
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 24 November 2025

by **V Simpson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/F1610/W/25/3372305

Ampney Park, Ampney Crucis, Cirencester GL7 5RY

- 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 Ms E Krohn of Ampney Park Ltd against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/03368/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as the change of use of existing residential and ancillary buildings, demolition of modern buildings and structures and erection of new buildings together with access, parking and landscape works, repair of existing listed and curtilage listed structures, all in association with the proposed new use of the site as a function / events venue location including visitor accommodation and associated facilities (sui generis mix of uses).
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/F1610/Y/25/3372326

Ampney Park, Ampney Crucis, Cirencester GL7 5RY

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Ms E Krohn of Ampney Park Ltd against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/03369/LBC.
 - The works proposed are described as the change of use of existing residential and ancillary buildings, demolition of modern buildings and structures and erection of new buildings together with access, parking and landscape works, repair of existing listed and curtilage listed structures, all in association with the proposed new use of the site as a function / events venue location including visitor accommodation and associated facilities (sui generis mix of uses).
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change of use of existing residential and ancillary buildings, demolition of modern buildings and structures, and erection of new buildings, together with access, parking and landscape works, repair of existing listed and curtilage listed structures, all in association with the use of the site as a function / events venue location including visitor accommodation and associated facilities (sui generis mix of uses), at Ampney Park, Ampney Crucis, Cirencester, GL7 5RY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/03368/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule 1.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for the change of use of existing residential and ancillary buildings, demolition of modern buildings and structures, and erection of new buildings, together with access, parking and

landscape works, repair of existing listed and curtilage listed structures, all in association with the use of the site as a function / events venue location including visitor accommodation and associated facilities (sui generis mix of uses), at Ampney Park, Ampney Crucis, Cirencester, GL7 5RY, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/03369/LBC and the plan refs EX000 P2, PR001-P8, PR003-P3, PR190-P3, UH-340-101, PR002-P2, PR101-P4, PR102-P4, PR121-P6, PR122-P6, PR123-P6, PR140, PR160-P4, PR180-P1, PR200-P3, PR220-P6, PR221-P6, PR260-P3, PR105-P4, EX001-P3, EX181-P1, and 105127-PEF-XX-DR-C-000008 rev P02 insofar as it relates to the carriageway, signage, island, bollard and visibility splays, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule 2.

Preliminary Matters

3. These appeals relate to the same site and the same scheme. Unless stated otherwise, and despite the differences in the planning permission and listed building consent regimes, I have dealt with both appeals together. This is to avoid unnecessary repetition.
4. Parts of the appeal site are within the Ampney Crucis Conservation Area (the CA). The site also contains several Grade II listed buildings which include; Ampney Park¹; Gatepiers and Gates at Ampney Park and adjoining curved wall² (the gateway); and Pumphouse on Ampney Brook³. Consequently, in reaching my decisions I have exercised my statutory duties under sections 66(1) - for appeal A, 16(2) – for appeal B, and 72(1) - for both appeals, of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 – as amended (the Act).
5. The Council's heritage-based reasons for refusing the applications centre on the perceived harmful effects of the formation of the proposed access to the western side of the site. Excepting that element of the scheme, the Council raise no concern regarding the effect of the other works and development on the special interest of the previously identified listed buildings or the CA. Having regard to the evidence before me and from my observations on site, I agree that these other elements of the scheme would preserve the listed buildings within the appeal site, their settings, and any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess; and they would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. As such, the significance of these designated heritage assets would not be harmed by these other proposed elements.
6. Parts of the section of wall that is proposed to be altered to accommodate the new access have been rebuilt in recent years – as a result of either vehicle collision or tree fall. Even so, the original stone appears to have been re-used, and the form and design detailing of the reconstructed parts closely matches those nearby undamaged sections of wall. Importantly for the purposes of the appeals, it is physically attached (fixed) to and extends from the gateway building, and is ancillary to it in both form and function. As such, and in accordance with section 1 (5) (a) of the Act, I have treated it 'as part of' the gateway listed building.
7. Furthermore, the same section of wall forms part of the formal boundary enclosure to the expansive grounds of Ampney Park, and there is no compelling evidence

¹ Official List Entry Number: 1090018

² Official List Entry Number: 1090013

³ Official List Entry Number: 1090026

before me demonstrating that the wall and Ampney Park have historically or on 1 January 1969 been in separate ownerships. Moreover, the wall and Ampney Park have a strong functional relationship. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that by virtue of section 1 (5) (b) of the Act, the wall should also be treated as part of the Ampney Park listed building. As should Stables Cottage, which the main parties agree is a curtilage listed building of Ampney Park. I have assessed these appeals accordingly.

8. A copy of a signed and dated Unilateral Undertaking (UU) has been submitted in support of this appeal, and the Council has had the opportunity to comment upon it. The UU includes an obligation relating to the payment of a financial contribution towards environmental and ecological mitigation measures. I return to this later.

Main Issues

9. The main issues are:
 - for both appeals - whether the development and works would i) preserve the Grade II listed buildings - Ampney Park and the Gatepiers and Gates at Ampney Park and adjoining curved wall, or their settings, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess, and ii) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ampney Crucis Conservation Area; and,
 - for appeal A - the effect of the development on the North Meadow and Clattinger Farm Special Area of Conservation habitat site.

Reasons

Heritage Assets

Special Interest/Significance

10. While the evidence indicates that parts of the house at Ampney Park may date from the late 16th to early 17th century, it has subsequently been subject of several notable phases of extensions and remodelling in the 18th and 19th centuries. These have increased its scale and grandeur, such that it is now a good example of a large historic country house, containing high-quality architectural detailing from different periods of time. The significance of this heritage asset is therefore principally derived from its historic interest, and from the architectural interest of the historic fabric of this house. Formal gardens and parkland form part of the setting of this designated heritage asset, and the historic functional link between much of these and the house still exists. As such, and despite some less sensitive additions within the grounds – including the indoor riding arena, the setting continues to make a moderate contribution to the significance of this heritage asset.
11. I do not doubt that much of the parkland at Ampney Park was historically bordered by a stone wall. The remaining sections of this wall provide an indicator of the prominence of the property within. Consequently, and because the section of wall that would be changed as a result of the appeal scheme forms part of a historic formal entrance to the Ampney Park estate, it also makes a modest positive contribution to the significance of Ampney Park as a whole.
12. Based on both the relevant official list entry and the historic maps provided, the gateway is likely to have been erected sometime between the late 19th and early

20th century as part of a new formal entrance from the road now known as the A417 to Ampney Park. That being the case, the whole gateway structure has historic interest - both in its own right and as part of the evolution of the wider Ampney Park Estate, which is a major contributor to the significance of the gateway heritage asset.

13. The gates, gatepiers and curved wall also have intricate design detailing, and they are constructed of high-quality materials - including ashlar blocks, other shaped and dressed stone and ornate wrought iron gates. Furthermore, and despite some recent re-building, the rubble-stone part of the recessed gateway structure also adds to the architectural interest of this heritage asset. This is because it frames the gatepiers, gates and curved walls and enhances the grandeur of the wider entrance they form part of. As such, and even though the rubble stone element of the gateway structure has less architectural interest than the gates, gatepiers and curved wall, it still makes a moderate contribution to the significance of the gateway heritage asset as a whole. As does the nearby parkland which forms part of the setting of this listed building.
14. The CA includes large parts of the village of Ampney Crucis as well as parkland. Development within the CA is of a fairly low density, and many of the historic buildings and roadside boundary walls within it appear to be constructed of local Cotswold Stone. The parkland and the many trees and plants within the CA, as well as the nearby fields, add to the semi-rural character and appearance of this area. The resultant high-quality, attractive and verdant village streetscape, contributes to the special quality of this CA as a whole. Those parts of the appeal site that include the main house at Ampney Park, the associated gardens and parkland, and the rubble stone boundary wall between the parkland and the A417 share many of the CA's distinctive characteristics. That being the case, these parts of the appeal site contribute positively to the character and appearance of the CA as a whole and to its significance as a designated heritage asset.

Effects of the works and development

15. The new proposed entrance would require the demolition of a section of rubble stone walling that comprises part of the wider gateway entrance. It would also include the construction of new curved walls that would slope up to meet the level of the retained wall to each side of the gap that would be formed. In addition, it would include metal estate fencing and the installation of a traffic island, an unlit bollard, and associated signage.
16. Albeit to a small extent, such works and development would lead to a loss of historic fabric. They would also erode the integrity of Ampney Park's estate boundary walls and disrupt and detract from the primacy of one of its formal historic entrances. This is partly because of the proximity of such works and development to the existing gateway access. It is also because the new opening in the wall would be substantially wider than that through the existing gateway, and because its use would not be restricted by gates or other physical barriers.
17. Furthermore, the new opening and the introduction of modern elements within the within the settings of the assets - such as the sloping curved walls and the metal estate railings, would also alter the authenticity of how these assets are experienced and lead to a reduction in their overall grandeur.

18. In addition, and because rubble stone boundary walls are a distinctive characteristic of the CA, the loss of a short section of such walling in a location that is highly visible from the much-trafficked A717 road, would diminish a key element within the CA, and thereby cause harm to the character and the appearance of the CA as a whole.
19. For these reasons, the proposals would not preserve the Grade II listed buildings - Ampney Park and the Gatepiers and Gates at Ampney Park and adjoining curved wall, or their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Nor would they preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ampney Crucis Conservation Area. Consequently, the scheme would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act.

Heritage balance and conclusion

20. In line with paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I give great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets.
21. The harm that would be caused to the significance of the Ampney Park heritage asset would be towards the lowest end of the scale of less than substantial. This is because the walls only make a small contribution to the significance of this listed building as a whole, and because a very large proportion of its setting would be unaffected.
22. However, the scheme would reduce the grandeur and primacy of the gateway, there would be a small loss of its historic fabric, and there would be adverse change within its immediate setting. Consequently, the harm that would be caused to the significance of the gateway heritage asset would be towards the middle of the scale of less than substantial.
23. The new opening in the wall would be close to 2 other access-related openings, and it would only affect a small proportion of the otherwise long stretches of boundary walling within the appeal site and the wider CA. As such, the harm that would be caused to the significance of the CA as a whole would be to the very lowest end of the scale of less than substantial.
24. Nevertheless, I attribute considerable importance and weight to the harms that would be caused to each of these designated heritage assets.
25. Paragraph 215 of the Framework indicates that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
26. The 2 pumphouse buildings that form part of the Grade II listed Pumphouse at Ampney brook are both in poor condition. The scheme subject of these appeals includes significant works and development to repair/stabilise these buildings, which would help to preserve this heritage asset. The public benefit that would result from this is attributed substantial weight.
27. A significant number of new jobs would be directly created from the operation of the proposed function / events venue and associated visitor accommodation. Moreover, the proposed use of the site is also likely to result in indirect public benefits to the local economy and community, as a result of increased demand for other supporting services and facilities, including taxis, catering services and overnight accommodation. Given the significant number of visitors that could

reasonably be expected to use the site, the associated benefits are likely to be sizable, and great weight is attributed to them.

28. Economic benefits would also arise during the implementation of the scheme. However, such benefits are likely to be over the short to medium term, and as such they attract only a little weight.
29. The large venue building would be constructed a little further from the main house at Ampney Park than the large indoor riding arena - which would be removed. In a small way, this would help to reinforce the primacy of the house at Ampney Park, and better reveal the significance of this heritage asset. Moreover, the use of the appeal site for events is likely to result in a substantial increase in the number of visitors to the property, allowing the heritage assets within the site to be more widely appreciated. I attribute moderate weight to the public benefits that would result from these outcomes.
30. The timber stables and much of the fencing dividing the parkland and around the outdoor arena have already been removed. That being the case, the resultant benefits to the character and appearance of the area and to the way that Ampney Parks's setting contributes to its significance, have not been dependent on the implementation of the appeal scheme, and would not therefore be public benefits resulting from it.
31. The gateway structure and the oblique angle of the drive prevent good intervisibility at the western entrance to Ampney Park. While the proposed works and development close to this entrance would improve this, very little weight is attributed to the associated improvement to highway safety. This is because such improvements are necessary to mitigate the increased risk of harm from the additional use of this access.
32. On balance, the harms identified to the relevant designated heritage assets, would be outweighed by the sum of the public benefits that would result from the implementation of the scheme. That being the case, the proposal would not conflict with policies EN1, EN2, EN10 and EN11 of the Cotswold District Local Plan⁴ (the local plan). Collectively, and amongst other things, these seek to protect, conserve and enhance the built, natural and historic environment, and to only permit development that would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset if the public benefits would clearly outweigh this harm. Nor would it conflict with those parts of the Framework that relate to the protection of the historic environment.

European sites

33. The site is located within the 4.2 – 9.4km zone of influence of North Meadow which forms part of the North Meadow and Clattinger Farm Special Area of Conservation (SAC) - a habitat site afforded protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 - as amended (the habitat regulations). The SAC contains Lowland hay meadows that qualify under the habitat regulations. The conservation objectives of the SAC are to ensure that; its integrity is maintained or restored as appropriate; and, that it contributes to achieving the favourable conservation status of its qualifying features.

⁴ Cotswold District Council – Cotswold District Local Plan 2011-2031 (adopted 3 August 2018)

34. The evidence indicates that new overnight accommodation within the zone of influence of the North Meadow part of the SAC can be expected to result in an increase in recreational pressure within it. This is through trampling, eutrophication/nutrient enrichment from dog faeces, litter, and interference with hay production and grazing, and picking of flowers. As the appeal site is within the zone of influence of the SAC, and because the scheme includes additional overnight accommodation, there is a pathway of potential adverse effect from the development on the integrity of the habitat site. Therefore, without suitable mitigation, and both alone and in combination with other developments, a likely significant effect on the internationally important features of the SAC cannot be ruled out.
35. In these circumstances, and where the development would otherwise be acceptable, the Habitats Regulations require that the competent authority undertake an Appropriate Assessment (AA) in relation to the likely significant effects of the proposal on the integrity of the SAC. In undertaking this AA, I have had regard to the signed and executed UU, the Council's interim mitigation strategy for North Meadow and Clattinger Farm Special Area of Conservation⁵ (the mitigation strategy), the consultation response from Natural England, and the related representations from the main parties.
36. As previously indicated, the proposed development would provide additional overnight accommodation within the zone of influence of the North Meadow part of the SAC. Consequently, there is likely to be an increased demand for the use of the North Meadow part of the SAC, which, without suitable mitigation, would compromise the conservation objectives of the SAC and lead to an adverse effect on its integrity. However, the mitigation strategy identifies a series of measures to overcome any such adverse effects. The delivery of these measures is based on a financial contribution being made to the Council to be used to support access management and engagement works within the SAC (SAMMs).
37. The UU includes a commitment to make a payment to the Council for the purpose of environmental and ecological mitigation measures related to the SAC. It also requires this financial contribution be made before the commencement of the development. The amount of this contribution aligns with that set out in the mitigation strategy. Furthermore, in its response dated 15 December 2025, Natural England advise that the measures identified in the North Meadow and Clattinger Farm Special Area of Conservation Interim Recreation Mitigation Strategy 2023-2028 are sufficient to avoid an adverse impact to the integrity of the European Site and relevant features, and that the mitigation measures set out within the UU would adequately secure the deliverability of these measures. I am therefore confident that suitable mitigation would be provided, which would prevent an adverse effect on the integrity of the SAC from the development. Furthermore, and given that the UU is necessary to secure the required mitigation, it meets the 3 tests outlined at paragraph 58 of the Framework.
38. For these reasons, the development would not cause harm to the North Meadow and Clattinger Farm SAC habitat site. Consequently, the development would comply with policies EN1, EN8 and EN9 of the Local Plan. Amongst other things, these seek to prevent development that would have a detrimental impact on

⁵ North Meadow and Clattinger Farm Special Area of Conservation Interim Recreation Mitigation Strategy 2023-2028 – dated May 2023 – Prepared by Cotswold District Council, Swindon Borough Council and Wiltshire Council in partnership in Natural England

protected species, and species and habitats of principal importance for the purposes of conserving biodiversity unless adequate provision can be made to ensure the conservation of the species or habitat. They also seek to ensure that development proposals promote the protection, conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.

Other Matters

39. The Grade I listed Church of the Holy Rood⁶ occupies land adjacent to the appeal site. It is an Anglican church, which according to the official list entry, has Saxon foundations with some Norman and other later elements, including a 15th Century tower. Within the associated churchyard are several Grade II listed monuments, and the well-preserved Grade I listed cross - which the evidence indicates to be of medieval origin. From the information before me, the special interest and significance of these assets primarily stems from, singularly or in combination, their archaeological, historic and/or architectural interest. However, they are also derived, to a greater or lesser extent, from their associated churchyard and wider partially built-up yet verdant settings.
40. Whilst there would be an intensification in the use of the appeal site near to these assets, I am satisfied that this would not adversely alter how these assets would be experienced or how their intrinsic heritage merits could be understood. Consequently, the settings of these designated heritage assets would be preserved, and their significance would not be harmed.
41. The ecological survey information suggests that the scheme is likely to result in the destruction of several day roosts for bats, which are within the indoor riding arena and the stone wall at the western access to the site, and that these variously accommodate brown long-eared, common pipistrelle, whiskered and Brandt's bats. It also indicates that areas of the site form part of habitats used by water voles and otters.
42. However, given the age of the related survey information, I cannot rely on it to provide an accurate reflection of the current use of the site by bats, water voles, otters, and great crested newts, all of which are species afforded protection under wildlife regulations. As such, and in the absence of a mitigation strategy and method statement that is based on the findings of up-to-date surveys related to bats and their roosts, otters and water voles and great crested newts, it is reasonable and necessary to impose a condition requiring further survey work to be undertaken. In the event these indicate the ongoing presence of protected species within the site, then the condition must also require that an updated mitigation strategy and method statement be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. This is to ensure that any losses to protected species would be minimised and that unavoidable losses would be adequately mitigated or compensated.
43. On the basis that the implementation of the scheme would harmfully disturb species afforded European protection, a European Protected Species (EPS) licence from Natural England will be required to undertake the proposed scheme. From the evidence before me, and subject to a suitably detailed licence application being made, I have no reason to doubt that the derogation tests would be met, and that such a licence would be granted.

