



Appeal Decisions

Hearing held on 10 January 2024

Site visit made on 9 January 2024

by Zoe Raygen DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st January 2024

Appeal A Ref: APP/W0530/W/23/3318839

Plot A1 Moor Drove, Histon, Cambridge, CB24 9AN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Arram Price against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04263/FUL, dated 12 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is change of use from disused land to single site for 1 static caravan, day room and parking.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W0530/W/23/3318840

Plot B2 Moor Drove, Histon, Cambridge, CB24 9AN

- 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 Miss Jolene Gentle against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04858/FUL, dated 16 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is change of use from disused land to single site for 1 static caravan, day room and parking.
-

Appeal C Ref: APP/W0530/W/23/3318842

Plot C3 Moor Drove, Histon, Cambridge CB24 9AN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Joshua Price against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04264/FUL, dated 14 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is change of use from disused land to single site for 2 static caravans, day room and parking.
-

Appeal D Ref: APP/W0530/W/23/3318843

Plot D4 Moor Drove, Histon, Cambridge CB24 9AN

- 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 Jessie Price against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04297/FUL, dated 14 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is change of use from disused land to single site for 1 static caravan, day room and parking.
-

Appeal E Ref: APP/W0530/W/23/3318844

Plot E5 Moor Drove, Histon, CAMBRIDGE, CB24 9AN

- 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 Ms Sarah Price against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04298/FUL, dated 15 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is change of use from disused land to single site for 1 static caravan, day room and parking.
-

Appeal F Ref: APP/W0530/W/23/3318845

Plot F6 Moor Drove, Histon, CAMBRIDGE, CB24 9AN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Tony Price against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04299/FUL, dated 15 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is change of use from disused land to single site for 1 static caravan, laundry/shower room and parking.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is allowed, and planning permission is granted for change of use from disused land to single site for 1 static caravan, day room and parking at land east of Plot A1 Moor Drove, Histon, Cambridge, CB24 9AN in accordance with the terms of the application 20/04263/FUL, dated 12 October 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision notice.
 2. Appeal B is allowed, and planning permission is granted for change of use from disused land to single site for 1 static caravan, day room and parking at land east of Plot B2 Moor Drove, Histon, Cambridge, CB24 9AN in accordance with the terms of the application 20/04858/FUL, dated 16 November 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision notice.
 3. Appeal C is allowed, and planning permission is granted for change of use from disused land to single site for 2 static caravans, day room and parking at land east of Plot C3 Moor Drove, Histon, Cambridge, CB24 9AN in accordance with the terms of the application 20/04264/FUL, dated 14 October 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision notice.
 4. Appeal D is allowed, and planning permission is granted for change of use from disused land to single site for 1 static caravan, day room and parking at land east of Plot D 4 Moor Drove, Histon, Cambridge, CB24 9AN in accordance with the terms of the application 20/04297/FUL, dated 14 October 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision notice.
 5. Appeal E is allowed, and planning permission is granted for change of use from disused land to single site for 1 static caravan, day room and parking at land east of Plot E5 Moor Drove, Histon, Cambridge, CB24 9AN in accordance with the terms of the application 20/04298/FUL, dated 15 October 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision notice.
-

6. Appeal F is allowed, and planning permission is granted for change of use from disused land to single site for 1 static caravan, laundry/shower room and parking at land east of Plot F6 Moor Drove, Histon, Cambridge, CB24 9AN in accordance with the terms of the application 20/04299/FUL, dated 15 October 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision notice.

