



Appeal Decisions

Hearing held on 14 January 2025

Site visit made on 14 January 2025

by Timothy C King BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 February 2025

Appeal A: APP/C1435/C/23/3326457, APP/C1435/C/23/3326458, APP/C1435/C/23/3326459, APP/C1435/C/23/3326460, APP/C1435/C/23/3326461, APP/C1435/C/23/3326462, APP/C1435/C/23/3326463, APP/C1435/C/23/3326464, APP/C1435/C/23/3326465, APP/C1435/C/23/3326466, APP/C1435/C/23/3326467

Land at Randalls Farm, Whitesmith, Chiddingly, East Sussex BN8 6JB

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
 - The appeals are made by Mr J Robb, Ms Margaret Robb, Mary Robb, Mr James Robb, Ms M Connors, Ms Margaret O' Conner, Mr P J O'Brien, Mr P J Connors, Ms Kathleen Cash, Mr Jim O'Brien and Ms Ann Brien against an enforcement notice issued by Wealden District Council.
 - The enforcement notice was issued on 27 June 2023.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is 'Without planning permission, change of use of the Land from agriculture to a mixed use for agriculture and to a use for the stationing of residential caravans and the associated construction of a hardstanding, installation of a septic tank, the removal of a section of hedgerow to form an access, and the erection of post and rail fencing.
 - The requirements of the notice are:
 1. Stop using the Land for the stationing of residential caravans;
 2. Remove all caravans from the Land;
 3. Break up and remove all hardstanding areas laid on the Land to facilitate the said unauthorised use;
 4. Remove the septic tank and all associated pipes, channels and drains from the Land;
 5. Remove all fencing from the Land;
 6. Reinstate the area where the hedgerow has been removed to form an access by planting 6 plants per linear metre of various species, subject to various criteria; and
 7. Remove all materials, rubble, debris, tools, equipment and any other domestic paraphernalia associated with and arising from compliance with the above requirements.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements in full is 12 months after this notice takes effect.
 - The appeals are proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) (a), (f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
-

Appeal B: APP/C1435/W/23/3330564

Land at Randalls Farm, Whitesmith, Chiddingly, East Sussex BN8 6JB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- The appeal is made by Mr J Robb against the decision of Wealden District Council.

- The application Ref WD/2023/0958/FR, dated 25 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as '*Part retrospective application for the change of use of land for the stationing of 5 no. static and 4 no. touring caravans associated with 4 no. gypsy and traveller pitches (4 no. pitches in total) including hardstanding, fencing and package treatment plant.*'
-

Formal Decisions

Appeal A

1. It is directed that the enforcement notice be corrected by:
 - i) deleting requirements 1 and 2, and substituting these with a single requirement, stating the following:

'Cessation of the residential use of the land, and the removal of all caravans on the land facilitating this.'
 - ii) deleting requirement (iii) and its substitution with the following:

'Remove all hardstanding and any structures on the land associated with the unauthorised use of the land.'
 - iii) Deleting requirement (iv).
2. Subject to the above corrections the appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld, and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act, as amended.

Appeal B

3. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the part retrospective application for the change of use of land for the stationing of 5 no. static and 4 no. touring caravans associated with 4 no. gypsy and traveller pitches (4 no. pitches in total) including hardstanding, fencing and package treatment plant on land at Randalls Farm, Whitesmith, Chiddingfold, East Sussex BN8 6JB, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Preliminary Matters,

4. The current agent is not the person who originally lodged the appeal, and put forward claims on various appeal grounds. The new agent has since withdrawn the appeal on ground (b); in other words, it is accepted that the alleged breach of planning control has occurred as a matter of fact. It was also confirmed at the Hearing that the ground (c) appeal was merely to separate the elements that required the benefit of planning permission and those which did not. The appellant confirmed that any permitted development rights might relate only to the pole and rail fencing. This might be the case but, given my decision on Appeal B it is not necessary that I explore this matter further.
5. Regarding grounds (f) and (g), as discussed at the Hearing, I am satisfied that the requirements stated in the enforcement notice are commensurate with the breach of control occurring. Also, as I indicated, were I to extend the compliance period beyond the stipulated 12 months, this would be tantamount to a temporary planning permission; potentially dangerous given the continued

use of the existing access. Accordingly, the appeals on grounds (f) and (g) do not succeed, and I shall therefore concentrate, on the merits and impacts of the scheme the subject of Appeal B, whilst drawing a distinction between this and the application deemed to have been made which falls to be assessed by virtue of the ground (a) appeal on Appeal A.

