



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 20 January 2026

Site visits made on 19 January 2026 and 23 January 2026

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/25/3369680

Land Opposite Meadow View, Shortwood Road, Pucklechurch BS16 9PQ

- 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 Jason McDonagh against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/02055/F.
 - The development proposed is described as “change of use of land as a travellers caravan site”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use of land to travellers site (residential use) with the erection of 1no day room, 1no stable block, siting of 2no mobile homes and 2no touring caravans, creation of hardstanding, access onto a classified highway (Class B) and associated works at Land Opposite Meadow View, Shortwood Road, Pucklechurch BS16 9PQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P24/02055/F, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the header is taken from the application form. A different description is included on the appeal form and the Council’s decision notice. I have used this revised description in my decision above although I have added reference to a residential use for reasons of precision. At the hearing, the appellant’s agent indicated the proposed development would involve the keeping of horses as an incidental activity to the residential use. I am satisfied no prejudice would be caused to any party by basing my assessment on the amended decision.
3. The submitted drawings indicate the extent of the appeal site outlined in red and other land in the appellant’s ownership outlined in blue. As discussed at the hearing, my assessment is based on the proposed change of use relating only to the land within the defined appeal site, even though a submitted drawing shows the seeding to other land in the appellant’s ownership.
4. I carried out an unaccompanied visit to the appeal site and the surrounding area on the day before the hearing. During this visit, I was able to obtain clear views of the development plot from a public footpath along the western edge of the site. As such, there was no need for a visit to view the site with representatives of the Council and the appellant after the close of the hearing. However, I carried out a further unaccompanied visit following the hearing to experience views towards the site from a public footpath that runs from Gibbs Lane in Siston to Lodge Road.

5. On my first visit I saw on the appeal site an area of hardstanding, piles of spoil and building materials as well as items of plant and a vehicle. The site was previously a temporary construction compound associated with the creation of a cycleway/footpath on Shortwood Road. The appellant accepts that the hardstanding and debris on the site is unauthorised. At the hearing it was agreed that as a baseline for assessment purposes the plot should be treated as part of an open grass field. My assessment is made on this basis.
6. There is mention within the submissions of an emerging development plan document. I was advised at the hearing that this has been submitted for formal examination but no start date for the examination has been set. I have been provided with no copies of policies from this draft document and it attracts very little weight in my assessment as it is at a fairly early stage towards adoption.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are (i) whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Siston Conservation Area (the CA), (ii) if any harm to the significance of the CA would occur, whether the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh this harm, (iii) whether the proposal would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and (iv) its effect on the character and appearance of the area and the landscape in general terms.

Reasons

The effect on the CA.

8. The CA includes the hamlet of Siston and the surrounding countryside. Its northern boundary generally follows the southern edge of Shortwood Road. The appeal site is part of a field that adjoins Shortwood Road and that lies on the edge of the CA. The land slopes downwards from the road as it lies on one side of the Siston Brook Valley. The footpath on the edge of the plot runs downwards from the road and beyond the southern boundary of the appeal site before veering off across other paddocks towards Siston Lane.
9. The Siston Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (the SPD) explains the significance of the CA lies with the architectural and historic character of Siston Court, adjacent historic properties including St Anne's Church as well as outlying farms. Also, the SPD refers to the attractive rural landscape in which the Siston hamlet lies. The appeal site lies away from the hamlet and intervening vegetation and the landform means there would be little intervisibility between the proposed development and the historic buildings within the village. No concern is raised by the Council that the proposal would affect the setting of any listed building within Siston and I find no reason to disagree with this position.
10. However, the SPD also explains how the gently rising slopes of the Siston Brook Valley help enclose views out of the CA and screen encroaching development. The sense of enclosure achieved by landform and planting contributes to a perception of remoteness and tranquillity. The appeal site adds to this enclosed, rural setting to Siston as it forms part of a field on the slopes of the valley. Also, a hedge on the roadside provides a buffer between the countryside and Shortwood Road as well as the Meadow View Gypsy and Traveller site on the opposite side of the highway. Traffic noise is noticeable on the front part of the site. However, as you walk along the public footpath away from the highway the noise becomes

quieter and there is a distinct sense of being within a rural landscape with extensive views of the countryside. In these regards, the appeal site and its immediate surroundings make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.

