



Appeal Decisions

Hearing and site visit held on 7 August 2024

by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI ACMI fCMgr

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2024

Appeals A & B Refs: APP/R1845/C/21/3287457 and 58

The Beeches, Curslow Lane, Shenstone, Kidderminster DY10 4DX

1. The appeals are made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended ("the 1990 Act"). Appeal A is made by Mr N McGinley and Appeal B is made by Mr Joseph McGinley against an enforcement notice issued by Wyre Forest District Council.
2. The notice was issued on 27 October 2021.
3. The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice, as corrected, is the change of use of the land from equestrian use to a mixed use for the stationing of caravans for residential occupation and the keeping of horses and operational development including the laying of services, installation of a septic tank and associated pipework, laying of hardstanding and erection of ranch fencing, sheds and external lighting in connection with the mixed use.
4. The requirements of the notice, as varied, are to:
 1. Cease the mixed use of the land for the stationing of caravans for residential occupation and the keeping of horses.
 2. Remove from the land all caravans, services, septic tanks and associated pipework, hardstanding, ranch fencing, sheds and external lighting.
 3. Restore the Land to its condition prior to the breach of planning control.
5. The period for compliance with the requirements, as varied, is 12 months.
6. Appeal A is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (b) and (g) of the 1990 Act.
7. Appeal B is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(b) and (g) of the 1990 Act. Since ground (a) is not pleaded, Appeal B an application for planning permission is not deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act.

Summary of Decision: Appeal A is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed, and temporary planning permission is granted for three years, subject to conditions, as set out in the formal decision below. No action is taken in Appeal B.

Appeal C Ref: APP/R1845/W/21/3285175

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the 1990 Act against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Noel McGinley against the decision of Wyre Forest District Council.
- The application Ref 21/0666/FUL, dated 2 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2021.
- The development proposed is change of use of Land for the creation of 6 Gypsy/Traveller pitches comprising the siting of 6 mobile homes & 6 touring caravans.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

1. Corrections and variations made by the previous Inspector to the issued notice are not contentious as no injustice is caused to any party: for clarity, I have also adopted them in my banner header above. The s78 planning appeal is for 6 pitches and not 5 as stated in the application form.
2. The Inspectorate's decision issued on 22 March 2023 was challenged in the High Court pursuant to section 288 and 289 of the 1990 Act. Permission was subsequently granted on 14 November 2023. The claim was conceded by consent (order dated 12 March 2024). I must only redetermine ground (a) and the s78 appeal (Appeal A and C).

Appeal A and C - ground (a) & S78 appeal

3. For background information, the site's lawful use is the keeping of horses. There is a stable type of structure, and the site is accessed via an existing roadway. The terms of the deemed application are directly derived from the corrected allegation. Essentially, planning permission is sought for the mixed-use referred to in the banner header. In Appeal C, the scheme includes some retrospective-and-prospective development given the change to the site's layout.

Main issues

4. The site is located inside the Green Belt and a residential caravan site of this kind constitutes inappropriate development. The unauthorised use and proposed scheme would have an adverse effect on openness of the Green Belt and conflict with the fundamental aim of keeping land open. The appeal parties also agree with the previous Inspector's findings on highway safety and sustainability: I concur. The appellant challenges landscape findings, however.
5. The common main issues are firstly, the effect of the Appeal A and C development on the character of the landscape, and secondly, whether any 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 required to justify the grant of planning permission.

Reasons - *character of the landscape*

6. I undertook a comprehensive accompanied site visit to gain an impression of the site and locality. The appellant contends that the site and the land surrounding it is not the subject of any landscape designations such as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, but its character has been assessed and recorded in the Worcestershire County Council Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Guidance (Landscape Character Assessment SG). The site lies at the boundary between two landscape character areas: Principal Timbered Farmlands, which lie to the south and the Estate Farmlands to the north.
7. The Principal Timbered Farmlands are recorded as being characterised by amongst other things a small-scale landscape with scattered hedgerow trees. The approach to the site from the south along Curslow Lane is typical of this landscape. In contrast the Estate Farmlands are described as an ordered agricultural landscape characterised by medium to large scale fields.

8. There are public footpaths to the north and west of the appeal site. There are glimpsed views of the site for a short distance along the footpath on the opposite side of Curslow Lane which runs perpendicular to the road. Extensive hard standings have been laid on the site to accommodate the caravans and the access has been altered to provide improvements to visibility splays. The latter has involved the removal of roadside trees and vegetation. The stable/hay barn has been retained on the site together with an open area parallel to the road. As a result, the caravans are currently set back from the road. The same arrangement applies in the Appeal C scheme.
9. Curslow Lane is at a low point relative to the land to the west and this results in the level of the land rising away from the road across the site. The notice relates to land that was probably grassland before the caravans were brought onto the site. However, the latter was also used for equestrian-related activities and included a stable or hay barn, an area enclosed by fencing described as a sand school and the access serving these facilities. That said, given the site's location and positioning, it is reasonable to assume that the character of the land was not dissimilar to the verdant, green, and natural appearance of the surrounding countryside. Contrary to the appellant's arguments, I consider that the introduction of the residential use, facilitated by the stationing of caravans and associated work, has significantly changed the site's physical characteristics.
10. Keeping of horses for recreational use is also likely to have had a visual effect on the appearance of the landscape. However, in comparison, the caravans facilitate a residential use. The latter introduces domestic living to this part of the countryside where caravans are not a feature of the landscape. Fencing divides the pitches from the paddocks and there are physical barriers dividing areas occupied by the caravans. A similar arrangement is shown on the proposed site layout plan in Appeal C and planting along the site boundaries could have a softening effect. The caravans and associated development are, and would be, noticeable to the naked eye when seen from the site access and highway. This is because of the site's layout and positioning, and the area's topography. The introduction of domesticity across the site, facilitated by the stationing of caravans, external lighting and the placing of outdoor furniture or washing lines, individually or cumulatively, appears as incongruous features I disagree with the claim that the evergreens planted along the site's boundary reduce the visual impact of the residential caravan site.
11. In Appeal C, the layout places the caravans in closer proximity to each other than they are at present such that the area of the pitches is much smaller. However, 6 mobile homes and tourers are proposed to be accommodated and there will be limited space between them other than for parking. A separate amenity area is shown providing a secure, gated space for the residents. Compared to the current setup, the caravans would not extend across the site. That said, they would be larger than the current touring caravans. The proposed scheme in Appeal C would appear out of keeping with the rural character of the landscape.
12. Much is made of the locality's existing features. To the south of the site, there are two plots accommodating residential caravans and buildings. There is some confusion as to their planning status. The appellant insists on comparisons with the appeal site and caravans associated with the fishing lakes. Similarly, there are substantial buildings served by Curslow Lane to the south of the site which are visible from the public footpaths because of the topography of the land. However, these do not substantially detract from the predominately rural nature of the landscape surrounding the site and as described in the Landscape Character Assessment SG. In any event, while there are caravans found nearby and in the wider locality, I am concerned with the visual impact of this appeal site's residential use.

13. I too find that the development is visible from the surrounding area, noticeable in views from the highway and footpaths. The introduction of caravans and paraphernalia associated with domestic lifestyles is likely to significantly harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The Appeal A and C development would be contrary to Policy SP.20 of the Wyre Forest Local Plan (LP), which requires new development to integrate effectively into its surroundings and to be a positive addition to the landscape.

Other considerations - *The need for and supply of gypsy and traveller sites*

14. There was much debate about the need for more pitches in the district. The previous Inspector's approach to this topic was also the focus of the challenge. The Council insist that it has identified the need for additional pitches as set out in the 2020 Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment (GTNA). However, Annex 1 to the revised PPTS contains a definition of gypsies and travellers for planning purposes. The Council's approach to meeting the needs of those who do not meet the PPTS definition needs to be addressed given this latest update: I am not satisfied the GTNA does not provide a robust enough evidence base as it requires a refresh. The level of need for additional pitches is likely to increase not decrease.

