



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 30 and 31 July 2024

Site visit made on 31 July 2024

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th of September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/W/24/3341840

The Stables, Trenders Avenue, Rawreth, Hullbridge, SS6 9RG

- 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 Thomas Scott against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/00358/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the material change of use of land and building for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the material change of use of land and building for the stationing of caravans for residential purposes. at The Stables, Rawreth, Hullbridge, SS6 9RG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00358/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Thomas Scott against the decision of Rochford District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. On 30 July 2024 the Government published a consultation on proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and other changes to the planning system. The proposed reforms are draft and therefore may be subject to change before any final document is published and thus carry limited weight. However, the written ministerial statement (WMS) is a material consideration which confirms the direction of travel of Government Policy. The parties have had the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes.

Main Issues

4. The parties agree that the appeal scheme would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This is because the appeal scheme is not any of the types of development listed as an exception within paragraph 154 of the Framework.
5. As a result, the main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the openness and purposes of the Green Belt
 - on the character and appearance of the area;

- residential amenity, with particular regard to noise; and
- whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify it.

Reasons

Openness

6. The appeal site is situated in the Metropolitan Green Belt where policy GB1 of the Rochford District Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 (CS) seeks to direct development away from the Green Belt as far as practicable and will prioritise the protection of Green Belt land, based on how well the land helps achieve the purposes of the Green Belt.
7. The parties agreed that it would not be practical for gypsy and traveller sites to be located outside of the Green Belt given the nature of the district. However, the council considers that the site contributes to the purposes of the Green Belt and that the development would result in encroachment through the siting of the two pitches to the rear of the site. However, the parties agreed that policy GB1 is inconsistent with the Framework and therefore I have given any conflict with it limited weight.
8. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy, as set out in the Framework is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open and the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.
9. The appeal site comprises a roughly square shaped field, comprising an existing stable block at the front of the site with a small paddock to the rear. It is bounded on two sides by bridleways, with Trenders Avenue being a bridleway which is used by vehicles to access existing residential and commercial development and could be considered an unmade road. Bridleway 74 is narrower and overgrown and is more akin to a footpath.
10. The proposal would also result in a modest degree of urbanisation and encroachment into previously undeveloped land, with the introduction of two pitches sited behind the existing stable, extending the area of existing hardstanding, contrary to paragraph 143 of the Framework which identifies the five purposes of the Green Belt, and of which c) is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
11. In this instance the effect of the cumulative increased scale of development would clearly be experienced both visually and spatially. For this reason, the proposed development would compromise the openness of the Green Belt, in that it would be reduced. Whilst the loss of openness would be limited, harm to the Green Belt would occur. This matter carries modest weight in this site-specific circumstance.
12. Paragraph 16 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) confirms that traveller sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt. When applying Paragraph 155e of the recent Framework, it is apparent the proposed change of use would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt.
13. Accordingly, the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt which paragraph 152 of the Framework states is, by definition, harmful to the Green

Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 153 of the Framework states that in considering a planning application substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt.

Character and appearance

14. Trenders Avenue comprises a number of both residential dwellings and commercial sites. Opposite the site is a gated residential development comprising large residential properties grouped around a courtyard. Further along Trenders Avenue is another gypsy and traveller site. I also saw other plots containing caravans but am not aware if these are associated with gypsy and travellers or whether these were in connection with works taking place on those sites.
15. Trenders Avenue is described by the Council as being part of a wider plotland area, which is dominated by open parcels of land with occasional mixed development and sporadic residential development. Therefore, the general character of the area is one of mixed development within a semi rural setting.
16. The current stable block, which is visible from Trenders Avenue, contributes to this mixed development and is therefore not an alien feature amongst this varied pattern of development and is viewed within the context of other development which lines Trenders Avenue.
17. Having regard to the scale of the proposed development, the siting of the two pitches to the rear of the stable block, whilst increasing the amount of development on the site would not be out of character with the wider context of plotland development and other similar development evident further along Trenders Avenue.
18. The existing close boarded fencing, whilst not entirely appropriate within a rural context, is similar to other boundary treatment along Trenders Avenue. Opposite the site, boundary treatments in the form of brick walls and metal gates are evident as are other examples of close boarded fencing and trellis. As such it has only a modest impact on the character and appearance of the area.
19. The existing screening limits views into the site to those from the existing access. From these localised viewpoints the development would result in a change from the rural setting of the site, albeit this would be viewed in the context of the existing residential development along Trenders Avenue and as such it would be of a scale and form appropriate to the locality.
20. It has been suggested that matters of boundary treatment could be controlled by condition and this would enable further consideration to be given as to whether a more sensitive boundary treatment, particularly adjacent to Trenders Avenue, could be erected, if the appeal were to be allowed.
21. I therefore conclude the development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings in accordance with policy DM1 of the Rochford District Council Local Development Framework Development Management Plan 2014 (DMP) which seeks to ensure the design of new development promotes the character of the locality to ensure that it positively contributes to the surrounding environment.

Residential Amenity - Noise

22. The Council have provided no evidence to support their suggestion that the resultant noise levels arising from the development would result in undue harm to residential amenity. However, anecdotal evidence was provided by third parties of how the occupation of the site by two families would result in increased noise and disturbance to those currently residing in the residential area.
23. There is no commercial use of the site proposed and I have nothing before me to indicate that the residential occupation of the site going forward, for two pitches, would result in a level of noise and disturbance to existing residents which would be detrimental to their residential amenity.
24. I have also had regard to how other nearby residential properties are more closely grouped together and noise such as from children playing in gardens or dogs barking could equally be experienced from those properties and as such would not be uncommon within a residential setting such as Trender Avenue.
25. It was also put to me that noise and disturbance would be experienced from increased movements along Trender Avenue. However, this road is already used to serve a number of residential and commercial properties and as such already experiences a degree of traffic movement including residents cars and vehicles providing deliveries. There is nothing before me to suggest that the occupation of the site by two families would lead to an increase in traffic movements, such that noise and disturbance would occur above that which already exists from vehicles using Trender Avenue.
26. Therefore, the proposal would, in this regard, accord with policies DM1 (xi) and DM3 (ii) of the DMP which, whilst not specifically referencing noise, seek to have regard to the impacts upon the amenities of neighbouring properties and protect the amenity of surrounding areas.

Other Matters

27. I have had regard to all of the other matters raised by local interested parties, including the nature of the existing road network and the ability of refuse vehicles being able to access the site, the impact of increased traffic movements associated with the proposed development. However, there is no substantive evidence before me that there would be harm in respect of these matters, and no objection has been raised by the Council or statutory consultees in particular with regard of highway matters.
28. I have also taken into account the concerns raised with regard to ecology, drainage, and whether any commercial activity is likely to take place on the site. Matters of drainage and a restriction to ensure no commercial activity takes place on the site can be controlled by condition. With regard to the need for an ecology assessment the Council in considering the application were content that no formal assessment was required and no reason for refusal was advanced in relation to ecology matters and there is no substantive evidence before me that there would be harm in respect of these matters.
29. Therefore, none of the matters raised provide a compelling reason why planning permission should not be granted.

Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS)

30. The appeal scheme proposes a net increase of two units on a site that lies within the Zone of Influence for one or more of the European Designated Sites (EDS) scoped in the RAMS.
31. The Conservation of Habitat and Species Regulations 2017 require that the competent authority must ensure that there are no significant adverse effects from the proposed development, either alone or in combination with other projects, that would adversely affect the integrity of the EDS. The effects arising from the proposal need to be considered in combination with other development in the area and adopting a precautionary approach.
32. Since the development is for two pitches, the number of additional recreational visitors would be limited and the likely effects on EDS from the proposed development alone may not be significant. However, in combination with other developments it is likely that the proposal would have significant effects on the designated site.
33. Given my findings, the Regulations place a duty on the competent authority to undertake an appropriate assessment of the implications of the appeal scheme in view of the site's conservation objectives.
34. The site is within the zone of influence where new residential development is likely to result in recreational pressure, which would, both alone and in combination with other development within the zone of influence, have a likely significant effect on the interest features of the EDS. Therefore, I consider that the development would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the site, but regard can be had to whether these adverse effects can be mitigated.
35. The Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) sets out a strategic approach to mitigation by several councils across the wider area. It details mitigation measures that would be funded by financial contributions at a specified tariff per dwelling. Since these include a range of habitat-based measures such as education, communication and monitoring, and have been endorsed by Natural England, I am satisfied that the measures would adequately overcome any adverse effects of the proposal on the EDS.
36. The appellants have indicated that they have made a per dwelling contribution to fund the Essex Coast RAMS. The Council have confirmed receipt of the payment. This approach can be problematic as there is no obligation on the Council to spend the money as envisaged and in a particular timescale. However, the evidence before me indicates that as a responsible public body it will transfer the funds to Chelmsford City Council, which is the organisation responsible for administering the mitigation strategy. Therefore, I am satisfied that the mitigation measures have been secured and would be used for their intended purpose.
37. The contributions would be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development, in accordance with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations. As such, the contributions toward the mitigation schemes would count as mitigation toward maintaining the integrity of the sites.