6. There is a clear difference between the reasons for refusing planning permission – the subject of Appeal B - and the reason for issuing the enforcement notice. Whereas the decision notice shows that permission was refused due to the considered effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the location of the use, its considered effect on highway safety, the consequential loss of, or harm to, trees covered by a tree protection order (TPO), and the development's implications for surface water drainage, the enforcement notice was issued solely on highway safety grounds due to the occupiers using a substandard vehicular access into and from the site.
7. This inconsistency would strongly suggest that the unauthorised development, as detailed in the planning application, was given full consideration at the application stage, but the Council's concerns as to the frequent use of the existing access was the overriding objection. In the circumstances I shall deal with both the 'actual' and 'deemed' application together, whilst drawing distinctions.

Background

8. In April 2022 the Council was made aware that gypsies and travellers had moved onto the land for residential purposes. The Council decided that it was expedient to serve an enforcement notice requiring that the land be cleared of the caravans, the removal of the hardstanding laid and fencing erected, and also the reinstatement of a section of hedgerow that had been removed.

Matters concerning the enforcement notice

9. Requirement (6) would involve prescriptive measures to reinstate the section of hedgerow previously removed. Such measures, although holding merit, represent a positive obligation upon the appellant and go beyond the remedial steps that are allowed for under the s173(4) of the 1990 Act. Accordingly, I shall delete this requirement. Instead, this matter is addressed by way of condition 1(j).
10. It was agreed between the main parties at the Hearing that Requirements 1 and 2 could be amalgamated and reworded, and still achieve the same objective.
11. At the Hearing the Council accepted the appellant's claim that no septic tank exists, or has existed, at the site. Rather than an underground tank, a package treatment plant – a small sewage treatment system that treats wastewater on site - is present, as applied for. Accordingly, Requirement 4 is deleted.
12. The description of the unauthorised development mentions an agricultural use, and this gave rise to discussion. Although it is accepted by the parties that the land was previously in use for agriculture, the appellant indicates that since

2022 the land has only be used for gypsy and traveller accommodation and also the keeping of a small number of horses on a field to the rear of the caravan pitches.

13. This is consistent with my observations at the site visit carried out following the Hearing itself.

Appeal A – the deemed planning application (DPA), and Appeal B

Main Issues

14. The main issues are as follows:

- 1) whether the Council has a five year land supply for gypsy and traveller purposes, current need, and the availability of alternative accommodation;
- 2) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
- 3) whether the location of the development is acceptable having regard to the Council's spatial policy;
- 4) the effect of the development, with the use of the existing access, on highway safety, and whether the proposed new access would be satisfactory in this respect;
- 5) the proposal's effects on surface water drainage;

Reasons

Policy, need, and provision of sites

15. The existing level of local provision and need for sites along with the availability, or lack of, alternative accommodation are relevant matters under criteria within the government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, December 2024 (PPTS).
16. Paragraph 10 of the PPTS expects Councils, in their local plan, to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of sites against their locally set targets. The Wealden Core Strategy Local Plan (WCSLP) dates from 2011 and identified that between 2006 and 2016 there would be a need for an additional 32 gypsy and traveller permanent pitches. It was indicated that 23 pitches would be allocated in a then forthcoming Site Allocation Development Plan Document. However this document never materialised.
17. In 2022 a more up-to-date study was undertaken with the compilation of the East Sussex Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTAA) which also identified a need for 32 pitches, but between the period of 2021 and 2040, although a distinction was made between gypsies and travellers meeting the PPTS definition and those which cover the needs of all ethnic gypsies and travellers. This obviously indicated a higher level of need, and pre-dated the *Lisa Smith* judgement which grouped these together.

18. The Council accepts it cannot meet the 5 year land supply requirement, and given the policy situation each planning application proposing accommodation for such is dealt with on its own individual planning merits.
19. When I questioned the Council witness it was apparent that there is little in the way of local alternative accommodation which the appellant might consider.
20. On this main issue there appears to be a clear unmet need for gypsy and traveller pitches and the objectives of WCSLP policy in this regard have not been achieved. I afford this substantial weight.

Character and appearance

21. The site is an open field located in the countryside, outside of any defined settlement boundary. It is situated off the west side of the busy A22; a classified road. A ditch runs alongside the highway and the appeal site lies behind a mature native hedgerow, interspersed with trees, some of which are now protected by a tree preservation order (TPO) issued in September 2023.
22. The site has been divided up into four pitches separated by pole and link fencing. There is a single static caravan on each pitch, although one pitch contains two statics. Touring caravans are also positioned on the land. An extensive area of hardstanding has been laid to facilitate vehicular movements in front of the statics. From my site visit I noted that the site is well laid out with a defined orderly arrangement.
23. Just prior to the Council refusing planning permission a TPO ref 2023/0011 was issued to protect ten oak trees along the front of the site. No objections were raised, and this Order was later confirmed. Both parties appear to accept that these trees will not be affected by the proposed creation of a new access into the site. That said, I note certain other trees close to the southern boundary of the site, which could have had their roots impacted by the hardstanding laid, which itself is unsightly.
24. In the local context, although this is considered as a countryside location there is sporadic development, including residential dwellings, in the vicinity. The development is currently on open land, but with landscaping, planting and the creation and maintenance of suitable buffer zones, along with adherence to all conditions agreed by both parties, the various measures would make for a satisfactory form of development. This would meet the aims of WCSLP policy WCS 10 and policy EN27 of the Wealden Local Plan (WLP).

Location

25. As mentioned, the appeal site is located in the countryside, and the proposal is not seen to be in a sustainable location in terms of having good access to facilities and services. It is therefore contrary to the aims and requirements of WCSLP policies WCS14, WCS11 and its relevant Spatial Planning Policy Objectives, along with WLP policy EN1.
26. The general needs of gypsies and travellers mean that they frequently look to locate themselves in rural locations, and there is immediate conflict with the spatial policies of Councils. Both main parties in the current case, along with interested parties, have drawn my attention to the infrequency of local bus

services and the distances involved. By the very nature of gypsies' lifestyles and movements there is heavy reliance on the private motor vehicle and, accordingly, their modus operandi is irreconcilable with the objectives of such policies as WCSLP 14, WCSLP 11 and WLP policy EN1.

27. The proposal is therefore in direct conflict with the said planning policies.

Highway safety

28. The site is reached via an access shared with two adjacent cottages. A longstanding access point, it has not, though, been previously used to transport mobile homes and tourer caravans. Also the visibility splays are substandard when compared with modern requirements.

29. The existing access is clearly unsuitable, and it is understandable that this prompted the enforcement action taken.

30. The proposed new access would be located some 32m to the south of the existing access opposite to an existing vehicular crossover off the A22. The submitted drawing ref T016-003 shows it would have a width of 5.5m with gates positioned 15m back from the edge of the carriageway so that an arriving vehicle either towing a caravan or transporting a static caravan is able to station itself within the access without obstructing the free flow of vehicles along the highway. A swept path analysis prepared by the appellant's traffic consultant also demonstrates that the access would be laid out to suitably accommodate all ingress/egress movements for a 10m rigid delivery vehicle and a car towing caravan.

31. In accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) visibility splays measuring 2.4m x 215m are required either side of the access. The left hand (south side splays) meet the required standards whereas the right hand splays fall short due to the alignment of the A22, although the distances involved meet the desirable speeds up to 59mph, and meet the absolute minimum for speeds up to 69mph. The County Council's highway officer indicated that a speed survey was carried out to assess southbound speeds using a radar speedometer, comprising of 100 vehicles and two surveyors.

32. Also, following submission of a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit in support of the proposed access arrangements, it is understood that negotiations took place between the appellant's consultant and highway officers. It is permissible for southbound drivers to travel at speeds of up to 60 mph and, on the basis that the right hand splays achievable meet the desirable minimum for speeds of up to 59mph, and also meet the absolute minimum for speeds of up to 69mph given that the highest speed recorded at the survey was 56mph, the local highway authority has provided no objections. This, though, would be subject to the submission of certain details for subsequent written approval, to ensure a satisfactory arrangement.

33. In the above connection I have had particular regard to the comments of the Parish Council on this matter and also a neighbouring occupier, Alli Styles, who spoke very eloquently at the Hearing and highlighted her objections to the development. At my site visit I looked carefully at the proposed point of access and observed, accordingly, the traffic speeds along the A22. Whilst it seems clear to me that the width and positioning of the proposed access, along with

the splays possible, would be located in a more preferable location than that existing I did have some reservations as to whether highway safety might still be compromised to a degree. However, mine is a relatively untrained eye compared to that of highway authority officials and, without technical or empirical evidence otherwise - and no accidents relating to the current access were drawn to my attention - I must afford significant weight to the comments of the local highway authority.

34. To conclude on this main issue I am mindful of the advice within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that development should only be prevented or refused if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. If the access is constructed with the dimensions and splays proposed I am satisfied that highway safety would be maintained and the requirements of WCSLP policy WCS11(2) would be met.

Surface water drainage

35. The site lies within Flood Zone 1, and is thereby at low risk of flooding. As such, no site specific flood risk assessment is required to accompany the proposed scheme. However, concerns have been raised by both the Council and other interested parties as to the incidence of surface water drainage problems due, not least, to the hardstanding laid. I accept that the packet treatment plant would augment site discharge but, in the circumstances, and due to an absence of detailed remedial measures put forward by the appellant in respect of drainage, I am of the view that the development would likely cause problems. As such, a viable drainage solution needs to be employed to serve the site.
36. As it stands, therefore, I conclude that the development, as implemented, fails to demonstrate that there would be adequate arrangements which could, in turn, cause problems outside the site. Accordingly, the proposal is in conflict with policy WCS14 and relevant advice in the Framework. However, this matter can be potentially ameliorated by way of an appropriately worded planning condition.

Other Considerations

37. The Council's replacement local plan is currently at Regulation 18 stage. The next milestone will be a further round of consultation, known as 'Regulation 19', where the pre-submission version of the emerging plan is produced and is then submitted to PINS for its Examination in Public. No firm indication as to when the plan's eventual adoption is expected was expressed by the Council at the Hearing.
38. The new development plan, once adopted, may represent a sea change in a number of ways, including the likely allocation of sites for gypsy and traveller provision. Accordingly, I have borne in mind that this would amount to a material change in circumstances.

Planning Balance

39. As I have mentioned the absence of allocated pitches for gypsy and traveller purposes with the Wealden District area is a matter that I must afford

significant and considerable weight to, but this does not mean that planning permission should be granted at the expense of other important factors involved, which may elicit harm.

40. Accordingly, it has been agreed that reasonable and necessary planning conditions should be imposed to mitigate against potential harm, and this takes in the proper construction of an appropriate new access, the stopping up of the existing access, measures to guard against problems of surface water drainage, and visible improvements made to the site itself. Improvements include the replanting of the hedgerow, and the Council had already put forward prescriptive measures in this regard within the enforcement notice's requirements. Although I have had to remove this particular requirement from the notice due to the limitations of the statute, these measures could potentially form the basis of negotiations between the appellant and the Council. At this point, though, in the absence of details, it is beyond my remit to make suggestions here.
41. I accept that the development is in an unsustainable location, but strict adherence to the Council's spatial policy in this regard would effectively debar the presence of new gypsy settlements in rural locations, and this is less than feasible. In this connection I am again mindful of an unmet need for such developments.
42. On balance, therefore, I consider that the development can be made potentially acceptable, and the importance of the Site Development Scheme (SDS) condition, which would also mean that failure to comply with its requirements would cause the planning permission to fall away and the removal of all caravans, vehicles, structures, equipment and materials brought onto the land, is obvious.
43. Were I to decide that a full planning permission would not be appropriate I have considered granting a temporary permission and, in this regard, I have referred to the government's planning practice guidance which says that a temporary permission may be appropriate where a trial run is needed in order to assess the effect of the development on the area or where it is expected that the planning circumstances will change in a particular way at the end of that period. The replacement local plan would represent such a change and it will likely show sites allocated for gypsy and traveller provision. This remains to be seen but, if so, alternative sites might be made available to satisfy the needs of the occupiers at the appeal site. However, with no firm timetable as yet as to the new local plan's adoption, there is no indication as to when alternative sites may come forward.
44. I must, therefore, weigh up the various factors involved. The SDS, details of which are required by condition, places a considerable onus on the appellant to instruct his planning agents to draw up an acceptable scheme, and also a timetable for its implementation. If this is achieved I am satisfied that proper observance of the various elements in the SDS, along with adherence to the requirements of the other conditions – particularly relating to measures necessary to ensure appropriate surface water drainage at the site, along with a new and improved point of access to and from the site – would largely ameliorate the existing harm and allow for a satisfactory form of development.

Also, with suitable planting and landscaping, the use and associated buildings would not be unduly obtrusive and would likely blend in with its surroundings.

45. In light of the above, although I have considered the possibility of granting a five year temporary position to allow for the monitoring of the surface water drainage measures implemented, also to test the suitability of the new access, as the adoption of the replacement local plan is likely to come about during the next five years, a time limitation condition cannot be properly justified given that full and appropriate details could lead to the implementation of a satisfactory development. Both main parties agreed to this approach, also the inclusion of a fall-away clause. Accordingly, given the expense involved in putting together a suitable SDS, it will be in the appellant's interest to properly and comprehensively approach the requirements thereto in order that the details can be discharged and the approved measures implemented. If problems remain then the Council hold further remedial powers in order to regularise matters.
46. I am therefore satisfied that a full, conditional, planning permission is appropriate here, with named occupants in the interests of certainty. As the level of occupancy has seemingly remained constant for nearly the past three years, this suggests a settled development.
47. The DPA seeks planning permission for the development as it stands, whereby the modified scheme, the subject of Appeal B, proposes planning permission with changes; not least the new access point. In this regard, in allowing Appeal B, and granting a conditional planning permission, s180(1) of the 1990 Act as amended provides that where, after the service of an enforcement notice, planning permission is granted for any development carried out before the grant of that permission, the notice shall cease to have effect so far as it is inconsistent with that permission. Nonetheless, as Appeal A is dismissed the enforcement notice will not cease to have effect, and will itself remain active unless the Council chooses to withdraw it.
48. A clear distinction between the two appeals has therefore been drawn.

Conclusions on Appeals A and B, and conditions

49. For the reasons given above I conclude that Appeal A should not succeed. I shall therefore uphold the enforcement notice with corrections and refuse to grant planning permission on the deemed application. As regards Appeal B, I am satisfied that the various conditions imposed will suitably ameliorate the impacts of the development as it stands. This appeal is therefore allowed.
50. In addition to the condition employed to ensure an appropriate SDS there are also conditions to not only restrict occupation to gypsies and travellers but, more specifically, to limit it to the current named occupiers, given the well ordered site layout. In this connection a condition is also imposed to restrict the number of pitches to that existing, and also the number and type of caravans stationed on the land.
51. A condition is included to require that the visibility splays are kept clear of obstructions and also one requiring that an inwardly opening gate be satisfactorily distanced from the back edge of the highway. In addition, a

condition is imposed to prohibit commercial activities taking place on the land, and also one restricting the weight of attendant vehicles.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, vehicles, structures, equipment and materials brought onto the land for the purposes of such uses shall be removed and the land restored to its condition before the development took place within 30 days of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in below:

