

Appeal Decisions

Hearing held on 10 April 2025

Site visit made on 10 April 2025

by **H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 May 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/W1525/W/24/3348289

Land east of Ragged Robins, Lower Stock Road, West Hanningfield, Chelmsford, Essex CM2 8UY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Gary Sharp against Chelmsford City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00386/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erect a hay barn.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W1525/W/24/3348294

Land east of Ragged Robins, Lower Stock Road, West Hanningfield, Chelmsford, Essex CM2 8UY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Gary Sharp against Chelmsford City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00387/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erect a cow barn.
-

Appeal C Ref: APP/W1525/W/24/3348295

Land east of Ragged Robins, Lower Stock Road, West Hanningfield, Chelmsford, Essex CM2 8UY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Gary Sharp against Chelmsford City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00388/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erect a cow barn.
-

Appeal D Ref: APP/W1525/W/24/3348298

Land east of Ragged Robins, Lower Stock Road, West Hanningfield, Chelmsford, Essex CM2 8UY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Gary Sharp against Chelmsford City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00389/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erect a cow barn.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted to erect a hay barn at Land east of Ragged Robins, Lower Stock Road, West Hanningfield, Chelmsford, Essex CM2 8UY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00386/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted to erect a cow barn at Land east of Ragged Robins, Lower Stock Road, West Hanningfield, Chelmsford, Essex CM2 8UY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00387/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Appeal C

3. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted to erect a cow barn at Land east of Ragged Robins, Lower Stock Road, West Hanningfield, Chelmsford, Essex CM2 8UY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00388/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Appeal D

4. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted to erect a cow barn at Land east of Ragged Robins, Lower Stock Road, West Hanningfield, Chelmsford, Essex CM2 8UY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00389/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Applications for costs

5. Applications for costs were made by Mr Gary Sharp against Chelmsford City Council. These are the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

6. As set out above, 4 appeals are before me which, together, propose a single hay barn and 3 cow barns. Given the close proximity of the proposed barns, their design similarities, linked functions and the extent of the interrelationship between their effects it was appropriate to issue a single decision document covering the separate appeal proposals.
7. On each of the submitted planning application forms, the appellant certified that they were the sole owner of the application sites. However, it has since transpired that the appellant is not the legal owner of all of the land to which the appeals relate. The outcome of this is that there has been a failure to comply with the statutory notification and certification requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.
8. However, I have no reason to conclude that this failure has been borne out of a calculated or reckless disregard of the statutory process. Importantly, the evidence before me indicates to me the owner of the field within which the barns are proposed has been kept fully apprised of the development proposals and is supportive of them. As a result, the landowner has not been prejudiced by the procedural error, and I have no reason to conclude that any interested parties have been the subject of any procedural unfairness because of the error either. Consequently, I am satisfied that the appeals can proceed.

9. The appeals have been the subject of screening directions issued under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations). In exercise of the powers conferred by Regulations 14(1) and 7(5) of the EIA Regulations, the Secretary of State directed that the developments did not constitute EIA development.

Main Issues

10. The main issues are:

- The effects of the proposed developments upon the safety of highway users; and
- The effects of the proposed developments upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

The safety of highway users

11. The appeal sites are located within a rural area which is partly characterised by the area's settlements and building groups being connected by quite narrow and meandering country lanes. There is an absence of footpaths, and the roads are lined by trees, hedgerows and grass verges. Lower Stock Road, which is adjacent to the appeal sites, is one such country lane.
12. The proposed barns would contribute to the appellant's wider cattle breeding enterprise comprising of different hubs. At the hearing, the appellant explained that the purposes of the cow barns the subject of the Appeals B, C and D would be to overwinter stores and that each of the 3 cow barns could house between 40-50 stores. This activity would be supported by the proposed hay barn in Appeal A.
13. Based upon the appellant's statements at the hearing, the most frequently required vehicular movements would entail twice daily visits, a key purpose of which would be to check on the welfare of the stores. Such visits could be undertaken by small vehicles, indeed, the appellant indicated that a gator vehicle would likely be used.
14. It is proposed that the cow barns would be cleaned out with the soiled straw removed every 5-6 weeks utilising a tractor and a 10-tonne tipper with 2-3 trips per barn necessary. It is proposed that the supporting hay barn right beside the cow barns would house the cattle's feed, or the majority of it, whilst rainwater harvesting utilising the proposed tanks would supply them with water. This setup would negate the need for frequent movements to and from the appeal sites to deliver the stores' sustenance. The hay barn would require re-stocking, but the appellant's submissions at the hearing were that this would be concentrated at harvest time, and it would entail approximately 4 trips utilising a tractor with trailer. The likes of a telehandler would be necessary to move the hay within the appeal sites, but the appellant asserts that this could be kept on site and that there would be no need for it to come and go from a location offsite.
15. Since the cow barns would be used for overwintering, the stores would arrive around October time and likely depart between February and April. The appellant set out at the hearing that the stores' transportation to the cow barns would be his responsibility, undertaken utilising his tractor and trailer which has a capacity of

around 6 cattle. Working on the basis of 40-50 stores per cow barn this would mean around 7 to 9 arrival trips per barn.

16. Once winter has passed, the process of stores departing the barns would differ as other farmers/future owners would collect them. The number of stores these farmers would collect would vary, as would the vehicles which would be used to do so. Therefore, it seems to me that the departure of the stores at the end of winter would be prone to more unpredictability.
17. Despite the submissions made to me, both in writing, and at the hearing, which challenge the appellant's assertions, I have no firm basis on which to conclude that his explanations of the operations which would take place at the appeal sites are inaccurate. Neither do I have evidence before me which compellingly indicates to me that relevant agricultural and livestock welfare regulations, codes or best practices would demand alternative management practices to those which the appellant intends to deploy. In turn, I cannot conclude that the key vehicle movements which would be undertaken to and from the appeal sites would differ to any significant extent from those I have set out above.
18. Evidence before me on precisely how the construction phase of the development would be managed is quite limited. Doubtless, trips by some large delivery vehicles would be necessary at times in the process. However, the movements associated with the construction phase of the development would be quite short-lived and, through the imposition of conditions, the likes of parking and unloading could be controlled and managed.
19. The narrow nature of Lower Stock Road, and of other local roads, means that when the likes of the tractor and trailer or any larger construction vehicles visit the site, there would be times when drivers would be required to perform manoeuvres such as reversing movements to enable the passage of vehicles. They are limited, but there are some passing places to assist with this. There would also be the potential for some passage conflicts to arise with other highway users such as pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. The conflicts between the various highway users which would arise would result in inconveniences, and it would be important that care be exerted.
20. However, overall, whilst some of the vehicular movements which would be associated with the proposed developments remain difficult to precisely predict, on the basis of all that is before me, I find the number of vehicle movements necessary in association with the proposed developments would be quite low. It will already be an established characteristic of the area that some large vehicles navigate the area's country lanes. The proposal would add to this, but it would not do so to an extent that would be disproportionate. I cannot rule out some vehicles clipping oversailing branches along Lower Stock Road or other country lanes. However, again, the proposal would not disproportionately add to this occurrence taking place on the local road network.
21. The access point to Lower Stock Road is already in place. Its surface currently comprises of some loose materials which, for the egress of larger vehicles onto the road, would be an unsatisfactory arrangement. However, through the imposition of conditions, a surface treatment improvement could be agreed and implemented to provide a solution. I have no substantive evidence before me which indicates to me that visibility at the site access would be insufficient. Consequently, and

subject to conditions, the access point itself would be safe and suitable to serve the developments proposed.

22. I have no reason to conclude that the level of traffic arising from the proposals would result in undue wear on road surfaces or that the local roads would not be acceptably maintained.
23. Concerns have been expressed to me in relation to the effects of the proposal upon children travelling to local schools. Given the magnitude of the highway movements I have described, the access arrangements and, since I have no reason to conclude that there are safety issues with local junctions, I have no firm basis on which to conclude children would be affected particularly or disproportionately.
24. Factoring all these matters together, I find that the proposed developments would result in no quantum or nature of vehicle movements which would give rise to conditions which would be unacceptably prejudicial to highway safety nor that would result in any severe effects upon the road network. Therefore, the effects of the proposed developments upon the safety of all highway users would be acceptable. As a result, the proposals comply with those policies within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seek to ensure that developments are served by safe and suitable accesses, incorporate effective highway mitigation measures as necessary and which set out that development should only be prevented on highway grounds if there would be unacceptable effects on highway safety or severe cumulative impacts on the road network.

