



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 5 November 2024, 11 March 2025 and 23 July 2025

Site visit made on 23 July 2025

by Peter Willows BA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/C/24/3345298

Land at Saxon House, Haroldslea Drive, Horley, Surrey RH6 9PH

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Miles Delaney against an enforcement notice issued by Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The notice was issued on 26 April 2024.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is *Without planning permission, the material change of use of the Land from amenity land of Saxon House, Haroldslea Drive, Horley RH6 9PH to a gypsy/traveller site including the siting of a mobile home and laying of a new access track as shown and annotated in the approximate position marked on the attached plan.*
 - The requirements of the notice are:
 - i. Cease the use of the Land shown outlined in red on the attached plan for the siting of a mobile home. (use as a gypsy/traveller site)
 - ii. Permanently remove from the Land the mobile home located as shown approximately on the attached plan outlined in black.
 - iii. Permanently remove from the Land the access track as shown in the approximate area outlined and annotated on the attached map.
 - iv. Remove from the Land all material and debris resulting from taking the above steps.
 - v. Restore the Land to the condition it was in before the breach of planning control took place.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 3 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Decision

1. It is directed that the enforcement notice is corrected by the removal of the reference to 'paragraph (b)' at section 1 of the notice and its replacement with 'paragraph (a)'.
2. Subject to that correction, the appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended) for the development already carried out, namely the material change of use of the Land from amenity land to a Gypsy/Traveller site including the siting of a mobile home and laying of a new access track at Saxon House, Haroldslea Drive, Horley, Surrey RH6 9PH, as shown on the plan attached to the notice and subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Application for costs

3. An application for an award of costs was made by the appellant against the local planning authority. That application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

4. On two occasions I opened the hearing only to adjourn it shortly afterwards due to matters relating to procedural fairness. Substantive matters relating to the merits of the development were only discussed on 23 July 2025.
5. The notice refers to paragraph (b) of section 171A(1) of the 1990 Act. Paragraph (b) is concerned with failing to comply with any condition or limitation subject to which planning permission has been granted. The notice should, in fact, have cited paragraph (a) of section 171A(1), which relates to carrying out development without the required planning permission. I am able to correct that minor error without causing injustice to either party.

Ground (a)

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:
 - Whether the development accords with local and national policies concerning the location of development and the provision of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation;
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area;
 - Whether the site is an appropriate location in terms of flood risk, having regard to relevant local and national policies; and
 - Whether any harm is outweighed by other considerations, including any need for the development and the personal circumstances of those living at the site.

Local and national policy

7. The development plan for the area is comprised of a Core Strategy and a Development Management Plan (DMP).
8. The appeal site falls within the designated Rural Surrounds of Horley, wherein development is subject to Policy NHE7. This requires that development should protect the countryside in accordance with national policy. It goes on to set out particular forms of development that may be permitted. That includes the creation of new dwellings in certain circumstances, but no specific mention is made of pitches for Traveller caravans. Thus, the main relevance of NHE7 is the emphasis on protecting the countryside and avoiding visual harm.
9. The approach to Gypsy and Traveller sites is set out in Policy CS16 of the Council's Core Strategy. Although this is not referred to in the enforcement notice, the Council agreed at the hearing that it is a relevant policy. The policy says that a sequential approach will be taken to identifying suitable sites, with possible sites within the urban area being considered first, then all other countryside sites not within the Green Belt, then Green Belt sites.
10. The Council argues that the preferred sites for the purposes of CS16 are the Traveller sites included in sustainable urban extensions identified in the DMP. However, it is clear from the policy and its supporting text that the policy is to be used for assessing individual planning applications, as well as deciding on allocations. Thus, the fact that provision is made for Traveller sites in allocations in

the plan does not necessarily rule out other sites coming forward as individual proposals, to be assessed against the criteria in the policy. The extent to which current needs are met by allocations in the plan is, however, an important consideration in the overall planning balance.

11. This site is not within the Green Belt. It is not within the urban area either but is close to the built up part of Horley, and thus relatively close to local services and public transport, including the train station. I do not have detailed evidence from either side as to whether there are sequentially preferable sites available, but it is common ground that about 70% of the borough is in the Green Belt. Seen in that context, there is some merit in the location of this site on the edge of the built up area in terms of the preferred locations described in CS16.
12. CS16 sets out 6 criteria for assessing the suitability of sites for allocation in the DMP and any planning applications for sites not allocated. Of those, the key concern raised by the Council relates to visual amenity and the character of the area, a matter I address later. None of my findings elsewhere in this decision lead me to find conflict with any of the other 5 criteria in CS16.
13. Core Strategy Policy CS10 sets out a wide range of planning matters to consider to ensure that development is sustainable, but does not give any specific steer regarding the location of Traveller pitches.
14. National policy is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (the PPTS). The Framework establishes that the needs of Travellers must be taken into account in planning for homes. The PPTS sets out a range of matters to be considered in determining planning applications for Traveller sites. These include the existing level of local provision and need for sites; the availability of alternative accommodation for the applicants; other personal circumstances of the applicant and criteria set out in local policy.
15. Drawing these threads together, both local and national policy require proposals for Traveller sites to be considered against a range of criteria. Such development is not excluded as a matter of policy from the Rural Surrounds of Horley, but must be assessed against the relevant criteria and take account of the aim of protecting the countryside.

Character and appearance

16. To the west of the appeal site, Haroldslea Drive runs through a residential area, before becoming narrower and more rural in character. Much of the land to either side of the road in the vicinity of the appeal site is open or treed. However, there are regular pockets of development, including some large houses such as Saxon House, which are a part of the character of the area.
17. The enforcement notice describes the appeal site prior to the development as 'amenity land of Saxon House'. At the hearing the site was referred to both as a horse paddock and a hay field. It does not appear to have been in any sense a formal garden. However, given the broad nature of the term 'amenity land' and the evident association of the land with Saxon House, it does not appear that the way it is described in the enforcement notice is necessarily wrong.

18. Whatever the precise use of the site before the development, it seems it was essentially free from built development, used for hay and/or horses, and very different in character to the site as I saw it. The site now contains a mobile home and associated domestic paraphernalia, including outdoor furniture and a trampoline, such that its residential use is very obvious from within the site.
19. Furthermore, there is significant built development in the form of a substantial access driveway and a large area of hardstanding, which are finished in a loose surface of chippings. The driveway is lined with lighting columns, and a patio has been laid behind the mobile home. A large wooden dog kennel has also been built.
20. The visual impact of the development is limited to a very significant degree by the trees and other substantial greenery surrounding the site. Consequently, the residential caravan use of the site is not obvious from the road. Nevertheless, the wide driveway, complete with lighting columns, together with the dog kennel, are in clear view. Consequently, the site has a far more developed appearance than it would previously have had. I am also mindful that views into the site are likely to be more extensive in the winter months than when I viewed it in July.
21. Since this is not an area devoid of built development, even the driveway and other features seen from the road do not look entirely out of place. Moreover, a site development scheme could improve the appearance of the site and its impact on the street scene with changes to the hardstanding, landscaping and boundary treatment. Nevertheless, as things stand, the development as a whole tips the character of the area slightly in the direction of being more built up and, as a consequence, there is some harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, there is conflict with the aims for visual amenity and local landscape character within Core Strategy Policies CS2 and CS16 and DMP Policy NHE7.
22. I have also been referred to DMP Policy DES1. While that is a design policy and appears to be primarily aimed at new built development, it seeks to secure appropriate landscaping in new development and, to that extent, is relevant. As things stand, the development would benefit from landscaping to help integrate it into its surroundings and, consequently, there is conflict with DES1 in that respect.

Flood risk

23. Although the Council does not oppose the development on the basis of flood risk, I raised it prior to the hearing and have treated it as a main issue. The appeal site lies next to Burstow Stream. A flood risk assessment (FRA) has been carried out for the appellant by Flume Consulting Engineers and has considered flooding from all sources. The FRA advises that the site falls within Flood Zone 2, indicating a medium risk of flooding. Annex 3 of the Framework sets out flood risk vulnerability classifications, and establishes that caravans, mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use are 'highly vulnerable'.
24. Detailed 'Product 4/6' flood level information was obtained from the Environment Agency (EA) to inform the FRA and assess actual risk from watercourses. This indicates that the risk from flooding at the site is less than that indicated by the Flood Zone 2 categorisation, with the vast majority of the site falling beyond the 1 in 1,000 year return period flood extent. This is important evidence regarding actual flood risk at the site. Flooding from all other potential sources has been considered and found to be low.

25. The Framework and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) set out a sequential test in order to take account of flood risk in planning decisions. This approach is reflected in Policy CCF2 of the DMP. The Framework advises that the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding.
26. The Framework explains that the sequential test may not be required in certain instances where it can be demonstrated that there is no built development within parts of the site at risk of flooding. Nevertheless, while certain changes of use are also excluded from the requirement for the sequential test, Footnote 62 establishes that it should be applied 'as appropriate' to caravan sites.
27. Here, there is no explanation in the FRA as to why the sequential test has not been addressed in this instance. The PPG emphasises the important role the local planning authority makes in applying the sequential test and I am mindful that the Council has not given any indication that it would be failed if it were applied in this case. Nevertheless, since it has not been shown why the sequential test has not been addressed, I am unable to conclude compliance with the Framework, the PPG or Policy CCF2 in that respect.
28. Nevertheless, the FRA indicates that no relevant built development is located in any part of the site at risk of flooding. It also shows that the driveway (and therefore the escape route during a flood event) is not at risk of flooding. The FRA indicates that the development is safe and the Council does not dispute its findings.
29. I understand from the written evidence of some local people and evidence given at the hearing that some properties very close to the appeal site have suffered from flooding in the past. However, the effects of flooding can be very localised and flooding at nearby property does not show that the appeal site itself is at flood risk. While there are also some references to the appeal site itself flooding in the past, overall, I attach more weight to the appellant's FRA.
30. National planning policy describes an 'exception test' to be applied in certain instances where the sequential test is passed. I consider that there are sustainability benefits associated with the provision of an additional Traveller pitch in this instance and that the development is safe, such that the requirements of the exception test would be met.
31. Looking at the evidence as a whole, while it has not been clearly shown why the sequential test has not been addressed in this instance, I am satisfied that the development is safe. The evidence indicates that the site is not at high levels of flood risk, such that there is compliance with Policy CS16 in that respect.

Need and supply

32. The PPTS advises at paragraph 28 that 'If a local planning authority cannot demonstrate an up-to-date 5 year supply of deliverable sites, the provisions in paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework apply'.

33. Paragraph 11(d) states:

where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or

any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

34. The most recent assessment of the need for Traveller pitches within the Borough is within the Council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA), which was published in July 2017 and works to a baseline of March 2016. The Council has engaged a company to provide a new GTAA, but the first draft of the document is not expected until later in the year.
35. The GTAA identifies a need for 32 pitches over the period 2016-2031. This includes both people who met the 'planning definition' that applied at that time and other 'unknowns' and Travellers who did not meet the definition. Thus, it does not confine itself to the now unlawful definition of Travellers that applied at the time.
36. That said, things have now moved on and the Traveller definition in the revised PPTS is now broader still, with the inclusion of 'all other persons with a cultural tradition of nomadism or of living in a caravan'. There is no specific evidence before me to show what effect the change in the definition might have. However, it strikes me as a significant change, such that the actual requirement could well be materially higher than that set out in the GTAA and the local plan. Moreover, the GTAA is now of some age, being based on fieldwork carried out 9 years ago. I have not been referred to any set date by which the GTAA must be reviewed, either in the document itself or elsewhere. However, the previous GTAA was carried out in 2013, and so had a significantly shorter shelf life.
37. There is also some evidence, in the form of the regular Traveller Caravan Count, to suggest that need in the area may have changed significantly since the GTAA was published. The count figure for the Borough has risen consistently over the years from 23 in January 2016 to 175 in January 2024. Such figures must be treated with caution, since they say nothing about the occupants of the caravans or their circumstances. Nevertheless, the very significant change in the figures suggests to me that things may have moved on since the GTAA was published. At the hearing the Council's representative acknowledged that the trend was likely to be upwards and that actual current need will not be known until the new GTAA is completed.
38. Given my concerns regarding the current GTAA, as outlined above, I am not satisfied that it can be relied upon as a demonstration of current need. Although the local plan inspector concluded that the GTAA was soundly based, the document was relatively new at the time and was being considered against a different policy background. The Council points out that appeal decisions at

Pickets Lane in 2023 endorsed the GTAA but, again, the fieldwork for the GTAA is now older and the policy background different to the position then.

39. As to the supply of sites, at the hearing I was provided with a Housing Delivery Monitor document, which sets out the Council's assessment of the housing land supply position at 31 March 2025. This sets out the need for and supply of Traveller pitches for the 5-year period April 2025-March 2030. It identifies a need of 4.8 pitches for that period, giving an annualised average need of 0.96 pitches. It identifies a supply of 12.8 pitches – amounting to a 13.33 year supply.
40. The supply relies heavily on 8.8 pitches of oversupply from previous years and in fact includes only 4 new pitches. Thus, it does not reflect the actual number of sites that may come forward in the coming years. But regardless of that, my concerns regarding the calculation of need mean I am not satisfied that the Council can demonstrate that there is, in fact, a 5 year supply in any event.
41. The appellant has not produced any alternative calculation of need and supply to contrast with the Council's figures. However, the wording of Paragraph 28 of the PPTS means that the onus is on the local planning authority to demonstrate an up-to-date 5 year supply of deliverable sites. The lack of an up-to-date assessment of current need means that it is unable to do that.
42. I conclude that the Council is unable to demonstrate an up-to-date 5 year supply of deliverable sites. Accordingly, the planning balance set out at Paragraph 11(d) of the Framework applies.

Personal circumstances

43. I am told the site is occupied by the appellant, his wife, and their 5 children, with a further child on the way.
44. One child attends secondary school and another is at primary school. The family intend two of the other children to enrol at school and nursery. One child does not attend school. The location of the appeal site, within close proximity to schools, is said to be a benefit of the location.
45. Three of the children suffer from serious medical issues. Two of the children regularly attend a hospital in London for specialist care. I am told that all three of these children have to be under constant care and special monitoring due to the sensitivity of their conditions. This is said to be the main consideration in the purchase of the appeal site, given its proximity to Horley Station, facilitating easy access to London via train for medical treatment.
46. I understand the appellant works in landscaping, and has been trying to set up his business locally. I am told the appellant and his family have always travelled, including to traditional horse fairs and similar. The family define themselves as Travellers, and they wish to bring up their children in the same way. They do not consider bricks and mortar housing to be compatible with their way of life.
47. It is claimed that if the appeal were to fail the family would be forced into a roadside existence. However, in assessing the actual likelihood of that, I am mindful that the family own a site with multiple pitches at Green Lane, Shipley Bridge, not far from the appeal site. There is dispute over who actually owns it. The appellant said at the hearing that his father owns it. However, I have been referred to a Land Registry Title Register document for the site, which shows Miles

Joseph Delaney as the registered owner. I have no documentary evidence to cast doubt on that document. In any event, it is clear that the site is in the control of the wider family, whether owned personally by the appellant or not.

48. I understand that there are currently 6 pitches on that site – 3 of which are authorised and 3 unauthorised. I am told that the site is full – all pitches being occupied by family members. Even so, the fact that the family control this significant site causes me to doubt the actual likelihood that the appellant and his family would be forced into a roadside existence. Indeed, I understand that they resided at that site prior to moving to the appeal site.
49. Many local residents are also of the view that the appellant and his family do not need the appeal site for their personal use but regard it instead as a potential commercial proposition. However, I have no firm evidence to support that claim and the site appeared to be occupied when I saw it.
50. I have no reason to doubt the health conditions referred to by the appellant. However, the evidence does not show that only this specific site would meet the needs of the appellant and his family. In particular, the reasons for the appellant leaving his previous site are not clear and I have no evidence to show that there would be difficulty in accessing schools or healthcare from that location. Nevertheless, I accept that remaining at the current site would result in the least possible disruption for family members in terms of healthcare and the schooling of the children, which is a benefit of the development.
51. Viewing matters as a whole, I attach a small degree of weight to the personal circumstances outlined by the appellant.

Other Matters

52. The Council refers to DMP policies DES4 and DES5. However, these policies appear to me to be concerned with housing mix and standards within built developments rather than caravan sites such as this and I regard the other policies I have highlighted elsewhere as more relevant to my decision.
53. Some local residents have expressed concern that further Traveller pitches could be created on this site or on nearby land in the future. However, the number of pitches on the site could be controlled with a planning condition. Any future proposals for additional pitches on the site or elsewhere would need to be considered on their merits at the time.
54. Policy CS16 refers to the need for sites to be integrated into the local area and seeks to promote co-existence with the local community. Here, a range of concerns have been raised by local residents to the effect that local community life may be harmed by the development. However, the site is within an area containing an element of low-density residential development, just beyond the main built-up part of Horley, with adequate access to local facilities. Consequently, this single pitch, set well back from the road, would not dominate the settled community, but would not be isolated from it either. Accordingly, it is a site that can be adequately integrated into the local area in my view, in line with the aim of co-existence with the local community.
55. Haroldslea Drive is narrow and unlit at this point, and I have noted the concerns raised regarding the access. However, there is no technical evidence to support

those concerns and the Council does not oppose the development on that basis. Consequently, I am not persuaded that planning permission should be withheld due to the access.

56. I have considered the various other concerns raised by local residents, but am not persuaded, on the evidence before me, that they should have a significant bearing on my decision.

Planning Balance

57. I have not found any 'in principle' conflict with Policy NHE7 arising from the use of land within the Rural Surrounds of Horley as a Traveller site, and there is compliance with most aspects of Policy CS16 as well. However, I have found some harm to the character and appearance of the area, and consequent conflict with these and other local plan policies. This leads me to conclude that there is conflict with the development plan as a whole. Moreover, this is clearly a case of intentional unauthorised development. In a Written Ministerial Statement made on 17 December 2015, the Government confirmed that this is a material consideration. This weighs against the granting of planning permission.
58. While the failure to carry out the sequential test counts against the development, my finding that the development is safe leads me to conclude that there is no strong reason to resist the development based on flood risk.
59. Set against the harm I have found, the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of pitches for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. In accordance with local and national policy, this weighs in favour of the development. It also means that Paragraph 11(d) of the Framework applies. The need for a pitch at this site is reinforced, to a small extent, by the personal need of the appellant and his family. Overall, the provision of a Gypsy/Traveller pitch at the site, adding to the supply of such sites and meeting the specific needs of the appellant and his family, is a significant benefit of the development. I also consider that the harm to the character and appearance of the area could be reduced by changes to the site, which could be the subject of a planning condition.
60. Weighing up the case as a whole, the harm arising from the development does not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework, taken as a whole. There are also no strong reasons to withhold planning permission relevant to Paragraph 11(d)(i) of the Framework. This leads me to conclude that, notwithstanding the conflict with the development plan, planning permission should be granted.
61. I have considered whether it would be appropriate to grant a personal or temporary planning permission. However, a personal planning permission is not justified, because of the limited weight I attach to personal circumstances.
62. A temporary planning permission would allow the site to remain in use while the Council assesses and addresses the need for pitches in the area, either through planning permissions or the review of the local plan. However, given the limited harm in this case, the planning balance is not such as to justify a condition restricting the planning permission to a temporary period.

Conclusion and Conditions

63. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed on ground (a). I shall grant planning permission for the development as described in the notice as corrected. The enforcement notice will be corrected and quashed. In these circumstances the appeal on ground (g) does not fall to be considered.
64. I have attached a condition restricting occupancy of the site to Gypsies and Travellers because the permission is justified by the need for such provision. I have specified the number of pitches and caravans to reflect the nature of the matter enforced against and to ensure that the scale of the development is not excessive. Details of the site layout, landscaping, boundary treatment and external lighting, together with restrictions on vehicles and commercial activities, are all necessary to ensure that the amenity of the area is not compromised. I have required a scheme to be provided to ensure that suitable provision is made for surface water drainage and have required details of measures to ensure that the site is flood resilient, in line with the recommendations of the FRA.

Peter Willows

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Alan Masters, Counsel

Brian Woods BA TP MRTPI, WA Planning and Architecture

Miles Delaney

Michael Delaney

Bridget Delaney

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

James Amos BA(Hons) Dip TP – Principal Planning Officer

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Richard Stephenson

Maureen Hart

Susan Allen

Julian Morrish

DOCUMENTS

1. Housing Delivery Monitor – Position at 31 March 2025
2. Updated list of suggested conditions

CONDITIONS

- 1) The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than Gypsies and Travellers, defined as persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, and all other persons with a cultural tradition of nomadism or of living in a caravan, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.
- 2) There shall be no more than 1 pitch on the site, and on the pitch hereby approved no more than 2 caravans (as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 as amended) shall be stationed at any time, of which only 1 caravan shall be a static caravan.
- 3) The use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, equipment and materials brought onto the land for the purposes of such use shall be removed within 60 days of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in i) to iv) below:
 - i) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, schemes addressing the following matters, which shall include a timetable for their implementation, shall have been submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority:
 - the internal layout of the site, including the extent of the residential pitch, the location of the caravans, and the extent and location of the hardstanding;
 - the hard and soft landscaping of the site, including details of the planting densities, size, position and species of all new proposed planting, together with details of how the landscaping is to be maintained and measures to ensure the landscaping at the entrance is kept to a height of 1m or below at all times;
 - details of all fencing and boundary treatment;
 - measures to protect the mobile home from flooding and ensure its flood resilience, and a safe means of escape in the event of flooding;
 - details of the design of a surface water drainage scheme;
 - details of any external lighting.
 - ii) If within 11 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve any of the schemes or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State.
 - iii) If an appeal is made in pursuance of ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.
 - iv) The approved schemes shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable.

Upon implementation of the approved schemes specified in this condition, the schemes shall thereafter be maintained.

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

- 4) No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on the site.
- 5) No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials.