



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 16 December 2025

Site visit made on 17 December 2025

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/W/25/3366311

The Birches, Church Lane, Temple Grafton, Alcester B49 6NX

- 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 Richard Birch against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03043/FUL.
The development proposed is described as “Change of use of land to use as a residential caravan site for 3 gypsy families, each with two caravans, together with laying of hardstanding and erection of ancillary storage building”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the header above is taken from the planning application form. The Council’s decision notice gives a different description of “*retrospective change of use of land to a residential caravan site comprising 3 gypsy/traveller pitches, each accommodating 2 caravans, including no more than 1 mobile home, construction of associated hardstanding and bunds, change of use of existing stable to amenity outbuilding, and erection of storage outbuilding*”. The appellant has agreed to this description and so it forms the basis of my assessment. No injustice would be caused to any party by taking this approach.
3. On my site visit, I saw that the change of use, the erection of the storage building and the provision of the hardstanding and most of the bunds have all been carried out. The layout of the mobile homes and touring caravans was not entirely consistent with the details shown on the plans and part of the bund to the front boundary has not been constructed. In the interests of clarity, I confirm that the details as shown on the appeal drawings form the basis of my decision.
4. As well as the change of use and the various works outlined in the amended description, one of the appeal drawings show a storage container towards the rear of the site. At the hearing, I was advised this container and the storage outbuilding are used to store domestic items and equipment used in the management and maintenance of the adjoining field, which is in the appellant’s ownership. Also, at the hearing the appellant’s agent advised a fence on the site frontage and shown on the appeal drawing forms part of the appeal development. The gate and adjoining brick pier at the entrance of the site already benefits from planning permission. However, in light of the clarification provided at the hearing, I have

treated the siting of the storage container and the erection of the front boundary fence as forming part of the appeal scheme.

5. Part of the bund near to a public right of way alongside the rear boundary is outside the appeal site as defined by a red line on the submitted plans. On the advice of the appellant's agent, I have excluded this part of the bund from my assessment.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are (i) the development's effect on the character and appearance of the area and the landscape, (ii) flood risk, (iii) whether the development accords with part 9 of policy CS.21 of the Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy adopted 2016 (the CS) with regards to the use of previously developed, untidy or derelict land, and (iv) the issue of intentional unauthorised development (IUD).

Reasons

Planning history.

7. Planning appeal decision reference number APP/J3720/W/20/3263984 is dated 23 May 2022 (hereafter referred to as the 2022 appeal). This grants planning permission for the creation of a single Gypsy and Traveller pitch on land that forms part of the current appeal site. The permitted use is for a limited period of 4 years. It must cease and all works undertaken in connection with the use shall be removed and the land restored to its previous condition at the end of this period.
8. I am also referred to appeal reference number APP/J3720/W/23/3326522, which was dismissed on 1 October 2024 (the 2024 appeal). This decision relates to a scheme for the change of use of land on the appeal site for 3 Gypsy families, each with 2 caravans as well as hardstanding, amenity block and new access. I have had regard to both of these decisions in my assessment.

Effect on character and appearance of the area.

9. Prior to the appeal development being carried out, the site formed part of a field used for the keeping of horses. The stable block mentioned in the description of development has been in place since at least 2013. The appellant also suggests there was an associated area of hardstanding, although there are no plans or photographs that show this. In any event, it would seem the site previously had a typical rural appearance as it was mainly an open grassed paddock with trees and hedges on the boundaries and with an equestrian use. The site is next to a residential property but it would have been seen as part of the countryside just beyond the built up extent of the village. It is reasonable to treat the site as a field as a baseline for my assessment, particularly given the restoration requirements as imposed on the development allowed under the 2022 appeal.
10. The site falls within the Arden Special Landscape Area (the SLA) as referred to and designated under CS policy CS.21. The accompanying text to this policy explains the purpose of the SLA designation is to protect, enhance and facilitate better management of the best of the landscapes within the District and outside the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In addition, the Council's Special Landscape Areas Study June 2012 (the Study) sets out the key qualities of the SLA as well as key management recommendations. The appeal site before the development contained none of the identified key features, although the retention

of pasture land is recommended under paragraph 6.12 of the Study. The Council accepts the site lies in an area with a low sensitivity to change, although it forms part of the SLA.

11. Both the Inspectors for the 2022 and the 2024 appeals recognise the area of countryside between the western edge of Temple Grafton and the eastern edge of Ardens Grafton as being a gap between 2 villages of some significance. There is no development plan policy that defines or attaches value to this gap and I am referred to no single viewpoint where both villages and their separation can be appreciated. However, the sense of Temple Grafton and Ardens Grafton as being 2 distinct, nucleated villages is readily apparent when travelling along the connecting road and through the intervening countryside. Therefore, I tend to agree with the previous Inspectors' views that there is a degree of value to the countryside in which the appeal site lies in terms of providing a small but fairly open gap between settlements.
12. From Church Lane, the mobile homes, caravans and hardstanding on the site are partially screened by the roadside fence and gates as well as the trees and hedges to the front of the appeal site and the adjoining field. However, gaps within the vegetation allow sight from the pavement of the appeal development, particularly during times of leaf-fall. Also, the tops of caravans can be seen above the gate, the walls to the side of the entrance and over the fence. Moreover, the roadside fence is clearly visible from Church Lane. Vegetation screens the development from the footpath to the rear of the plot but again it can be glimpsed when close to the site's boundary through gaps in the hedge. There are also views of the caravans from the footpath on higher land further away from the site, although these are veiled to a degree by existing vegetation within the adjoining field. Overall, the development is not prominent in the landscape but it has a noticeable, albeit localised visual effect.
13. The development has resulted in a significant change in the appearance of the site from a grassed field with a small stable to a plot almost entirely covered with gravel and chippings and accommodating mobile homes and caravans. It is also fair to expect the change of use would lead to associated vehicles and domestic paraphernalia being on the site. The residential use is not out of keeping with the area given the site's close proximity to the built up extent of the village and the adjacent house. I also take on board that Gypsy and Travellers sites in general terms are frequently found in rural areas. Indeed, the appeal site is in the Avon Valley and outside the Green Belt and so according to the explanation to CS policy CS.21 it is located in a preferred broad location for Gypsy and Traveller sites. However, it does not follow that any particular proposal would have an acceptable effect on the landscape. From where it is seen on the roadside and the footpath, the appeal development appears as a form of encroachment into the countryside through the loss of open grassed land and the introduction of residential activity and associated features.
14. The roadside fence is close-boarded and it sits in front of trees and bushes. It is similar in appearance to the fence that runs to the front of the adjoining residence and it forms a continuous connection between this fence and the piers leading to the permitted gate. The fence is not an unusual feature to the area but it is of a design that is more typically associated with residential properties rather than to the road frontage of a field. Its introduction is an obvious sign of a change in the nature of the appeal site from part of the countryside to a built up extent of the

village. Therefore, the fence emphasises the loss of rural qualities of the site as a result of the development.

15. The bunds are fairly low and lie behind the fence and the hedgerow on the rear boundary. As such, they have little visual effect on the locality.
16. The Inspector for the 2022 appeal raised a concern that the proposal then being considered would weaken the defined edge of Temple Grafton by not providing a comparable strong boundary to that on the western side of the adjoining residence. However, with the current appeal a new hedgerow and line of trees are proposed along the western boundary of the appeal site. Over time, this would mature to become a boundary feature of similar appearance to that which already exists on the other side boundary of the site. Therefore, the current appeal development would address the concerns raised by the 2022 appeal Inspector in respect of the effect on the defined edge of the settlement. In addition, the new planting would contribute to the rural and natural feel of the locality, although in some views it would be seen with the appeal development.
17. Whilst an encroachment into the countryside, the development only causes a minor reduction in the separation gap between Temple Grafton and Arden Grafton. As such, there is no meaningful effect on the integrity of each of the settlements. Also, due to its size and location next to the built up extent of the village, the development does not fundamentally undermine the relationship of the nucleated settlement to the landscape. Therefore, I find no significant conflict with requirement 5 of CS policy CS.15.
18. In summary, I find the development has a negative effect on the intrinsic beauty of the countryside as it appears as a form of development encroachment. The site is not prominent but it is seen from the road and the footpath and so the detrimental effects are noticeable. Proposed planting would create a new strong boundary to the village edge and would contribute to the natural aspects of the area. Also, the resulting extension of the built up extent of the village does not significantly undermine the integrity of Temple Grafton and Arden Grafton. Even so, the acceptability and benefits of the development do not and would not fully address nor overcome the detrimental effects in terms of undermining the site's contribution to the rural nature and qualities of the locality.
19. Therefore, I conclude the development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and that it does not protect nor enhance the SLA. In these regards, it is contrary to CS policies CS.5 and CS.12 as well as to part 2 and the second element of part 9 to CS policy CS.21. Amongst other things, these policies look to ensure development does not compromise the objectives of the SLA and they resist unacceptable adverse impacts on the landscape.

Flood risk.

20. The front part of the appeal site is identified as being at high risk of surface water flooding on Environment Agency flood risk maps. A plan provided by the appellant shows one of the mobile homes and 2 of the touring caravans being within the flood risk area. The appellant contends that the layout of the site could be amended so that no caravans would be within the area identified as being at flood risk. In any event, a large part of the hardstanding, the route to the site access as well as part of the front bunding would be at high risk of surface water flooding.

21. Part 4 of CS policy CS.21 states that Gypsy and Traveller pitches should avoid areas prone to flooding from surface water. The development does not accord with this provision. At the same time, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) promotes a sequential risk-based approach to proposals known to be at risk of any form of flooding. This consists of a sequential test (the ST) and if necessary an exception test. At the hearing, the Council's representative accepted the need to consider the Framework's provisions on flood risk, notwithstanding the clear conflict with part 4 of CS policy CS.21.
22. The aim of the ST is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding. This means not allowing development if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the development on land with a lower flood risk. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states the ST need not be applied where there is a site-specific flood risk assessment that shows the proposed layout and mitigation measures would ensure occupiers would remain safe from surface water flood risk¹. The appellant's submissions indicate how surface water run-off from the development will be disposed of. However, this information fails to convincingly show the effects of a surface water flood event on the occupiers of the development and their possessions. The comments of the Inspector for the 2022 appeal relate to a different scheme that did not include a large part of the current site that is identified as being at high flood risk. With the current appeal scheme, I consider the ST needs to be applied as there is no flood risk assessment that clearly shows occupiers would remain safe in a flood event.
23. The PPG provides advice on the search area that should be adopted in applying the ST for individual planning applications². For non-major housing development, it is inappropriate for an area of search to extend beyond an individual village and its immediate neighbouring settlements. The proposal is for a residential Gypsy and Traveller site rather than housing but it is appropriate to adopt this approach in applying the ST for the appeal scheme. Moreover, the PPG states that to be considered reasonably available, other sites must be suitable for the proposed development and have a reasonable prospect of being developed at the same time of the proposal³. In this case, the appeal development is already in place and so other sites should be available now or in the near future to be deemed reasonably available.
24. Neither the Council nor the appellant are able to identify any other land that is suitable for the appeal development. Accordingly, it is fair to conclude there is no land at a lower flood risk than the appeal site and that is reasonably available and suitable for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. Therefore, the ST has been met.
25. The Framework refers to an exception test that may have to be applied where development has to be provided in areas not at the lowest risk of flooding. However, the notes to table 2 in the PPG's flood risk section states that the table does not reflect the need to avoid flood risk from sources other than rivers and sea⁴. Therefore, when considering the relevant provisions of the Framework and

¹ Planning Practice Guidance, Flood Risk and coastal change section, paragraph 027 Reference ID: 7-027-20220825, revision date 17 09 2025.

² Planning Practice Guidance, Flood Risk and coastal change section, paragraph 027a Reference ID: 7-027a-20220825, revision date 17 09 2025

³ Planning Practice Guidance, Flood Risk and coastal change section, paragraph 027a Reference ID: 7-028-20220825, revision date 17 09 2025

⁴ Planning Practice Guidance, Flood Risk and coastal change section, 079 Reference ID: 7-079-20220825, revision date 25 08 2025

the PPG together, I am of the view the exception test is not applicable in this case as the site is subject to pluvial rather than fluvial flood risk.

26. In any event, paragraph 181 of the Framework seeks to ensure development does not increase flood risk elsewhere. Also, it states that where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site specific flood risk assessment. This requirement applies to this case as the appeal site includes land subject to surface water flooding and as the residential caravan development is a more vulnerable use compared to a field. The same paragraph sets out requirements for development that is allowed in areas at risk of flooding. These include that the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, that it is appropriately flood resistant and resilient, any residual risk can be safely managed and that safe access and escape routes are included as part of an agreed emergency plan.
27. The appellant has provided a drainage strategy report although this relates to the 2022 appeal scheme rather than the current appeal development. Also, information has been submitted on a proposed French drain system to dispose of surface water from the development. However, no site-specific flood risk assessment document has been provided. The submitted Information on the extent of the flood risk area and the depth of flood water is rudimentary and it makes no reference to actual ground levels on the site or the effects of climate change. There is little evidence before me on the sources of the flooding, the velocity and flow routes of flood water and how such factors may affect the development. Also, there is limited information on how the development, including the bund to the front and the hardstanding, may affect flood water flows and the site's capacity to hold surface water in a flood event. At the hearing, the appellant's representative suggested the proposed French drain would provide some flood water storage capacity but it is also suggested it would take water from the mobile homes and the impermeable elements of the development. The lack of details on the drainage system or evidence on the permeability qualities of any surfacing means there is a significant uncertainty over the capability of the development to hold or prevent the run-off of floodwater.
28. Furthermore, the extent of the high flood risk area suggests that the access to the development would be affected in a flood event. There is no information before me to substantiate the claims made at the hearing that the depth of flood waters is unlikely to impede movement to and from the site, particularly for pedestrians who have no access to vehicles. In the absence of detailed analysis on how the construction of the bund and hardstanding would affect floodwaters, I am unconvinced by the appellant's claims in these regards.
29. The 2022 appeal Inspector found the development then under consideration would not be at risk of flooding and would not increase flooding elsewhere. However, in arriving at this view they refer to a Flood Impact Assessment and photographic evidence that has not been provided as part of this appeal. As such, I am unable to arrive at an informed view on the validity of such evidence. Moreover, the 2022 appeal scheme would affect a much smaller part of the identified high flood risk area compared to the current appeal development. As such, I am unconvinced that permeable surfacing such as that proposed for the 2022 appeal scheme as well as the proposed French drain would ensure the appeal development does not exacerbate flood risk elsewhere or would prevent ill-effects in a flood event.

30. The 2024 appeal decision makes no mention of the issue of flood risk. However, this does not negate the need for me to consider the current appeal development against flood risk policies given the acknowledgement that part of the site is subject to surface water flooding.
31. I have carefully considered whether the identified shortcomings could be addressed through the imposition of planning conditions. It would be reasonable to secure a revised layout of the mobile homes and touring caravans so that they would be positioned outside the high flood risk part of the site. As such, the most vulnerable elements of the development could be located in the areas of lowest flood risk. The development would also include sustainable drainage systems in terms of permeable surfacing and the French drain. However, the information provided fails to convincingly show how the development as a whole would be affected by recognised surface water flooding and how this could be safely managed. As a consequence, there is insufficient evidence to show the development would avoid increasing flood risk elsewhere or that safe access and egress routes could be maintained during a flood event. Therefore, the development would not fully comply with paragraph 181 of the Framework.
32. For these reasons, I conclude insufficient information has been provided to show the development accords or would accord with local and national planning policy and guidance on flood risk. In these regards it is contrary to the provisions of part 4 of CS policy CS.21 and CS policy CS.4. Amongst other things, these look to ensure Gypsy and Traveller Sites are not within areas subject to high surface water flood risk and that development generally minimises flood risk from all sources. Also, the development would not accord with the provisions of the Framework on flood risk, even though the ST is met.

Part 9 of CS policy CS.21.

33. CS policy CS.21 sets out criteria against which proposals for Gypsy and Traveller sites will be assessed. Part 9 of the policy implies the development should make best use of previously developed, untidy or derelict land where available and suitable. There is a dispute between the main parties as to the extent of the appeal site that constituted previously developed land before the appeal development was carried out. In any event, the Council is unable to identify any other specific site that is available and suitable for the development. Therefore, it follows that there is no available and suitable previously developed, untidy or derelict land that could be utilised as an alternative to the appeal site. As such, I conclude the development does not conflict with part 9 of CS policy CS.21.

Intentional unauthorised development.

34. Whilst not a stated refusal reason, the Council through its submissions has referred to the Written Ministerial Statement from August 2015 that establishes IUD as a material consideration in the determination of appeals. The Inspector for the 2024 appeal attributed moderate adverse weight to this as a factor in their determination of that appeal.
35. The appellant's agent accepts that IUD has taken place as the appeal development has been largely completed without the required planning permission. The lack of an alternative Gypsy and Traveller site for its occupants represents a mitigating circumstance to which I attach weight. I can also understand the appellant's reason for choosing the appeal site for the

development given that it benefits from temporary planning permission under the 2022 appeal. However, the laying of an area of hardstanding much larger than that allowed under the 2022 appeal is less understandable as it has exceeded the minimum necessary to site the caravans and create a habitable environment.

36. Therefore, I attach limited adverse weight to the IUD in my overall assessment of this appeal. This is less than the Inspector for the 2024 appeal, although in that case it would seem the appellant advanced no mitigating circumstances to justify the IUD.

Considerations in support of the development and planning balance.

37. Under the first 2 main issues, I have found the development does not accord with CS policies. Therefore, it does not accord with the development plan when read as a whole and so it follows to consider whether other factors justify allowing the appeal.
38. Under paragraph 9 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document (PPTS) there is a requirement for local planning authorities to set pitch target for Gypsies and Travellers. Also, under PPTS paragraph 10a, authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites.
39. On the issue of need for pitches, I am referred to table A1.1 of the Stratford-on-Avon and Warwick District Gypsy, Traveller, Travelling Showpeople and Boat Dwellers Accommodation Assessment dated August 2024. From this, it can be concluded there is a need for 34 additional pitches within the Stratford-on-Avon District between 2024 and 2029. The table deducts from this figure 16 pitches that it states represents additional pitch supply for the period. However, the Council's evidence fails to identify any specific sites that are currently available for pitch provision. Therefore, the information provided indicates a significant need for additional Gypsy and Traveller accommodation and a marked deficit in the supply of sites to address the need.
40. The Council is unable to show a 5 year supply of deliverable sites and so paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is engaged. This states that planning permission should be granted unless the circumstances under sub-paragraphs 11(d)(i) or (ii) apply.
41. In this case, I have found insufficient evidence has been provided to show the development accords with the provisions of paragraph 181 of the Framework on flood risk. This paragraph includes clear advice that development should only be allowed in areas of risk of flooding where the points as outlined in sub-paragraphs 181(a) to (e) are met. The failure to show the development fully complies with the terms of paragraph 181 of the Framework constitutes a strong reason to refuse permission when applying the policies that protect areas at risk of flooding. As such, the circumstances under sub-paragraph 11(d)(i) exist and so the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out under paragraph 11 of the Framework does not apply in this case.
42. Nonetheless, in my overall assessment of the appeal, I attach significant weight to the contribution the development makes towards addressing a recognised need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches. In these regards, it accords with the government's aim at paragraph 4(e) of the PPTS to promote more private Gypsy and Traveller

site provision. To allow the development would advance an opportunity for Gypsy and Travellers as a protected group to meet their accommodation needs.

43. Also, the Council does not dispute the claim that the current occupants of the development have no alternative settled base where they could reside. The occupiers are the appellant and their close relatives and so there are personal benefits in terms of them living together on the same site. One of the residents is under 18 years of age and so they are a child, albeit not now in formal education. It is in the best interests of that child as well as all the other occupants to have a settled, authorised site on which to live, particularly in terms of accessing health facilities. These personal benefits attract moderate weight in support of allowing the appeal.
44. Moreover, the site is conveniently located so that occupants would be able to access and support facilities in Temple Grafton. The range of local services is limited but they include a primary school within easy walking distance. This close proximity would be a clear benefit of the development should future residents include primary school age children. A broader range of services at Bidford-on-Avon, Alcester or Stratford-upon-Avon would only realistically be accessible by car but drive times from the site to these settlements are not unduly excessive, particularly when bearing in mind the rural location of the site. I give positive weight to the fact that the development provides a settled base for occupants to have reasonable access to education and health facilities.
45. CS policy CS.21 sets out criteria against which proposals for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation will be assessed. However, it does not identify nor allocate sites for such developments, despite a recognised need for more pitches. Instead, CS policy CS.21 says that a forthcoming Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan will identify sites. No such document has been produced by the Council. To my mind, this represents a failure of policy as since the CS adoption in 2016 and seemingly for some time previous to this there has been no positive action from the Council to identify sites for Gypsies and Travellers pitches, despite the stated intention to do so under CS policy CS.21. This is a significant failing as the criteria-based policy approach has resulted in a persistent under-supply of pitches. The failure of policy attracts moderate weight in support of allowing the appeal.
46. As such, there are several factors which add support to the appeal development being allowed. Collectively, these attract considerable weight. However, the CS policies referred to under the first main issue are generally consistent with the provisions of the Framework that say planning decisions should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Also, my concerns over flood risk are supported by the provisions of the Framework. As such, I attach considerable weight to the harm caused by the development in these regards. The IUD issue adds a little further weight to my concerns. Overall, I find the benefits of the development and the other factors in support of allowing the appeal are of insufficient weight to justify granting planning permission contrary to the provisions of the CS and the Framework.
47. Whilst permanent planning permission is sought, I have considered whether granting temporary planning permission would be appropriate. The harmful effects of the development would be reduced if it is only allowed for a short period and during that time other sites could become available for the occupants. However, a temporary permission would also reduce the weight to be given to the identified

benefits. Even if I allow the development for a period of 3 years as discussed at the hearing, there is a significant risk of flood events occurring at the site during that time. As such, a temporary permission or a permission that allows only the current occupants to reside at the site would not fully address my concerns so as to make the development acceptable.

Human rights and public sector equality duty.

48. Dismissing this appeal could lead to the current occupants having to leave the site. Such a decision could interfere with their rights to peaceful enjoyment of their possessions and to respect for a private and family life and their home under Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998. However, these are qualified rights. Those that could be affected by the flood risk issues associated with the site include the current occupiers. With this in mind, I consider an interference with the occupants' human rights would accord with the law and be pursuant of well-established and legitimate aims to ensure development does not exacerbate flood risk and to recognise the intrinsic beauty of the countryside.
49. Also, I have due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. This sets out the need to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This includes those of a particular race and so the occupants of the development. Granting planning permission for a settled base close to Temple Grafton would advance equality in terms of providing Gypsies and Travellers with residential accommodation suited to their needs. It would also allow the opportunity for the occupants to foster good relationships with the local community. However, the harm caused by the development outweighs the benefits in these regards and so dismissing the appeal would be a proportionate and necessary response to the PSED.

Conclusion

50. The development conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Philip Brown

Natasha Birch

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Alex Williams

Counsel acting on behalf of the Council

Joshua Cooper

Planning Officer

INTERESTED PARTIES

Fraser Henderson

Temple Grafton Parish Council and
objector

Ashley Jones

District Councillor and objector

LIST OF DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING:

1. Planning permission reference number 23/00600.FUL for removal of hedge and erection of gates and piers at The Birches, Temple Grafton.
2. Environment Agency Surface Water Flood Maps.