



Appeal Decision

Hearing held 9 April 2024

Site visits made 8 April 2024

by Graham Chamberlain BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U1430/W/23/3330956

**The Old Vineyard, Birchenwood Farm, Pashley Road, Ticehurst,
East Sussex TN5 7HE**

- 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 Celia Stanley against the decision of Rother District Council.
- The application reference is RR/2023/272/P.
- The development proposed is described as 'Building operations and an extension to the existing shed building to provide residential accommodation for a Gypsy and Traveller, together with the removal of the storage containers'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issues

2. I have taken the description of development from the decision notice and appeal form as this reflects the amended description agreed by the Council and appellant during the course of the application. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') has been published since the Council made its decision. The parties had an opportunity to address this.
3. At the outset of the hearing the parties agreed that the appeal scheme is not an application for a Gypsy and Traveller site or pitch. Instead, the proposal is for the conversion of the existing building to create a one-bedroom dwelling. The appellant nevertheless indicated that there was a hybrid element to the application because she meets the definition of a Gypsy and Traveller for planning purposes as set out in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) and the appeal scheme would be culturally appropriate accommodation for a Gypsies and Travellers. These are points I will return to.
4. Although not a reason for refusal, it became apparent at the hearing that the Council are of the view that the proposal would harm the setting of a Grade II listed building (Birchenwood Cottage), and that the harm would not be outweighed by public benefits. This was also a position adopted by interested parties in writing and again at the hearing. I have therefore included this as a main issue. The appellant had adequate opportunity to address this point. Consequently, the main issues in this appeal are:
 - Whether the proposed development would be in a suitable location with reference to the accessibility of services and facilities;

- Whether the proposal would conserve the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty AONB)¹; and
- The effect of the proposed development on the significance of Birchenwood Cottage, a Grade II listed building, with particular reference to whether its setting would be preserved.

Reasons

The accessibility of services and facilities

5. There are some services near to the appeal site at Swallows Oast but these appear to be small farm business units and a wedding venue. As a result, they are unlikely to be used regularly by future occupants of the appeal scheme. The nearest collection of everyday facilities, including the closest bus stop, are located at Ticehurst, the centre of which is about one mile from the appeal site. There is no local definition or guidance of what distances should be travelled for walking to be a genuine² transport option. It is nevertheless of note that the National Design Guide (NDG) defines 'walkable' as no more than 800m. The trip into Ticehurst from the appeal site would exceed this by some way.
6. In addition, future occupants of the appeal site would have to walk along the B2099 to reach Ticehurst. Upon leaving Ticehurst this road is devoid of pavements and has only narrow grass verges. This means pedestrians would have to walk in the carriageway. This is not unusual in some rural areas, but in this instance the speed limit is 40mph and visibility is restricted by hedges and bends. The road was also quite busy when I visited and there is nothing to suggest what I saw was untypical. As a result, the walking environment from the appeal site into Ticehurst is dangerous, uncomfortable and unattractive.
7. Cycling might be an option given the distance to Ticehurst and other local settlements such as Flimwell. However, the use of this mode of transport would be notably tempered by the level of fitness, confidence or proficiency needed to cycle, especially along undulating and sinuous country lanes with fast moving traffic. Substantive evidence is not before me demonstrating that cycling is a frequently used mode of transport by existing residents, which could have been an indication of cycling being a genuine transport choice.
8. Even when accounting for the rural location of the appeal site, where opportunities for sustainable transport would be more limited than urban areas, the appeal scheme is poorly placed to promote both active travel and the use of public transport. In essence, future residents of the appeal scheme would be reliant on private motorised transport. The number of journeys would soon add up over the life of the development. Accordingly, the appeal scheme would result in a moderate level of social and environmental harm linked to additional vehicle use, including reliance on fossil fuels and undermining the health benefits from active travel.
9. The appellant submits that the number of vehicle movements would actually reduce as a result of the appeal scheme because she would no longer need to travel to the site every day to care for her two dogs and to manage the land.