⁶ Official list entry number: 1172051

44. Despite the benefits that can result from effective communication between the applicants and the local community prior to the submission of a scheme, there is no requirement for this.
45. Even if other venues in the nearby area can accommodate events of a similar type and scale to those that the appeal scheme would facilitate, the planning system does not operate to stifle competition.
46. There is no compelling evidence before me from which to conclude that the local water and drainage infrastructure has insufficient capacity to accommodate the additional demand that would result from the scheme.
47. The evidence indicates that the main access to the site will be via the western entrance that adjoins the A417. That being the case, and while an increase in vehicles using the eastern access can't be ruled out, any such increase is likely to be small, and it could be accommodated within the local road network without causing harmful levels of congestion or disturbance.
48. It is likely that there would be a peak in the number of vehicle movements to and from the site close to the start and finish times of events. However, at such times, the increase in traffic on the local roads would not be substantial, and it would not overwhelm the local road network.
49. The proposed use of the appeal site is likely to generate some additional noise, light and activity levels. However, subject to conditions being imposed upon any planning permission related to these matters, then the scheme would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties, as a result of noise, lighting or activity. Such conditions would restrict hours of operation, require the implementation of measures contained within the Noise Management Plan (Memo Ref. 21-0027-1 Ampney Park Noise Management Plan R04.1 Issue), and require the implementation of an external lighting plan which specifies the minimum levels and amount of lighting that is necessary for the safe and effective operation of the premises.

Conditions

50. Some of the Council's suggested conditions have been consolidated and the wording of conditions has been amended where appropriate. This is for clarity and to meet the 6 tests within paragraph 57 of the Framework.

Appeal A

51. Conditions specifying the time-period for the implementation of the permission are imposed. For certainty, a condition is also added specifying the plans to which this permission relates.
52. Conditions requiring the council's approval of the detailed design of elements of the scheme, and external materials and their finishes are imposed. These are to protect the character and appearance of the area and to minimise any harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets within and close to the appeal site.
53. A condition requiring the provision and implementation of a landscaping scheme which relates to both hard and soft landscaping works, is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area and to minimise and mitigate harm to biodiversity. Conditions related to re-planting, and which require compliance with

the tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement, are imposed for the same reasons.

54. Conditions are imposed requiring the provision of; a lighting scheme; updated bat, great crested newt, water vole and otter surveys; and an updated biodiversity mitigation strategy and method statement. These are necessary to protect biodiversity - including European protected species. The lighting condition is also required to protect the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties and the character and appearance of the area.
55. The conditions requiring species surveys, a biodiversity mitigation strategy and method statement, and a landscaping scheme need to be pre-commencement conditions. This is to prevent/minimise harm to biodiversity during site clearance and construction works.
56. Conditions limiting the hours that the main venue building may be open to guests or visitors, and that relate to noise management, are necessary. This is to prevent harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings.
57. To ensure the public benefit from the preservation of the pumphouse buildings, a condition must also be imposed requiring the completion of the parts of the development that relate to the pumphouse buildings prior to the first use of the wider scheme.
58. There is no need for separate conditions requiring the provision of a construction environmental management plan, an ecological design strategy, a landscape and ecological management plan, or a tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement. This is either because such details have already been provided or because these matters are within the scope of other conditions related to biodiversity and landscaping.
59. An electric vehicle charging point would undoubtedly help to promote sustainable travel and healthy communities. However, from the evidence I cannot conclude that this would be necessary to make the development acceptable. An associated condition is not therefore justified.

Appeal B

60. There is no need to impose a plans condition. This is because the plans are referred to in the formal decision. However, for certainty, a condition specifying the time-period for the implementation of the works is added.
61. To protect the significance of the designated heritage assets – at the gateway, Ampney Park and the pumphouse, it is necessary to impose conditions requiring further detailed plans, samples, and a working method statement for works related to these buildings.

Conclusion

62. For the aforementioned reasons, appeals A and B should be allowed.

V Simpson

INSPECTOR

Appeal A Ref: APP/F1610/W/25/3372305

Schedule 1: Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos. EX000 P2, PR001-P8, PR003-P3, PR190-P3, UH-340-101, PR002-P2, PR101-P4, PR102-P4, PR121-P6, PR122-P6, PR123-P6, PR140, PR160-P4, PR180-P1, PR200-P3, PR220-P6, PR221-P6, PR260-P3, PR105-P4, EX001-P3, EX181-P1. It shall also be carried out in accordance with drawing no: 105127-PEF-XX-DR-C-000008 rev P02, but only insofar as it relates to the carriageway, signage, island, bollard and visibility splays.
- 3) No development shall take place, and no site clearance in preparation for the development hereby permitted shall be undertaken until updated bat, water vole, otter and great crested newt survey reports and an updated biodiversity mitigation strategy and method statement, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall subsequently be undertaken in accordance with the details within the approved biodiversity mitigation strategy and method statement.
- 4) No development shall commence, and no site clearance in preparation for the development hereby permitted shall be undertaken until a scheme detailing both hard and soft landscape works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include an implementation programme, details of the numbers, species, size and locations of any proposed planting, and a management/maintenance plan. The development shall subsequently be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 5) No development above ground level shall take place until details/samples of all external facing materials and their finishes have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall subsequently be carried out in accordance with the approved sample details.
- 6) No development above ground level shall take place until sample panels showing the colour, coursing, bonding, treatment of corners, pointing and mortar of any new facing stonework, have been provided on site and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall subsequently be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and any panels shall be retained on site until the completion of the development.
- 7) Prior to their installation/construction, elevation and section plans of any new or replacement external; glazed screens, doors and windows, eaves, verges and ridges, window heads and cills, rooflights, flues, chimneys, panelling, railings, gates and boundary treatments hereby permitted, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall subsequently be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 8) Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted, the visibility splays, carriageway alterations, signage, traffic island and non-illuminated bollard indicated on the plan at appendix B (drawing number 105127-PEF-XX-DR-C-000008 rev P02) of Pell Frishmann Technical Note ref: 105127-PEF-XX-XX-RP-TN-000002 shall be provided and thereafter retained.
- 9) Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted, an exterior lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the development shall be implemented and retained in accordance with the approved scheme, and no additional exterior lighting shall be installed.
- 10) Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted:
 - a schedule of works for the repair and restoration of the Pumphouse at Ampney Brook designated heritage asset shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority; and
 - the buildings shall be repaired and restored in accordance with the approved schedule.
- 11) If, within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, any trees or plants which form part of the approved landscaping scheme die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, they shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species.
- 12) The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the tree protection plan details identified within the Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) document produced by Tree Parts Ltd dated 18 March 2024, and the associated sheet plans.
- 13) The use of the development hereby permitted shall be operated in accordance with the Noise Management Plan - Memo Ref. 21-0027-1 Ampney Park Noise Management Plan R04.1 Issue, produced by Sustainable Acoustics.
- 14) Customers and visitors shall not have access to the venue building and any external events shall cease between the hours of 00:00 and 09:00 on any day.

End of schedule 1

Appeal B Ref: APP/F1610/Y/25/3372326

Schedule 2: Conditions

- 1) The works hereby authorised shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
- 2) Prior to the commencement of the works hereby permitted to the gateway, Stables Cottage and the Pumphouse at Ampney Brook, a detailed method statement of the works to these buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall subsequently be carried out in accordance with the approved method statement.

- 3) Prior to the commencement of the works hereby permitted to the gateway, Stables Cottage and the Pumphouse at Ampney Brook, details / samples of the materials to be used in the works to these buildings, and their finishes, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall subsequently be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) Prior to commencement of the works hereby permitted to the gateway, Stables Cottage and the Pumphouse at Ampney Brook, and in so far as they relate to these buildings, elevations and cross section profile drawings at a scale of 1:5 of any new and any replacement windows, doors, screens and panelling, and elevations and cross section drawings at a scale of 1:10 of any new and replacement stone walling and capping, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall subsequently be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 5) Prior to any re-pointing works being undertaken to the gateway, Stables Cottage and the Pumphouse at Ampney Brook, details of the proposed mortar mix shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and a sample of the proposed pointing to each of these buildings shall be provided on site and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall subsequently be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

End of conditions for appeal B.