Preliminary Matters

7. The Government issued a revised version of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites on the 19 December 2023 (the PPTS). The revision relates to the definition of Gypsies and Travellers contained in Annex 1 of the PPTS updated following recent case law¹. Parties had the opportunity to comment on this prior to the Hearing.
8. Since the application was determined, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was published in December 2023. Policies that are material to this decision have not fundamentally changed and I have had regard to the latest version of the Framework and new paragraph numbers in reaching my decision.
9. The six appeals relate to six additional pitches at an established Gypsy and Traveller site of nine authorised pitches² as well as four temporary pitches³. In addition, I saw at my site visit a number of unauthorised pitches including nine which are also the subject of appeals under my consideration⁴ heard at a Hearing on 9 January 2024 and dealt with in a separate decision.
10. The Council has refused the six planning applications the subject of this appeal for the same reasons. I have therefore addressed all the appeals in one decision as most of the issues are the same. I have considered the appeal sites on their own merits and only considered the cumulative impact in association with each other and with those pitches which are authorised on a permanent basis. That is except for the nine pitches which I have considered in a separate Hearing, and which are located either side of the sites the subject of these appeals.
11. At this Hearing only four of the appellants and some of their families were present. In addition, the agent representing the appellants was not present. After seeking views, I heard from the parties present about their Gypsy and Traveller status and their personal circumstances. All parties present agreed that I would progress all the remaining matters, including the personal circumstances and status of the absent appellants, amongst others, by written representations with all parties. I have taken account of the responses received in my decisions.
12. It was confirmed at the Hearing that the appellants and their families had been living at the appeal sites for some time. It was clear at my site visit that the pitches had already been provided. However, the layout of each is different to how the proposal is shown on the submitted site layout plans, in terms of the location of the mobile homes and the provision of amenity buildings. The

¹ *Smith v SSLUHC & Ors* [2022] EWCA (the Lisa Smith judgement)

² APP/W0530/08/2067087 & APP/W0530/W/17/3183666

³ APP/W0530/23/3317545 (the 2023 decision)

⁴ APP/W0530/W/23/3322128 & APP/W0530/W/23/3322185

development is still essentially a proposal in the sense that it is far from being completed. What is for my consideration is as shown on the submitted plans and not any alternative development which has, or has alleged, to have taken place. Accordingly, I have considered the appeals on this basis.

13. I had already visited this established Gypsy and Traveller site the day before and seen all these appeal sites as well as the surrounding area. It was agreed at the Hearing that I did not need to revisit, especially given that some of the appellants were absent.

Main Issues

14. The appeal sites are located within the Green Belt and by virtue of paragraph 16 of the PPTS the proposals would be inappropriate development drawing it into conflict with this document. In that context, the main issues for all six appeals are:

- The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt;
- The effect of the proposal on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt;
- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
- Whether the proposal complies with the requirements of Policy H/22 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018; and
- Would the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Openness and Purposes

15. The proposals would see the siting of up to 14 caravans and 6 amenity buildings which would have a spatial and visual impact on openness.
16. However, I saw at my site visit that, due to local topography and the presence of dense field hedgerows, visibility into the site from public vantage points is minimal. Therefore in my view the impact on openness is only limited and localised.
17. The caravans and buildings would be single storey with a modest mass within large plots with space around the structures. Nevertheless, they would lead to a loss of spatial openness which would have a significant adverse effect on openness and, due to the extent of the plots, encroachment into the countryside.
18. Consequently, there would be conflict with Policy NH/8 of the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 (Local Plan) which requires development in the Green Belt not to have an adverse effect on openness. The proposals would also be contrary to the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy contained in the Framework to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open and one of the purposes to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

The proposals would not conflict with any of the other purposes of the Green Belt.

Character and appearance

19. The area within which the appeal sites are located is largely open fields with well-defined boundaries comprising hedgerows and trees. Since at least 2008 when planning permission was granted for 6 of the authorised pitches there have been caravans on the site and these form part of the established character laid out in an L shape around access roads and comprising caravans, amenity buildings and surface storage on hardstanding.
20. The six appeal sites would be seen within the context of the existing pitches being located around a central access road with three pitches on either side, extending no further into the countryside to the east than those authorised pitches to the south. While they would increase the developed area leading to a loss of open field, they would not breach the existing field line maintaining the integrity of the field structure. Furthermore, they would not be visible from public vantage points due to the existing landscape screening. I appreciate that a substantial belt of trees to the west has been removed. However, any views to the appeal sites from this location would be screened by the existing authorised pitches to the west.
21. As well as the six plots in isolation, I have also considered them cumulatively with each other, the authorised plots and those that I am considering under the separate appeals. It is true that the plots as a whole, both authorised permanently and unauthorised, would cover a large area of countryside. However, together they would still be contained within an existing field boundary and would not be visible from any public vantage points. The structures would be of a similar character and single storey with space around them, integrating with the existing authorised development.
22. Some planting could help effectively integrate the additional plots, however in my view the containment of the site in the context of the authorised development means that that it is only the loss of part of the open field that would lead to minor harm to the character and appearance of the area, whether considered in isolation or cumulatively. However, this would result in the proposals not preserving or enhancing the character of the local rural area as required by Policy HQ/1 of the Local Plan. Furthermore they would have an adverse effect on the rural character of the Green Belt contrary to Policy NH/8 of the Local Plan.
23. The Council also refers to Policy NH/9 of the Local Plan. However, this refers to the redevelopment of previously developed sites and infilling of the Green Belt, neither of which is the case here.
24. I realise that I have found a different level of harm to that of the Inspector in the 2023 decision. However, that decision was in respect of pitches which are set apart from the authorised pitches with no direct relationship with them which is different to those proposed in the six appeals before me now.

Policy H/22

25. Policy H/22 of the Local Plan is regarding proposals for Gypsies and Traveller sites on unallocated land outside of development frameworks. Planning permission will only be granted outside development frameworks and the Green Belt where it meets a number of criteria.
26. Sites within the Green Belt would need to comply with local and national policy and if considered acceptable would also need to comply with the criteria in the Policy. Although not contained in the Council's reason for refusal, in its statement of case the Council allege conflict with criteria b, c, d, f and g.

Accessibility (b)

27. The appeal sites are close to the settlements of Histon and Cottenham which have a range of services and facilities providing for the day to day needs of residents. There is a bus service which would give access to the settlements from the appeal sites. The Council's primary concern is the lack of streetlighting along the footway which leads from the appeal sites to the villages. It is true this would make the journey on foot or cycle uninviting in the dark. However, I am also mindful that Policy C of the PPTS recognises that sites may need to be located in rural areas and the countryside. In addition, the occupants, would by definition travel by caravan pulled by a vehicle. Although in the open countryside, this site is only a very short car journey to Histon and Cottenham. I am satisfied therefore that there is no conflict with this criterion.

Pressure on services and facilities (c)

28. No evidence was presented by the Council to suggest that local services were under pressure. I am aware that the residents have been on site for a number of years and are registered with local health facilities. On the evidence before me therefore there is nothing substantive to indicate that the needs of residents could not be met appropriately by local facilities and services.

Number and nature of pitches (d)

29. I consider that the number and nature of the pitches is appropriate to the site size and location given my findings above regarding the character and appearance of the area. The consideration of whether it is inappropriate with respect to the Green Belt designation is a separate matter. To say that the pitches are not appropriate because the development is inappropriate in the Green Belt, as the Council does in its office report, would mean that this criterion could never be met.

Domination of nearest settled community (f)

30. I saw that Histon and Cottenham, between which the appeal sites are located are large villages. In comparison, the cumulative size of the gypsy and Traveller site with these appeal sites is negligible in this context, and it is located a reasonable distance from the settlements to ensure that there would be no dominance. In addition I have seen no evidence that the everyday needs of the residents would be to an extent to swamp local services and facilities. I am satisfied therefore that this criterion is met.

31. The Council suggested that this criterion is similar to criterion (g) regarding the unacceptable adverse impact on the countryside and landscape character. However, in my view these two elements are separate considerations, one regarding the relationship with surrounding settled communities and the other the impact on the character and appearance.

Countryside and landscape character (g)

32. I have already found that the proposal will only have a minor harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area due to the loss of an open field. I do not consider given my findings that this would be to the extent of having an unacceptable adverse impact on the countryside and landscape character within the context of this policy given the existing structures on site, the lack of visibility and the retention of field patterns.
33. Therefore, for the reasons above I conclude that the proposals meet criteria b, c, d, f and g of Policy H/22. The Council also allege conflict with criteria a which relates to the need for pitches and availability of alternatives which I consider below.

Other Considerations

Need for pitches

34. I have before me two recent appeal decisions regarding Gypsy and Traveller sites within the District⁵. Both Inspectors found that the Council could not demonstrate an adequate supply of sites to meet the needs of ethnic Gypsies and Travellers and the level of unmet need is substantial. The Council agreed in writing that this remains the position and there is no evidence which would lead me to a different conclusion. I give the unmet need substantial weight.

Alternative sites

35. The Inspectors on the two recent appeal decisions also found that there are no vacant pitches on existing lawful sites and that the public sites are full with long waiting lists. The Council also confirmed in writing that this situation has not changed. This is reiterated in correspondence from the Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer (GTLO) stating that in the last seven years only 2 pitches have become available on the Council owned sites with 40-50 applications being made per pitch. Although, the appellants have not provided any details of a search for other sites where they could live, it is apparent from the evidence before me, that there is a lack of alternative sites.
36. The Council confirmed in writing that the timescale for the emerging local plan would be adoption in 2026 but that was not guaranteed, and it would be likely to make allocations in accordance with a new GTAA which has been commissioned. However, this is sometime in the future, and I give the lack of suitable and available alternative sites considerable weight.
37. Whilst this is a case of intentional unauthorised development, given the lack of alternative pitches I give this minor weight.

⁵ APP/W0530/W/23/3317545 & APP/W0530/W/23/3318910

38. Given my findings on this and the need for pitches then I am satisfied that the proposals meet the requirements of criterion a of Policy H/22 of the Local Plan.

Personal circumstances

39. The occupiers of the site, which are part of the extended family group of existing residents would be as follows:

Appeal A

- Arram Price and Sharon Smith with two resident dependents

Appeal B

- Jolene Gentle and her eight resident dependents

Appeal C

- Joshua and Sabrina Price and their two resident dependents

Appeal D

- Jessie and Lyla Price and their five resident dependents

Appeal E

- Sarah Price and her 5 resident dependents

Appeal F

- Tony Price and Pamela Piggott and their four resident dependents

40. The appellants who attended the Hearing, and subsequently those in writing, confirmed that all the economically active members of the family travel for work for part of the year as well as attending Appleby Horse Fair. Others remain at home to look after children or others with health needs both within the site and within Histon. I am therefore satisfied that the residents meet the definition of Gypsies and Travellers in the PPTS.

41. I was also presented with evidence regarding medical conditions for residents of Appeal B and Appeal F which required them to have regular GP and hospital appointments. All residents across the six plots are registered with local health facilities. A settled base would ensure continuing access to GP and hospital facilities. I therefore give significant weight to the health needs of those residents.

42. Much emphasis is also placed on the need for the extended family to be together to provide mutual support. The GTLO reports that the Moor Drove site is well established and the residents settled. The majority are from the extended family of the Prices. The family members rely on each other for support, childminding, health needs and employment. There is a very positive family dynamic. There are complex and extensive personal circumstances which means the residents rely on each other for support. This is not disputed and matches the compelling evidence I saw and heard.

43. It was also confirmed at the Hearing that the children across the four sites attend the local school or nursery school. Those living on Plot E5 also attend a

local primary school with one at pre-school. Those on plot A1 are home schooled.

44. Article 3(1) of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child provides that the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration in all actions by public authorities concerning children. The children's best interests are a primary consideration. The best interests of the children would be served by the families continuing to reside at their long-established home and business base. Their needs are being met presently at this base. Should the appeal be dismissed, and the families required to vacate the site, they would be forced to either lead a roadside existence or double-up on pitches elsewhere. This would inevitably impact negatively on the children's education and wellbeing. In addition the loss of the mutual support provided by the extended family would also have a negative impact on the children's wellbeing. The best interests of the children is a factor that attracts significant weight.

Other Matters

45. The Council refers to Policies H/20 and H/21 of the Local Plan in its first reason for refusal. However, Policy H/20 allows for the safeguarding of sites with unrestricted planning permission for Gypsies and Travellers. The proposal would not conflict with that requirement. Policy H/21 states that if a need is identified for sites, then they will be sought as part of large scale new communities and significant major development sites. While the proposals before me would form an extension to a standalone site, I was not advised of any opportunity for sites as proposed under this policy to meet the identified need. Therefore neither policy has been determinative.

Whether the harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations

46. I have found that the development is inappropriate within the Green Belt and causes significant adverse harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt. These attract substantial weight. The development is also a case of intentional unauthorised development. However, given the circumstances I outline above this carries minor weight. The proposals would also cause minor harm to the character and appearance of the area which carries minor weight.
47. Set against this, I have found that there continues to be an unmet need within the District. In addition, the Council is unable to demonstrate an adequate supply and there are no alternative or available sites for the appellant and their family to move to. It is uncertain when any would be available in the future. Furthermore, it would be in the best interests of the children to remain on the appeal site.
48. I have had regard to the PPTS that states that subject to the best interests of the child, personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm so as to establish very special circumstances. The site would be occupied by a number of children having regard to Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights. If the appeals were to be dismissed then the families would revert to a roadside existence, where it would be difficult for the children to access facilities and support. I consider the best interest of the children would be to remain on the sites with access to educational and health facilities as well as support from

extended family. This would provide a safe and secure base to access facilities, which, due to a lack of alternative sites, is not available elsewhere.

49. Therefore, in this instance, the matters I have identified above together, including the best interests of the child in all appeals, carry very great weight such that they clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm. Looking at the cases as a whole, I consider that very special circumstances exist which justify the development. As such there would be no conflict with the requirements of the Framework.
50. As the proposals would meet Green Belt policy, then the requirements of Policy H/22 are met and there would be no conflict in this respect. However, there would still be conflict with policies NH/8 and HQ1 of the Local Plan drawing them into conflict with the development plan as a whole. However, the material considerations I outline above, including the Framework, are sufficient to outweigh that conflict in this instance.

Conditions

51. The Council suggested a number of conditions for the appeals prior to the Hearing I sought comments from the appellants in writing and have taken the response into account. I have had regard to those conditions and considered them against the tests in the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practise Guidance (PPG), making such amendments as necessary to comply with those documents.
52. A condition restricting the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. As development has commenced then a condition giving a timescale for commencement is not necessary.
53. There is justification for the sites to be occupied by Gypsies and Travellers to safeguard the supply of the sites for this purpose and as such a condition is necessary to restrict occupation. A personal condition is also necessary as although there is an outstanding need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches, the justification for the pitches being in this Green Belt location relates to the personal circumstances of the appellants and the particular supportive relationships with the residents of the authorised pitches.
54. It is necessary to restrict the number of pitches and caravans to protect the character and appearance of the area. It is also reasonable to impose a condition to ensure that commercial activities do not take place on the sites and no vehicle over 3.5 tonnes is stationed, parked, or stored on the sites to protect the character of the area and residents' living conditions.
55. Although I have considered the development on the basis of the submitted plans, a condition is imposed to ensure that details of the internal layout of the sites, means of foul and surface water drainage, external lighting and hard and soft landscaping are submitted, implemented and maintained to give the Council certainty as to how the development is implemented on the sites in an acceptable way and within a timely manner. There is a strict timetable for compliance because permission is being granted retrospectively, and so it is not possible to use a negatively worded condition to secure the approval and implementation of the matters outlined in this condition before the

development commences. The condition will ensure that the development can be enforced against if the details are not submitted for approval within the period given by the condition, or if the details are not approved by the local planning authority or the Secretary of State on appeal, or if the details are approved but not implemented in accordance with an approved timetable.

56. The appellants asked for a condition allowing the use to be transferable to other members of their own family. I understand that family relationships on the site are close, however I have determined these appeals based on the evidence before me for each plot and the requirements of those families are part of the reason that the very special circumstances exist to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. I cannot be certain that the same would be the case for other members of the family.

57. The Council has requested a condition restricting the use of the appeal site for five years as per the most recent appeal decision. However, as I have explained, that appeal site has a different relationship to the authorised pitches to those I am considering now and therefore there is no need for a temporary consent.

Conclusion

58. For the reasons given above I conclude that all six appeals should be allowed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES FOR APPEALS B, C, D and F

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Phoebe Carter	Senior Planning Officer, South Cambridgeshire District Council
Amy Stocks	Senior Planning Officer, South Cambridgeshire District Council
Dean Scrivenor	Principal Planning Officer, South Cambridgeshire District Council

FOR THE APPELLANT

Jolene Gentle	Appellant
Joshua Price	Appellant
Jessie Price	Appellant
Pamelyn Piggott	Appellant's relative
Tony Price	Appellant

CONDITIONS APPEAL A

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: block plan, site plan, proposed day room.
- 2) The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than Gypsies and Travellers, defined as persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.
- 3) There shall be no more than one pitch on the site and on this pitch hereby approved no more than two caravans, shall be stationed at any time, of which only one shall be a static caravan as defined by the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Site Act 1968 as amended.
- 4) The use hereby permitted shall be carried out only by the following: Arram Price and Sharon Smith and their resident dependents.
- 5) The 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 28 days of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in i) to iv) below:

- i) Notwithstanding the details shown on the site layout plan, and within 4 months of the date of this decision, a Site Development Scheme including the following details shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 - 1. the internal layout of the site including the extent of the residential pitch/es, the location of the caravans and vehicle parking, any buildings, hard standings and external lighting;
 - 2. hard and soft landscaping scheme including means of enclosure and surfacing materials, details of any trees, shrubs and hedges to be planted and a schedule of landscape maintenance for a period of 5 years following initial planting;
 - 3. the means of foul and surface water drainage of the site; and
 - 4. a timetable for the implementation for the Site Development Scheme.
- ii) If within 8 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve the scheme or 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 scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.
- iv) The approved site development scheme shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable. Upon implementation of the approved scheme specified in this condition, that scheme shall thereafter be retained.

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.

- 6) No commercial activities shall take place on any part of the site, including the storage of materials and goods.
- 7) No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked, or stored on this site.

CONDITIONS APPEAL B

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: block plan, site plan, proposed day room.
- 2) The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than Gypsies and Travellers, defined as persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.

- 3) There shall be no more than one pitch on the site and on this pitch hereby approved no more than two caravans, shall be stationed at any time, of which only one shall be a static caravan as defined by the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Site Act 1968 as amended.
- 4) The use hereby permitted shall be carried out only by the following: Jolene Gentle and her resident dependents.
- 5) The 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 28 days of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in i) to iv) below:
 - i) Notwithstanding the details shown on the site layout plan, and within 4 months of the date of this decision, a Site Development Scheme including the following details shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 1. the internal layout of the site including the extent of the residential pitch/es, the location of the caravans and vehicle parking, any buildings, hard standings and external lighting;
 2. hard and soft landscaping scheme including means of enclosure and surfacing materials, details of any trees, shrubs and hedges to be planted and a schedule of landscape maintenance for a period of 5 years following initial planting;
 3. the means of foul and surface water drainage of the site; and
 4. a timetable for the implementation for the Site Development Scheme.
 - ii) If within 8 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve the scheme or 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 scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.
 - iv) The approved site development scheme shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable. Upon implementation of the approved scheme specified in this condition, that scheme shall thereafter be retained.

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.
- 6) No commercial activities shall take place on any part of the site, including the storage of materials and goods.
- 7) No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on this site.

CONDITIONS APPEAL C

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: block plan, site plan, proposed day room.
- 2) The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than Gypsies and Travellers, defined as persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.
- 3) There shall be no more than one pitch on the site and on this pitch hereby approved no more than four caravans, shall be stationed at any time, of which only two shall be a static caravan as defined by the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Site Act 1968 as amended.
- 4) The use hereby permitted shall be carried out only by the following: Joshua and Sabrina Price and their resident dependents.
- 5) The 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 28 days of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in i) to iv) below:
 - i) Notwithstanding the details shown on the site layout plan, and within 4 months of the date of this decision, a Site Development Scheme including the following details shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 1. the internal layout of the site including the extent of the residential pitch/es, the location of the caravans and vehicle parking, any buildings, hard standings and external lighting;
 2. hard and soft landscaping scheme including means of enclosure and surfacing materials, details of any trees, shrubs and hedges to be planted and a schedule of landscape maintenance for a period of 5 years following initial planting;
 3. the means of foul and surface water drainage of the site; and
 4. a timetable for the implementation for the Site Development Scheme.
 - ii) If within 8 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve the scheme or 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 scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.

- iv) The approved site development scheme shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable. Upon implementation of the approved scheme specified in this condition, that scheme shall thereafter be retained.

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.

- 6) No commercial activities shall take place on any part of the site, including the storage of materials and goods.
- 7) No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked, or stored on this site.

CONDITIONS APPEAL D

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: block plan, site plan, proposed day room.
- 2) The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than Gypsies and Travellers, defined as persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.
- 3) There shall be no more than one pitch on the site and on this pitch hereby approved no more than two caravans, shall be stationed at any time, of which only one shall be a static caravan as defined by the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Site Act 1968 as amended.
- 4) The use hereby permitted shall be carried out only by the following: Jessie and Lyla Price and their resident dependents.
- 5) The 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 28 days of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in i) to iv) below:
 - i) Notwithstanding the details shown on the site layout plan, and within 4 months of the date of this decision, a Site Development Scheme including the following details shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 - 1. the internal layout of the site including the extent of the residential pitch/es, the location of the caravans and vehicle parking, any buildings, hard standings and external lighting;
 - 2. hard and soft landscaping scheme including means of enclosure and surfacing materials, details of any trees, shrubs and hedges to be planted and a schedule of

landscape maintenance for a period of 5 years following initial planting;

3. the means of foul and surface water drainage of the site; and
 4. a timetable for the implementation for the Site Development Scheme.
- v) If within 8 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve the scheme or 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.
 - vi) If an appeal is made in pursuance of ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.
 - vii) The approved site development scheme shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable. Upon implementation of the approved scheme specified in this condition, that scheme shall thereafter be retained.

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.

- 6) No commercial activities shall take place on any part of the site, including the storage of materials and goods.
- 7) No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on this site.

CONDITIONS APPEAL E

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: block plan, site plan, proposed day room.
- 2) The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than Gypsies and Travellers, defined as persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.
- 3) There shall be no more than one pitch on the site and on this pitch hereby approved no more than two caravans, shall be stationed at any time, of which only one shall be a static caravan as defined by the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Site Act 1968 as amended.
- 4) The use hereby permitted shall be carried out only by the following: Sarah Price and her resident dependents.
- 5) The 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 28 days of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in i) to iv) below:

- i) Notwithstanding the details shown on the site layout plan, and within 4 months of the date of this decision, a Site Development Scheme including the following details shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 - 1. the internal layout of the site including the extent of the residential pitch/es, the location of the caravans and vehicle parking, any buildings, hard standings and external lighting;
 - 2. hard and soft landscaping scheme including means of enclosure and surfacing materials, details of any trees, shrubs and hedges to be planted and a schedule of landscape maintenance for a period of 5 years following initial planting;
 - 3. the means of foul and surface water drainage of the site; and
 - 4. a timetable for the implementation for the Site Development Scheme.
- ii) If within 8 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve the scheme or 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 scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.
- iv) The approved site development scheme shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable. Upon implementation of the approved scheme specified in this condition, that scheme shall thereafter be retained.

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.

- 6) No commercial activities shall take place on any part of the site, including the storage of materials and goods.
- 7) No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked, or stored on this site.

CONDITIONS APPEAL F

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: block plan, site plan, proposed day room.
- 2) The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than Gypsies and Travellers, defined as persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of

an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.

- 3) There shall be no more than one pitch on the site and on this pitch hereby approved no more than two caravans, shall be stationed at any time, of which only one shall be a static caravan as defined by the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Site Act 1968 as amended.
- 4) The use hereby permitted shall be carried out only by the following: Tony Price and Pamela Pyggott and their resident dependents.
- 5) The 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 28 days of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in i) to iv) below:
 - i) Notwithstanding the details shown on the site layout plan, and within 4 months of the date of this decision, a Site Development Scheme including the following details shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 1. the internal layout of the site including the extent of the residential pitch/es, the location of the caravans and vehicle parking, any buildings, hard standings and external lighting;
 2. hard and soft landscaping scheme including means of enclosure and surfacing materials, details of any trees, shrubs and hedges to be planted and a schedule of landscape maintenance for a period of 5 years following initial planting;
 3. the means of foul and surface water drainage of the site; and
 4. a timetable for the implementation for the Site Development Scheme.
 - ii) If within 8 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve the scheme or 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 scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.
 - iv) The approved site development scheme shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable. Upon implementation of the approved scheme specified in this condition, that scheme shall thereafter be retained.

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.
- 6) No commercial activities shall take place on any part of the site, including the storage of materials and goods.

- 7) No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked, or stored on this site.

*****END OF CONDITIONS*****