn-type building at the western end of The Woodlands. Vehicles which appeared in the process of being broken for parts were present on the wider site, while items including body parts, engines and gear boxes were evident within Building A and the wider site. Nigel Wicks' evidence was that people present in Building A at the time of the visit stated that they were working as mechanics. The vehicle repair use was characterised by the appellant as being nothing more than a *de minimus* ancillary activity comprising a very occasional hobby of Robert Beck Jnr, but the extent of equipment and vehicles present in Building A, along with the employment of mechanics, indicates, as a matter of fact and degree, that the vehicle repair use was significant. Vehicles in the process of being broken goes beyond a suggested scrap-only use. I am satisfied that vehicle repair and breaking was occurring as a primary component of the mixed use at that time.
10. There was ample evidence of an equestrian use of the land up until at least 2018, when horses were present in stables where Building B now stands, and I have no reason to doubt that Building A was erected for equestrian purposes, that being a significant component of the use of The Woodlands at one point. However, the only place that equestrian use could have taken place when the notice was issued was Building A, which as I have indicated above was being used for a different purpose when the notice was served, hence no doubt why equestrian use was not included within the mixed use. Nonetheless, it appears that the building was, and is, still required for foaling, treating ill horses, and some overwintering. On the balance of probabilities therefore I consider that the land was in equestrian use along with the other activities and I shall correct the allegation to include equestrian use in the description of the mixed use enforced against.
11. In summary, with the exception of forestry, the component uses of the mixed use have all occurred, albeit the equestrian use has been overlooked. I shall correct the description to remove reference to forestry and to add equestrian use as a component of the mixed use. No injustice arises from these corrections.

Ground (d)

12. This ground is that it is too late to take enforcement action. However, so far as the material change of use is concerned, the appellant now accepts that the material change of use enforced against only began when the waste operation undertaken by Skip and Go Ltd started operating from the site in about March

2020, so that the mixed use has not been operating for the requisite 10 year period. What this ground seeks to establish is that prior to the material change of use by the addition of the Skip and Go Ltd waste use a mixed use subsisted comprising a scrap yard use, equestrian use and residential use, the latter being accommodation for a caretaker/handyman who has lived on the site since February 2010, at times in a caravan and at other times in a small portacabin or other such mobile structure. It is claimed that that mixed use had subsisted for more than 10 years before the notice was issued. If so, then there would be a right to revert to that use in the event that the mixed use enforced against was required to cease, provided that it was in fact the last use before the use enforced against. The prospect of reverting to that use would provide a fallback position when considering the planning merits of the use under ground (a).

13. The appellant claims that the scrap yard and equestrian use of the site began in 2005 when his father, under whose name the scrap use was registered, bought The Woodlands in 2005. Up until then the business had operated from another site in Chatham. However, while the business may have used The Woodlands as a base from that time, aerial photography suggests that there was very little, if any, actual scrap yard use taking place on the land itself before 2012, and even then all that can be seen with any degree of certainty is the presence of empty scrap bins on a relatively small area of hardstanding in front of stables. It seems much of the scrap business involved, and still involves, off-site collection and direct transfer of scrap, whereas the scrap now present on the site is, in the main, brought there for sale by others. That appears to have been a change in how the site had been used, requiring infrastructure such as the weighbridge and on-site plant and machinery. The presence of scrap on the site itself is not evident until 2015 to 2017, and even then at a level far lower than present. Up until 2017 there is no sign of the significant levels of plant now being used to sort and manage the scrap stockpiles, and no documentation has been provided to support the claim that the land was being used as a scrapyards in 2010 or before, when it would have had to be operating to have achieved lawfulness as part of the mixed use claimed. Had some items associated with the appellant's scrap business, be it empty scrap bins or trucks, been on the site at times, or even regularly, that would not necessarily have involved a material change of use of the land to a scrap yard use.
14. In order to establish lawfulness of a use to which the land use can revert, the burden of proof is on the appellant to prove, on the balance of probability, that a mixed use of scrap yard, equestrian and residential use of the land had become lawful by the time of the material change of use to the use currently enforced against. While the appellant is adamant that he was operating the scrap business from the site from 2005, the aerial photography and the complete absence of documentation from that period cast very considerable doubt on the claim that an on-site scrap-yard use had been present for 10 years when the waste operation was introduced. For this reason I consider that the appellant has not discharged the burden of proof.
15. A second issue raised under this ground concerns Building A. When the notice was issued Building A had been substantially completed for more than 4 years, and hence would, in its own right, be immune from enforcement by virtue of section 171B(1) of the 1990 Act. However, it is well established that where there has been a material change of use of land, structures which may, viewed

in isolation, have become immune from enforcement may nonetheless be required to be removed in order to restore the land to the condition it was in before the breach of planning control occurred. The question this matter raises, which is essentially a ground (f) matter, is whether, in the circumstances, the building can be required to be removed. In ground (f) terms, the question is whether its removal would exceed what is necessary to remedy the breach.