Setting of Listed Buildings

38. Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses when dealing with planning applications.
39. Trenders Hall is a Grade II sixteenth century house with later alterations and additions, including a sixteenth century rear range which is weatherboarded. In my view, the significance of Trenders Hall is derived from its visual appearance and historic interest and its setting is experienced within the wider landscape.
40. The glossary of the Framework gives a definition of the setting of a heritage asset as “the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced”. It goes on to advise that the extent of this setting is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve.
41. The appeal site is somewhat distant from Trenders Hall and the appeal development must be considered in the context of the existing stable. Furthermore, the proposed development would be contained within the existing site boundaries and would not extend further into the adjoining paddocks.
42. Therefore, as a result of the distance between the appeal site and the listed building and lack of any evidence of a historical connection between the appeal site and Trenders Hall, or that the land was once in the same ownership. The parties agreed at the hearing that the appeal site is not within the setting of Trenders Hall and from my own consideration of the evidence before me I am of the same opinion.
43. I have had regard to how this differs from the findings of the Council’s Heritage advisor, who concluded that the site made a limited contribution to the setting of the heritage asset but did not go onto explain why they considered that the site was within its setting. In particular they set out that there was no known functional link and the sites were well screened from one another.
44. However, as they went onto conclude that the proposal did not result in any harm to the significance of the heritage asset I am content that this difference in views on setting would have no bearing on the outcome of my decision.

Dominance of nearest settled community

45. The Council have advanced a case that provision of 2 pitches in Trenders Avenue, would result in dominance of the nearest settled community. There are currently 4 other permitted pitches in Trenders Avenue, located some distance from the appeal site, further down Trenders Avenue. The Council agreed that there are approximately 30 houses along Trenders Avenue.
46. The PPTS sets out in paragraph 25, that decision makers should ensure that sites in rural areas respect the scale of and do not dominate the nearest settled community. Trenders Avenue is on the edge of the larger settlement of Rayleigh and it is possible that consideration in this regard should be given to the wider community of Rayleigh. However, even if I were to accept that the development should be considered in the context of the settled community in Trenders Avenue, I am not persuaded that 2 pitches on a reasonably sized plot would result in the settled community being dominated.
47. I also have no evidence before me to suggest that the proposal would lead to an adverse impact on services and facilities within the wider settlement of

Rayleigh, as paragraph 25 also seeks to avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure.

48. As such I am not persuaded that the proposed development, having regard to its scale, even taking into account other similar development in the vicinity of Trender Avenue, would result in a dominance of the nearest settled community.

Other considerations

49. As set out above, the development constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. I have found it to result in modest harm in terms of loss of openness to the Green Belt. Substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Need for Gypsy and Traveller Sites

50. It is common ground that the Council cannot demonstrate an up to date 5 year supply of deliverable sites, with parties putting the need between 12 pitches by 2024 (appellant) or 14 pitches by 2026 (council). Evidence has been provided in the form of a recent appeal decision¹ in Rochford, from January 2024, where the Inspector in this appeal noted that the lack of supply had endured for a considerable period and that there had been policy failure in respect of the provision of Traveller pitches in the district.
51. It is clear that there remains a failure of policy with the timescale for the adoption of a new Local Plan having slipped several times, and now suggested to be on course for submission in 2025. Furthermore the 15 pitches allocated under policy GT1 of the CS have not yet been delivered.
52. This means that unmet need can only be met through windfall sites coming forward with no possibility of securing a supply of plan led sites until at least 2026. The Council also accepted that the allocation of future sites will be on land that is currently within the Green Belt.
53. Under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) set out in s149 of the Equality Act 2010, I need to consider how the modest increase in the supply of sites arising from the development could positively contribute to the advancement of equality and good relations, with s149 placing an onus on public authorities to avoid discrimination and being proactive in promoting equality. The equality implications arising from the development are, as such, an important factor in favour of the proposal. As such I consider that need for Gypsy and Traveller sites carries considerable weight.
54. In accordance with the PPTS, in these circumstances, lack of supply should be a significant material consideration in relation to a planning decision when considering the grant of a temporary planning permission. However, the PPTS makes it clear that this does not apply to sites within, amongst other things, the Green Belt. It also does not say that the lack of supply is a significant material consideration when considering permanent schemes.

Personal Circumstances

¹ APP/B1550/C/21/3286151 & 3286152

55. Evidence has been supplied by the appellant to demonstrate a nomadic habit of life and the Council has not taken an alternative view or suggested the submissions are inconsistent or inaccurate. Accordingly, there is no dispute that the proposed occupiers are Gypsies and Travellers.
56. The appellant and his family are an ethnic minority, and thus have the protected characteristic of race under s149(7) of the Equality Act 2010 and so, as required by section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010, the public sector equality duty is applicable.
57. There is therefore a need to have due regard to eliminating discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations. The appeal scheme would support the traditional way of life of families that have a protected characteristic and facilitate the establishment of a settled base for the appellant's family whilst they continued to pursue a nomadic lifestyle for economic purposes.
58. The appeal site would be occupied by, on the first pitch, the appellant, his wife and four children. The family have been residing in temporary locations whilst seeking to establish a permanent base. The second pitch would be occupied by the appellant's mother and father and whilst they previously occupied a pitch in Slough, it has subsequently been sold and they have since 2021 been doubling up on friends and families pitches and are currently living on the roadside.
59. I have been provided with details of the families health conditions and it is clear that several occupants would benefit considerably from a settled base in order to have access to regular health care and more importantly hospital treatment within a setting that requires less travelling time.
60. The two households also wish to have a settled base together in order that they can provide support to each other, particularly when the appellant is away travelling for work.
61. Article 1 of the First Protocol sets out that a person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions and that no one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life and his home.
62. Dismissing the appeal would represent an interference with the home and family life of the proposed occupiers, such that both Articles would be engaged. There is also a positive obligation imposed by Article 8 to facilitate the gypsy way of life.
63. Aside from the best interests of the children, I attach moderate weight to the other personal circumstances as a factor in favour of the scheme noting that Policy E of the PPTS sets out that subject to the best interest 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.

Best Interests of the children

64. Where Article 8 rights are those of children, as in this case, they must also be seen in the context of Article 3 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. This requires a child's best interests to be a primary consideration.

More particularly, case law identifies that, although a primary consideration, the best interests of a child are not a determinative planning issue, but no consideration must initially be regarded as more important or, in advance of the subsequent assessment of the individual circumstances, be given greater weight.

65. The Planning Practice Guidance advises that decision-makers need to consider whether children's best interests are relevant to any planning issue under consideration. In doing so, it similarly advises they will want to ensure the approach is proportionate. Decision-makers need to consider the case before them, and need to be mindful that the best interests of a particular child will not always outweigh other considerations including those that impact negatively on the environment or the wider community.
66. The appeal site would provide a settled base for 4 children, and their best interests need to be carefully considered. I accept that the best interests of the children would, in principle, be served by a permanent and secure home, whilst having regard to the fact that their educational needs are currently being met by a school in the local area. Whilst this can be maintained through the appellant's current arrangement living with family members on a nearby site, there is uncertainty that this situation will continue in the future.
67. If the appeal is dismissed, then the family would continue living in temporary locations, leading to a degree of uncertainty which could impact upon the children's welfare if they had to move from their current location. Instead, an enduring settled base would enable certainty in terms of access to education, healthcare and generally supporting the children's welfare by, for example, attending clubs, making friends and being close to family.
68. The merits of the case presented are such that I afford the benefits, of this development to the best interests of the children, significant weight.

Green Belt Balance

69. I have identified that the scheme would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt as defined by the Framework and result in harm to the openness of the area. It would, by definition, be harmful to the Green Belt, harm which the Framework indicates should be given substantial weight. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the harm to the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
70. There are several points in favour of the proposal. The Council are unable to meet the accommodation needs of the appellant, who are ethnic Gypsies and Travellers. The appeal scheme would support the traditional way of life of a family that has a protected characteristic.
71. The appeal scheme would facilitate the establishment of a settled base for the appellants' family whilst they continued to pursue a nomadic lifestyle for economic purposes. This would allow cultural traditions to be balanced with the practicalities of modern living thereby, advancing equality of opportunity. The unmet need for pitches also indicates inequality in housing opportunities and the proposal would help to offset this in a modest way.
72. These are important points in achieving the social sustainability sought by Paragraph 13 of the PPTS. It does not automatically follow that the appeal should be permitted because the PSED is relevant. Nonetheless, the equality

implications weigh notably in favour of permitting pitches at the appeal site because dismissing the appeal would perpetuate the disadvantages currently endured.