¹ Also referred to as the High Weald National Landscape

² 'Genuine' being easy, comfortable and attractive as indicated in the National Model Design Code

10. Managing the land will inherently require some trips to the site, but they need not be daily visits. Indeed, managing the site would principally involve the occasional cutting of the meadow and adjacent hedges. Keeping dogs at the site is a personal choice of the appellant that may not endure and is not an intrinsic aspect of the land use. That said, as things currently stand the presence of two dogs on the site would require a daily visit in the interests of animal welfare. This would probably result in two highway movements a day.
11. The Local Highway Authority has estimated that a residential use at the appeal site would generate around four vehicle movements a day. This seems very plausible given that any occupant would be reliant on travel by car to access everyday services and villages. As such, the proposal would likely double the number of vehicle movements. Consequently, the harm identified above would not be mitigated by extinguishing the existing daily trip. In arriving at this view, I have not factored in any increase in vehicle trips from deliveries, as the appellant already has some domestic items delivered to the appeal site to be picked up when she is visiting her dogs.
12. As a material consideration, it is important to note that the Framework supports the re-use of redundant and disused buildings at isolated locations in the countryside without a stipulation that they be located close to services and facilities. Being away from any settlement, the appeal site is isolated. However, The Framework also states that the scale and extent of development in designated landscapes such as AONBs should be limited. To this end, Policies RA3 and RA4 of the Rother Core Strategy (CS) exceptionally permit the conversion of traditional historic farm buildings in locations away from services and facilities. The rationale being that the retention of these buildings, which are an important part of the landscape of the AONB, can justify a new home in a location away from services and facilities. Other conversions, such as that proposed³, do not benefit from this exception and are subject to the policies in the development plan concerned with promoting sustainable transport.
13. To this end, Policy TR3 of the CS states that new development should minimise the need to travel and support good access to employment, services and community facilities. When read in its proper context and with reference to the supporting text to the policy, including Paragraph 18.37, it is apparent that the term 'good access' means sustainable forms of travel. Moreover, Policy TR3 flows from Policy OSS3 of the CS, which requires proposals to be considered in the context of the low carbon potential of a site. For the reasons given above, the proposal would be at odds with these policies⁴.

Whether the proposal would conserve the AONB

14. The High Weald AONB Management Plan explains that the High Weald is a medieval landscape, defining components of which include an abundance of ancient woodland and small, irregular fields bounded by hedgerows and woods.
15. The appeal site encompasses part of a field situated on the edge of a small historic farmstead. Save for an area of informal hardstanding around the

³ There is nothing of substance before me to suggest the appeal building is a traditional historic farm building. Indeed, it is clearly of modern construction being flat roofed and built from block work.

⁴ The Council have also referred to Policies PC1, SRM1 and LHN6 in its reason for refusal. However, PC1 does not appear relevant in considering this main issue and Policy LHN6 refers to Gypsy and Traveller sites, which the appeal scheme would not be. Policy SRM1 refers to Policy TR2, but this simply requires new transport infrastructure and is therefore irrelevant in this instance as the Council is not seeking any.

entrance, the relatively small field is a meadow broadly enclosed by dense hedging. Accordingly, the appeal site is in a localised landscape that is tranquil, in good condition and representative of the High Weald, which is a nationally protected landscape on account of its rarity and value. In addition, the area has a high scenic quality with impressive views looking southeast across the appeal site towards the undulating wooded countryside beyond.

16. The existing building on site is of negligible architectural interest but has the appearance of a small conventional storage building within the field. It therefore has a recessive appearance. The appeal scheme would result in this building being significantly enlarged and altered to have a domestic appearance due to the insertion of windows and doors. The presence of the structure would therefore be heightened in localised views, including from the adjoining public footpath. The bulky flat roofed form would also jar with the traditional architecture evident at the neighbouring historic farmstead. Overall, the enlarged building would have a strident and discordant appearance.
17. In addition, the proposal would permanently introduce a domestic curtilage. This would invariably result in domestic paraphernalia and vehicles being present. This effect would be different to an agricultural use. The spread of the curtilage and domestic paraphernalia could be controlled through a condition, but the appeal scheme would nevertheless have the appearance of an unfortunate domestic incursion that would erode the rural character of field. This incursion would be highly apparent, eroding the tranquil scenic value of the local landscape.
18. In this respect the appeal scheme would have similar impacts to the previously dismissed proposal⁵ involving the siting of a caravan at the appeal site. The Inspector in that case concluded that domestic paraphernalia would harm the natural beauty of the AONB. The overall harmful impact now proposed may not be as great as the previous proposal, which included the siting of a pale caravan, but the use of black weatherboarding as a finish to the building would not reduce the impact to the point of not being significantly harmful.
19. In an attempt to mitigate the impact, the appellant proposes the removal of the existing storage containers which are situated towards the back of the site. These are unattractive utilitarian features so their removal would be a benefit. However, there is no need to approve a dwelling to facilitate the removal of these portable features. In any event, it is my judgment that the benefit would not overcome the permanent long-standing harm to the AONB that would otherwise occur if the appeal scheme were constructed.
20. The appellant has also proposed a soft landscaping scheme as a means of reducing the visual presence of the new dwelling. However, once mature this could risk obscuring the pleasant views across the appeal site from the public footpath. Notwithstanding this, the landscaping would take time to mature and is unlikely to fully screen the proposal unless it is structural in form and composition. This is not what is proposed. In any event, landscaping could fail in the future so it would be imprudent to rely on it to mitigate the presence of inherently discordant and harmful development in a landscape of high value.
21. In conclusion, the appeal scheme would harm the landscape character and scenic beauty of the AONB. Accordingly, the proposal would not conserve or

⁵ APP/U1430/C/16/3165550

enhance the AONB contrary to the expectations of section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act. It would therefore be at odds with Policies OSS4, RA2, RA3 and EN1 of the CS, Policies DEN1 and DEN2 of the Development and Site Allocations Local Plan and Policy R1 of the Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan (NP)⁶. These policies seek to secure development that respects, and does not detract from, the character of the area, provides a high-quality response to the local context, and conserves the landscape.

The effect on the significance of Birchenwood Cottage

22. The application is not supported by a Heritage Statement, but it is nevertheless possible to discern that Birchenwood Cottage is probably an early 19th Century building. It has a hipped roof and pleasantly balanced weather boarded elevations. It is an attractive cottage that reflects the local vernacular and forms part of an historic farmstead. In this respect it imparts heritage value from its architectural and historic interest and value as a repository of bygone building traditions and lifestyles. The building is experienced within the local agricultural landscape with which it is intrinsically linked. The agricultural setting contributes positively to the significance of the listed building.
23. The previous Inspector⁷ concluded that the introduction of a caravan for residential use would erode the agricultural setting of the listed building and that this erosion would result in limited harm to its significance. This is a finding that would apply equally to the appeal scheme because it would similarly be a stark residential incursion into the agricultural setting of the listed building. Moreover, the proposal would result in the creation of a discordant and unattractive dwelling directly behind Birchenwood Cottage. The impact would be moderated by the intervening fencing and vegetation. There is also a change in levels and the storage containers would be removed. Nevertheless, even when accounting for these points the proposal would still result in some limited harm to the setting of the listed building.
24. In conclusion, the proposal would result in some limited harm to the significance of Birchenwood Cottage. Its setting would not be preserved. As a result, the proposal would be at odds with Policy EN2 of the CS, which states that development proposals should preserve the setting of locally distinctive vernacular buildings. Furthermore, the proposal would be contrary to the expectations of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Paragraphs 195 and 196 of the Framework.

Other Considerations

The personal circumstances of the appellant

25. During the hearing the appellant said that she considers herself to be homeless because she is currently 'sofa surfing' with friends and relatives. That statement contradicted what was said in the planning application, which is that she is currently living at a privately owned caravan club site. Moreover, there was an indication that she travels 'four miles a day' to care for her dogs on site. The reference to a set distance suggests the trips are from a settled base.

⁶ The Council referred to Policy LHN6 of the CS and Policy H of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites in the first reason for refusal, but as the proposal is not for a Gypsy and Traveller pitch these policies are not relevant.

⁷ APP/U1430/C/16/3165550

26. Following an adjournment at the hearing, the appellant indicated that the reference to the caravan club site was a mistake and that she can travel between 4 and 7 miles to the site depending on where she is staying. No substantive evidence has been provided to support this or to confirm where she has been living in recent years. Given the inconsistencies, I have considered the reference to homelessness with caution, especially as there is no evidence that the appellant has registered as homeless with the local authority. It is also of note that in the previous appeal on the site, the caravan was only intended to be occupied for two days a week on a temporary basis. This would suggest that the appellant had alternative accommodation. Indeed, it was confirmed at the time that she was living in Margaretting-Tye.
27. Notwithstanding the above, there is no dispute between the Council and appellant that the appellant meets the definition of a Gypsy and Traveller for planning purposes as set out in the PPTS. This is despite the fact the appellant has not followed a nomadic habit of life for some time, that being travelling for the purposes of earning a living. This is presumably because the definition includes those who have once travelled but have now ceased to travel, either temporarily or permanently, due to the educational needs of dependents or on account of health or old age. Nor is it a point in dispute that the appellant is part of an ethnic minority and therefore has the protected characteristic of race under the Equality Act 2010. In such circumstances, the Act requires due regard to be had to the need to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not. This includes minimising the disadvantages connected to that characteristic.
28. The nomadic habit of life of Gypsies and Travellers such as the appellant is linked to their culture. However, without a settled base it is difficult for them to balance their traditional way of life with the practical realities of modern living. As a result, there are equality benefits in delivering accommodation that balances a cultural preference to live in a way that facilitates a traditional nomadic way of life with the practicality of a settled base.
29. Achieving the above balance normally involves the provision of static caravans with space for touring caravans, the latter being used when travelling. Because of this, Gypsies and Travellers often have an aversion to bricks and mortar housing and wish to continue living in a caravan when they stop travelling because this is what they are psychologically accustomed to⁸. Moreover, living in a caravan is also often preferred after ceasing to travel because their cultural identity is reinforced by living in a caravan on a traveller site. As a result, and for planning purposes, caravans are considered culturally appropriate accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers, but bricks and mortar housing is not. This is why sites providing accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers include 'pitches' (i.e. somewhere to pitch a caravan).
30. The Council and appellant agree that the local demand for Gypsy and Traveller sites and pitches is currently higher than the supply. This may be remedied in the future with a new local plan, but as things currently stand it would be difficult for the appellant to identify and secure such accommodation in the short to medium term. Accordingly, the appellant has turned to the appeal scheme as a means of meeting her accommodation needs. Her age, mobility

⁸ Living in bricks and mortar housing after travelling can result in a sense of claustrophobia and restlessness.

and general health add an imperative to finding a permanent home despite her most recent ailment having been recently treated.

31. The proposed dwelling is considered by the appellant to be a culturally appropriate means of meeting her accommodation needs because it would be a small bungalow, similar in size to a caravan, in a rural setting adjacent to a historic farmstead. However, the proposal is for a permanently constructed 1-bedroom dwelling with a conventional layout. As a result, there is a weak link between it and a nomadic habit of life. It is therefore very questionable whether the proposal would be the type of accommodation usually considered culturally appropriate for a Gypsy and Traveller, that being a caravan pitch for the reasons set out above. In this respect, occupation of the structure would not meaningfully echo a traditional nomadic habit of life any more than other small dwellings in the countryside would.
32. Furthermore, the supporting statement explains that the appellant does not have an aversion to all bricks and mortar accommodation. Instead, she finds it difficult to live in bricks and mortar accommodation close to other homes. Indeed, the appellant has lived in bricks and mortar housing before and has not indicated that this affected her wellbeing. As a result, other modest properties with space around them could fulfil her accommodation needs. There is no evidence before me to suggest the appellant has explored these options. Nor is there anything of substance to demonstrate she could not afford such accommodation. Indeed, I understand the appellant was offered £150,000 for the freehold of the site by a neighbour. In this respect, interested parties have indicated that capital could be raised from selling the appeal site. Accordingly, it has not been adequately demonstrated that the appellant's accommodation needs can only be met by converting the existing building on the appeal site.
33. If I were to accept that the personal circumstances of the appellant are so acute as to justify the conversion of the building to a dwelling despite the harm caused, then it would be necessary to impose a personal permission to secure this benefit. If not, then the appellant could simply sell the site having never lived there. However, imposing a personal permission would have some significant problems. This is because the appellant's personal circumstances will ultimately cease at some point in the future if she opts to move. This would mean that any future occupant would be in breach of the personal condition. Removing the condition would result in a situation where the harm I have previously identified is no longer outweighed by the benefit of meeting the appellant's accommodation needs. The risk, therefore, is that planning policies are ultimately circumvented. This is why planning permission usually runs with the land rather than individuals.
34. As an alternative, a condition could be imposed requiring the demolition of the building, or for it to revert to an agricultural use, when the personal circumstances cease. The appellant drew the parallel of an agricultural building constructed under permitted development rights which must be removed if agriculture activity at the unit ceases within ten years. However, once established it may prove more difficult to justify the removal of an extant home in a time of high housing pressure than a redundant farm building. Moreover, and as the appellant pointed out, demolishing a home may not be environmentally sustainable. I am also mindful that the Planning Practice

Guide specifically advises against such a condition in any event⁹.

Consequently, even if I found the appellant's personal circumstances to be a significant point in favour of the proposal, which I do not for the reasons already given, then the problems with securing a personal permission would reduce the weight afforded to the personal circumstances.

35. To summarise, there is some inconsistencies in the appellant's proposition that she is homeless. Even if she is, there may be other accommodation options that have not been explored, such as other small bungalows. Furthermore, the appeal scheme may meet the preferences of the appellant, but I find no special justification for it on account of providing culturally appropriate accommodation for a Gypsy and Traveller. Finally, even if I considered the personal circumstances of the appellant to be a significant point in favour of the scheme, which I do not, it would be inappropriate to secure this benefit through a condition. Overall, the ability of the appeal scheme to meet the accommodation needs of the appellant is a matter of moderate weight.

The public benefits of the scheme

36. The appeal scheme would result in the delivery of a home which would be wheelchair accessible. Furthermore, there would be some modest economic benefits through the construction works and from the future spend of the occupant. There may also be some moderate benefits to wildlife through the planting of additional native species. The applicant would also be able to continue managing the land, although it has already been demonstrated by her past actions that she does not need to live on site to achieve this. These additional benefits carry moderate weight.

Whether the proposal would support the general accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers

37. Being a bricks and mortar home, the appeal scheme would not amount to a Gypsy and Traveller pitch as it would not facilitate a nomadic habit of life. Nor would it provide culturally appropriate accommodation for those that have ceased to travel but have an aversion to bricks and mortar homes. This would be all the more so because the Council and appellant agree that a condition would need to be imposed preventing the siting of caravans on the site given the findings of the previous Inspector. Accordingly, the parties agreed following discussions at the hearing that a condition requiring occupation by a Gypsy and Traveller would be inappropriate. I share this view. Consequently, the appeal scheme would make no contribution towards the provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches in the area or assist in addressing the shortfall.

Spatial strategy and Policy RA3

38. The appellant argues that the proposal would gain support from Policy RA3 of the CS. This policy allows the creation of new dwellings in the countryside in extremely limited circumstances. It then goes on to list four types of circumstances, none of which relate to the appeal scheme. The use of the term 'including' means the list is not closed. The appellant therefore submits that this leaves the door open to the appeal scheme gaining support from this policy. However, the qualification of 'extremely limited circumstances' indicates that the policy should not be applied too liberally.

⁹ Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 21a-014-20140306

39. Indeed, I share the view of interested parties that a sensible approach to Policy RA3 could be to treat it as being supportive in principle of the types of development listed (a) to (d) and any other types of development in the countryside explicitly supported by local or national policy.
40. In this sense, Policy RA3 could lend support to the proposal if Policy LHN6 were engaged and adhered to. However, as the proposal is not for a Gypsy and Traveller site then Policy LHN6 is not triggered. Even if it were, the proposal would fail against its requirements given the unacceptable harm that would occur to the AONB due to the proposal failing to conserve the nationally protected landscape. In respect of national policy, Paragraph 84 of the Framework permits rural conversions, but as the existing building is neither redundant nor disused and the conversion would not enhance the immediate setting, the proposal gains no support here. Moreover, I have already explained why Policy RA4 of the CS provides an acceptable additional limitation on rural conversions in the context of the AONB. Accordingly, the appeal scheme does not gain support from Policy RA3 and, by extension, Policy H5 of the NP. If anything, it would be at odds with these policies.

The residual concerns of interested parties

41. The 'conversion' of the existing building would require a significant extension and a new roof. It is also unclear whether the existing structure would need to be underpinned or strengthened in some way. A survey has not been submitted to demonstrate the appeal scheme would amount to a conversion. For these reasons, interested parties submit that the proposal would be tantamount to the construction of a new building. There is support for conversions in the countryside in the development plan (albeit if the building is a traditional historic structure) but not generally for new build dwellings. As a result, there is some traction to the argument. However, given my findings on the other matters it has not been necessary to consider this further.
42. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) considers the existing access is substandard on account of its narrow width. As a result, two vehicles cannot pass and therefore a motorist entering the access may need to reverse out onto a busy road with fast moving vehicles. The LHA did not ultimately object to the proposal because it did not consider an intensification in vehicle activity would occur. It is unclear upon what basis and evidence this conclusion was formed. This matter was discussed at length at the hearing and the Council took the view that there would be an intensification and that is a finding I share. It is therefore difficult to understand why the Council has also not advanced concerns regarding highway safety. Nevertheless, given my findings it has not been necessary to consider this point further either.

Paragraph 11 of the Framework

43. Paragraph 11d) of the Framework states that where a local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply then permission should be granted. This presumption can only be displaced if the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide clear reasons for refusing the development¹⁰, or any adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

¹⁰ This includes policies related to AONBs and designated heritage assets such as listed buildings.

44. In this instance the proposal would result in significant harm to the AONB. This is a matter that carries great weight. Against this, the personal circumstances of the appellant and the benefits of the scheme cumulatively carry moderate weight. As such, the harm to the AONB would not be outweighed by these factors. Accordingly, the application of policies in the Framework aimed at conserving the AONB provide a clear reason for refusing the development.
45. Furthermore, the less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed building should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In so doing, the Framework states that designated heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource that should be conserved for existing and future generations. Any harm to their significance is therefore an important matter. Indeed, the Framework states that great weight should be given to an asset's conservation. Conservation in this context means sustaining, and thus not harming, an assets significance. It is also of note that the statutory duty¹¹ is a matter that must be given considerable importance and weight. This is not an instruction to dismiss a proposal that would harm the setting of a listed building, but it nevertheless provides a strong presumption in favour of preservation.
46. The proposal would result in limited harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset. This is an important matter. Against this, the public benefits of the proposal are only of moderate weight. Overall, the public benefits are not of sufficient force to outweigh the less than substantial harm that would occur. Accordingly, there would be a conflict with Paragraph 200 of the Framework as harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset would not have clear and convincing justification.
47. Accordingly, the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets provide a clear reason for refusing the proposed development. Even if they did not, and Paragraph 11d)ii of the Framework (the 'tilted balance') was relevant, Paragraph 14 of the Framework, which is engaged in this instance, states that the adverse impacts of allowing development that conflicts with a neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. That would be the situation here given the great weight I would afford the harm and the moderate weight the private and public benefits would accrue. In coming to this view, I have carefully considered the Officer's report and the reasons for the positive recommendation. However, I have come to my own views for the reasons given.

Conclusion

48. The proposal would not adhere to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, this appeal should fail. This finding is a proportionate response that balances the qualified Article 8 Human Rights of the appellant to respect of private and family life and home with the proper planning of the area and its economic well-being, including the protection of the environment.

Graham Chamberlain
INSPECTOR

¹¹ See Section 66(1) of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

APPEARANCES

For the Appellant:

Mr Lee May
Celia Stanley-Willet
Bradley Willet

Solicitor, Breachers LLP
Appellant
For the appellant

For the Local Planning Authority:

Mrs Sarah Shepherd BA Hons MRTPI
Mrs Holly Harrison BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Rother District Council
Rother District Council

Interested Parties:

Robert Bank
Stephen Burley
Dan Kirkby
Helen Kirkby
Tim Taylor
Francesca Nowne
Martin Parker
Cllr Mary Barnes
Helen Kirkby

Northern Parishes
Ticehurst Parish Council
Local Resident
Local Resident
Lawyer for Objectors
Clerk, Ticehurst Parish Council
Local Resident
District Councillor
Local Resident

DOCUMENTS (received at or after the hearing)

- List of relevant policies not listed in the Statement of Common Ground