Within 3 months of the date of this decision, notwithstanding the details as submitted, a site development scheme (SDS) shall be submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority and shall include a timetable for its implementation and:

- a) Internal layout of the site to show re-positioned static caravans, including the southernmost caravan, details of appropriately sized buffer zones, and reposition outside the root protection zone and turning space (which shall thereafter be retained in perpetuity for that purpose).
- b) External lighting of the site, which shall include timetable for removal of existing and replacement with a scheme which is low level, hooded and directional.
- c) Details and specifications of the new access, to include details of the culvert, and visibility splays as shown on drawing no. T1016-011 shall be provided, and thereafter maintained and kept free of all obstructions over a height of 600mm, including removal of any existing obstructions.
- d) Details of surface water drainage, to include winter groundwater monitoring to establish highest annual ground water levels to support the design of any infiltration to inform the design of any soakaways and or/or the details of any attenuation feature; and landowners' permission for discharge, and details to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the highway. To this end a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development to secure the operation of the scheme shall be agreed.
- e) Details on method of foul drainage disposal.
- f) Details of the method of stopping up the northern access, to include fencing and hedgerow planting.
- g) A full site investigation and risk assessment (undertaken by a competent person) to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on site, which shall include an assessment of potential risks and an appraisal of remedial and preferred options.
- h) A remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use.
- i) An Arboriculture Method Statement, to include measures to remove hardstanding impacting on root protection zones.
- j) A scheme of landscaping and ecology, to include ecological enhancements, buffer planting to boundaries, details of native species, numbers and plant sizes and provisions for maintenance of the landscaping for 5 years.
- k) Details on refuse and recycling storage

If within 6 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority

refuse to approve the SDS or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal should have been made to and accepted as validly made by the Secretary of State.

If an appeal is made in pursuance of (i) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.

The approved SDS shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable and shall be retained for the duration of the use of the site and development.

In the event of a legal challenge to this decision made pursuant to the procedure set out in this condition, the operation of the time limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

2. The access shall not be used until the visibility splays shown on the submitted plan (plan no T1016-003) are cleared of all obstructions exceeding 0.8m and below 2.1m in height and kept clear thereafter.
3. The gate shall be positioned at least 15m back from the edge of the highway and open inwards in order that a vehicle may wait clear of the highway whilst the gate is being operated.
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 Travellers Sites December 2024.
5. The occupation of the site hereby permitted shall be carried on only by the following and their resident dependants:
Pitch 1: Patrick Brien and Margaret Brien
Pitch 2: Jim Brien and Ann Brien
Pitch 3: Patrick Joseph Connors and Kathleen Connors
Pitch 4: James Robb and Margaret Robb

When the land ceases to be occupied by those named above the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, materials and equipment brought onto the land in connection with the use, including the amenity block hereby approved shall be removed with the land. Within one month of that time, the land shall be restored to its condition prior to occupation of the site taking place

6. There shall be no more than 4 pitches on the site and each of the pitches hereby approved no more than one static caravan and 1 touring caravan excepting the southernmost pitch which shall have no more than two static caravans and one touring caravan, as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968, stationed at any time.

7. No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on this site. No more than one commercial vehicle per pitch shall be kept on the land for use by the occupiers of the caravans hereby permitted, and they shall not exceed 3.5 tonnes in weight.
8. No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Alan Masters of counsel

Peter Brownjohn – Senior Planner, WS Planning & Architecture

Brett Littlewood – Apex Strategies

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Caitlin Boddy – Planning Team Leader, Wealden District Council

Jon Honeysett – Enforcement Team Leader, Wealden District Council

David Massheder – Tree & Landscape Officer, Wealden District Council

Daniel Pilbeam – Trainee Enforcement Officer, Wealden District Council

Teresa Ford – Highway Officer, East Sussex County Council

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Jim Brien

Patrick Brien

Alli Styles

Councillor Geoffrey Draper