Character and appearance

25. There are many mature trees and hedgerows within the local area, and the boundaries of the field within which the developments are proposed similarly benefit from mature landscape features. This means that the views of the proposed barns from some of the nearby public vantage points would be filtered ones. This includes views along stretches of Lower Stock Road and from the public footpaths that run alongside the field's eastern boundary and closely beside Bellcoins. The screening afforded by the trees and hedgerows would be particularly effective when they are in full leaf during the summer months.
26. Furthermore, it is proposed that the developments would be served by additional planting which, in time, would bolster the screening and softening of the barns, and this can be secured by conditions. The clearest views of the barns would be from Lower Stock Road where the access point provides a break in the hedgerow and trees, but this break is quite narrow.
27. The proposed barns would all be aligned towards the field's western boundary and there would be benefits of the layout proposed. The hay barn would be in the foreground in the clearer views from Lower Stock Road and, to some extent, it would mask the cow barns behind it. It also means that a narrower side elevation of the hay barn would address the viewer. Furthermore, the proposed layout avoids the barns being more extensively spread and sprawled out across the otherwise undeveloped field. The incorporation of timber to the barns' elevations is proposed, this is an appropriate material choice which would be sympathetic to the rural surroundings.

28. Sections of Lower Stock Road are designated as protected lane, a non-designated heritage asset. Such lanes are remnants of a network of minor roads and tracks which date from the medieval period. Lower Stock Road's protected sections exhibit historic integrity, diverse characteristics and biodiversity value. Furthermore, the combination of its features such as trees and stretches of watercourse are aesthetically pleasing. The significance of the protected lane as a non-designated heritage asset principally stems from the aesthetic and historic attributes I have set out.
29. No trees or sections of hedgerow within the protected lane are proposed for removal. I have already mentioned that vehicles associated with the proposed developments could clip oversailing tree branches whilst some churn-up of grass verges from vehicle passage is another potential impact on features of the protected lane. However, I have set out in my first main issue that trip generation would be quite low in overall terms. In turn, the occurrences of the protected lane's landscape features being affected would be moderated. Furthermore, since only sections of Lower Stock Road are designated as protected lane, some of the effects of the vehicle movements may well take place in unprotected parts. For these reasons, the overall magnitude of the effects upon the protected lane's features would be modest, and I find that the harm to the non-designated heritage asset would be limited.
30. Although now a single house, Bellcoins was historically a pair of farmworkers cottages. The property is of considerable age, and it exhibits traditional and characterful architecture including a distinctive roofscape. Because of its aesthetic, and the evidence it provides of rural life in the past, it has architectural and historic interest, and it is a non-designated heritage asset. Being set within a rural area and with fields to its surrounds, Bellcoins maintains an association with agricultural land, and this setting contributes to its significance.
31. Even the nearest of the proposed barns would maintain a considerable setback from Lower Stock Road, and, in turn, it would be well separated from Bellcoins. Although the proposal would result in the existing field becoming much more built-up, the agricultural function of the buildings would be congruous with Bellcoins' heritage and its countryside setting. Furthermore, the layout of the barns, their orientation and use of sympathetic materials would further assist with the proposals' assimilation into the heritage asset's setting. Consequently, I find that no harm to Bellcoins as a non-designated heritage asset would result from the proposals.
32. Situated within a rural location, the surroundings to the appeal site are relatively quiet and peaceful, and this contributes to the area's character. The introduction of the proposed developments would not give rise to a level of traffic which would be so marked as to erode the area's rural ambience.
33. It is submitted to me that the proposed developments could be proposed at alternative sites which, it is asserted, would be preferable. However, I have limited information on which sites or why they would be preferable. Furthermore, I must assess the proposed developments on their own merits.
34. Interested parties refer to damage having taken place to landscape features due to the installation of a replacement gate at the site access. However, I have very limited information on the alleged damage, it is not clear to me that planning

permission was required for the works nor is the matter very relevant to the developments which are now proposed. Therefore, this is a matter of very limited weight in my decision.