15. As the PPTS advises, in producing their LP, authorities should identify, and update annually, a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites against their locally set targets. Footnote 4 contains guidance on what constitutes deliverability¹. My attention is drawn to LP Policy SP.14, which is underpinned by the GTNA. The Policy indicates that the need throughout the 15-year plan period is 13 pitches under the PPTS definition, 3 of which were required in the first five years to 2024/25. There is a further wider need for 22 pitches for those who did not meet the PPTS definition at that time. The need is set out in table 7.0.4, which forms part of the reasoned justification to Policy SP.14.

16. The table contains two columns differentiating between the need in PPTS terms and the wider 'cultural need'. The PPTS column begins with the 5-year shortfall to 2024/5. That figure is reduced by 3 pitches to allow for potential turnover on existing sites and by a further 4 pitches to allow for expansion of existing sites, but it is unclear as to how, when and where this turnover is likely to occur, or which sites are expanded. After taking account of the provision of 4 new pitches on a new site at Wilden Lane, the residual PPTS to 2024/25 is calculated at 3 pitches: the residual pitch requirement for non-PPTS is 14. It seems to me that the level of unmet need lacks clarity given the position with the GTNA and reliance on turnover on existing pitches and the expansion of sites.

17. On the supply side, again there is an over reliance upon turnover and use of existing sites via expansion without clear explanation as to how or which sites are to be expanded. LP Policy SP.14 sets out a list of sites which are safeguarded to meet the needs of gypsies and travellers over the plan period and the vast majority are already in use.

18. There was much debate about two site allocations – Site M (Wilden Lane) and N (Zortech Avenue). Site M is unlikely to come forward any time soon and I regard it as not deliverable within the first five years to 2024/2025. The evidence does not clearly show this site is likely to come forward any time soon. This is because it is in private

¹ To be considered "deliverable", sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that development will be delivered on the site within five years. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within 5 years".

ownership, it is a scrap yard and there is no evidence to indicate the current owner intends to apply for planning permission to change its use to a residential caravan site for gypsies and travellers.

19. Zortech Avenue, which is a 1.48 ha site allocated for 16 pitches, is available to purchase and the intention is for it to be delivered during 2021 to 2026. The land was part of the former Burlish Golf course and has been extensively tipped with hardcore. It is adjacent to the proposed site for the travelling showpeople and it shares an access drive from Zortech Avenue. While adjacent to an industrial unit, it is also close to a residential area with easy access to a range of facilities including education. The Council will consider a separate access from Walter Nash Road West, which would provide a more direct route for residents of the site to access local schools, shops, and the nearby play facilities.
20. The Council explained that it wishes to prepare the site for 16 pitches by retaining hardcore on the land. The evidence presented demonstrates a willingness to do the work as the Council has obtained quotations for the preparatory work, and undertaken soil sampling. However, prior to any utility provided or pitches constructed, the work requires significant engineering operations given the considerable amount of tipped material. Evidently, all this requires financial investment, due to the nature, extent, and scale of preparatory works.
21. In addition, there is a need to obtain planning permission for the residential caravan site and the evidence presented does not clearly show to me how standards for 16 pitches, as set out in LP Policy DM.5, would be achieved given this site's layout and the topography. It is also unclear how appropriate buffering would be provided for the adjacent Burlish Top nature reserve and to screen the development from the adjacent dwellings on Birchen Coppice. There is lack of clarity on vehicular access from either Zortech Avenue or Walter Nash Road West.
22. I share the Council's optimism about the potential for Zortech Avenue as it could go some way in meeting the short-to-medium unmet need for additional pitches within the district in a suitable and sustainable location and setting. However, given what I have already said elsewhere, the quantum of the evidence presented, including documentary and oral evidence, makes me doubt if Zortech Avenue will come forward by 2026, as envisaged by LP Policy SA.K17.
23. Drawing all the above points together and given my findings about Zortech Avenue and Wilden Lane site, I disagree with the previous Inspector's conclusions that, as it stands, the Council can identify a 5-years' worth of deliverable sites against the locally set target in the LP.

Availability and lack of alternative accommodation

24. The appellant and his family left the site at Sandy Lane for various reasons and would not move back – that site does not meet the needs of his family in terms of security. The Zortech Avenue site is suggested by the Council as an alternative, but the appellant cannot afford that site, especially if the preparatory costs are added to the purchase price. Additionally, if Zortech Avenue was a realistic option, the appellant is concerned that he and his family are Irish Travellers and mixing with other types of gypsies on a large site would present challenges. Furthermore, the appellant said that he would prefer a site which accommodated his family only given his concerns about security and safety and in terms of his and his family's health. However, it has not

been shown that part of the Zortech Avenue site could not be secured to meet the needs of the appellant in these regards.

25. To be regarded as a genuine or realistic alternative, the Zortech Avenue site would need to be shown to be suitable, affordable, acceptable, and available. The reasons why the appellant finds this site to be unsuitable and unacceptable need to be tempered by the fact that at present the land is not in use by any gypsy or traveller group and has not been laid out. However, it would be unreasonable to expect the appellant to acquire all the land and in that context his concerns regarding living on the same site as gypsies and travellers from other ethnic groups remain valid. I too find that the evidence presented to me does not show that alternative accommodation is affordable. Therefore, at present, Zortech Avenue has not been demonstrated to be a realistic alternative in terms of affordability and availability.

Personal circumstances of the appellant and his family, including best interests of the children

26. There has been change in the personal circumstances since the previous Hearing. Given the sensitive nature of the personal circumstances, I will not explain them here. The health and educational needs of the occupiers are well documented and the evidence is unchallenged. Clearly, the development allows for an extended family to live together enabling them to provide support for each other, which is acknowledged as of importance to the gypsy and traveller community. It is reasonable to assume that a stable base from which to access education and healthcare is in the best interests of the occupiers, including the children. Similarly, the occupation of the site by much of the extended family allows members to help with caring, parenting and meeting the needs of those who have health concerns.

Human Rights and Public Sector Equality Duty

27. These rights must be considered under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)². This includes not only respect for home but also private and family life and traditional gypsy lifestyle. The refusal of planning permission could result in the entire site's occupiers being evicted. Interference with their home, private and family life is therefore serious, but must be balanced against the wider public interest in pursuing the legitimate aims stated in Article 8. In this location, the inappropriate nature of the development represents a grave land-use objection. There is a need for restrictive policies to be applied to such areas and this restriction is an appropriate proportional response to that need.
28. There is no alternative site presently suitable and available for occupation in the district, or indeed, the wider area: that makes interference more serious and, as indicated above, given that background, it would be in the best interests of each child to remain on the site. This is a primary consideration in the proportionality assessment required by Article 8. It is necessary to consider whether it would be proportionate to refuse planning permission in all the circumstances of this case. I shall consider whether refusal would have a disproportionate effect on the appellant and occupiers of the site in my overall conclusions.
29. Occupiers are Irish Gypsies and are persons who share a protected characteristic. I have borne in mind the need to eliminate discrimination; advance equality or opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and foster good relations between persons who share a

² The ECHR protections have been codified into UK law by the Human Rights Act 1998.

relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The need for a settled base together with the present lack of a suitable available alternative site and the general unmet need have been considered. I will assess if dismissal of the appeals would be proportionate in the light of any potential equality impacts in my overall conclusions.

