



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 19 August 2025

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

by R Major BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/25/3360286

Allerthorpe Golf and Country Park, Melbourne Road, Allerthorpe, East Riding of Yorkshire YO42 4RL

- 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 Allerthorpe Golf and Country Park Limited against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00390/PLF.
 - The development proposed is change of use of land for the siting of 12 additional static caravans with landscaping and infrastructure works in connection with the existing caravan site.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use of land for the siting of 12 additional static caravans with landscaping and infrastructure works in connection with the existing caravan site at Allerthorpe Golf and Country Park, Melbourne Road, Allerthorpe, East Riding of Yorkshire YO42 4RL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00390/PLF, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Allerthorpe Golf and Country Park Limited against East Riding of Yorkshire Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. At the Hearing it was agreed by the main parties that the site address and the description of development on the Council's decision notice were both more accurate than those within the submitted planning application form. The appellant therefore confirmed they had no objection to the site address and the description of development from the Council's decision notice being used in any decision. Consequently, the site address and the description of development in the above banner heading and my formal decision are taken from the Council's decision notice.
4. Both the main parties agreed at the Hearing that the appeal proposal would not affect the setting of the Grade II Listed Building at Low Farmhouse and would not affect the significance of the Allerthorpe Conservation Area (the CA). Consequently, both parties requested the 'Heritage' section of the Statement of Common Ground be read to reflect this final, agreed position.

5. Following the Council's decision on this proposal, the East Riding of Yorkshire Local Plan Update 2020-2039 (2025) (ERLP) was adopted. This supersedes the policies of the East Riding Local Plan 2012-2029 Strategy Document (2016) referenced in the reason for refusal. The main parties were invited to comment on the implications of the ERLP for this appeal, and their comments have been taken into consideration.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the living conditions of nearby residents, with particular regard to the cumulative impact arising from 'comings and goings' to the appeal site; and
 - designated open space.

Reasons

The living conditions of nearby residents

7. The appeal relates to a parcel of land located in the southwest corner of Allerthorpe Golf and Country Park (the park). The park formerly comprised an 18-hole golf course and an appeal¹ was allowed in 2017 for change of use of part of this golf course for the siting of 150no. holiday lodges and caravans.
8. In 2021 a planning application² was approved for the siting of a further 75no. static caravans at the park. As such, the park currently has consent for up to 225no. static caravans. From the evidence before me the vast majority, if not all, of these static caravans are now on site. The park also currently contains a 9-hole golf course, as well as facilities including a bar / restaurant and golf shop.
9. The proposal seeks to change the use of the appeal site to provide an additional 12no. static caravans, along with landscaping and infrastructure works, which will be used in connection with the wider park.
10. At present the appeal site largely consists of an area of well-maintained grassland, with a number of mature trees. This parcel of green space clearly forms part of the park as it is enclosed on its northern, southern and western edges by hard surfaced internal roads used by vehicles and pedestrians to navigate around the park. I also observed that this green parcel of land already contains several existing static caravans in its southeast corner, with nearby caravans and associated facilities located on the opposite side of the internal road to the north.
11. The Council contends that the coming and goings associated with the appeal proposal, in combination with the existing consents for a total of 225no. caravans on the wider site, would lead to adverse harm to the residential amenity of residents within the nearby village of Allerthorpe. In addition, at the Hearing the Council also drew my attention to additional coming and goings associated with the restaurant on the park, which the appellant confirmed was a successful business frequented not just by residents of the park, but also by visitors from the wider area.
12. During my visit I observed that Allerthorpe is a small village with a predominantly linear formation along the main road which runs through it. A distinctive feature of this rural village is its wide grassed verge on the northern side of Back Lane. This green

¹ Appeal Decision APP/E2001/W16/3151708

² Council Ref: 21/00107/PLF

feature, along with residential gardens and a significant number of mature trees, provides an attractive green and rural character and appearance to this village and contributes to its significance as a CA. In terms of comings and goings, I largely found this village to be peaceful and quiet, with vehicular movements along the main through road frequent, but not excessive.

