



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 May 2025

by Jane Smith MA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/W/24/3356483

Field West of Beachlands Nursery, Newells Lane, West Ashling, West Sussex PO18 8DD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr C Jones against the decision of Chichester District Council.
 - The application Ref is FU/24/00038/FUL.
 - The development proposed is use of land for the stationing of a caravan for residential purposes, together with the formation of hardstanding and associated landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for use of land for the stationing of a caravan for residential purposes, together with the formation of hardstanding and associated landscaping at Field West of Beachlands Nursery, Newells Lane, West Ashling, West Sussex PO18 8DD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref FU/24/00038/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. Although the description of the proposed development refers to 'stationing of a caravan', the plans make provision for parking of a touring caravan alongside the proposed single mobile home. The proposed layout is consistent with the formation of one gypsy and traveller pitch. The Council considered the application on that basis, and so have I.
3. The emerging Chichester Local Plan 2021-2039 (emerging CLP) has been submitted for examination in public and the examination is ongoing. Main Modifications have been proposed to emerging Policies H13 and NE7, which were referred to in the reasons for refusal. Both parties have had the opportunity to comment on any implications of the Main Modifications for their cases and I have taken comments received into account. Where no modifications are proposed to the draft wording, I have given these emerging policies significant weight, on the basis that the plan has reached an advanced stage and it appears unlikely that further changes will be made to the wording of those particular policies.
4. A Unilateral Undertaking (UU) dated 15 October 2024 was provided with the appeal, making provision for a payment of a financial contribution towards access mitigation measures in respect of the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area. While the appeal was in progress, the Council highlighted that the required fee had increased as a result of an annual review. Furthermore, the

October 2024 UU was not effectively drafted, as it lacked a plan identifying the land and the signatory's interest in the site was not explained.

5. To address those points, a new UU dated 16 April 2025 was provided for the increased amount, including a plan of the site and signed by the appellant. I have taken the April 2025 UU into account, along with evidence from both parties that a financial contribution of the correct, increased amount has in fact already been made to the Council.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the proposed development would dominate the nearest settled community, with reference to the effect on the character and appearance of the area and the cumulative number of gypsy and traveller pitches in the locality.

Reasons

Appeal Site and Existing Sites

7. The appeal site is a long, narrow parcel of land which currently contains a timber stable building at the far end. It is otherwise largely hard surfaced with fenced boundaries. At the time of my site visit there were some parked vehicles on the site, including a touring caravan, but the stable was the only existing building.
8. The site runs along the northern boundary of the Field West of Beachlands Nursery (FWBN) gypsy and traveller site, where the Council's evidence indicates that 16 pitches have been permitted in total. That site is laid out with a series of internal access roads and plots defined by boundary fences, containing a variety of mobile homes and lodges. There are also two authorised gypsy and traveller sites on adjoining land, identified in the Council's Statement of Case as Tower View and Scant Road East. Although these three existing sites back on to each other, each has its own entrance, off different roads, and they are readily understood as separate sites. The appeal site relates most closely to the FWBN site, with which it shares an entrance.
9. Directly to the north of the appeal site is an open field. At the time of my site visit, there were several mobile homes and caravans in the field, outside the boundaries of the appeal site or any of the authorised sites identified in the evidence. These were not on defined plots and the caravans appeared to be parked, rather than installed with any degree of permanence. While I have noted their presence, the proposal before me is for a single pitch within the boundaries of the appeal site and does not include the adjacent land. I have considered it on that basis.
10. In combination, the Council states that there are 60 permitted pitches on the three authorised sites. Representations from Funtington Parish Council place the number of pitches in the locality at 74, including unauthorised pitches. The Parish Council also alludes to a further potential 10 pitches and the emerging Local Plan includes provision for limited intensification of two of the existing sites, although not the FWBN site. Notwithstanding the conflicting evidence about the precise number of existing pitches, it is clear that the combined scale of the three adjoining sites is already substantial and that the emerging Local Plan also anticipates some limited further intensification.

Policy Context

11. In the adopted Chichester Local Plan 2014-2029 (adopted CLP), Policy 36 includes criteria for the determination of planning applications for additional gypsy and traveller pitches. They include that in rural and semi-rural areas sites should not dominate the nearest settled or gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople communities. Policy H of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) similarly includes a requirement for decision-makers to ensure that sites in rural areas respect the scale of, and do not dominate, the nearest settled community, and avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure.
12. The emerging CLP includes a criteria-based policy (Policy H13) for new gypsy and traveller sites or the intensification/expansion of existing sites. The first criterion requires in summary that the site and proposal is well-related and appropriate in scale to the nearest settled community, having regard to factors such as the scale and form of existing gypsy and traveller sites in the area. It must be demonstrated that the number of pitches proposed, considered in relation to both the individual proposal, and the cumulative impact in relation to other existing encampments in the area, will not dominate the local settled community. Although the wording refers to 'encampments', I have interpreted that as also encompassing existing authorised, permanent gypsy and traveller sites in the area.
13. Emerging policy H13 also requires that proposals avoid unacceptable harm to the character of the local area, although adopted Policy 36 does not include a similar requirement outside areas designated for their landscape, heritage or nature conservation value. In the PPTS, Policy H includes that weight should be given to the effective use of previously developed land and that sites should be well planned or soft landscaped in such a way as to positively enhance the environment and increase its openness.
14. Neither the adopted CLP nor the PPTS defines how dominance should be assessed. Although the emerging CLP goes into slightly more detail about the factors to be considered, it also does not define 'dominate' or provide any objective parameters such as numerical or percentage levels of development in comparison with the nearest settled community.
15. The Council's evidence is focussed largely on the visual impact of the existing and proposed gypsy and traveller development, in relation to the more sporadic pattern of bricks and mortar housing. Representations from the Parish Council, supported by others, also raise issues relating to pressure on local infrastructure and the reaction of the settled population towards a cumulative and ongoing growth in the scale and number of gypsy and traveller sites in the locality. Based on the issues raised by the Council and interested parties, I have considered whether the proposed development would be unduly dominant in terms of the character and appearance of the area, taking account of its relationship with the existing sites, as well as whether any harm would arise from the cumulative scale of the gypsy and traveller population, in relation to the scale of the settled community in West Ashling, including pressure on village services and facilities.

Character and Appearance

16. Although West Ashling has a clearly defined centre around 1km away, the village has a dispersed character, with housing radiating sporadically outwards along the rural lanes. There is a cluster of houses near the junction of West Ashling Road

and Newells Lane, close to the appeal site, as well as individual properties strung out more loosely along both roads. Although the appeal site is well outside the village centre, it is close to the outlying housing, as are the three neighbouring gypsy and traveller sites. There are other nearby villages as well as some much larger settlements slightly further away, but West Ashling can readily be identified as the nearest settled community to the site.

17. The three existing gypsy and traveller sites are densely developed, in contrast with the much more sporadic distribution of the bricks and mortar housing. Equally, that means that they occupy a relatively compact and well-defined area, enclosed by Newells Lane, Scant Road East and West Ashling Road. In terms of geographical extent, the land occupied by the sites is considerably smaller than that occupied by the settled community of West Ashling, including the outlying housing.
18. Around the sites, there are areas of undeveloped land, as well as sporadic housing, hedgerows and trees along the roadside. Mobile homes can be seen from the highway, but they are generally fairly well screened. In a few places, there are some prominent boundary features, including walls, gates and fences. The metal gate into the appeal site is an example, although it is set well back and only briefly visible as one travels along Newells Lane. Generally, the sites are not widely conspicuous, and they do not visually dominate the area, being seen in the context of the houses and other buildings which also front the rural roads.
19. While the character of the area occupied by the gypsy and traveller sites has clearly changed since it was open fields, the sites are now an established feature. Furthermore, the appeal site already contains built development in the form of a fairly substantial stable building and hardstanding. The building was approved over 10 years ago, along with associated hardstanding, access track and parking areas. The evidence indicates that the amount of hardstanding has increased in the interim. Nevertheless, the site is not an open field and has not been for some time, and it was neat and tidy when I visited, with no visible rubbish or waste materials.
20. The plans propose siting the mobile home and space for parking of a touring caravan and other vehicles directly in front of the stables. Therefore, while they would be visible along the site access, they would be seen against the background of the existing building, as well as the adjacent authorised pitches to one side. The site as a whole is orientated parallel to the boundary of the FWBN site, and there is little sense of encroachment into the adjacent field. Soft landscaping is proposed, including new hedging and post and rail boundary fences, which would be an enhancement over the existing fencing. The amount of hardstanding would also be reduced.
21. Taking account of the specific layout of the site, including the existing building, and the proposed enhancements, this single pitch would not be intrusive in itself. Nor would it cause the combined sites to be any more visually dominant than they are at present.
22. Although an earlier appeal decision (the May 2023 appeal)¹ did refer to some moderate harm to the character and appearance of the area, that was in the context of several proposed pitches being considered in combination. The Inspector also acknowledged that the appearance of the site could be improved by landscaping, as is now proposed. In addition, since those appeals were dismissed,

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/W/20/3259313

additional pitches have been approved and implemented on the wider site, which has changed the surrounding context. I have therefore reached a view based on the current circumstances on site and the evidence before me.

Cumulative Number of Pitches

23. As recognised above, the total extent of the existing sites is significant, in the context of a village which is reported as having under 200 households in bricks and mortar dwellings. I am mindful of the Inspector's conclusion in the May 2023 appeal that the appeal site would not dominate the nearest settled community, even when it was considered in combination with several other pitches. However, I recognise that additional pitches have been approved since then. Furthermore, the emerging CLP is now further advanced, so Policy H13 carries greater weight, and that policy more explicitly requires that cumulative effects are considered.
24. While there are limited services and facilities in West Ashling, no specific evidence has been advanced that they are unable to cope with the local population, including those living on the various gypsy and traveller sites. While I have noted that there is a local school, which could be particularly affected by growth in the number of young families, the views of the Education Authority were sought at the time of the application, and they confirmed that they had no comment.
25. There are other villages nearby and, as was mentioned in the Officer Report, occupiers of the gypsy and traveller sites also have ready access to the major road network and larger settlements, such as Southbourne, which provides a greater range of services. While those settlements could only realistically be reached by car, the driving distances are readily manageable, and the nomadic lifestyle adopted by the gypsy and traveller community means that future occupiers are highly likely to have access to private vehicles. As such, any additional pressure on local infrastructure is likely to be spread across a range of services and facilities and not solely focussed on the limited services in West Ashling.
26. It is apparent from the representations that there is tension between the travelling and settled communities in West Ashling. I also recognise that a point could arise where small, incremental developments cause a tipping point to be reached, such that the cumulative scale of gypsy and traveller sites development more objectively dominates the settled community. However, the introduction of this single pitch does not clearly trigger any such tipping point. Nor, given the well-defined nature of the plot, the existing built development on it, and the proposed enhancements, would this proposal establish any precedent for further expansion onto undeveloped land which does not share those characteristics.

Conclusion on Main Issue

27. For the reasons given above, having had regard to the effect on the character and appearance of the area and the cumulative number of gypsy and traveller pitches in the locality, I conclude that the scale of the proposed development would not dominate the nearest settled community. As such, it would not conflict with relevant requirements in Policy 36 of the adopted CLP, Policy H13 of the emerging CLP or Policy H of the PPTS, as summarised above.

Habitats Regulations Assessment

28. In response to consultation on the application, Natural England (NE) highlighted that, without appropriate mitigation, the application would have an adverse effect on the integrity of Chichester Harbour European Sites, identifying specifically the Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area (SPA) and Stodmarsh Ramsar Site. However, they raised no objection to the proposed development subject to appropriate mitigation being secured. Their response also identified the required mitigation.
29. The Council has confirmed that the UU addresses the second reason for refusal, which related to mitigation of the effect of recreational disturbance on the European Sites. The application also includes proposed mitigation measures in relation to nutrient neutrality. Nevertheless, in accordance with the Habitats Regulations², it is incumbent on me as Competent Authority to undertake an appropriate assessment of the implications of the proposed development for the European Sites in view of their conservation objectives.

Recreational Disturbance

30. The appeal site falls within the Zone of Influence (Zol) for the Chichester and Langstone Harbour SPA. This is among several European sites along the Solent coastline which provide over-wintering and breeding habitat for protected bird species. Those protected species are vulnerable to disturbance from human recreational activity, which can affect their success in feeding, migration and breeding, leading to population decline. Increased disturbance as a result of recreational activity by occupiers of new residential development within the Zol is a factor. Consequently, the proposed development would, in combination with other development, have a likely significant effect on the European Site.
31. As part of the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership, which also includes NE, the Council has developed a strategic approach to mitigation of likely significant effects from recreational disturbance. Known as the Bird Aware Scheme³, mitigation measures are funded and implemented across the affected sites, including habitat management, education and monitoring. Developers can make a financial contribution based on the number of dwellings proposed, towards the strategic mitigation scheme, and the required contribution for gypsy and traveller development is specified.
32. The UU dated 16 April 2025 imposes an obligation on the developer to make a financial contribution into the Bird Aware Scheme, at the amount currently applicable. Both parties have confirmed that this payment has already been made to the Council. Based on the evidence before me, I am satisfied that suitable measures are in place to ensure that the funds are used to mitigate likely significant effects arising from the proposal, in combination with other development. That is consistent with NE's advice on the application.
33. That being the case, I conclude that the proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of the relevant European Sites, as a result of recreational disturbance. Nor would there be any conflict with relevant requirements in Policy 50 of the adopted CLP or Policy NE7 of the emerging CLP, both of which include requirements for

² The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

³ Bird Aware Solent Revised Strategy September 2024

avoidance and mitigation of recreational disturbance in the Chichester and Langstone Harbour SPA.

Nutrient Neutrality

34. The Chichester Harbour European Sites encompass a range of coastal habitats which support protected bird, plant and animal species. The protected habitats have been identified as being vulnerable to harm arising from algal growth, as a result of nitrates being discharged into the protected waters. Indeed, the emerging Local Plan highlights evidence that intertidal parts of the Chichester Harbour Site of Special Scientific Interest are now in 'Unfavourable – declining' condition. Consequently, the additional wastewater discharge from small scale residential development in the Solent catchment can have a likely significant effect on the European Sites, in combination with other development.
35. A Nutrient Neutrality Statement⁴ (NNS) was provided with the application, detailing the proposed measures to mitigate the likely significant effect on European Sites. In particular, the proposed development would include installation of a package treatment plant (PTP) specified in the NNS, details of which have been reviewed by the Council in consultation with NE. Both parties have confirmed that mitigation of likely significant effects could be achieved by means of installation of the specified PTP, or one of an equivalent or higher performance. A management and monitoring regime would also be required, as set out in the NNS.
36. Since the mitigation measures would not rely on any land outside the site, they can be secured by conditions requiring installation and maintenance of the PTP. That is in line with the advice provided by NE, and the relevant conditions are imposed below. There is no objective evidence that the required maintenance regime would not be followed, and the conditions would enable that to be enforced, if necessary. The Environment Agency raised no objection to the proposed application, in which the use of a PTP was specified, although relevant permits would be required before the development could go ahead.
37. For the above reasons, subject to the measures described above, which can be adequately secured, I am satisfied that the proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of the relevant European Sites, either alone or in combination with other development.

Other Matters

38. The Council has confirmed that there is a clearly identified need for additional Gypsy and Traveller pitches within the District as a whole, based on its Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (2022). Furthermore, the PPTS makes clear that decision-makers should determine applications for sites from any travellers and not just those with local connections.
39. The appeal relates to a single pitch on a site which would provide sufficient space for children to play, and the availability of play space in the wider site is not a matter which is before me. Suitable provision is proposed for refuse and recycling.
40. The Inspector's comments about sustainable travel in the Newpound case⁵ related to a different location. Although the rural lanes near the appeal site lack streetlights

⁴ Southwest Environmental Limited Nutrient Neutrality Statement S23-002/NNS dated December 2023

⁵ Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/W/22/3303112

and pavements, there is a well-established pattern of development along those lanes, including the adjacent pitches on the wider site. The occupiers would have reasonable access to the limited services in the village, much like members of the settled community, and they would also be able to travel to additional services and facilities in the wider area. The access already serves several other pitches, and there is no substantive evidence that there would be any unacceptable effect on highway safety.

41. Foul drainage measures would be implemented, as detailed above. While I have noted concerns raised about the effect of hardstandings on surface water run-off towards other properties, the proposal would reduce, not increase, the amount of hardstanding on the site. Suitable surface water drainage measures are proposed in principle, with details and implementation to be secured by the conditions below.

Conditions

42. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have considered against advice in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. As a result, I have amended some of them for consistency and clarity and have omitted others.
43. I have imposed a condition requiring compliance with the approved plans, in the interests of clarity. To avoid ambiguity, I have also imposed a condition specifying the number of caravans which may be stationed on the site, with the limit of two caravans being consistent with the details on the Location and Block Plan and the proposed formation of a single gypsy and traveller pitch.
44. Given that the site is outside any defined settlement boundary but has been judged acceptable in the context of development plan policies relating to expansion and intensification of existing gypsy and traveller sites, a condition restricting occupation to persons meeting the definition of gypsies and travellers in the PPTS is both necessary and relevant to the development permitted. Restrictions on commercial activity and vehicles are imposed in the interests of living conditions for occupiers of nearby properties.
45. I have imposed a condition to secure suitable drainage, for the reasons given above. Approval of these details prior to commencement is necessary, to ensure that any initial ground works are compatible with the proposed and approved drainage measures and the appellant has agreed to this pre-commencement condition. Conditions are also necessary to secure nutrient neutrality by means of the measures in the NNS, including installation of the PTP and its ongoing maintenance. However, I have truncated the suggested wording of condition 8, to avoid duplication of matters which are adequately covered in condition 9.
46. Given the nature of the development, opportunities to incorporate energy efficiency measures may be limited. Nevertheless, Policy 40 of the adopted CLP includes a requirement that energy from renewable resources be considered for all new dwellings and does not limit that requirement to new buildings. I have therefore imposed the suggested condition requiring the approval and implementation of such measures, while recognising that those would need to be tailored to the particular development proposed.
47. I have imposed conditions requiring implementation of the proposed parking, access, turning, cycle parking, electric vehicle charging and refuse arrangements,

in the interests of a well-functioning development, highway safety and access to a range of transport options.

48. Conditions to secure implementation of the proposed landscaping and boundary treatments are necessary to secure the proposed enhancements, in line with the requirements in the PPTS. While I recognise that the PPG advises that permitted development rights should only be restricted in exceptional circumstances, in this case it is necessary to limit the scope for introducing new fences, gates and walls, which could negate the enhancements achieved by means of the soft landscaping works. A restriction on additional hardstanding is necessary for similar reasons, but there is no need to refer to permitted development rights for hardstandings, since they are not of any clear relevance to the proposed development.
49. I have imposed a condition requiring that the construction methodology and ecological mitigation measures in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal are observed, to safeguard existing wildlife and habitat. However, I have not included the Council's additional condition specifying similar protective measures, to avoid duplication. Since a residential use is proposed, a blanket restriction on any external lighting would be unreasonable. However, I have imposed a condition requiring approval of any such lighting, to mitigate the potential impact on wildlife.
50. In response to the Council's recommendations, I have imposed a requirement for at least one hedgehog nesting box. The PEA identifies suitable hedgehog habitat behind the stable building, and this would help to mitigate any adverse effect on this species. However, I have not included a requirement for bird or bat boxes, since it is not at all clear that there is a suitable place for them to be installed, or that they would be necessary or effective, based on the evidence in the PEA. I have also not included a requirement for a buffer zone around existing hedgerows, since the only apparently relevant native hedgerow is next to the site access, which is already in regular use and where a 5m buffer zone could not realistically be implemented.

Conclusion

51. The proposed development would accord with the development plan and no material considerations indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed.

Jane Smith

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the plans 19060511_1 Rev 2 and 19060511_2.

- 3) No more than 2 caravans shall be stationed on the site at any time, of which no more than 1 shall be a static caravan. All such caravans stationed on the site shall comply with the definition of caravans as set out in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 as amended.
- 4) The site shall be occupied only by persons meeting the definition of gypsies and travellers as defined in Annex 1 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, updated December 2024 (or its equivalent future replacement national policy).
- 5) No commercial activities shall take place on the site at any time, including the storage of materials, and no burning of any item or waste materials of any kind may take place at the site.
- 6) 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 it shall not exceed 3.5 tonnes in weight.
- 7) No development shall commence until details of the proposed overall site wide surface water drainage scheme (SuDS) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The design shall follow the hierarchy of preference for different types of surface water drainage disposal systems, as set out in Approved Document H of the Building Regulations and the SuDS manual produced by CIRIA. The details shall include a section drawing of the proposed permeable surfacing with suitable permeable sub-base (MOT Type 3 or similar) of sufficient depth below. The site shall not be occupied until the complete surface water drainage system has been implemented in accordance with the approved surface water drainage scheme.
- 8) No development shall commence on the package treatment plant until a scheme for the maintenance and management of the system has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 9) The development hereby permitted shall not first be brought into use until the Nitrogen Mitigation Measures set out within the Nutrient Neutrality Statement (S23-002/NNS) (December 2023) have been carried out. That is to say the Solido Smart Treatment Plant shall have been installed to an operational manner for the purposes of adequately treating the wastewater from the development. Thereafter, the treatment plant shall be retained, maintained, and managed in accordance with the scheme for the maintenance and management of the package treatment plant, as submitted and approved pursuant to Condition 8 of this permission.
- 10) Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, a strategy outlining details of how renewable technologies will be incorporated into the proposal has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This strategy shall reflect the objectives in Policy 40 of the Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029. The approved strategy shall be implemented as approved.
- 11) Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, the access/turning area shall be provided on-site in accordance with the approved plans for Fire Tender Access. Thereafter, the access/turning area shall be maintained in perpetuity.

- 12) Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, the vehicle parking and turning spaces shall be provided in accordance with the approved plan. These spaces shall thereafter be retained for their designated use.
- 13) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be first occupied until the covered and secure cycle parking spaces have been provided in accordance with the approved plans (19060511_1 REV.2). Thereafter the cycle parking shall be retained for that purpose in perpetuity.
- 14) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the refuse and recycling storage facilities have been provided in accordance with the approved plan (19060511_1 REV.2). Thereafter the refuse and recycling storage facilities shall be maintained as approved and kept available for their approved purposes in perpetuity.
- 15) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be first occupied until 1.no Electric Vehicle (EV) charging point has been provided in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the Electric Vehicle Charging point shall be retained for the lifetime of the development.
- 16) The development hereby permitted shall not be first brought into use until on-site hard and soft landscaping works have been implemented in accordance with plans and details that shall first have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include plans showing details of the hard surfacing material, a planting plan and schedule of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities, and details of the proposed infrastructure and regime for watering and ongoing maintenance. Any trees or plants which, are removed, die, or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved.
- 17) Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, the boundary treatment shall be carried out in accordance with approved plans 19060511_1 REV.2 & 19060511_2. Thereafter the boundary treatments shall be maintained as approved in perpetuity.
- 18) Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order, 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order) no walls, fences or other means of enclosure (including bunding) other than those shown on the approved plans shall be erected within or on the boundary of the site unless details of their height, materials and location shall have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority via a subsequent planning application.
- 19) No area of hardstanding other than those shown on the approved plans or those approved under Condition 16 shall be laid on the site unless details of their materials and location shall have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 20) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the Preliminary Ecological Assessment 26 February 2024 prepared by Sylvatica Ecology Ltd and the methodology and mitigation recommendations they detail.

- 21) Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, at least one hedgehog nesting box shall be provided within the site and thereafter retained.
- 22) No external illumination shall be provided on the site other than in accordance with a scheme that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the proposed location, level of luminance and design of the light including measures proposed to reduce light spill. Thereafter the lighting shall be maintained in accordance with the approved lighting scheme in perpetuity.

END