35. For the reasons I have given, the proposed developments would successfully assimilate into their rural surroundings. I have identified that limited harm would result to Lower Stock Road as protected lane with non-designated heritage asset status. However, the proposed developments would make a valuable contribution to the rural economy, supporting agricultural productivity. Given this, the significance of the heritage asset and the effects upon it, the benefits of the proposals outweigh the harm to the heritage asset.
36. The effects of the proposed developments upon the character and appearance of the area would, therefore, be acceptable. As a result, the proposals comply with Policies DM14, DM23, S1 and S3 of the Chelmsford Local Plan (the LP), all of which I consider to be relevant to this main issue. In summary, and amongst other matters, these Policies require developments to be of a high quality of design and to respect the character and appearance of the areas they would be set within. They also seek to conserve and enhance heritage assets but set out that where harm is identified it may be justified, but it should also be minimised.

Other Matters

37. The appeal sites are not within or adjacent to it, but the Hanningfield Reservoir Site of Special Scientific Interest (the SSSI) is local to the area. Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 imposes a duty to take reasonable steps to further the conservation and enhancement of those features for which a SSSI is designated. The SSSI's main scientific interest lies in its breeding and wintering wildfowl including the duck species of Gadwall, Pochard, Shoveler, Teal, Tufted Duck and Shelduck. The SSSI's chalk sludge lagoon also supports an array of interesting and uncommon plants such as Golden Dock and Sea Aster.
38. Closer to the appeal site than the SSSI is the Sandon Brook, a watercourse which runs nearby to the site including, in areas, alongside Lower Stock Road. It is proposed that the stores be bedded on straw which would be used to absorb their waste. It is proposed that the waste then be removed from the site. In addition, no form of water discharge from the barns to any watercourse is proposed.
39. Measures are therefore proposed to be deployed which would manage the animal waste and any potential for it to enter the Sandon Brook and ultimately the SSSI should there be any hydrological connection with it. Given these factors, I have no reason to conclude that the proposed development would result in harmful effects upon water quality nor, in turn, that the proposal would be likely to result in any damage to the interest features of the SSSI.
40. The Ecological Survey and Assessment for Land off Lower Stock Road West Hanningfield report (the Ecological Survey) accompanies the proposals. I have no compelling evidence before me which indicates to me that the Ecological Survey misrepresents or underplays the ecological value of the sites or the implications of the proposals upon habitats and species.
41. As the applications for planning permission were made before 2 April 2024, the statutory biodiversity net gain framework does not apply. Nevertheless, Policy

DM16 of the LP seeks to ensure that development proposals enhance habitats and achieve a biodiversity net gain where possible. The submitted Ecological Survey recommends some biodiversity enhancements, including the provision of bat boxes and beehives. These measures can be secured by condition and ensure compliance with Policy DM16.

42. I have been provided with no substantive evidence that the proposals should have been supported by a flood risk assessment nor that the proposals would be the subject of, or cause, flood risks or drainage issues.
43. A quite considerable separation between each of the barns proposed and the nearest houses and bungalows would be maintained, this would particularly be the case with the cow barns proposed to house the stores. Given this separation, the orientation of the barns and the cleaning out processes proposed, I find that no unacceptable effects upon the living conditions of local residents by reason of the emission of noise or odours would result. In addition, I also have no firm basis on which to conclude that the proposed developments would attract vermin or result in forms of infestation.
44. Public representations refer to the contribution that the proposals would have upon climate change, partly in respect of the role of cattle farming and beef consumption and greenhouse gas emissions, but also in relation to the use of construction materials like concrete. However, on the countervailing side of this, the appellant refers to the benefits of greater self-sufficiency in respect of cattle farming and that, in making a contribution to the appellant's wider cattle enterprise, the proposals would assist in reducing reliance upon foreign imports. In the round, the evidence before me does not demonstrate to me that the proposed developments would make a contribution to detrimental climate change related effects.
45. A local resident has health conditions, and I am mindful that they would be likely to be particularly sensitive to changes in air quality and dust emissions. I am also mindful that children may live in the vicinity of the site and may also travel along the same roads as traffic associated with the proposed developments, on route to school for example. Given the quantum of highway movements which would arise from the proposals no detrimental effects upon air quality would result. Furthermore, conditions can be imposed which would require measures to be deployed to limit the effects of dust during the construction phase of the development.
46. The proposed buildings are for agricultural purposes. Consequently, they would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and their effects upon the openness of the Green Belt need not be considered.
47. The Three Compasses Public House, Bay Tree House, The Old Bakery, Gascoignes Farmhouse, Slough House Farmhouse and Kents Farm Cottage are each Grade II listed buildings situated either in the countryside in the surrounds of the appeal sites or on the fringes of West Hanningfield. The significance of these listed buildings is largely derived from their architectural interest due to their traditional and distinctive aesthetic. They also have historic significance as they provide evidence of rural life and rural development in the area. Due to the separation distances involved and the intervening landscaping the proposed developments would be screened from each of the listed buildings and they would not infringe upon their settings. I have no reason to conclude that any passing

traffic associated with the proposed developments would affect the listed buildings in any way. As a result, the significance of the listed buildings would not be harmed by the developments proposed and their features, interest and settings would be preserved.

Conditions

48. I have been provided with a schedule of suggested conditions. To ensure compliance with the advice on conditions contained within the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and, informed by the discussions held at the hearing, I have amended the schedule.
49. Condition 1 sets out the standard time limitation. Condition 2 is necessary to ensure that each development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the reason of certainty.
50. Conditions 3, 8 and 9 are each necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, including to precisely determine the proposed planting and to protect existing landscape features. I have also imposed a condition (10) on each permission regarding the rainwater harvesting tanks in the interests of certainty over their precise design and in the interests of protecting trees adjacent to them.
51. The plans do not depict lighting and, at the hearing, the appellant indicated that temporary light sources would most likely be utilised as required. However, in the absence of certainty on this, and should more permanent lighting be necessary, I have imposed condition 7 in the interests of the living conditions of local residents, the character and appearance of the area, and biodiversity.
52. Condition 12 is necessary in order to manage the construction phase of the developments in the interests of the living conditions of local residents. In the interests of highway safety, I have imposed conditions 11 and 13.
53. The ecology related conditions 4, 5 and 6 are each necessary to protect species, ensure biodiversity enhancements and safeguard the ecological value of a nearby local wildlife site.
54. The planning permissions define what developments are permitted. Therefore, any conditions setting out the purposes of the buildings are unnecessary. Other conditions have been suggested to me, including in relation to the removal of permitted development rights, the routing and use of certain vehicles, limits on store stock density and waste management. Both the Framework and content within the PPG are clear that planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they would satisfy all 6 tests for their imposition. From what is before me, I am not persuaded that the conditions relating to the matters raised would meet all of these tests and, consequently, I have not imposed them.

Conclusion

55. The proposed developments accord with the development plan taken as a whole. In my main issues and other matters, I have referred to the proposed developments' effects upon highway safety and living conditions including in respect to children and an individual with health conditions.

56. Given this, I have had regard to the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA) and the Public Sector Duty (PSED) under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. In summary, Article 8 of the HRA establishes a right for respect for private and family life whilst Article 1 of the First Protocol entitles persons to the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions. The PSED sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and access, and foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those who do not share it. Both disability and age are protected characteristics to which the PSED applies.
57. In allowing the appeals, the proposed developments would give rise to some increased vehicular movements and effects upon living conditions. However, these effects would not be significant, nor unduly harmful. Therefore, any interferences with the aforementioned rights and protected characteristics would be limited in these appeals and, since the proposals accord with the development plan, they would be for legitimate and well-established planning policy reasons. Consequently, it is appropriate and proportionate to allow the appeals.
58. Therefore, these matters, and the other relevant material considerations in these appeals, do not indicate that decisions other than ones in accordance with the development plan should be made. Consequently, I conclude that the appeals should be allowed subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

H Jones

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

Appeal A

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings:
23/30/17
23/30/19
23/30/20

Appeal B

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings:
23/30/21
23/30/23
23/30/24

Appeal C

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings:
23/30/25
23/30/27
23/30/28

Appeal D

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings:
23/30/29
23/30/31
23/30/32

Appeals A, B, C and D

3. The building hereby approved shall not be erected/constructed above ground level until details of the materials to be used in its construction/erection have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
4. Any trenches dug as part of the construction phase of the development hereby approved shall be covered overnight or, if they are to be left uncovered, sloping planks shall be positioned within them for the overnight period.
5. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until a scheme of biodiversity enhancements has been carried out in accordance with details which shall have first been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall provide for:
 - i) The provision of a Schwegler 2F bat box on the building;
 - ii) The provision of four bird nesting boxes to be sited on trees;
 - iii) The provision of a hedgehog nesting box to be sited at the base of a hedge; and
 - iv) The provision of two solitary bee hives
6. No development shall take place until a Biodiversity Method Statement for Local Wildlife Site Ch75 Blythhedges Meadow has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Method Statement shall include the following:
 - i) purpose and objectives for the proposed method statement works;
 - ii) detailed design(s) and/or working method(s) necessary to achieve stated objectives (including, where relevant, type and source of materials to be used);
 - iii) extent and location of proposed works shown on appropriately scaled plans;
 - iv) a timetable for implementation, demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of construction;
 - v) persons responsible for implementing the works;
 - vi) initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant); and
 - vii) the detail of the disposal of any wastes arising from works.

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained as such thereafter.

7. No lighting to serve the development hereby approved shall be installed/erected until details of the lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details to be provided shall include:
 - i) The design and location of all lighting to be installed/erected;
 - ii) Details of the intensity of all lighting to be installed/erected; and

- iii) Details of any motion sensitive or timing control features to be deployed

All lighting installed/erected shall accord with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained as such.

8. All development works and works to trees and hedgerows shall accord with the details within the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement TPSQU0031 and its appendices (the AIA). No site clearance, preparatory work, construction or any other development shall take place until all trees and hedgerows scheduled for retention, as detailed within the AIA, have been protected in accordance with the details contained within the AIA. The protection measures shall be retained until the completion of the development works.
9. No development above ground level shall take place until details of a scheme of landscaping has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme shall include:
- i) details of proposed planting including the species, plant supply sizes, planting locations and plant numbers/densities;
 - ii) detail of any hard surfacing materials aside from the access and any turning facility; and
 - iii) Management and maintenance details which shall set out how the landscaping shall be maintained and managed for a period of five years from the completion of the development.

The scheme of landscaping shall be carried out in the accordance with the approved details before the development is brought into use. 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.

10. Prior to the installation of the rainwater harvesting tank, details of its location, size and design shall have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
11. No development shall take place until details of the surface treatment of the vehicular access within 15 metres of the highway boundary has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The vehicular access shall be carried out before construction of the remains of the approved development commences and in accordance with the approved details.
12. No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:

- i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- iv) wheel washing facilities;
- v) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction; and
- vi) the delivery and construction working hours.

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

13. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied/brought into use until a vehicle turning facility has been carried out which would ensure all vehicles serving the development can egress onto Lower Stock Road in forward gear in accordance with details which shall have first been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The vehicle turning facility shall thereafter be retained for these purposes.

End of Schedule

Appearances

For the appellant:

Gary Sharp	Appellant
Steven Hopkins	Managing Partner and Solicitor at Holmes & Hills LLP
Millie Cook	Solicitor at Holmes & Hills LLP

For the local planning authority:

Alison Hutchinson	Hutchinsons Planning & Development
Matthew Perry	Principal Planning Officer
Hayley Mason	Planning Officer
Councillor Stephen Hall	Elected Member from Planning Committee

Interested Persons (local residents):

Mark Wilkes

Sue Wilkes

Elizabeth Knill

Howard Knill

Anthony Del Pizzo

Sarah Howson

Jackie Dowles

Adam Murray

Paul Galley

Virginia Henderson

Interested Persons (other):

Paul Morris

Documents submitted at the hearing

From the appellant:

1. Google Earth Image depicting farm hubs and lanes
2. Conveyance document and accompanying email
3. Beggar Hill Appeal Decisions APP/H1515/W/24/3347695,
APP/H1515/W/24/3347697, APP/H1515/W/24/3347699 and
APP/H1515/W/24/3347702

From the Council:

1. Plan Titled “Lower Stock Road Protected Lane Sections”