13. At the Hearing the Council explained that the reference to harm arising from 'comings and goings' in the reason for refusal relates to people moving to and from the site, both in vehicles and on foot. Whilst the Council contend it is difficult to quantify and measure this harm, it was claimed that the existing site is at capacity and any increase in the level of movements to and from the site would harmfully impact upon how residents enjoy the rural countryside location of this village, as well as impacting upon their health and well-being. It was further claimed that the increase in noise associated with vehicle movements was also affecting residents.
14. In respect of the number of vehicular movements through the village, the appeal is accompanied by a Transport Note³ (TN) which uses the Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS) database to estimate the existing levels of vehicular movements from the consented 225no. caravans at the park. Using this same database the TN also estimates the additional vehicular movements that would arise from the appeal proposal.
15. The TN estimates that the appeal proposal would generate an average of 14no. additional vehicular movements through the village of Allerthorpe per day⁴ during the peak summer months of June, July and August.
16. The TN also details the levels of traffic that pass through the village of Allerthorpe. However, it was acknowledged by the appellant that this data is from 2017 and therefore may not accurately reflect the current levels of traffic through the village. Nevertheless, it was confirmed at the Hearing that the Highway Authority did not raise a concern in respect of the content or figures provided within the TN. Additionally, no alternative evidence has been submitted to challenge the information and figures within the appellant's TN.
17. As such, based on the evidence before me, as well as my observations on site, I do not find the additional vehicular movements generated by the appeal proposal, in combination with the existing vehicle movements through the village, would cause adverse harm to the amenity of residents or affect their health and wellbeing. Additionally, no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate how noise associated with vehicles passing through the village, which has a speed limit of 30mph, would cause adverse harm to residential amenity.
18. Furthermore, the Council could not explain precisely what harm is caused to residential amenity by people walking through this village. It was also unclear how any such potential harm could be differentiated between walkers from the park and residents of the village. Whilst the Council confirmed that in their opinion the harm from people walking through the village from the park is greater than the harm from walkers that live within the village, and that the village was being swamped by visitors, I have been provided with no substantive evidence to support these assertions.

³ Appeal Transport Note (January 2025) Job No: LTP/24/3296 Issue 1

⁴ Between the hours of 07:00 – 22:00

19. Whilst not included within the Council's reason for refusal my attention has been drawn to Allerthorpe Neighbourhood Plan (2019 – 2034) (2020) (ANP) Policy ANP07 which relates specifically to development proposals for stationary lodges, mobile homes or caravans. Both the main parties acknowledged at the Hearing that this policy is relevant to the appeal proposal.
20. ANP Policy ANP07 states that proposals for use of land for stationary lodges, mobile homes or caravans will be permitted subject to six criteria / bullet points, insofar as they are relevant to the site and/or development concerned. The fourth bullet point requires that the development is of an appropriate scale to its location and will not result in an unacceptable cumulative impact of holiday accommodation within the neighbourhood plan area.
21. With regard to scale, the provision of 12no. additional caravans within the grounds of the park, which has consent for up to 225no. units, ensures that the scale of the appeal proposal would be in proportion with the existing development in this location.
22. In terms of cumulative impact, I have not been provided with any definition in the Development Plan as to what represents an "unacceptable cumulative impact". The parties agreed at the Hearing that this was a matter of planning judgement.
23. There would be a relatively small increase in the number of units on the site. And, like both parties, I am sensitive to the potential for incremental development reaching a point where the cumulative impact of such increments can become unacceptable.
24. However, for the reasons previously given, I have been provided with no substantive evidence to demonstrate that the appeal scheme before me, in combination with existing consents at the park, including the restaurant and golf course, would cause any adverse harm to the living conditions of the residents of Allerthorpe. As such, and from what I heard and saw, I do not find that the appeal proposal would result in an unacceptable cumulative impact of holiday accommodation within the area.
25. In coming to this view, I acknowledge the concerns of Allerthorpe Parish Council (APC) that the number of units on the appeal site would exceed the number of residential dwellings in Allerthorpe. However, the number of caravans on the park in relation to the number of properties in Allerthorpe does not in itself result in the appeal proposal having a harmful impact.
26. In view of all the above, based on the evidence before me and my own observations of both pedestrian and vehicular movements through the village of Allerthorpe, I conclude that the cumulative impact arising from the appeal proposal in combination with the existing consents at the park would not lead to adverse harm to the living conditions of the residents of Allerthorpe.
27. The proposal therefore accords with ERLP Policy ENV1 and ANP Policy ANP07, where they require, amongst other things, that all development has regard to the amenity of existing residents, and that proposals are of an appropriate scale for their location and would not result in an unacceptable cumulative impact of holiday accommodation within the neighbourhood area. I also find no conflict with the provisions of the Framework where it seeks to ensure that developments promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing users.

Open space

28. Prior to its use as a holiday park the appeal site formed part of an 18-hole golf course and therefore provided opportunities for outdoor recreation and leisure. Whilst a 9-hole golf course has been retained within the wider park, the appeal site is not within this retained golf course area.
29. As a result of its current use for tourism, both the main parties agreed at the Hearing that the appeal site no longer has a leisure and/or recreation use. Furthermore, it was confirmed by both parties that as there is no public access to the appeal site it does not form an area of, or have value as, public open space.
30. Nevertheless, the appeal site is designated as open space within the ERLP Policies Map and ERLP Policy C3 is therefore relevant. Section D of this policy states that proposals resulting in the loss of existing areas of open space will only be supported where criterion 4 is met, along with any of criteria 1, 2 or 3.
31. With regard to criterion 4, both the main parties confirmed that the proposal would comply with this criterion and I observed on my visit that the appeal site is well screened from viewpoints outside the park by existing mature vegetation and earth bunds both along its boundaries and within the site itself. As such I find that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable detrimental impact on the amenity or character of the area, in compliance with criterion 4.
32. In addition, the appellant and Council both contend that the appeal proposal complies with criterion 1 of Policy C3 as when the change of use of part of the previous 18-hole golf course to holiday lodges was permitted by the previous Inspector, it was demonstrated that the site was surplus to requirements as an 18-hole facility⁵. From the information and evidence before me I see no reason to disagree with the main parties findings on the appeal proposal's compliance with this criterion.
33. In coming to the above view, I am aware that despite demonstrating that the 18-hole golf course was surplus to requirements the previous inspector, before allowing the appeal, still found that the loss of designated open space would be contrary to the aim of ERLP Policy C3 to safeguard existing areas of open space for outdoor recreation.
34. However, in that appeal the inspector was considering an application for holiday lodges on land that formed part of an 18-hole golf course, whereas the appeal before me would not affect the land of the retained 9-hole golf course.
35. Rather, it seeks to provide 12no. additional holiday lodges on part of the park which, as agreed by both parties, is not in recreational or leisure use, does not benefit from public access and has no value as public open space. As such the circumstances surrounding the appeal before the previous inspector and the appeal scheme before me are significantly different.
36. Additionally, the Council also suggested compliance with criterion 3 of Policy C3, stating the re-opening of the 9-hole golf course has provided alternative sport and recreation provision. However, given that the 9-hole golf course is already operational I do not agree that the appeal scheme before me would result in the development of an alternative sport and recreation provision. I therefore do not find that the proposal complies with criterion 3.

⁵ Paragraph 36 of Appeal Decision APP/E2001/W16/3151708

37. Nonetheless, I acknowledge that the appeal proposal, providing more caravans on the park, would result in an effective use of a section of the site that is not currently being used. Additionally, through their use by future occupants of the development, the proposal would also assist in supporting the vitality and viability of the existing 9-hole golf course, as well as other facilities at the park and within the wider area.
38. I also note that the previous inspector imposed a condition limiting the number of holiday units on the park to 150. Stating that this condition was necessary for clarity and in the interests of retaining sufficient areas of open space to secure a satisfactory layout and appearance for the development. However, this condition does not mean that additional holiday units cannot be applied for and permitted if considered to be acceptable. To that end, I observed on site that the appeal proposal ensures that sufficient areas of open space would be retained and that a satisfactory layout and appearance would be provided.
39. The APC has drawn my attention to the East Riding of Yorkshire Council Open Space Area Supply Report (2020) (OSASR) which identifies Allerthorpe as having a shortfall of all types of open space. I have however been provided with no evidence to demonstrate that the appeal site formed part of the existing areas of open space that were assessed as part of the OSASR. Furthermore, given that the appeal site is not open to the public I find that it has very limited value as an area of open space and thus its loss would not have a harmful impact upon the existing areas of open space in Allerthorpe.
40. My attention has also been drawn to the requirement of ANP Policy ANP07 which states that development for use of land for stationary lodges, mobile homes or caravans will be supported provided that the proposal would not involve the unacceptable loss of any open space. This policy does not therefore seek to protect all areas of open space, only that unacceptable loss of open space should be avoided. For the reasons given above, I find the appeal proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of open space.
41. In view of all the above, based on the evidence before me the appeal site does not benefit from public access or have value as public open space. Furthermore, I find that the loss of open space from the appeal site would not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the amenity or character of the area. While I acknowledge the designation of the land as open space, because of the developments permitted since its designation, its utility and value as open space has diminished considerably. Consequently, I conclude that in all the circumstances, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of open space and accords with ERLP Policy C3 and ANP Policy ANP07, the relevant provisions of which I have set out above. I also find no conflict with the provisions of the Framework where it seeks to guard against the loss of valued facilities.

Other Matters

Protected sites

42. Policy ENV4⁶ of the ERLP requires proposals for tourism accommodation to consider the impact of recreational pressure when located within 5km of the Lower Derwent Valley (LDV) international habitats sites. The parties agreed that the appeal site is located within the 5km buffer zone of the Lower Derwent Valley Special Protection

⁶ Criterion 1. iii

Area (SPA), Lower Derwent Valley Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Lower Derwent Valley Ramsar and Lower Derwent Valley National Nature Reserve (NNR).

43. These European protected sites are afforded protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (the Regulations) and paragraph 194 of the Framework confirms that listed Ramsar sites should be given the same protection as European protected sites. Primary reasons for their designations include the presence of river lamprey, lowland hay meadow and alluvial flood meadow habitats, and the populations of wintering waterfowl and spring passage wading birds.
44. Given the location of the appeal site in relation to these designated sites, as the competent decision-making authority under the Regulations, it is my duty to undertake an appropriate assessment as to whether the proposal would be likely to have a significant effect on the interest features of these statutory designated sites (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects).
45. In this regard, the appellant has submitted a Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment⁷ (HRA). This HRA details how the existing park provides an attractive facility for a variety of leisure uses, including outdoor recreation and walking, with footpaths, greenspace and woodland habitats. Furthermore, the HRA refers to the close proximity of Allerthorpe Lakeland Park, an existing outdoor recreational area located 150m from the appeal site.
46. As such, the HRA states that existing and proposed residents in the area are not reliant or directed to the statutory designated sites for recreational activities. The HRA therefore asserts that there is a reasonable likelihood that users of the proposed holiday lodges, as well as other existing lodges and houses in the area, would disperse and use the other areas of greenspaces in the local area that are outside the statutory designated sites.
47. Consequently, the HRA concludes that the proposal would have no adverse effect on the integrity and conservation objectives of these statutory designated sites for nature conservation, either alone or in combination with other projects. Nevertheless, the HRA advises that the inclusion of a 'Homeowners Pack' which could be distributed to residents of the proposed development, advising of the proximity and importance of these statutory designated sites, as well as identifying other areas for recreation and dog walking, would further reduce any risk or harm to these statutory designated sites. It is advised that the details and distribution of this 'Homeowners Pack' could be secured by condition.
48. The Council has confirmed that it has accepted the HRA as its own assessment and agrees that the proposal would not result in adverse effects on the integrity of the statutory designated sites. Furthermore, Natural England have been consulted as part of both the planning application and the appeal procedure, and confirmed that they have no concerns relating to impacts from the proposed development on the integrity of the LDV designated sites and associated qualifying features.
49. I have no reason or evidence to disagree with the findings of the HRA, the Council or Natural England in respect of the effect of the appeal proposal on the statutory designated sites. As such, given the availability of alternative recreational opportunities in the area, which would divert residents from use of the designated sites, as well as the appellant confirming that they will provide a 'Homeowners Pack'

⁷ Prepared by ERAP (Consultant Ecologists) Ltd; Ref: 2023-095c; Dated 2023-095c

to residents, I conclude that the development would not adversely affect the integrity of the statutory designated sites and their conservation objectives.

50. In view of the above, I therefore find no conflict with ERLP Policy ENV4 and the proposal would likewise be in accordance with the relevant provisions in the Framework which seek to ensure development does not adversely affect the integrity of habitat sites.

Designated heritage assets

51. The appeal site is located a significant distance from both the Grade II Listed Building at Low Farmhouse and the CA. Furthermore, there is substantial vegetation screening and existing caravans / lodges between the appeal site and both these designated heritage assets. Consequently, the appeal site would not affect the setting of the listed building and it would not harm the significance of the CA. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in any harm to these designated heritage assets.

Location and transport

52. The sustainability of the site has been questioned by APC, with concerns raised over the roads not being safe to walk and there being no evidence of the shuttle bus service referred to by the appellant.
53. In respect of walking, the comment that walking to and from the site is unsafe and that the site is unsustainable for walking are somewhat contrary to the Council's concerns that comings and goings associated with people walking to and from the site would have an adverse impact upon the living conditions of residents within Allerthorpe.
54. Nevertheless, based on my own observations on site I found that Melbourne Road, with its 60mph speed limit, lack of footways and lack of street lighting was not an attractive road for walking, especially for people with young children and/or a disability. However, my attention was drawn to a public right of way along Waplinton Lane which connects the park to the village of Allerthorpe. Furthermore, the parties agreed at the Hearing that cycling to Allerthorpe and Pocklington was a realistic alternative to use of the car, and a return public bus service ran once a week from Allerthorpe to Pocklington.
55. The appellant also confirmed at the Hearing that the shuttle bus service from the site is in operation and used by visitors on a call out basis. No substantive evidence to the contrary has been provided and the main parties confirmed that the provision of this shuttle bus service was secured as part of the Travel Plan required to be submitted and approved in accordance with a condition on the previous appeal decision at this site.
56. Furthermore, within the Statement of Common Ground the main parties agreed that Pocklington, which offers a wide range of services, is accessible from the appeal site by a range of modes of transport and this was reiterated at the Hearing. It was also agreed at the Hearing that in comparison to other caravan parks within the borough, the appeal site represents one of the more sustainable locations.
57. Based on the submitted information, the discussion at the Hearing and my own observations, I see no reason to disagree with the main parties that the appeal site

represents a sustainable location for the proposed use, with access to nearby services and facilities via a range of transport modes.

58. APC has raised concerns over the safety of the existing vehicular access into the site on Melbourne Road which would also serve the additional vehicular movements associated with the proposal. I note that the Highway Authority has not raised any objection in respect of vehicles accessing the site and the Council confirmed that the Highway Authority raised no objection on highway safety grounds in general. As such, and based on my observations on site, I have no evidence that the appeal proposal, or the continued use of the existing access into the site, would have a harmful impact upon highway safety.
59. A concern has been raised that the proposed caravans could be used as permanent homes. However, suitably worded conditions could be imposed to ensure that the caravans are occupied as holiday accommodation only and not as a person's sole or principal residence.
60. It has been queried whether the existing wastewater pipe is suitable to serve the additional needs created by the proposal. I note that no objection has been raised by Yorkshire Water, subject to conditions, and I have no substantive evidence that wastewater cannot be effectively dealt with from this site.
61. APC has made reference to anti-social behaviour in the village, however very limited information as to what this anti-social behaviour involves, and its association with the park has been provided. I therefore give this matter very limited weight in my consideration of the appeal.

Conditions

62. I have considered the conditions put forward during the Hearing against paragraph 57 of the Framework, and the advice contained in the Planning Practice Guidance. Where applicable, I have edited these conditions following the discussion at the Hearing to improve precision and enforceability.
63. In addition to the standard time limit condition (1), I have attached a condition specifying the approved plans to provide certainty (2).
64. A pre-commencement condition has been included which requires the submission of details relating to temporary vehicle parking, loading and manoeuvring of vehicles, and wheel washing facilities during the construction phase of the development (3). This pre-commencement condition is necessary in the interest of highway safety throughout the construction phase.
65. Pre-commencement conditions have also been imposed requiring a Construction Environmental Management Plan (4), a Wildlife Enhancement Plan (5), a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (6) and tree protection measures (7) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. These pre-commencement conditions are necessary to ensure that protected species, habitats and trees are protected throughout the construction phase of the development and to ensure that wildlife mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures are managed and maintained appropriately throughout the development.
66. A condition which requires details of any external lighting that is to be installed on the site to first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council is necessary in order to control the risk of light spillage and mitigate potential impact on protected

species (8). A condition requiring the submission of details relating to the provision and distribution of a 'Homeowners Pack' to residents is both reasonable and necessary to reduce any risk of harm to designated sites (9).

67. Conditions to ensure that the caravans / lodges are used for holiday accommodation only and not occupied as a person's sole or principal residence (10), as well as a requirement for a register to be kept by the owner/operator of the site (11), are both necessary to prevent the units from being used for permanent residential accommodation. A condition limiting the number of additional pitches on the appeal site to 12, and that these shall be laid out as shown on the approved plan, is necessary for clarity, to protect the living conditions of surrounding occupiers, and to secure a satisfactory layout and appearance (12).
68. A condition requiring the provision of all the new soft landscaping, as shown on the approved plan, to be carried out within the first planting season following completion, or first occupation, of the development (13) has been attached. This condition is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
69. In the interest of highway safety, a condition restricting the use of the emergency access is also necessary (14).
70. Conditions are imposed to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted drainage strategy (16), that foul and surface water be drained on separate systems (17) and that no piped discharge of surface water from the site shall take place until works to provide a satisfactory outfall have first been submitted to and agreed by the Council (15). These conditions are all necessary to reduce the risk of flooding at the site.

Conclusion

71. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, the proposed development would accord with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate it should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore allowed.

R Major

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - H2/140601/33 REV E Location Plan received 20.02.24
 - H2/140601/35 REV A Block Plan received 20.02.24
3. No development hereby permitted shall commence on site until details of the temporary vehicle parking, loading, offloading, manoeuvring and wheel washing facilities for the contractors carrying out building and construction works on the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The construction of the development hereby permitted shall only be carried out in complete accordance with the approved details.
4. No development hereby permitted shall commence on site, including site clearance works, until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity), compiled by a suitably qualified ecologist, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include all the recommendations included within section 5.0 of the submitted ecological report (Ecological Survey and Assessment, ERAP Consultant Ecologists, Ref: 2023-095 - January 2024) with additional measures included in respect to amphibians and reptiles. The CEMP shall also include:
 - A risk assessment of potentially damaging construction-type activities;
 - Full details of practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction, including action to be taken if any protected species are found during construction works;
 - The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features;
 - Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs;
 - Details of a lighting strategy which secures dark corridors for foraging bats and nesting birds on the boundaries of the site both during construction and operation;
 - Details of site induction information and tool box talks for all relevant on-site working practices. Protocols to demonstrate that the site work force will be briefed about potential ecological issues on the site prior to commencement of construction shall be provided;
 - Details of personnel responsible for over-seeing the implementation of measures detailed in the CEMP; and

- Timings for implementation.

The approved CEMP shall be implemented and adhered to in accordance with the approved details and timetable thereafter.

5. No development hereby permitted shall commence on site until a Wildlife Enhancement Plan (WEP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The WEP shall include all mitigation and enhancement measures recommended within section 5.0 of the submitted ecological report (Ecological Survey and Assessment, ERAP Consultant Ecologists, Ref: 2023-095 - January 2024) and be compiled by a suitably qualified ecologist. The WEP shall include:

- A timetable for implementation;
- A detailed plan showing the locations and specification of the enhancement measures;
- The enhancement measures outlined in the above report;
- Details of bat and bird boxes;
- Details of the means of enclosure to demonstrate that boundary treatments will not result in a loss of habitat connectivity through the development, by creating hedgehog highways which provide holes under boundary features for hedgehogs to pass through;
- Hedgehog friendly features including hedgehog houses which should be positioned round the site within hedge bases;
- Details of insect boxes and log piles to increase the habitat for local biodiversity;
- Details of how the landscaping strategy, as indicated on the submitted Block Plan (H2/140601/35 Rev A), shall incorporate native species landscaping throughout the site and utilise British species of local provenance wherever possible; and
- A Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) calculation undertaken using the Defra Metric to demonstrate that the final landscape proposals have sought to achieve a net gain in biodiversity.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved WEP and its approved timetable for implementation, and the enhancement measures shall be retained as such thereafter.

6. No development hereby permitted shall commence on site until a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP shall be compiled by a suitably qualified ecologist and detail how wildlife enhancements and habitats are to be managed and maintained, cross referenced to the final landscape proposals. The content of the LEMP shall cover all on-site landscape and habitats and include the following:

- Description and evaluation of features to be managed;

- Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management aims and objectives of management;
- Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;
- Prescriptions for management actions;
- Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period);
- Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan;
- Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures; and
- Timetable for implementation

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details and timetables contained within the approved LEMP and adhered to thereafter.

7. In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with drawing no. H2/140601/35 REV-A. Paragraphs (i) and (ii) below shall have effect until the expiration of 5 years from the date of the occupation of the development hereby approved for its permitted use:
- i) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998:2010 Tree Work – Recommendations;
 - ii) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size, species and maturity, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority;
 - iii) No development hereby permitted shall commence on site until all retained trees have been enclosed by protective fencing in accordance with a plan that has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The protective fencing shall be maintained and retained until the construction phase of the development is complete and all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made.
8. No external lighting shall be installed on site unless a lighting scheme, including details of the design, size, luminance level and shielding arrangements, has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any scheme shall be reviewed by a suitably qualified ecologist and shall be designed to minimise light spill, taking into account advice on bats and artificial lighting in the UK as set out in the Bat Conservation Trust in Conjunction with the Institution of Lighting Professionals - Guidance Notes 08/18 and 08/23. Any external lighting shall only be installed, and retained thereafter, in accordance with details contained within the duly approved lighting scheme.

9. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until a plan with respect to the provision of information to avoid recreational disturbance to statutory designated sites has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall be produced with input from a suitably qualified ecologist and shall include:

- Details of the provision and distribution of 'Home-Owner' leaflets which shall include information informing residents of the presence and importance of the statutory designated sites; how residents can help protect them, including an outlined 'responsible use code'; and the identification of other areas for recreation/dog walking away from the sensitive sites.

The mitigation measures within the plan shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development and adhered to as such in perpetuity thereafter.

10. The lodges/caravans hereby permitted shall not be occupied other than as holiday accommodation only. They shall not be occupied at any time as a person's sole or principal residence.

11. The site owners/operators shall maintain an up-to-date register of the names of all the individual lodge/caravan owners and occupiers and their main home addresses, and shall make the following information available to the Local Planning Authority upon request:

- copies of the register;
- a copy of the licence between the site owner / operator; and
- the lodge / caravan owner /occupier for each pitch.

12. The total additional number of pitches on the site, whether occupied by lodges or static caravans, shall not exceed the maximum of 12 and these shall only be laid out in accordance with the details shown on drawing no. H2/140601/35 REV-A.

13. All soft landscaping comprised in the approved drawing no. H2/140601/35 REV-A shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the first occupation of the development or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. All shrubs, trees and hedge planting shall be maintained free from weeds and shall be protected from damage by vermin. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species.

14. Means of vehicular access to the permitted development shall not be from the proposed emergency access on the track leading to Manor Farm, except in the case of access and egress for emergency vehicles.

15. No piped discharge of surface water from the site shall take place until works to provide a satisfactory outfall, other than the existing local public sewerage, for surface water have been completed in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved surface water details shall be retained and maintained as approved thereafter.
16. Notwithstanding the requirements of condition 15, the surface water drainage works shall be constructed in accordance with the Technical Note dated 31 May 2023 by JBA Consulting (JBA Project Code KKR - 2023s0517) prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, and retained as such thereafter.
- For the avoidance of any doubt, the total discharge rate from the whole site, which incorporates the land edged red and the land edged blue on approved plan: 'H2/140601/33 REV E Location Plan', shall not exceed 19.7 litres per second into the watercourse.
17. The appeal site shall be developed with separate systems of drainage for foul and surface water.

*****End of Conditions*****

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mark Lane BA (Hons) MRTPI	Director at DPP
Mike Raynor BA (Hons) MIHE	Associate at LTP

FOR THE COUNCIL:

Christopher Ellis BSc (Hons) MRTPI	Principal Planner
------------------------------------	-------------------

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

List of amended planning conditions