73. The accommodation needs and personal circumstances of the intended occupiers are together, significant points in favour of the proposals. Furthermore, the best interests of 4 children is a primary consideration. All would benefit considerably from a settled base from which to gain stability and an education. I have attached moderate weight to the accommodation needs and personal circumstances of the appellant, and significant weight to the best interests of the children.
74. The Council have also confirmed that it is unable to demonstrate a supply of sites, and that the identified need will not be addressed through policy allocations until 2026 at the earliest.
75. Therefore, whilst having regard to Policy E of the PPTS, having taken account all the considerations outlined above collectively, they outweigh the substantial weight which must be given to Green Belt harm. Consequently, I consider that there are very special circumstances necessary to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt on a permanent basis and is therefore in accordance with policies GB1 and H7 of the CS.

Conditions

76. The Council has suggested conditions which I have considered against the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. As well as the standard implementation condition, I have imposed a condition to ensure that the proposal is carried out in accordance with the approved plan to provide certainty.
77. The proposals are acceptable, partly due to the personal circumstances of the intended occupiers and therefore it is necessary to impose a condition detailing this. As the proposed occupants are Gypsy and Travellers and the permission would be personal it is not necessary to restrict occupation to Gypsies and Travellers, defined so as to not exclude those who have ceased travelling permanently.
78. As only two pitches are justified it is necessary in the interests of certainty to secure this and the total number of caravans permitted on the site. I have also restricted the commercial use of the site and the size of vehicles to be kept at the site.
79. In order to ensure suitable living conditions for the occupiers of the site, details of foul drainage are also required.
80. To limit the visual impact details of landscaping, external lighting and boundary treatments are also required to be submitted, agreed and implemented.

Conclusion

81. The proposal adheres to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Pannell

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr M Green – Green Planning Studio Ltd
Mr T Scott
Mr L Scott

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr M Stranks BA MRTPI – Team Leader Development Management (North Team)
Y Dunn MSc Licentiate of the RTPI – Business Manager (Planning)
Cllr I H Ward SMC (Tech); ABPPA (Medical); MIED; LRPS; LBIPP; LMPA; MinstISM;
RTPI (affiliate); TCPA. – Former portfolio holder for Planning and Development
Committee Member.
Cllr D Efde – Committee member and former vice chairman of the Council's
Development Committee.

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Mr A Taylor
Mr T Cotterill
Mr I Foster

DOCUMENTS

Document 1 – Historic Buildings and Conservation Advice, 31.07.23
Document 2 – Statement of Mr A Taylor
Document 3 – Copy of letter dated July 2024 to Trenders Avenue residents from
Rochford District Council regarding waste and recycling collection vehicle access
Document 4 – Photograph along Trenders Avenue showing lorry and car attempting
to pass.

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 001 REV P01, 002 REV P01, 003 REV P03, 005 REV 03
- 3) There shall be no more than 2 pitches on the site and on each of the pitches hereby approved no more than 2 caravans [as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 as amended], shall be stationed at any time, of which only 1 caravan shall be a static caravan.
- 4) The occupation of the site hereby permitted shall be carried on only by Mr Thomas Scott and Mrs Louise Scott and their resident dependants and Mr Larry Scott and Mrs Pamela Scott.
- 5) When the land ceases to be occupied by those named in condition 4 above the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, materials and equipment brought on to or erected on the land, and/or works undertaken to it in connection with the use, shall be removed and the land shall be restored to its condition before the development took place.
- 6) No development shall commence until a scheme of hard and soft landscaping, including boundary treatments, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, identify those to be retained and set out measures for their protection throughout the course of development.
- 7) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species. Any hard landscaping shall be carried out prior to the first occupation of the site.
- 8) Before the development is first occupied a schedule of landscape maintenance for a period of 5 years shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation. All landscaping shall be maintained in accordance with the approved schedule.
- 9) The site shall not be occupied until works for the disposal of sewage have been provided on the site to serve the development hereby permitted, in accordance with details, including a maintenance plan, that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 10) No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on the site.
- 11) No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials.