



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 17 December 2025

Site visit made on 17 December 2025

by H Nicholls MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/H1840/W/25/3363594

Honey Orchard, Doverdale WR9 0QB

- 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 Scott Dunne against the decision of Wychavon District Council.
 - The application Ref is W/24/01841/FUL.
 - The development proposed is change of use of land to a mixed use for the keeping of horses and as a residential caravan site for 3 Gypsy/Traveller families, with a total of 4 caravans including no more than 3 static caravans, together with the laying of hardstanding, widening of access, and erection of amenity building (part retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use of land to a mixed use for the keeping of horses and as a residential caravan site for 3 Gypsy/Traveller families, with a total of 4 caravans including no more than 3 static caravans, together with the laying of hardstanding, widening of access, and erection of amenity building (part retrospective) at Honey Orchard, Doverdale, WR9 0QB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref W/24/01841/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. Insofar as the hard surfacing has been laid across the extent of the site already, the appeal scheme is partly retrospective. The widening of the access, and construction of the amenity building are prospective aspects, and though the site is in residential purposes in connection with an extant permission, only one caravan was on site at the time of my visit.
3. The previous permission on the site was granted under reference 19/02414/CU on 11 February 2020 (the '2020 decision'). It allows for the mixed use of the site for the permanent stationing of up to two caravans (one static) for occupiers that meet the definition of Gypsies and Travellers under the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) (then, of 2015) and for the keeping of horses. The permission is not personalised, though the appellant is the same individual named on the 2020 decision and has declared his interest as the landowner of the site on the current appeal application form.
4. An existing stable block was to be retained as part of the mixed residential and equestrian use of the site under the 2020 decision. Though the appellant has adjoining grazing land which can be accessed from the site, the domestic use¹ of

¹ For storage, utility and recreational purposes

the stable block appears to have largely overtaken any equestrian use that may occur on the site on an infrequent or seasonal basis. However, as it was claimed that it was still relevant, I have included reference to the mixed use of the land within the description of the current appeal proposal to enable any ongoing equestrian use of the site. The inclusion of this aspect was not considered prejudicial to any interested parties.

5. The Council has identified that the permission given under the 2020 decision has been implemented, albeit that a number of conditions have been breached. Whilst the Council has instigated and paused enforcement action, my decision in this case is without prejudice to any other proceedings.
6. On the basis that there is a permanent permission for at least one Traveller pitch (for up to one static and one touring caravan), I shall hereafter refer to it as Pitch 1. The proposal essentially seeks to supersede the permission which has been implemented by increasing the number of pitches to 3 (with up to 4 caravans in total: 3 statics and 1 tourer). I shall refer to these additional pitches as Pitches 2 and 3. The amenity building is proposed in connection with Pitches 2 and 3.
7. A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) was agreed on 19 September 2025. The agreed position at that time was that the Council could not demonstrate a five year supply of pitches for Gypsies and Travellers as required by the PPTS (updated 2024) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In November 2025, and as part of the examination process for the emerging South Worcestershire Development Plan Review (eSWDPR), the Council produced an update on its supply of pitches. This essentially changed the Council's position on its five year supply, reneging the concession in the SoCG. The implications of this changed position was therefore considered as part of the hearing.
8. Despite that the written evidence of the appellant referred to personal circumstances being a relevant material consideration, no names or other relevant details were provided until the day of the hearing itself. The detail provided of the proposed occupiers of Pitches 2 and 3² was not extensive and its acceptance was not considered prejudicial to the Council's case. I return to this further below.

Main Issues

9. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - whether the location of the development would accord with local policies concerning development in the countryside;
 - the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
 - the effects of the proposal on local amenity; and
 - whether other considerations, including the general need for and supply of Gypsy sites, outweigh any harm identified, such as to justify the development.

Reasons

Location of development

10. The *South Worcestershire Development Plan* (SWDP) (adopted 2016) includes a criteria based policy for the consideration of Gypsy and Traveller proposals, policy

² Hearing document 1

SWDP17. It indicates that the Councils³ will identify additional sites in a Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Site Allocations Development Plan Document and assess the suitability of proposals and planning applications (including for the intensification or expansion of existing authorised sites where appropriate) against a range of criteria.

11. In respect of the location of the appeal scheme, criterion i) of SWDP17 asks for consideration as to whether the site is within or on the edge of a town or Category 1, 2 or 3 settlement. The appeal site lies in a countryside position around 100m away from a public house, and a short distance again from the rural hamlet of Doverdale. It is also around 1.4km from the village of Dunhampton; a lower category settlement which has a shop and filling station. The other higher order settlements closest to the appeal site are Ombersley, around 4km away, which is a category 1 settlement, and the main town of Droitwich Spa, which is around 5km away from the appeal site by road.
12. Criterion vii) of policy SWDP17 requires consideration to be given to whether the size of the site and the number of pitches are of an appropriate scale for the location. Criterion x) requires consideration be given to whether the site has reasonable access to health services, schools and employment. Clearly, the site's size and location were previously found acceptable for one pitch, but the current proposal would intensify that use by a further two pitches, with additional future occupiers requiring access to everyday facilities and services of the type described in x).
13. The site is a distance from a main town and higher order settlements but offers a base from which residents could benefit from access to health services, schools and employment by relatively short road journeys. Whilst some facilities would be within cycling distance, the main mode of transport would most likely be by private vehicle. The aims in the PPTS are expressed as seeking to ensure that Traveller sites offer suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure, however, it does not define the preferred means by which Travellers should access these facilities. Taking a balanced view, whilst the site is not entirely sustainably located, it would provide at least reasonable access to a range of facilities.
14. In view of the above, I consider that the location of the appeal scheme complies with, in particular, SWDP policy SWDP17 x) concerning the location of Traveller developments in the countryside.

Character and appearance

15. The appeal site is a levelled area, now entirely hardsurfaced, extending to around 0.45 hectares. It adjoins an unnamed rural road to the north and west, which is also part of a popular walking route and National Cycle Route. To the south lies the car park and garden area associated with the public house. To the east is an area of pastureland within the appellant's ownership, bound on its eastern side by a wooded area along a brook which forms part of the *Hadley, Elmley and Hockley Brooks Local Wildlife Site* (LWS).
16. The exterior of the site is enclosed by robust native hedgerows which are managed to maintain at least an equivalent height of the internal close-boarded

³ The South Worcestershire Councils of Wychavon District Council, Malvern Hills District Council and Worcester City Council

fence of around 2m. There is a break in the hedge to allow for a wide point of access which has close-boarded timber gates of around 2m high. This access and gateway would be made modestly wider through the appeal proposal to facilitate simpler access with vehicles and caravans.

17. The appeal site is a part of the wider rural scene which comprises large areas of connected agricultural land which features occasional hamlets, isolated houses and rural buildings. Whilst mobile home sites are a less frequent occurrence, they are present in the local landscape and are not, in themselves, an incongruous feature.
18. The appeal site baseline is that of a mixed use for the keeping of horses and as a residential caravan site, and the upper parts of the existing stable block/amenity building and mobile home are visible from the adjoining rural road and from Doverdale Lane. Due to the robustness and height of the hedge, in addition to the internal close-boarded fence, there is no real visual permeability into the site to its hardstanding and it is only the parts of buildings and caravans above the fence and hedgerows of around 2m that can or would be seen. If the hedgerows were managed to a higher height, even less of these structures would be seen, particularly in summer. There would also be a further effect on the general rural ambience and tranquillity of the area with additional comings and goings of vehicles and people.
19. There is also an area to the north, north-east of the site on the adjoining rural road where the level changes and gaps in the tree belt along the brook reveal the elevation of the site and the eastern boundary evergreen hedgerow. From this particular viewpoint, the addition of further caravans and another building above the hedgerow would be most noticeable and would result in a degree of landscape and visual change.
20. The requirement under policy SWDP17 vii) as to whether the size of the site and the number of pitches are of an appropriate scale for the site also has a visual dimension. In this case, the site is of adequate size to accommodate the caravans and buildings proposed with adequate manoeuvring space. Whilst it would use the site more efficiently than for a single pitch, it would not appear cramped and would allow for the introduction of additional landscaping so as to soften the effects of the development.
21. There is a collection of established trees alongside the western boundary within a grassed amenity area but few areas of green within the site itself. A meaningful landscaping scheme, on eventual establishment, could help to soften the effects of the appeal proposal. However, on the basis that the existing hedgerow management would continue and until such a time as a landscaping scheme has been approved, implemented and established, a degree of landscape and visual harm would result from the total net addition of up to two caravans and a further building onto the appeal site. This would raise a degree of conflict with policy SWDP25 of the SWDP which seeks to ensure that proposals are appropriate to, and integrate with, the character of the landscape setting.
22. In respect of Traveller site proposals and intensification schemes, policy SWDP17, criterion v) requires consideration be given to whether any *significant* visual impact on the landscape can be mitigated (my emphasis). In my view, the visual impacts of the proposal would not be significant. SWDP17 criterion xi) asks whether the

site complies with good practice on designing Gypsy and Traveller sites. Insofar as the site is relatively spacious and benefits from enclosure by hedgerows, rather than entirely by high fences or walls, and contains some trees and soft landscaping, it complies with the PPTS. It could go further to introduce soft landscaping within and between pitches by way of a planning condition. However, on the basis that the proposal does not reach the threshold of significant visual harm and could also be made to comply with good practice on designing Traveller sites, the proposal does not conflict with policy SWDP17 of the SWDP.

Local amenity

23. Criterion ix) of SWDP17 asks whether the site is capable of providing adequate on-site services for water supply, mains electricity, waste disposal and foul and surface water drainage. The site is currently lawfully occupied and has a water supply and mains electricity. The appellant also advised that the site has a foul drainage connection to a septic tank and that there is a means of surface water drainage, though the related condition on the 2020 decision remains undischarged and I have not been provided with further details of such. Whether additional means of foul or surface water drainage would be required to facilitate the two additional pitches is unclear from the evidence before me. As such, this aspect would need to be conditioned, though it appears that there is sufficient room within the appeal site or within land owned by the appellant to fulfil the requirements of such a condition.
24. In terms of site lighting, which also has a visual dimension at nighttime, it is clear from the correspondence of interested parties that, at times, the levels of illumination at night have been excessive. To this end, I visited the appeal site location during the hours of darkness and found a low level of lighting at the site entrance gates and relatively limited lighting internal to the site. The adjoining public house has some floodlighting within its car parking area which was also on during the time of my visit. Given the rural character of the area and likelihood of dark skies being beneficial for biodiversity reasons, only limited night lighting should be used. This is an aspect which can be the subject of a planning condition.
25. The Council's decision notice also referred to PPTS paragraph 4 k) which seeks to ensure that in determining proposals for Traveller sites, local planning authorities give due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The proposal would not give rise to direct impacts on local residents through overlooking or excessive noise or disturbance. No other potential environmental effects have been brought to my attention that could not otherwise be addressed through drainage and lighting conditions. The scale of the proposal would not result in any domination of the nearest settled community, and whilst residents would need to access local healthcare and education facilities, the Council has not raised any issue about there being insufficient capacity to accommodate the increase in residents that would be associated with the proposal.
26. For the above reasons, the proposal does not conflict with policy SWDP17 of the SWDP or the PPTS.

Need, supply and alternative Gypsy/Traveller pitch considerations

27. The PPTS sets out that local planning authorities should identify and update annually, a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites against their locally set targets. It also clarifies that to be considered

deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that development will be delivered on the site within five years.

28. The *South Worcestershire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2019-2041* (July 2024) (the GTANA) looks at the accommodation needs for Travellers for the combined Council areas over the projected plan period. The need for the five year period for 2024 to 2029 for the Wychavon District to meet the ethnic definition of Travellers is for 57 pitches.
29. In its note, *Explanatory note on 5 year land supply position for Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpeople plots in Wychavon District Council*⁴, the Council breaks down the need for Wychavon for the entire plan period into five year sections. For the 2024 to 2029 five year period, the total need is for 57 pitches which equates to an annualised need of 11.4 pitches (rounded up or down to the nearest whole number).
30. The Council's monitoring data from Table 1 indicates that in the year 2024/2025, 10 pitches were granted permission and in the year 2025/2026, a further 28 had been given permission. The data therefore indicates that a cumulative total of 38 pitches had received permission against a need for those two particular years of 23 pitches.
31. The appellant's position is that the Council's approach to a five year supply was incorrect and that it was demonstrating less than the entire five years' worth of front-loaded supply as required by the PPTS. I agree that the Council appear to be setting the need targets for each five year period of the plan, then disaggregating it into an annualised requirement. It is then monitoring the cumulative supply from each year against the cumulative annualised need, rather than across the entire five year period. The rationale behind this approach has not been sufficiently evidenced. As such, until the Council can identify allocations or other sources of supply equal to or greater to the relevant full five year local requirement, my conclusion is that there is a shortfall in the supply of pitches.
32. During the hearing, an attempt was made to bring the need and supply position up-to-date for the current period 2025 – 2030 through oral submissions. For this period, the total need is around 52 pitches⁵, and at the present time, the supply of only 28 pitches granted permission in 2025/2026 contributes to meeting this need. The effect is that the shortfall is marginally greater if looking at this particular five year period compared to the 2024-2029 period that was considered in the written evidence, but it does not change the overall position that there is a shortfall in any event.
33. Whilst the Council indicated that the approach to monitoring the supply against the locally set need was considered as part of the examination on the eSWDPR and no issues had been raised with it thus far, I have not been provided with any Inspector's notes or similar evidence to corroborate this point. As such, I have reached my judgement on the evidence before me and the discussion that took place at the hearing.

⁴ Dated 18 November 2025

⁵ $11.4 \times 4 + 6$ (annualised requirement of 6 pitches per year for 2029/30 – 2033/34) = 51.6 pitches needed for 2025 – 2030, excluding the deficit of 1 pitch from the supply of 2024/2025.

34. In terms of alternative site considerations, the Council did not highlight any sites, available now, that would be preferable to intensifying the residential use of the appeal site. The appellant referred to caselaw⁶ about the responsibility for demonstrating available alternative sites and the approach to considering availability but did not know of any other sites available at the present time. Those to which the Council refer as being part of the allocations within the eSWDPR or within applications under consideration or due to be submitted were not considered by the appellant as meeting the definition of being available now. I do not disagree and cannot point to any alternative available sites to which the future occupiers may be directed in the event of a dismissal of the appeal.

Personal circumstances

35. It was agreed that the appellant, his wife and resident dependants can continue to benefit from the permanent permission to live on the appeal site on Pitch 1 which means that the consideration of personal circumstances is limited to those that would occupy Pitches 2 and 3.
36. The information submitted details that the occupiers of Pitches 2 and 3 would be the appellant's adult sisters, their spouses (where relevant) and their resident dependants. Of the six named dependants of these households, two are children, albeit both are towards the cusp of adulthood. It is not suggested, that given their ages, the two children that would move onto the site would be seeking access to any local school. One of the proposed adult residents has an ongoing medical condition that requires ongoing treatment.
37. It was also stated that one of the households lives in another authority area doubled up on a pitch with other family, whereas the other is currently living on the roadside, albeit without detail as to general whereabouts. The GTANA forecasts an equivalent inflow of Travellers to those migrating out from the area, so the effect of these two households coming into the area would not be of particular consequence in terms of overall pitch needs.
38. If the appellant sought to accommodate his extended family as explained, the provision of Pitches 2 and 3 alongside Pitch 1 would create a larger site for the extended family to facilitate the Traveller tradition. Those households, including children, would also benefit from the security of uninterrupted access to healthcare and education, should it be required. It would also provide a settled base to two households that would avoid the need for overcrowded doubling up arrangements and reduce the need for long-distance travelling and possible environmental damage caused by unauthorised encampments.

Other Matters

39. The Council's Delegated Report refers to the requirement for biodiversity enhancements to be included within the scheme, despite that none were secured under the 2020 permission. Since that time, the Environment Act of 2021 has mandated the requirement to provide a biodiversity net gain measures (BNG) of at least 10% uplift as part of all proposals, unless otherwise exempted. Whilst my attention was drawn to an appeal decision⁷ in which it was claimed that BNG was not required due to the retrospective nature of the scheme, I do not consider that

⁶ Doncaster MBC v FSS & Angela Smith [2007] and S Cambs DC v SSCLG and Julie Brown [2008] EWCA Civ 1010

⁷ Appeal Ref: APP/T3725/W/24/3356326 which was retrospective under Section 73A of the Act

position accurate in relation to the appeal scheme before me. Both parties agreed that if BNG were required, it could be secured by planning condition. I agree that this would be an appropriate course of action and could encompass any other biodiversity enhancement measures that could be delivered on the site.

40. I have taken into account the representations made by local residents in connection with the appeal scheme and deal with the specific matters not addressed elsewhere. In terms of the suitability of the highway to accommodate large vehicles, the Council's Highways Officer did not object on highway safety grounds, subject to details on the access widening, and considered that the increased vehicular movements associated with the site would be minor. The proposal would introduce up to two additional static caravans above the number of caravans that may currently be brought onto the land. These are not the type of caravans that are transported frequently such that there would be regular movements of heavy goods vehicles along the rural roads leading to the site, particularly with a condition limiting other large vehicles being brought to the site.
41. Whilst I note the reference to the previous application refusal for a total of four pitches to be created and that many local residents do not consider that the position has materially changed in respect of this three pitch proposal, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits and am not persuaded that the earlier refusal of permission should dictate the outcome in this particular case.

Planning Balance

42. The landscape and visual harms bring the scheme into conflict with SWDP policy SWDP25, though the harms do not exceed the higher threshold set in SWDP policy SWDP17 in relation to Traveller proposals. Nonetheless, these are adverse impacts that would result from the appeal scheme.
43. The benefits of the appeal scheme include the provision of two further pitches to meet the needs of Travellers and to help address the five year supply shortfall. For the future occupiers, whoever they may be, there are many benefits that come with having access to a permanent stable base, including the reduction in the need to travel long distances or resort to unauthorised encampments.
44. Paragraph 28 of the PPTS sets out 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 Framework apply. I have found this to be relevant in this case based on the evidence before me.
45. Paragraph 11 d) of the Framework sets out that where the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless: (i) the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed; or (ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the 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.
46. There are no policies in the Framework that provide a strong reason for refusal of the appeal scheme under 11 d) (i). Having given particular regard to the key policies of the Framework, the adverse impacts of the appeal scheme do not

significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Even if the proposal is taken as being in conflict with the development plan as a whole, the provisions of the Framework indicate, in this case, that a decision should be taken other than in accordance therewith. I have reached these conclusions without reliance on the personal circumstances of the intended occupiers.

Conditions

47. As the development has already commenced, a statutory time limit condition is not required. However, in the interests of certainty, a condition is necessary to specify that the appeal scheme shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved specified plans. As the proposed site plan details the limited access widening works which are proposed, more for convenience than any need for highway safety reasons, no further details of such are required by condition.
48. As details and capacity of foul and surface water drainage infrastructure is lacking from the appeal submission, a condition is required to secure these details prior to the occupation of Pitches 2 and 3. Similarly, details of the required cycle parking are required to maximise the ability for residents to use non-car modes of travel, prior to occupation of Pitches 2 and 3.
49. It is necessary to limit the number of pitches and caravans across the site taken as a whole in the interests of clarity and in order to limit the effects on the surrounding landscape. A scheme of landscaping is also required by condition to secure soft landscaping to offset the increase in the number and visibility of caravans and structures.
50. As details are also lacking in respect of the provision of external lighting and prohibition on other sources of external light other than any approved, a condition is necessary in relation to such. As the appeal scheme is not exempt from securing BNG measures, a condition is required to secure the provision of such.
51. In order to ensure that commercial activities are not undertaken with potential disruption to the amenities of neighbours, a condition is required to prohibit such. For similar reasons and in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition is required to limit the storage of large vehicles on the site.
52. In order to ensure that the amenity building is used for purposes incidental to the residential use of the site, a condition is required to specify such.
53. In addition, a condition is needed to limit the occupation of the site to Travellers that accord with the current definition of such. Despite the variance in the wording of the condition, this will make the permission for Pitches 2 and 3 broadly consistent with that for Pitch 1. However, as the permission for Pitch 1 is not strictly personalised to the appellant and the personal circumstances of the intended occupiers of Pitches 2 and 3 have not been determinative in this case, no personalised conditions are necessary.

Conclusion

54. For the foregoing reasons, the appeal is allowed.

H Nicholls

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Philip Brown

Agent, Philip Brown Associates

Scott Dunne

Appellant

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Julie Morgan

Wychavon District Council

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Chris Day

Ombersley Ward Councillor

HEARING DOCUMENTS:

Hearing document 1

Personal circumstances of intended occupiers

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) Unless where required or allowed by other conditions attached to this permission the development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the information (including details on the proposed materials) provided on the application form and the following plans/drawings/documents;
 - Site Location Plan submitted 12 Sept 2024
 - Proposed Site Layout submitted 12 Sept 2024
 - Floor Plan & Elevations submitted 12 Sept 2024
- 2) The caravans shall not be brought onto Pitches 2 and 3 or occupied until sheltered and secure cycle parking to comply with the Council's adopted highway design guide has been provided in accordance with details which shall first be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved cycle parking shall be kept available for the parking of bicycles only.
- 3) The caravans shall not be brought onto Pitches 2 and 3 until full details of all foul and surface water drainage systems to serve the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved drainage works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before occupation of any caravans on Pitches 2 and 3 and shall be retained thereafter.
- 4) The residential use of the whole site shall be restricted to a total of three pitches and for the stationing of no more than FOUR caravan(s), as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968, of which no more than THREE shall be static caravans.
- 5) 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, in accordance with Planning Policy for Traveller Sites or replacement planning policy or guidance.
- 6) The caravans shall not be brought onto Pitches 2 and 3 or occupied until a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The Biodiversity Net Gain Plan shall include the following details:
 - (a) information about the steps taken or to be taken to minimise the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the onsite habitat and any other habitat;
 - (b) the pre-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat;
 - (c) the post-development biodiversity value of the onsite habitat; (d) any registered offsite biodiversity gain allocated to the development and the biodiversity and the biodiversity value of that gain in relation to the development;

(e) any biodiversity credits purchased for the development from either DEFRA / NE or a provider in operation and that is listed in the National Biodiversity Gain Sites Register.

The Biodiversity Net Gain Plan shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details.

- 7) No more than 1 vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on the site.
- 8) The amenity block building hereby permitted shall only be used for amenity purposes ancillary to the use of the site as a residential caravan site.
- 9) No commercial activities shall take place on the site, including the storage of materials.
- 10) The caravans shall not be brought onto Pitches 2 and 3 or occupied until details of any external lighting to be provided in association with the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include times when the external lighting will not be switched on. Only external lighting in accordance with approved details shall be provided on the application site.

ENDS ----