



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 8 May 2024

Site visit made on 8 May 2024

by Nick Davies BSc(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/X2220/W/23/3332801

Cobb's Yard, Longmete Road, Preston CT3 1DN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ian Abercrombie against the decision of Dover District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/00015.
 - The development proposed is change of use of land to Gypsy/Travellers site for 3 pitches, each containing 1 mobile home, 1 touring caravan, erection of 3 detached day room buildings, stable building, and associated parking for car and light goods vehicle, hard surfacing, installation of septic tank, erection of fences/gates, landscaping, and alterations to existing entrance (existing Gypsy/Traveller pitch structures and surfaces to be removed).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use of land to Gypsy/Travellers site for 3 pitches, each containing 1 mobile home, 1 touring caravan, erection of 3 detached day room buildings, stable building, and associated parking for car and light goods vehicle, hard surfacing, installation of septic tank, erection of fences/gates, landscaping, and alterations to existing entrance (existing Gypsy/Traveller pitch structures and surfaces to be removed) at Cobb's Yard, Longmete Road, Preston CT3 1DN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00015, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of the development from the appeal form, as this is the one that is used in the Statement of Common Ground (the SoCG). It more fully and accurately describes the development than that given on the planning application form.
3. The development plan comprises the Dover District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy (February 2010) (the Core Strategy) and the saved policies of the Dover District Plan (2002) (the Saved Plan). The Draft Dover District Local Plan (the Draft LP) is currently being examined, and hearing sessions concluded in December 2023. Following the Inspectors' initial advisory letter, consultation on the Main Modifications commenced on 11 April 2024. Whilst the final Inspectors' report has yet to be received, it is not disputed that there is a high probability that policies will be adopted as originally worded, or as proposed to be modified. Therefore, having regard to paragraph 48 of the

National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), they carry considerable weight.

Main Issues

4. The Council's third reason for refusal related to on-site ecology, and a failure to demonstrate a net gain for biodiversity. However, it is agreed in the SoCG that, subject to suitable planning conditions, this reason has been overcome by the Preliminary Ecological Assessment and District Level Licensing certificate that were submitted with the appeal. I have imposed the planning conditions that were agreed by the parties at the Hearing.
5. The Council's fourth reason for refusal related to a lack of mitigation measures to ensure that there would be no harm to the integrity of the Thanet Coast and Sandwich Bay Special Protection Area (the SPA). However, the site lies outside the 9km Zone of Influence for the SPA, so there would be no Likely Significant Effect on its integrity. It is agreed in the SoCG that this reason is no longer relevant.
6. In view of the above, the main issues are:
 - a) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area;
 - b) the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupants of residential properties to the north with regard to noise and disturbance; and,
 - c) if harm is found on either of the above issues, whether there are material considerations that outweigh that harm.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. The appeal site comprises an existing Gypsy and Traveller site with a single static caravan close to the Longmete Road frontage, together with part of an undeveloped field beyond, which extends to the south. It is closely associated with a cluster of houses and agricultural buildings that lie on either side of the road. This enclave of buildings is, however, detached from Preston, which lies a short distance to the northwest. The site is, therefore, in the countryside.
8. The surrounding area is a predominantly open, flat landscape, with large, cultivated fields and commercial orchards. The fields are generally rectilinear, and defined by low hedges, or shelterbelts of tall trees. There are small clusters of traditional buildings, such as around the appeal site, but there is an absence of large modern agricultural buildings, or tall infrastructure, such as powerlines. Consequently, while it does not carry any special designation, it is an attractive landscape of open, undeveloped countryside. In accordance with Framework paragraph 180, its intrinsic character and beauty should be recognised.
9. The existing Gypsy and Traveller site aligns with The Old School House and Rookery Cottage, which front Longmete Road to the east. The plot does not extend beyond the rear garden boundaries of those dwellings, and it is effectively divided from the wider countryside to the west and south by robust conifer hedges. Consequently, it is not a prominent feature in the local landscape, and is only readily visible through the access point off Longmete

Road, and from a short stretch of the Public Right of Way (the PROW) that passes the site to the west and south. From where they can be seen, the static caravan, outbuildings, and hard surfacing have a much closer visual association with the adjacent built development than with the surrounding countryside.

10. The three proposed pitches would lie beyond the clearly defined boundaries of the frontage development, on an undeveloped green field. Whilst there is a belt of poplar trees along the western boundary, their canopies do not knit together to form a dense barrier, and there are significant gaps between the trunks. As a consequence, the undeveloped nature of the site is readily discernible from Longmete Road and the PROW to the west. Similarly, the broken line of small birch trees that runs parallel to the southern boundary of the appeal site does not visually segregate the site from its undeveloped surroundings when viewed from the PROW to the south. Consequently, this part of the appeal site appears as part of the wider open countryside. The three mobile homes, day rooms, and extensive driveway and parking areas, would not be well-screened by existing vegetation from these directions, and would therefore appear as an intrusion of built development into the surrounding countryside.
11. It is not disputed that the proposed stable would meet the requirements for horse-related development set out in Policy DD21 of the Saved Plan. This building would screen the parked vehicles and touring caravans from southerly viewpoints, but would be ineffective in doing so from a significant stretch of the PROW to the west and southwest. The appellant contends that, as the day rooms would be clad in dark timber, and would reflect the local vernacular, they would not be an incongruous addition to the landscape. However, in cumulation with the mobile homes, hard landscaping, and parked vehicles they would contribute to a concentration of development that would intrude into the countryside and harm its distinctive open character. This harm would be evident to walkers passing on the PROW, from a long stretch of Longmete Road, and, to a lesser extent, from more distant views from Preston Lane to the west.
12. Substantial soft landscaping is proposed as part of the development, including native hedgerows around the boundaries of the site, and between the pitches. Trees and understorey planting would define the southern boundary of the site, and a line of lime trees would be planted to link visually with the established avenue of trees leading to Ladydown Farm on the opposite side of the road. This planting would, in time, soften the impact of the development. However, even when the landscaping has matured, there would be a slight adverse impact on the landscape quality of the area. Furthermore, the enclosing nature of the hedges would be uncharacteristic of the surrounding open landscape, and it is unlikely that the planting would entirely conceal the development. Consequently, there would be some harm to the appearance and character of the area through a loss of openness and the intrusion of development into the countryside.
13. The proposal includes the removal of the existing Gypsy and Traveller pitch and all associated structures, surfaces, fences, and conifer hedging from the road frontage. The vacated plot would be laid to lawn. This would result in an increased sense of openness from Longmete Road and, together with the extended lime tree avenue, there would be some positive visual benefit to set against the harm that I have identified. However, the existing site is well-concealed from most viewpoints, and relates well to the adjacent built

development. The benefits to the character and appearance of the area through its removal would not, therefore, outweigh the harm resulting from the extensive intrusion into the countryside from the three proposed pitches.

14. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area, particularly in its early years. There would, therefore, be conflict with Policies DM7, DM15 and DM16 of the Core Strategy, which seek to protect the countryside, avoid harm to the landscape, and ensure that new Gypsy and Traveller pitches are screened from wider view. It would also conflict with Policy H4 of the Draft LP, which, in its modified form, requires proposals for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and to protect and enhance the character of the landscape. However, the harm would be relatively localised, and, after establishment of the landscaping, the impact would be reduced to a level that the Council agreed would be minor adverse. Consequently, I find that the harm would be limited.

Living conditions

15. Policy DM7 of the Core Strategy says that new Gypsy and Traveller sites should not lead to a reduction in the residential amenities of the occupants of any nearby dwellings. Modified Policy H4 of the Draft LP requires such sites to be compatible with neighbouring buildings and uses. The proposed pitches would lie to the rear of two houses that front Longmete Road – Old School House and Rookery Cottage. The northernmost pitch would be immediately adjacent to the rear garden boundary of these two properties. However, the proposed use would be residential, so it would be compatible with the residential use of the existing houses. The Council clarified at the Hearing that its concerns regarding noise and disturbance relate to the increased vehicle movements resulting from the intensification of the use, and the location of the parking spaces near to property boundaries.
16. The three pitches would be accessed via an improved driveway on the western side of the existing Gypsy and Traveller pitch. This access route is about ten metres away from the boundary with Old School House, which is marked by a high and dense conifer hedge. The landscaping proposals would prevent any vehicle movements on the part of the site that is currently occupied by the mobile home and associated structures and hard surfacing. Consequently, although the driveway would be used by three pitches as a result of the development, all traffic movements would be at a considerable distance from the property boundary, and segregated by a robust hedge. Vehicles using the driveway would be infrequent, and slow-moving. In these circumstances, the increased use of the driveway would not result in any significant disturbance to the occupants of Old School House.
17. The proposal would introduce traffic movements to the rear of the houses, where there is currently open countryside. However, the driveway serving the northernmost of the pitches would be beyond the proposed mobile home and day room. It would, therefore, be set away from the rear boundary of the houses, which is also marked by a tall hedge. Vehicle movements along this driveway would be very limited, and would have little impact on the living conditions of the occupants of the frontage dwellings. Vehicles using the driveways to the other two pitches would be a considerable distance from the

rear gardens, so would not result in any material impacts on the residential amenity of occupants.

18. There is a gap in the hedgerow to the rear of Rookery Cottage, so the car-parking spaces and touring caravan for the northernmost pitch would be evident from the rear garden. However, these vehicles would be stationary at most times, and the occasional closing of doors and starting of engines would not be an unusual occurrence in a residential environment. Additional landscaping is proposed in this corner, such that, over time this activity would be less noticeable, the visual impact of the parked vehicles would reduce, and privacy in the rear garden would be maintained.
19. Whilst the description of the proposal refers to the parking of light goods vehicles, the appellant confirmed that these were for the occasional towing of the touring caravans, and that no commercial uses would take place from the site. I have imposed conditions prohibiting commercial uses on the site, and limiting the number and size of vehicles, to ensure that the proposed use of the site is compatible with the adjacent residential uses.
20. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not result in noise and disturbance that would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of Old School House or Rookery Cottage. The development would, therefore, comply with Policy DM7 of the Core Strategy and Modified Policy H4 of the Draft LP in this regard.

Whether there are matters to outweigh harm

The supply of Gypsy and Traveller sites

21. Policy DM7 of the Core Strategy stated that site(s) would be allocated to meet the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy through a Site Allocations Document. However, no such document has been produced. More recently, Paragraph 7b) of the government's Planning policy for traveller sites (the PPTS) states that local planning authorities should prepare and maintain an up-to-date understanding of the likely accommodation needs of their areas over the lifespan of the development plan. Paragraphs 10a) and b) state they should identify, and update annually, a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of sites against their locally set targets. Where there is an identified need, paragraph 11 says criteria should be set to guide land supply allocations.
22. The Council commissioned the Dover Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showperson Accommodation Assessment 2018 (the GTAA), which identified a need for 30 pitches over the period 2014-2037. This was revisited through two documents in 2020^{1,2} (the updated GTAA), arriving at a need for 26 pitches over the revised plan period of 2020-2040. The Council's evidence identifies that planning permission has been granted for 26 pitches, and that 8 pitches identified as vacant in the GTAA have now been occupied. The Council's position is, therefore, that there is a surplus of eight pitches against the identified need. Consequently, the Council contends that it can demonstrate a five-year supply of sites.

¹ Gypsy and Traveller Site Options review Dover District Council Final Report January 2020

² Potential Gypsy and Traveller Sites Dover District Council Final Report March 2020

23. The appellant contests the Council's figures, arguing that since 2018, retrospective planning applications have been made for 17 pitches, representing need that was not identified in the GTAA. Furthermore, recent appeal decisions³ on a site within the district resulted in the grant of a two-year temporary permission for eight pitches. Expiry of that permission in June 2025 will add to the need within the district. It is also contended that reliance on the GTAA from 2018 means that there is no up-to-date evidence on the likely level of Gypsy and Traveller household formation, the number of such households currently living in bricks and mortar accommodation, or the number living on unauthorised sites.
24. The GTAA is dated September 2018, so it is over five years old. Furthermore, it is based on survey work that was carried out in 2017 and early 2018. Paragraph 18 of the document says that "*it is recommended that this evidence base is refreshed on a five-yearly basis to ensure that the level of pitch provision remains appropriate for the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople population across Dover*". The updated GTAA did not involve any new survey work, it merely annualised the original data to adjust it to cover the revised plan period. It is, therefore, still based on the GTAA evidence base which, on its own terms, is now out of date. Consequently, it does not provide a robust and up to date assessment of current need.
25. Nevertheless, on the basis of this evidence, the Draft LP does not allocate any new sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation, but identifies further provision through the intensification of three existing sites, which would provide an additional five pitches. Policy H4 allows for windfall sites to be considered on a site-by-site basis. The consultation process on the Main Modifications to the Draft LP is still ongoing. However, in view of the advanced stage that it has reached, and considering the Inspectors' initial findings, it is likely that this strategy will form part of the plan, which the Council hopes to adopt in the autumn. Consequently, it seems clear that there will be a continued reliance on the delivery of windfall sites to meet any existing demand that has not been identified, and future demand as the plan-period progresses.
26. The lack of a robust up-to-date assessment of current need, the lack of planned provision of sites over many years, and a likely reliance on windfall sites to meet future needs are factors that weigh in favour of the proposal.

Personal circumstances

27. The appellant already lives on the existing pitch on the site, which has a permanent and non-personal planning permission. He would occupy one of the three proposed pitches. The other two would be occupied by his parents and his daughter. It is agreed in the SoCG that all of the intended occupants are ethnic Romany Gypsies for the purposes of the Equalities Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty.
28. The appellant's parents currently live in bricks and mortar in Aylesham, about six miles away. Both suffer from a range of medical conditions, and the appellant visits at least once a day to provide care. The two-storey accommodation is not suitable for their needs, and they will soon have to find alternative provision. They have a desire to return to their traditional way of

³ Appeal Decisions APP/X2220/C/22/3313856 and APP/X2220/W/22/3305480

life and to live in a caravan. Sharing a plot with their son would allow him to provide the care they need in accordance with the Romany tradition.

29. The appellant's daughter is currently living with her brother, about 15 miles from the appeal site. She has a medical condition which requires support from familiar people. The appellant is her registered carer, which entails daily visits. Her brother has recently married, and she now needs to find alternative accommodation. Her desire is to live in a caravan in accordance with her traditional way of life. Sharing a plot with her family would allow her to receive the care she needs while living an independent life.
30. Paragraph 3 of the PPTS states that the government's overarching aim is to facilitate the traditional and nomadic way of life of travellers whilst respecting the interests of the settled community. This traditional way of life often involves living in supportive extended family groups. The appeal proposal would allow this, whilst resolving the accommodation needs of the appellant's parents and daughter. There would also be significant benefits to the appellant in making his caring responsibilities more manageable, which in turn would improve the health and wellbeing of his family.
31. The Council did not dispute the personal and health needs of the proposed occupants, but contended that they could be met through alternative vacant sites, sites with planning permission, or those that are allocated for intensification under Policy H3 of the Draft LP. However, it became clear at the Hearing that none of the suggested sites were suitable or available to meet the needs of the appellant's family for two main reasons. Firstly, an alternative site would need to be large enough to accommodate three pitches. Secondly, the particular personal circumstances of the appellant's daughter, which were not disputed by the Council, mean that her accommodation needs could not be met on a shared site. Consequently, vacant plots on current sites, or intensification of existing sites would not be a realistic option.
32. To conclude on this issue, the proposal would provide compelling health and wellbeing benefits to an extended family, and enable them to return to, or maintain, their traditional way of life. In the absence of any suitable and available alternative sites, or planned provision of new sites, these benefits carry substantial weight in favour of the proposal.

Other Matters

33. Although it is not a matter of dispute between the main parties, I am required by Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, or their settings, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Ladydown Farmhouse, on the opposite side of Longmete Road is a Grade II listed farmhouse and oast. Its significance lies principally in its historic value as an early 19th Century building, its architectural quality, and its rural surroundings.
34. The proposed pitches would be located behind the houses that front the opposite side of Longmete Road, so there would be no intervisibility between the site and the listed building in roadside views. The listed building is seen beyond the appeal site from some parts of the PROW, but in these views the existing houses intervene, so that there would be no impact on the setting of the listed building, and its significance would not be diminished in any way.

35. The issue of increased traffic, and the resultant impact on highway safety is raised in representations. Longmete Road has a carriageway that is wide enough for two cars to pass, and carries little traffic. The additional vehicles associated with two additional Gypsy and Traveller pitches could be accommodated without inconvenience to other highway users. The road outside the appeal site is straight with good forward visibility, and splays would be provided at the access point to allow the drivers of emerging vehicles to see oncoming traffic. I have imposed a condition requiring provision and maintenance of the splays. There is, therefore, no evidence to indicate that the development would result in conditions of highway danger or inconvenience.
36. It is also suggested that the proposal would obstruct the PROW, and that no details of foul drainage were submitted with the application. However, the PROW lies outside the appeal site, so would not be affected in any way. Details of a wastewater package treatment plant formed part of the application, and I have imposed a condition requiring its installation in the interests of pollution control.

Planning Balance

37. As set out above I have concluded that the proposal would cause limited harm to the character and appearance of the area, resulting in conflict with policies of the Core Strategy and the Draft LP which seek to protect the countryside and avoid harm to the landscape.
38. Set against that harm, the evidence demonstrates a lack of planned provision for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in the district over many years, with a historic reliance on windfall sites to meet needs. Furthermore, there is no robust up-to-date assessment of the current need for pitches in the district. As it is not proposed to allocate any new sites in the Draft LP, it is likely that there will be a continued reliance on the delivery of windfall sites to meet any needs that are identified in the future. In this regard, neither the PPTS nor the existing or emerging development plan prohibit the principle of Gypsy and Traveller development in the countryside. Meeting any future need for pitches is, therefore, unlikely to be achieved without a degree of harm to the countryside. These are factors that weigh in favour of the proposal.
39. I have also found that there would be significant benefits for the proposed occupants, allowing them to move out of unsatisfactory accommodation, and to pursue their traditional way of life in a supportive family group. Furthermore, I have found that there are no other suitable and available alternative sites where they could achieve this. Policy DM15 of the Core Strategy allows for development in the countryside in circumstances where it cannot be accommodated elsewhere, provided measures are incorporated to reduce, as far as practicable, any harmful effects on countryside character. The proposed landscaping means that the harm in this regard would be limited. I therefore give substantial weight to the personal health and well-being benefits to the intended occupants.
40. In the overall balance, the limited harm to the character and appearance of the area is outweighed by the uncertainty regarding the current level of need for Gypsy and Traveller sites, and the lack of alternative sites to meet the compelling personal needs of the appellant's family.

41. As it is the uncertainty of supply and personal circumstances that have tipped the balance, I have considered whether I should impose a temporary and/or personal condition on the permission. However, the existing pitch, which is to be removed, has a permanent and non-personal planning permission. The imposition of temporary and/or personal conditions on the proposed development would, therefore, leave the appellant in a less secure position than he is at present, and result in a reduction in the supply of unrestricted Gypsy and Traveller pitches in the area. Consequently, in the particular circumstances of this case, I have concluded that such conditions would be unreasonable. I have, however, imposed a condition limiting occupancy to Gypsies and Travellers as defined in the PPTS.

Conditions

42. I have considered all the suggested conditions against the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. Where I have agreed that the conditions are necessary, I have altered some of them, in the interests of clarity and precision, to better reflect the guidance.
43. In accordance with the legislation, I have imposed a condition limiting the period within which the development must commence. I have also included a condition specifying the relevant plans, as this provides certainty. In addition to those that I have already referred to above, conditions limiting the number of pitches and caravans on the site, how they are laid out, and limiting residential occupation to the static caravans are necessary to define the scope of the permission.
44. Conditions requiring the removal of the existing pitch, provision of the approved landscaping, provision of refuse storage facilities, and limiting external lighting and further means of enclosure are reasonable and necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

45. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Davies

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: TDA.2680.01 – Site Location Plan; TDA.2680.02 – Existing Site Plan; TDA.2680.03 Rev A – Proposed Site Layout & Detailed Landscape Scheme; TDA.2680.04 – Proposed Dayroom (Plans & Elevations); TDA.2680.05 – Proposed Stable Block (Plans & Elevations); TDA.2680.06 – Sectional Elevations of Existing & Proposed Site Entrance; Technical Details of wastewater treatment plant.

- 3) No development will take place (including any ground works, or site or vegetation clearance), until a method statement for the protection of biodiversity including (but not necessarily limited to) breeding birds, hedgehogs, hedgerows and trees during site and vegetation clearance and construction works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The content of the method statement will be informed by up-to-date ecological surveys of the site (if necessary), and will include:
- a) purpose and objectives of the method statement.
 - b) working method, including timings, necessary to achieve stated objectives.
 - c) extent and location of all features with potential ecological interest shown on appropriate scale plans.
 - d) 'Toolbox talk' information regarding species encounters that will be provided to contractors prior to works commencing.

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 4) No works above ground level will commence until details of the locations, specifications, and timings of measures to enhance biodiversity on the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details will be developed with reference to the proposals in the Preliminary Ecological Assessment prepared by Katia Bresso and dated 31 July 2023 and will include native species planting, installation of bat boxes, bird boxes, hedgehog nesting boxes and hedgehog gaps in any close-board fencing. The approved details will be implemented and thereafter retained and managed in accordance with the approved details.
- 5) Before the first occupation of any of the approved pitches, the hard landscaping scheme for the site, including hard surfacing and boundary treatments, shall be implemented in full in accordance with approved drawing numbered TDA.2680.03 Rev A and the approved boundary treatments shall be retained as such thereafter. Soft landscape works shall be completed during the first available planting and seeding seasons following completion of the hard landscape works. Any trees or other plants approved as part of the landscaping scheme which, within a period of five years from planting die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species.
- 6) Before the first occupation of any of the approved pitches, the wastewater package treatment plant shall be connected to the development, implemented in full and retained as such thereafter.
- 7) Before the development is first occupied, visibility splays shall be laid out at the site entrance, in accordance with a plan that has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, the visibility splays shall be kept permanently clear of any obstruction in excess of 0.6m in height above the carriageway edge.
- 8) Before the occupation of each pitch, refuse and recycling storage facilities shall be provided in accordance with details that have first been approved

in writing by the local planning authority and they shall thereafter be kept available for use at all times.

- 9) Within 6 months of the first occupation of any of the approved pitches, the existing mobile home and associated decking, summer house building, timber shed and touring caravan at the front of the site shall be removed and the area laid to lawn during the first available seeding season thereafter, as shown on the approved drawing numbered TDA.2680.03 Rev A.
- 10) The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than Gypsies and Travellers as defined in Annex 1: Glossary of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites as Updated 19 December 2023 (or its equivalent in replacement national policy).
- 11) There shall be no more than 3 pitches on the site. No pitch shall at any time contain more than 2 caravans (as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968), of which no more than 1 shall be a static caravan.
- 12) Only the static caravans on each pitch shall be used for primary residential accommodation on the site.
- 13) The static caravans hereby permitted and the parking areas shall be sited only in accordance with the approved drawing numbered TDA.2680.03 Rev A.
- 14) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no gates, walls, fences, or other means of enclosure, other than those shown on the approved drawings, shall be erected within the site.
- 15) No more than one commercial vehicle per pitch shall be stationed, parked, or stored on the site at any time. These shall only be for the use of the occupiers of the caravans hereby permitted and no vehicle shall exceed 3.5 tonnes in weight.
- 16) No external lighting shall be installed or retained on the site, other than in accordance with a scheme, including details of the position, height, and type of lights, which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 17) No commercial use and/or activity shall take place on the site at any time.

END OF SCHEDULE

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Dr Angus Murdoch - Murdoch Planning Ltd
Rhodri Crandon - Tirlun Design Associates Ltd
Katia Bresso - KB Ecology Ltd
Ian Abercrombie – Appellant
Reginald Abercrombie – Appellant’s father

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Nicola Kingsford – Principal Planning Officer, Dover District Council
Jillian Barr – Senior Planner (Policy), Dover District Council
Luke Blaskett – Team Leader Strategic Sites and Place, Dover District Council
Clare Dethier – Planning and Development Manager, Dover District Council

DOCUMENT SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING:

Decision Notice dated 10 September 2014 for planning permission reference
DOV/14/00546