16. It is clear from the evidence that the building was originally constructed as an equestrian building, mainly for over-wintering or foaling, notwithstanding that that equestrian use was not a lawful use of the land. No planning permission for equestrian use exists, nor could it have gained lawfulness though the passage of time in view of the timing of the material changes of use that have occurred. While the building was not erected for the purposes of the mixed use enforced against, it has been part and parcel of, and integral to, that use, and further, it was not works undertaken for some other lawful use of the land. As such, it can be required to be removed from the land. The same can be said of the hardstanding and track leading to Building A. The hardstanding in the vicinity of Building B is also claimed to be lawful due to the passage of time, but that hardstanding is in any case excluded from the requirement to remove hardstanding from the site and requires no further consideration.

Ground (a) and the deemed planning application

17. This ground is that planning permission should be granted for the mixed use enforced against. However, what is sought is planning permission for the mixed use of the The Woodlands, as it is now, being the land north of the palisade fence, for use as a scrapyard, for the keeping of horses (including the retention of Building A for equestrian purposes) and for the stationing of a mobile unit for residential purposes. This falls within the terms of the development alleged.
18. Each proposal must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise¹. In this instance the development plan includes saved policies of the Medway Local Plan, adopted 2003, (the MLP) and the Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013-30 (2020). Other material considerations include the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') and the Planning Practice Guidance ('PPG'). The Council's objections focus on the scrapyard use, in respect of which the parties agreed at the Inquiry that MLP Policies BNE25, BNE26 and BN34 were those most important for the determination of the appeal. Policy BNE25 concerns development in the countryside, with the aim of resisting the loss of countryside to encroaching urbanising development. Relevant to this appeal is the proviso that, aside from specific circumstances which do not apply here, development in the countryside will only be permitted if it maintains or enhances its character, amenity and functioning. Policy BNE26 concerns land within or on the edge of villages and other rural settlements. It expects development that is small in scale to be appropriate to the size of the settlement and without detriment to its amenity, character or setting. The Council accepted at the inquiry that this policy was met. Policy BNE34 applies within Areas of Local Landscape Importance and restricts development to those that do not materially harm the landscape character and function of the area unless the economic and social benefits are so important that they outweigh the local priority to conserve the area's landscape.

¹ Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended.

19. The main issue then is the effect of the scrap yard use on the character and appearance of the area, while material considerations are the economic and social benefits of the use, along with any environmental or other benefits that might be secured through a grant of planning permission.
20. Although close to the settlement of Hempstead, the site is clearly separate from it and within the open countryside where Policy BNE25 aims to maintain or enhance the character amenity and functioning of the countryside. The Medway Landscape Character Assessment (2011) identifies the appeal site as part of the Hempstead Fringe character area (area 29) within the Capstone and Horsted Valleys. Urban fringe landscapes within the Capstone and Horsted Valleys are noted as particularly threatened by fragmentation of the landscape from urban fringe pressures, with further encroachment considered as likely to overwhelm local distinctiveness.
21. The presence of the scrap operation, which is clearly evident from Hempstead Road, both visually and through associated activity, has a distinct urbanising impact within this urban fringe landscape, such that it fragments the landscape around the edge of the settlement and amounts to a loss of countryside by the encroachment of urbanising development, contrary to Policy BNE25.
22. There are some social and economic benefits to the scrap yard use, but it is unclear how many of the 17 employees are dependent on the continued use of the scrap yard in this location. No alternative sites have been investigated or assessed, but there is no cogent evidence to indicate that the business could not operate from a different site, nor is there evidence of a need for a scrap operation locally, notwithstanding that there is evidently a demand for the service provided. Overall I can only give moderate weight to the social and economic benefits of the scrap yard use, and that is not sufficient to outweigh the local priority to conserve the area's landscape, which is materially harmed by the scrap yard use. As such the development is contrary to Policy BNE34.
23. The landscape harm and the harm to the character and appearance of the area due to the urbanising effect of the scrap yard use place the development in conflict overall with the development plan. Policy BNE25 is not fully consistent with the national policies set out in the NPPF, which it pre-dates, in so far as it may be more restrictive of development in the countryside, so I accord the conflict with this policy only moderate weight. However, it is only one of the most important policies for determining the application, the others being Policy BNE26 and Policy BNE34 which I consider to be consistent with the NPPF. As such I consider that, taken as a whole, the development plan policies most important for determining the application are not out of date, and while there is no conflict with Policy BNE26, I consider that there is conflict with the development plan as a whole.
24. I have accorded moderate weight to the economic and social benefits. The possibility of securing additional woodland planting and better management of the existing Ancient Woodland in the appellant's ownership through an enhancement scheme that could be secured by condition can also be seen as a benefit of granting permission for the scrap yard use, and that can also be accorded moderate weight. However, the combined weight of these material considerations falls well short of outweighing the conflict with the development due to harm to the landscape and the character and appearance of the area. An argument has also been made for a temporary permission which would

allow more time to look for an alternative location for the scrap yard use. This is a matter that is also relevant to the appeal on ground (g) below, but while a temporary permission would lead to reduced harm overall, the harm being time-limited, the benefits would still not be sufficient to justify the continuing harm due to the scrap yard use.

25. No objection has been made to the equestrian component of the mixed use, nor has the building erected for equestrian purposes, Building A, been argued as harmful to the landscape or local character. It is a relatively unobtrusive building and has the appearance of a building designed for agricultural purposes. It is appropriate in scale and character to support the appellant and his family's equestrian interests. As such I consider that the equestrian use and the retention of the building for equestrian purposes does not conflict with the development plan.
26. The residential component of the use was intended to provide security among other things for the scrap yard use, but there are also personal considerations which I consider sufficient to justify planning permission for the occupation of a mobile structure on the site by the current occupant who has lived there for a considerable period. The appellant has already made a payment to mitigate any possible harm arising from the residential occupation on the Medway Estuary and Marshes SPA and Ramsar site, and I am satisfied, as the competent authority, that this development will not have any adverse effect on the integrity of the protected habitats, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.
27. I shall therefore allow the appeal on this ground and grant planning permission, subject to conditions, for equestrian use of the land to the rear of the 2 dwellings on The Woodlands as it stood before the incorporation of part of Great Knox Farm into the property, including the retention of Building A for those purposes, and for the stationing of a mobile structure for the purposes of human habitation, but I shall refuse planning permission for the scrap yard use.
28. A condition restricting the use of Building A to private equestrian use is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, while residential occupancy of the mobile structure will be restricted to the current occupant in view of the personal circumstances justifying the permission. For clarity, and in the interests of local character and amenity, I shall require the approval of a layout plan showing the siting of the mobile structure, external lighting and foul drainage, and the restoration of the site once the personal permission has come to an end.

Ground (f)

29. This ground is that the requirements, in the circumstances, exceed what is necessary to remedy the breach of planning control. In view of my findings on ground (b) I shall vary requirement 1 to reflect the actual mixed use, and for clarity, notwithstanding the effect of section 180 of the Act, I shall remove the requirements affecting Building A. I shall however rely on section 180 to enable the provision or retention of a mobile structure for residential purposes rather than vary requirement (v) since the layout plan required by condition will provide clarity and certainty in that respect.

30. The other matters raised on this ground concern the hardstanding and the requirement to plant trees. Building A aside, the notice requires the roadway to be planted with a woodland mix once the roadway has been removed. However, not all of the roadway was woodland before the current roadway was constructed. The woodland removed to accommodate the roadway was on land under the Great Knox Farm title, and it is this land that should be replanted in order to restore it to its condition before the breach took place. I shall exclude this land from the area granted permission for equestrian and residential use since that would not be compatible with the purpose of restoring the land to its previous condition. Regarding what was there beforehand, it was claimed that a tarmac or concrete track was found when constructing the current access track, but the evidence on this point was vague and ambiguous, and there is ample evidence of the removal of woodland to accommodate the new track. I shall correct the notice to show that land clearly and vary requirement (vi) accordingly. Aside from that, nothing in the requirements exceeds what is necessary to remedy the breach. The appeal on this ground succeeds to that limited extent.

Ground (g)

31. This ground is that the time for compliance is too short. The appellant will need to find alternative premises and then undertake the remedial works. Once suitable alternative premises have been found, since the development is a *sui generis* use it is highly likely that planning permission would be required. Time may also be required to adapt any new premises to the specific needs of the appellant's business. A period of 12 months is sought to cease the use, after which the remedial works would be carried out.
32. As a significant employer and contributor to the local economy, there is good reason to allow sufficient time for the scrap yard business to relocate, but against that must be weighed the continuing harm while it remains at the appeal site. I consider it reasonable that it will take up to 12 months to secure and prepare new premises with the appropriate consents, and a further 3 months for remedial work at the current site, planting aside. The planting requirement is for the planting season following the completion of the remedial works so can remain as it is. The appeal on ground (g) succeeds accordingly and I shall vary the notice to reflect that.

Paul Dignan

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Michael Rudd

He called	
Russel Haines	Workshop occupant GKF
John Howard	Mobile home occupant GKF
Genty Draper	Mobile home occupant GKF
Robert Beck	Appellant
Mike Harrington	Equestrian worker
Robert Beck Jnr	Occupant GKF and WF
Emma Veazey	Administrator
Matthew Green	Planning

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Dr Ashley Bowes

He called	
Nigel Wicks	Enforcement
Tom Wicks	Enforcement
Ian Warner	Planning

INTERESTED PERSONS

Cllr Lawrence	Local Resident and ward councillor
---------------	------------------------------------

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Opening submissions - Appellant
- 2 Opening submissions - Council
- 3 Speaking note – Cllr Lawrence
- 4 Council’s Expediency Report
- 5 Signed witness statements - appellant
- 6 Scrap metal dealer licences - appellant
- 7 Amended enforcement notice plan - LPA
- 8 List of conditions - LPA
- 9 Ancient woodland restoration plan proposal - appellant
- 10 Revised enforcement notice - LPA
- 11 Closing submissions - Council
- 12 Closing submissions - Appellant



The Planning Inspectorate

This is the plan referred to in my decision dated 25 January 2024

by Paul Dignan MSc PhD

Appeal Ref. APP/A2280/C/22/3296166