11. The proposal would introduce mobile homes, touring caravans, a dayroom building and a stable block onto the site. Also, it would lead to hardstanding, parked vehicles, lighting, residential activity and associated paraphernalia on the land. Therefore, it would clearly change the appearance and nature of the site from its baseline condition as part of a grassed field. The proposed buildings and mobile homes would be fairly low and planting is proposed that would partially screen the development. However, it would still be seen from public vantage points, particularly from Shortwood Road at the site entrance and from the stretch of public footpath leading from the road to where it turns off towards Siston Lane. Also, it would be seen from a distance from the public footpath leading off Gibbs Lane and from private property and land on the other side of the valley.
12. The obvious change in the appearance and nature of the site would undermine its contribution towards providing an attractive rural setting to Siston. I note the presence of existing stables within adjoining fields. However, as well as a stable, the proposal would include the siting of caravans and a residential use that would more closely reflect the Meadow View site opposite rather than the rural landscape within the CA. As such, the proposal would not assist in screening out development beyond the CA boundaries. Instead, it would blur the distinction between the rural character of the land to the south of Shortwood Road and the developed land to the north of the highway. Therefore, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of part of the CA.
13. The proposed landscaping would not entirely conceal the development. Also, whilst it may soften its appearance, the planting would be seen alongside the mobile homes, the dayroom and stable building. The layout of the planting and the site as a whole would be quite regimented, although in these respects it would be similar to existing stable complexes I saw in adjoining fields. I am unconvinced the proposed planting and landscape features would fully address or overcome the harmful effects of the proposal on the nature and appearance of the site. However, the visual effects of the development would be minimised as it would be confined to the northern part of the field and it would include greenery as screening.
14. The Gypsy and Traveller site would increase activities on the plot as well as trips to and from the land. However, it is fair to expect residential accommodation to not create excessive noise, especially within the context of the significant road traffic noise that can be heard at the front of the site. As such, the development would not meaningfully undermine any sense of rural tranquillity that users of the footpath experience nor the tranquillity associated with the Siston hamlet itself.
15. Furthermore, the development would not affect any of the special features of the CA as identified on page 9 of the SPD. Also, the evidence indicates it would not be on land that was previously part of the formal gardens or parklands associated with Siston Court. There is no longer any obvious sign of a historic agricultural connection between the land on the appeal site and any farm within Siston. As such, the development would not harm any specific historic interest associated with the CA. However, acceptability in these respects does not address the detriment that would be caused to the character and appearance of the CA.

16. For the above reasons, I conclude the development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA and so it would harm its significance. In these respects, it would not accord with policy CS9 of the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy 2013 (the CS). Amongst other things, this looks to ensure that heritage assets are conserved, respected and enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance.
17. The proposal would affect only a small part of the CA, near to its boundary and away from the important heritage features within Siston hamlet. As such, only a limited level of harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the overall CA. Having regard to phraseology used in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA. As such, the Framework dictates the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Policy PSP17 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan 2017 (the LP) is consistent with the terms of the Framework in that it only allows development that would be detrimental to heritage assets where public benefits outweigh the harm.

Heritage balance.

18. Under the provisions of section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. The Framework states that great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation, even if a proposal causes less than substantial harm to its significance. However, the provisions of the Framework and LP policy PSP17 do not entirely preclude development that would be harmful to the qualities of the CA. Such proposals would be permissible if the public benefits of the scheme provide clear and convincing justification for any detriment that would be caused.
19. There are a number of public benefits to the proposal. Firstly, it would provide 2 additional Gypsy and Traveller pitches. This benefit attracts considerable weight as the Council has identified a need through a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment dated November 2023 for 119 extra pitches between 2022 to 2042. Furthermore, the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 years' worth of supply of deliverable Gypsy and Traveller Sites when assessed against this target of 119 pitches. As such, the Council is not meeting the requirement set out under the provisions of paragraph 10a of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). Indeed, at the hearing the Council's representative was unable to identify any deliverable sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. This is a highly unsatisfactory situation given the level of recognised need.
20. Secondly, allowing the development would help reduce the likelihood of unauthorised encampments by Gypsy and Travellers. This is a serious risk given the need for more sites and the lack of supply. In these regards, the proposal would accord with the aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 in terms of fostering good relationships between those of a Gypsy and Traveller ethnic group and those who do not share this protected characteristic.
21. Thirdly, the proposal would provide a settled base from where occupants would have reasonable access to facilities such as schools and health care. Whilst this would primarily be a private benefit to the residents, there is a more general social

advantage to ensuring people can be educated and treated appropriately. In these respects, the development would advance the equality of opportunity for Gypsy and Travellers as advocated under the PSED.

22. Finally, the development through proposed planting and measures to be secured through the mandatory biodiversity gain condition would increase the biodiversity value of the site. This would be a fairly minor enhancement given the size of the site but nonetheless it would be in the public interest for environmental reasons.
23. The public benefits of the proposal when considered together attract very great weight. They provide clear and convincing justification to allow the development, notwithstanding the great weight to be attached to the harm that would be caused to the character, appearance and significance of the CA. Moreover, the layout of the development towards the road and the proposed landscaping would minimise the detrimental effects and the Council is unable to identify any other site where the public benefits of the appeal development could be delivered. Consequently, when applying the heritage balance, the development would accord with LP policy PSP17 and the terms of the Framework. Acceptability in these regards overrides the identified non-compliance with CS policy CS9 as this is inconsistent with paragraph 215 of the Framework and the requirement to weigh the less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset against any public benefits.

Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

24. The appeal site lies in designated Green Belt. Paragraph 16 of the PPTS clarifies that Gypsy and Traveller sites would be deemed as inappropriate development within the Green Belt unless exceptions set out in chapter 13 of the Framework apply. Paragraphs 154 and 155 of the Framework set out the types of development that are not inappropriate within the Green Belt.
25. CS policy CS5 states that development in the Green Belt will need to comply with the provisions of the Framework. Similarly, CS policy CS34 and LP policy PSP7 seek to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development unless very special circumstances exist. However, CS policy CS21 is inconsistent with the PPTS and the Framework as it does not allow for Gypsy and Traveller site proposals to be deemed as not inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Given this inconsistency, I attach very little weight to CS policy CS21 in my consideration of this main issue. Instead, the appropriate approach is to ascertain whether the proposal would fall within any of the development categories under paragraphs 154 and 155 of the Framework.
26. There is no case made by the appellant that the development when considered as a whole would fall within any of the exceptions listed under paragraph 154 of the Framework. I find no reason to disagree with this view.
27. Paragraph 155 of the Framework explains the situations when development on grey belt land within the Green Belt would be acceptable. In the statement of common ground prepared by the Council and the appellant it is stated the appeal site does not meet the definition of grey belt land as set out in the Framework. However, this stance assumes the policies of the Framework on heritage assets such as conservation areas provide a strong reason for refusing the development. For reasons as outlined under the first 2 main issues, I have already found that the development would accord with the Framework's provisions on protecting heritage assets as the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh any harm to the CA.

28. Furthermore, the site is a fairly small parcel of land away from any sizeable settlement. It does not serve a purpose in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas, in preventing towns from merging or by preserving the setting and special character of historic towns. Therefore, having regard to the full definition as set out in the Framework, the site represents grey belt land.
29. Under the second main issue, I have already identified a demonstrable unmet need for the development. The Gypsy and Traveller site would represent a form of development encroachment into the countryside. However, this would be to a fairly minor level so the proposal would not fundamentally undermine this or any of the other purposes of the remaining Green Belt within the Council's area. The development would provide a settled base with reasonable access to services within nearby Pucklechurch and to a broader range of facilities on the edge of Bristol. Therefore, it would be in a sustainable location having regard to the considerations outlined in paragraph 13 of the PPTS. As such, the proposal would accord with parts (a), (b) and (c) of paragraph 155 of the Framework. Part (d) of the same paragraph is not applicable as paragraph 18 of the PPTS states the Golden Rules do not apply to Gypsy and Traveller sites.
30. For the above reasons, I conclude the proposal would accord fully with paragraph 155 of the Framework and so it would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Therefore, it would accord with CS policies CS5 and CS34 as well as LP policy PSP7 that seek to resist inappropriate development in the Green Belt. As such, with regard to these policies, there is no requirement to consider the harmful effects of the development on openness or any other harm to establish whether very special circumstances exist.
31. At odds with the policies referred to in the paragraph above, CS policy CS21 dictates the proposal should not be approved except in very special circumstances. However, for the reasons given above, this policy is inconsistent with the PPTS and the Framework's provisions on Green Belt and so it attracts very little weight. When considering the local and national planning policy context as a whole, I find the development would be acceptable when assessed against Green Belt policy.

Effect on character and appearance of the area and landscape.

32. My considerations on the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the CA are covered under the first main issue. In addition, the Council raises concerns over the proposal's effect on the landscape in general terms. While it falls within the CA, the site and the wider area is not formally recognised for its scenic or landscape quality. Even so, the fields and hedgerows and views across the valley area have an intrinsic beauty that is reflective of the countryside.
33. The proposed buildings, caravans and other features associated with the residential use would be visible from the roadside, from the adjoining public right of way, from private land further down the slope and at a distance from land to the other side of the valley. The development would not be highly prominent due to the screening effects of existing and proposed vegetation. However, it would be very near to the public footpath to the side of the site and it would be seen on higher land when approaching along the footpath from the south. The proposal would therefore noticeably undermine the site's contribution as part of an open field to the rural qualities of the area.

34. The proposal would be near to a busy road and a Gypsy and Traveller site on the opposite side of the highway. However, due to the hedgerow along the roadside boundary of the site, it would be read as a separate entity and as encroachment of development into open countryside.
35. The scheme would lead to a new subdivision of the field. However, several local fields have already been sub-divided so there is an evolving pattern of smaller paddocks, with some containing stables. I also note a line of properties that face onto Shortwood Road to the west of the site. The depth of the appeal site and the development in relation to the road would be similar to these existing properties. Within this context, I find the sub-division of the field would avoid meaningful harm to the fundamental qualities of the landscape.
36. Nevertheless, for the reasons given I conclude the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and the landscape. In these regards, it would not accord with CS policies CS1, CS9 and CS34 and LP policy PSP1. Amongst other things, these look to ensure development respects and enhances the character and distinctiveness of the rural landscape.
37. The Council's refusal reasons also refer to LP policy PSP2. This supports proposals that conserve and where appropriate enhance the quality of the landscape. However, it also states that where development would cause harm in these respects it must result in benefits that outweigh the harm and that any harm is minimised and mitigated through landscape enhancements.
38. The position of the development towards the road and the inclusion of the proposed planting would represent reasonable mitigation so as to minimise the visual impacts of the development, albeit the scheme would still cause harm to the landscape. It follows to consider whether the benefits of the proposal would outweigh the detriment to the landscape to establish whether there is a conflict with LP policy PSP2. My considerations on this matter are covered in the Planning Balance section of this decision.

Other concerns.

39. Interested parties have raised other concerns with the proposal. The appellant's ecological assessment sets out measures to ensure no harm would be caused to protected species. The assessment was carried out after the site had been used as a temporary construction compound but this is an appropriate approach as the compound was lawfully constructed. In any event, there is little evidence to indicate the site supported protected species when it was an open field.
40. Vehicles coming to and from the development would need to cross the newly created cycleway and footway to the front of the site. However, drivers entering or leaving the site would be travelling slowly and there is sufficient visibility to ensure no unacceptable risk to cyclists or pedestrians.
41. The development would only be seen in the distance from the Cotswold National Landscape (the NL) and as part of a much wider visual envelope that includes the Gypsy and Traveller site on the opposite side of the road. As such, the proposal would not harm the qualities of the NL nor its setting.

42. I am taken to no policy that resists the loss of agricultural land. Also, it is unlikely the development would lead to unsustainable pressure on local services such as schools and health facilities as the proposal would only provide 2 pitches.
43. None of the above concerns constitute reasons to refuse planning permission. As such, they do not affect my overall conclusion.

Planning balance.

44. The development would be acceptable having regard to planning policies on heritage assets and Green Belt. However, the harm that would be caused to the landscape means the proposal would not fully accord with the development plan policies when read as a whole. It follows to consider whether other factors justify allowing planning permission contrary to the development plan.
45. The Council is unable to demonstrate a supply of 5 years' worth of deliverable Gypsy and Traveller sites against its targets and so paragraph 28 of the PPTS says paragraph 11(d) of the Framework should apply. This states that planning permission should be granted unless the circumstances as laid out in sub-paragraphs 11(d)(i) or (ii) exist. The development would be acceptable when assessed against the Framework's provisions on heritage assets and Green Belt and so sub-paragraph 11(d)(i) is not engaged. It follows to weigh the benefits of the proposal against the harm that would be caused to the landscape in light of the policies of the Framework taken as a whole.
46. The development would help meet South Gloucestershire's need for more Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in line with the government's objective set out in paragraph 61 of the Framework. Also, it would help address the government's aim as set out at paragraph 4 of the PPTS to promote more private Gypsy and Traveller site provision in general terms. The proposal would make a modest contribution of only 2 extra pitches but given the recognised shortfall in the supply of sites the benefits in these regards attracts significant weight.
47. The proposal would go against the advice at paragraph 187 of the Framework to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. However, the affected landscape is not formally recognised as being of the highest quality and the visual effects of the development would be fairly localised, particularly once the proposed planting has matured. Consequently, I attach moderate weight to the harm the proposal would cause in these regards.
48. Therefore, I find the adverse impacts of allowing the development in terms of its effect on the landscape would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. As such, the circumstances as set out under sub-paragraph 11(d)(ii) of the Framework do not exist and so the presumption in favour of sustainable development as laid out under paragraph 11 of the Framework is applicable. It also follows that the proposal would accord with LP policy PSP2 as the benefits of the proposal would outweigh the harm to the landscape. Accordingly, I find there are material considerations that justify granting planning permission contrary to CS and LP policies.

Conditions

49. A discussion was held at the hearing on the list of suggested conditions from the Council. Where appropriate I have made amendments for reasons of precision and

to remove unnecessary pre-commencement requirements. I have included condition 2 on the approved plans for reasons of clarity. I have amended the condition to require the mobile homes to be laid out as shown on the plans so as to minimise the visual impact of the development and to ensure sufficient parking and turning space.

50. Condition 3 is imposed to minimise the visual effects of the development. This condition covers the requirement to submit and carry out a landscape maintenance scheme. Conditions 4 and 5 are required to ensure the development causes no harm to protected species and wildlife. In light of these conditions, I find no need for a landscape and ecological management plan or a construction environmental plan to be approved and implemented. Moreover, there is no need to include the mandatory biodiversity gain condition as it is deemed to apply in any case under the provisions of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
51. Condition 6 is imposed to minimise the visual effects of the development and impacts on bats. Conditions 7 and 8 are also imposed to protect the attractiveness and tranquillity of the area by limiting caravans and activities on the site. However, there is no need for a condition that limits the number of horses that could be kept on the site as this would be controlled by the scale of the proposed stables. Also, a condition that restricts the parking of larger vehicles is unnecessary as the development would only consist of a residential use and incidental keeping of horses. The suggested condition that prevents fences, jumps or horse boxes on the site would be unreasonable and unnecessary as there would be little scope to exercise horses within the proposed traveller site itself and as such restrictions would potentially undermine the keeping of horses as proposed.
52. My assessment has been made on the basis the development would be occupied by Gypsies and Travellers and there is little evidence before me to indicate the development would be acceptable if occupied by any other persons. Therefore, it is necessary to impose a condition (no 9) that limits the occupancy of the development. A discussion was held at the hearing on conditions that would allow the development for a temporary period or that would restrict occupancy to individuals identified as intended residents by the appellant. However, for the reasons given above, I find that permanent permission in this case is justified. Also, the evidence provided on the personal circumstances of occupants has not been determinative in my assessment. Therefore, these conditions are not required.
53. Finally, I find the suggested condition on hours of construction work is not needed. The site is set away from any residences and noise from construction works is unlikely to affect living conditions given local traffic noise.

Conclusion

54. In some respects, the proposal would conflict with the development plan but material considerations strongly indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Dr Angus Murdoch

Mr Rhodri Crandon

Mrs Nichola Burley

Mr Jason McDonagh

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mrs Marie Bath

Mrs Jane Jarvis

Mr Rob Nicholson

INTERESTED PARTIES

Councillor Marilyn Palmer

District Councillor and objector

Ms Edina Boardman

Supporter of the proposal.

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out, and the mobile homes allowed shall be positioned, in accordance with drawing nos TDA.2974.01, TDA.2974.02, TDA.2974.03 revision D, TDA.2974.04 and TDA.2974.05 revision A.
- 3) Prior to the first use of the site as a travellers site the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:-
 - (i) a detailed landscaping and planting plan specifying the location, species, stock size, planting centres and quantities of all proposed native tree and hedgerow planting, together with details of all proposed boundary and hard landscape surface treatments, including proposed levels and any soil retention/retaining walls that may be required;
 - (ii) a timetable for the implementation of the proposed landscaping and planting; and
 - (iii) a 5 year landscape maintenance schedule covering the establishment of all new planting (and including watering).

The provision and maintenance of the approved landscaping and planting shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 4) Prior to the first use of the site as a travellers site, details of the location and specification of ecological enhancements such as a number of bird, bat and insect boxes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All the approved measures shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved and they shall thereafter be retained.
- 5) The development shall proceed in strict accordance with the mitigation measures as set out in Table 2 of the Ecological Assessment (by Brown Fisher Environmental, Reports 4 Planning and GS Ecology dated 8 August 2024, report reference number 247089PEA).
- 6) No external lighting shall be installed on the traveller site hereby permitted until details of the lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Only external lighting that has been approved by the local planning authority shall be installed on the site.
- 7) There shall be no more than 2 pitches on the land subject of this permission and within each individual pitch there shall be no more than one mobile home and one touring caravan (as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 as amended) stationed at any one time.
- 8) No commercial activities shall take place on the traveller site hereby permitted, including the storage of materials, a livery, a riding school or any other business.
- 9) The site hereby permitted 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.