Planning balance - conclusions on ground (a) & s78 appeal

30. The development in Appeal A and C have harmful implications for the Green Belt in terms of inappropriateness, erosion of openness and encroachment into the countryside, which is a serious planning objection. In accordance with national policy, such harm carries substantial weight. Accordingly, there is conflict with the Green Belt protection objectives found in national and local planning policy. There is significant harm to the character and appearance of the countryside contrary to LP Policies DM.22 and SP.20.
31. I too attach moderate weight to the previous findings about intentional unauthorised development, which, evidently, had occurred. However, the previous Inspector's findings on highway safety and sustainability are neutral in the planning balance in that they neither weigh in favour or against the schemes.
32. To my mind, there is a clear and immediate unmet need to accommodate gypsies and travellers in the district. The evidence presented does not show to me there is an immediate prospect that this unmet need will be properly satisfied soon. Nonetheless, the LP has allocated sites to come forward, but none seem to have materialised in the first five years of the LP. The level of need has increased as time marches on. Nevertheless, having heard the Council's evidence on this matter, I am optimistic, and steps are now being taken to address shortcomings. This finding weighs, significantly, in support of granting planning permission for Appeal A and C.
33. There is deficiency in that the Council cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five-year supply of deliverable traveller sites. This should be a significant material consideration in any subsequent planning decision when considering applications for the grant of temporary planning permission. However, as the PPTS points out, the exception is where the proposal is on land designated as Green Belt, such as this site.
34. There is no other site available at the current time. If the families are forced to leave the site now, it is likely they would resort to living on an unauthorised roadside encampment which is not conducive to their health and wellbeing and has other implications. Given enforcement action has been taken, the latter is a realistic prospect. I attach moderate weight to the lack of an available alternative site.
35. The personal circumstances add further weight in favour of granting planning permission. The PPTS, however, explains that, subject to the best interests of the child, personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt and any other harm so as to establish very special circumstances. The best interests of the children are of considerable importance, but these interests do not always outweigh other considerations. The best interests of the children involved would clearly be served if families had a settled base.
36. The case in favour of planning permission, in Appeal A and C, has been forcefully put. Nevertheless, in my planning judgment, the advanced considerations in support of the appeals, whether taken individually or cumulatively, do not, on balance, clearly outweigh the conflict with planning policies designed to protect the Green Belt so as to justify the grant of a permanent planning permission on the basis of very special circumstances. Although, at present, there is no alternative site for the

appellant/occupiers to go to, in all the circumstances it is not disproportionate to refuse permanent planning permission right now. I shall, however, consider the grant of temporary planning permission next.

37. The totality of harm to the Green Belt is substantial. Although it would be reduced were it for only a limited period, the PPTS states that even temporary traveller sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt which again should only be granted permission on the basis of very special circumstances. The material considerations to which regard must be had in granting any permission are not limited or made different by a decision to make the permission a temporary one. The latter might be appropriate where planning circumstances will change in a particular way at the end of that period.
38. The appellant submits that a conditional temporary planning permission for 5 or 3 years should be granted. However, the Council is making some progress in addressing alternative site provision to meet current and future need. It seems to me that alternative site provision is likely to come forward within the next couple of years. Estimates for site clearance and preparation works at Zortech Avenue have been obtained. A longer period would give sufficient time to allow for the completion of the plan-making process as well as examining alternative site options, addressing the need, and identifying a five-year deliverable supply of sites. It would allow for the possibility of the provision of a gypsy site through the grant of planning permission once suitable sites have been identified.
39. The NPPF and PPTS provide a very strong and considerable incentive to proceed quickly with site allocations in a planned and coordinated manner. The discussion at the Hearing is persuasive and I believe the Council is responding to previous shortcomings and action is being taken to address the needs of travellers via plan-making. On this occasion, the Council is serious and proactively taking steps to address the needs of gypsies and travellers in its administrative area. The possibility of planning circumstances changing by at least end of 2027 seem realistic, and relate to the potential Zortech Avenue site, and updating of the GTNA. There is a clear and precise timetable for change. For these reasons, I consider that a shorter period of three years is reasonable.
40. Having regard to all of the evidence presented on this topic and the particular circumstances of this case including personal circumstances and the lack of alternative site for the appellant and occupiers to go to right now, thus forcing them to roadside existence, I am of the firm opinion that a three year temporary planning permission is wholly reasonable and a pragmatic approach to this planning conundrum as circumstances are likely to change at the end of three years in a particular way. Additionally, temporary permission would give the appellant and occupiers a base from which they can access health and educational facilities. I am satisfied that this would be a proportionate approach to the legitimate aim of protecting the environment, and it would have no greater impact on the appellant/occupiers than would be necessary to address the wider public interest.
41. On the circumstances and facts of this case, it is therefore concluded that, on balance, the points raised in support of Appeal A, including best interests of the children, are sufficient to clearly outweigh the harm identified so that very special circumstances exist, provided that the use is limited to a period of three years from the date of my decision.

Conditions³

³ The Council did not suggest any conditions, but I have reviewed those previously referred to in the officer report.

42. I will consider imposing conditions only in relation to Appeal A. Bearing in mind the need to allow sufficient time to find an alternative site with planning permission, and the local planning process to take its course, I consider three years is justified and reasonable. A restoration scheme would need to be agreed with the Council.
43. A condition limiting occupation to the appellant and resident dependants is necessary because the personal circumstances which have weighed in the overall balance in favour of the grant of temporary permission. Occupiers are gypsies for planning purposes, nevertheless, it is necessary to additionally impose a condition restricting occupation to those persons who fall within that planning policy definition, because I have placed weight on status.
44. I am not persuaded a drainage scheme is required neither are there access improvements needed given the provision of onsite facilities and the permission is temporary in nature. Commercial activity and vehicle sizes should be restricted. However, since a temporary planning permission is justified, I concur that it would be too onerous to require a comprehensive landscaping scheme, though some landscaping has taken place.
45. In the interests of visual amenity and given the site's location as well as the fact that temporary permission is granted, I shall impose a condition limiting the number of pitches to six, which reflects the current makeup and occupiers of the site. I will also limit the number of caravans to 6 given the effect on character if the landscape. Each pitch can only have 1 caravan. Any variation is a matter for the appellant and Council to resolve.

Overall conclusions - Appeals A, B and C

46. Having considered all other matters, for all the above reasons, my conclusions are that ground (a), Appeal A, should be allowed for a limited period of three years. In Appeal B, I take no further action and the enforcement notice will be quashed because of allowing Appeal A. Appeal C should be dismissed.

Formal decisions - Appeal A

47. The appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended for the development already carried out, namely the mixed use for the stationing of caravans for residential occupation and the keeping of horses and operational development including the laying of services, installation of a septic tank and associated pipework, laying of hardstanding and erection of ranch fencing, sheds and external lighting in connection with the mixed use at The Beeches, Curslow Lane, Shenstone, Kidderminster DY10 4DX, subject to the following conditions:
- 1) The use hereby permitted shall be for a limited period being the period of three (3) years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The occupation of the site hereby permitted shall be carried on only by Noel and Joan McGinley, Annemarie McGinley, Dennis and Caroline McGuire, Julie McGinley and Joe Mannings, Ned and Josephine Ward, Patrick and Cindy McGinley, Theresa McGinley Joseph (Gerry) and Victoria McGinley, and their resident dependants only.
 - 3) When the land ceases to be occupied by the named individuals in condition 2) and their resident dependants, or at the end of 3 years, whichever shall first occur, the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, buildings, structures, materials and equipment brought on to the land to facilitate that use, or works undertaken to it in connection with the use, shall be removed and the land restored to its condition

before the development took place, in accordance with a scheme and timetable of works that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

- 4) The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than gypsies and travellers as defined in Annex 1: *Glossary of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites* (or its equivalent in replacement national policy).
- 5) There shall be no more than six (6) pitches on the site and on the pitches hereby approved no more than one (1) caravan shall be stationed at any time as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 as amended.
- 6) No more than one commercial vehicle shall be kept on the land whatsoever for use by the occupiers of the caravans hereby permitted, and it shall not exceed 3.5 tonnes in weight. No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials.

Appeal B

48. No further action is taken.

Appeal C

49. The appeal is dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

For the appellant:

Alison Heine	Agent
Noel McGinley	Appellant

For the Council:

Richard Jennings	Team Lead, Planning Enforcement
Helen Hawkes	Planning manager
Heather Stone	Planning Policy

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE HEARING

By the appellant:

Two letters from Abigail Martin Tuition relating to home schooling.

By the local planning authority:

Plan showing public footpaths in the vicinity of the site.

Extracts from Wyre Forest District Local Plan (2016-2036) (2022) relating to allocated sites for gypsy and traveller development at Firs View, Wilden Lane and Land rear of Zortech Avenue.

Redline plan of Land rear of Zortech Avenue

Landscapes of Worcestershire – Landscape Type Advice Sheets – Principal Timbered Farmlands and Estate Farmlands and extract from Worcestershire County Council website.