



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 16 June 2026

Site visit made on 16 June 2026

by Zoë Franks, Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/L3815/C/26/3377990

Thornham Products, Thornham Lane, Southbourne, Emsworth, West Sussex, PO10 8DD

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Michael Connors against an enforcement notice issued by Chichester District Council.
 - The notice was issued on 15 February 2026.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission the material change of use of the Land to a residential mobile home site.
 - The requirements of the notice are to: (i) cease the use of the Land as a residential mobile home site. (ii) Remove the mobile homes from the Land. (iii) Remove the touring caravans from the Land. (iv) Remove the lamp posts from the Land.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is six months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (b), (f), (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended) for the development already carried out, namely the material change of use of the land to a residential mobile home site at Thornham Products, Thornham Lane, Southbourne as shown on the plan attached to the notice and subject to the conditions in the schedule to this decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised on 17 August 2026, after the hearing date, and its policies are material considerations of critical importance which must be taken into account in decision-making from the day of its publication. The parties were given the opportunity to comment on the revised Framework relating to issues in the appeal in writing, and which were taken into consideration in the determination.

Ground (b)

3. This ground of appeal is on the basis that the matters alleged in the notice have not occurred. The appellant argues that the description of the use is incorrect as there is a mixed use on the site which constitutes the residential mobile home use as well as a boat storage use.

4. It is for the appellant to prove this ground of appeal on the balance of probabilities. He says that the previous permission reference 25/00804/FUL dated 25 June 2025 ("the 2025 Permission") for the part retrospective application for the use of the use for B8 storage of boat and associated marine storage was implemented by the construction of hardstanding which was an element of the consented development.
5. Whilst I accept that this consent was part retrospective and therefore implemented, Condition 3 provides that the use permitted shall cease within 3 months of the date of the failure to fulfil requirements regarding the hard and soft landscaping scheme to include a timetable for implementation. The landscaping scheme was to be submitted for the written approval of the LPA within 6 months of the date of the decision. There is nothing before me to show that this scheme was submitted, approved or implemented, and therefore to show that the use permitted by the decision can lawfully continue.
6. In any event, the 2025 permission was for a single use which comprised boat and associated marine storage. This is materially different from a mixed use where the boat storage is one element of a composite use also including a residential use.
7. The use of the appeal land as a residential mobile home site was the opening of a new chapter in the planning history of the site. It could be possible to have a mixed use of the site incorporating both of these elements, but the appellant has not shown on balance that the boat storage use has taken place on the site alongside the residential use.
8. On the information before me, the material change of use as alleged in the notice has taken place. The appeal on ground (b) does not therefore succeed.

Ground (a) and the deemed planning application

9. The deemed planning application is for the development as alleged in the notice, in this case the material change of use of the land to a residential mobile home site. The appellant has proposed an alternative scheme and layout of the appeal land.
10. The appellant has not disputed the Council's description of the site:

*"The site is currently broadly divided into three sections; a single mobile home in the front section, understood to be occupied by members of the appellants family; a second section towards the middle of the site comprising 5 mobile homes packed into a tight area, without any formal pitch division, and rented privately to persons who have not claimed traveller status; and a third section at the northern end of the site on which touring caravans are stationed on an ad-hoc basis and with no hard surface."*¹
11. The alternative scheme put forward by the appellant shows 3 pitches on the northern part of the site with an access road along the western boundary. In addition there is new landscaping proposed to include 40 trees.
12. Section 177(1) of the 1990 Act provides that planning permission may be granted in relation to the whole or any part of the matters stated the notice as constituting a breach of planning control.

¹ Council's Statement of Case

13. The Council accepts that the residential use in the alternative scheme falls within the description of the breach given in the notice. However, they argue that the development overall would be materially different and that the trees at the front of the site would create an orchard use thereby instituting a material change of use of the appeal site to a mixed use.
14. The alternative scheme proposed is materially different to the development as it was at the date of the notice. However, that is not the test which must be satisfied in order for it to be considered as part of the ground (a) appeal: rather the proposed scheme must form part of the matters as alleged in the notice. The alternative scheme does not subdivide the site into different planning units, and I do not accept that, as a matter of fact and degree, the planting of the trees and the other proposed landscaping is anything other than ancillary to the primary residential use.
15. As such, the alternative scheme does form part of the matters alleged in the notice, and as such can be considered under the deemed planning application.

Main issues

16. The main issues are:
 - Whether the development is located in the countryside or in an unsustainable location;
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, in particular the Chichester Harbour National Landscape and the adjacent public right of way;
 - Whether the development is at risk of flooding;
 - The effect of the development on the Chichester and Langstone Harbours Special Protection Area;
 - Whether the appellant meets the policy definition of gypsies and travellers;
 - Whether there is a need for and supply of gypsy and traveller pitches in the area;
 - Personal circumstances;
 - Best interests of the children and Human Rights
 - Whether the development was intentional unauthorised development;
 - Planning Policy including the Development Plan and the 2026 NPPF; and
 - Any other considerations

Location

17. The appeal site is located in the countryside outside of the settlement of Emsworth. It is accessed from the adopted Thornham Lane to the south and a public right of way runs adjacent to its northern boundary. It is near to a sewage treatment works and marina, as well as stables and residential plots.
18. The Chichester Local Plan 2021 – 2039 ("the CLP") forms part of the development plan for the area. Policy S2 Settlement Hierarchy states that development in the rest of the Plan area, which includes the appeal site as located in the countryside, is restricted to that which requires a countryside location or meets an essential local rural need to support rural diversification, neither which is the case here. The development does not therefore accord with this policy although it is also

necessary to consider the policies which relate specifically to gypsy and traveller sites.

19. As the deemed planning application is for a residential gypsy site, Policy HO12 of the 2026 Framework advises that traveller sites should be located so that they provide a settled base and may also mean that locations not well-related to existing settlement may be appropriate. The site should also enable access to frequently used-services such as education, welfare and health services, and the information provided by the appellant is that this is happening in this case. The appeal site therefore meets these policy requirements. As this policy accepts that gypsy sites may be located outside of settlements, it must therefore also be accepted that facilities and services may need to be accessed by car. The appeal site has a range of activities within a two-mile radius.
20. Policy H13 of the CLP, Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople allows for the flexible release of sites on a case-by-case basis. It is broadly compliant with the 2026 Framework although it sets out additional specific criteria which are not required in the Framework and is therefore inconsistent with it in this regard. This site is well-related and appropriate in scale to the nearest settled-community in Emsworth and will not dominate it. Flood Risk, character and appearance and landscape issues are dealt with later in this decision, and also covered in the Framework policies.

Character and appearance

21. The 2026 Framework advises that development proposals within Protected Landscapes (which includes the Chichester Harbour National Landscape within which the appeal site is located) should be limited in scale and sensitively located and designed to avoid harm to the statutory purposes and special qualities.
22. The Landscape Visual Impact Assessment ("LVIA") submitted by the appellant concludes that the proposed scheme will conserve and enhance the National Landscape (AONB) in accordance with the Framework and CLP. The Council has not submitted its own LVIA
23. I was able to see the appeal site in its context during the site visit. The site is fairly enclosed, with little in the way of views into it other than directly from the north from the direction of the footpath. The area around the site is in various mixed uses, including the water sewage works which appear urban and industrial. The residential bungalows and other buildings on adjacent sites are single storey and the caravans on the appeal site will reflect their scale, massing and height. The appellant's landscape evidence was that this would still be the case even if the raised platforms and floor levels were provided as part of the flood risk mitigation.
24. The proposed landscaping scheme will add to the existing screening of the site and the LVIA assesses it as being year-round, particularly when viewed through the access from Thornham Lane. The proposed scheme including the use of native species has been designed to take account of the relevant development plan documents and I am satisfied that it will sit well within the existing mixed uses of the area when viewing the site from outside of it. The proposed access route to the north can be designed to limit views into the site from that direction. The development allowed in the Boat Permission would be located further to the front of the site with the northern end to be retained as grassed area but as there are

currently clear views across the site from the footpath any such boat storage use as previously consented would be easily visible as part of the landscape.

25. Overall, the development with the proposed landscaping scheme is sensitively located and designed to minimise adverse impacts on the National Landscape. The development, including the landscaping, will inevitably change the appearance of the site, but it will not cause harm to the landscape and is therefore not in conflict with Policy NE2 Natural Landscape of the CLP, or the Framework.

Flood risk

26. The appeal site is located in Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3. The proposed scheme locates the residential pitches in the northern part of the site which is the least at risk as it is currently within Flood Zone 1.
27. The 2026 Framework states that the aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source. Applying the advice in Policy F5 of the 2026 Framework, the sequential test should be used in relation to this site as the main access and egress route, and only route allowing vehicular access, would go through Flood Zone 2 and 3 and be at risk of future flooding.
28. The Framework advises that a sequential risk -based approach should be taken to applications in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding. The principal flood risk issue relates to future tidal climate change scenarios rather than present-day flood risk. The Chichester SFRA and the Environment Agency's site-specific tidal modelling indicate that the vast majority of the site may come within Flood Zone 2 or 3 due to future tidal flood risk in climate change scenarios over time.
29. The appellants, in their FRA and associated technical comments, argue that they have taken a proportionate response to the flood risk. The proposed scheme locates the caravans on the northern part of the site which is within Flood Zone 1, and the caravans will sit on a platform formed at approximately 600mm above surrounding floor levels to provide a clear margin of safety providing 300mm freeboard above the defended climate change level. There would also be an escape evacuation plan which can utilise the northern access on foot if required and managed evacuation incorporating forecast-led tidal flood warning arrangements.
30. Neither party has provided a list of alternative sites at lower flood risk. The appellant argues that they have undertaken the sequential test by putting the caravans on the northern part of the site, and whilst this could have been a persuasive argument it does not take account of the fact that the main and only vehicular access is through the southern part within Flood Zone 2 and 3. Access to the footpath to the north is not currently easily accessible. I saw during the site visit that it is overgrown and on very uneven ground. This could be made more accessible, and secured by way of a condition, but it will only be usable on foot which would be problematic for those with limited mobility including very young children, and will not allow belongings to be taken from the site.
31. Even taking into account that the land supply in the local area is constrained due its coastal location with flood risk and National Landscape, and taking a proportionate approach in light of the scale and type of development and scarcity

of gypsy and traveller sites in the area, a sequential risk-based approach has not been adequately undertaken as set out in the 2026 Framework. I am therefore unable to conclude that there are no alternative sites. I will deal with issues regarding the lack of 5 year supply of pitches in due course as planning practice guidance advises that it is not a relevant consideration in applying the sequential test for individual applications, although it will be relevant when considering the planning balance.

32. In addition, Policy F6 and Annex 6 of the 2026 Framework identify caravans intended for permanent residential use as Highly Vulnerable in terms of Flood Risk, and Table 3 advises that such development should be refused in Zone 3. The main access (and only vehicular escape route) is within Zone 3.
33. A permanent use of the land as sought is in conflict with the flood risk policies in the 2026 Framework and this is a material consideration, as well as being in conflict with Policy H13 of the CLP which advises that accommodation for gypsies and travellers should avoid locations where there are significant constraints including flood risk.
34. The lifetime of residential development is generally taken to be 100 years. The flood risk on the northern part of the site, where the caravans would be located, arises from future tidal flood risk in end-century climate change scenarios. Some of this risk could be removed by limiting the lifetime of the development by the granting of a temporary permission. This would not overcome the concerns regarding the vehicular access through the current Flood Zone 2 and 3, but the additional measures described in the FRA, including the use of the raised platform and pitch levels, ground profiling and evacuation plan including registration with the Environment Agency Flood Warning Service and evacuation triggers allowing for precautionary departure, as well as the provision of a proper access way to the north by foot could mitigate the risk sufficiently in the shorter-term.
35. A temporary permission for ten years can mitigate the flood risk over the reduced lifetime of the development and provide wider sustainability benefits in providing the gypsy and traveller pitches needed in the area, albeit for a limited period. This will allow time for alternative sites to be considered and hopefully secured, and also allow for the children on the site to continue and complete their time in their current schools.

Special Protection Area

36. The development is located within the Chichester Harbour SPA buffer zone. It is likely to have a relevant effect on the Chichester and Langstone Harbour SPA by virtue of the net increase in overnight accommodation resulting in increased nutrient loading and increased recreational disturbance on the habitat of protected species.
37. The appellant has provided a unilateral undertaking under section 106 of the TCPA which provides for a financial contribution in accordance with the joint mitigation strategy outlined in the Bird Aware Solent Strategy and Solent Recreation Mitigations Strategy. This is in accordance with Policy NE8 of the CLP and I am satisfied that it can make the development nutrient neutral for its lifetime and acceptable in terms of recreational disturbance causing no adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA.

38. The contribution makes the development compliant with the CLP and the Framework.

Gypsy and Traveller policy

39. The appellant, and the members of his family who occupy the site, meet the definition of gypsies and travellers in the Framework. There is not a 5 year supply of gypsy and traveller pitches in the area, and no alternative site for the appellant and other occupiers identified to by either party (notwithstanding that the Council says there are vacant pitches and unimplemented permissions in the district). I note that a previous appeal decision refers to issues regarding policy failure in this area but this pre-dates the adoption of the CLP in August 2025, when the relevant policies were found to be sound. In addition, it can be seen from the recent pitch figures provided that the shortfall is decreasing.
40. The appellant's family cannot return to their previous site for personal reasons, and have nowhere else to go. The Council does not have other pitches elsewhere which it can identify for the current occupants, other than one temporary pitch for up to 12 weeks on a transit site. This is not permanent and would not accommodate all of the occupants.
41. I therefore give great weight to the occupants' need for pitches and the lack of supply in the district.

Personal Circumstances

42. The appellant and his wife grew up in the area and have strong local and family connections and compelling personal reasons for wishing to stay in the locality. The three pitches will be occupied by the appellant and his extended family living as three households. There are currently seven children living on the site, three of whom have places in local schools. The families also access local healthcare provision.
43. The site provides a settled base for the families and enables access to frequently used services and is therefore located in accordance with the criteria set out for Traveller Sites as set out in Policy HO12 of the 2026 Framework.

Best interests of the children, Human Rights and PSED .

44. Article 8(1) of the Human Rights Act, the right to respect for private and family life and home, is engaged and is a material consideration.
45. There are no other sites available for the occupiers and the appeal site is therefore the only current option to provide a secure home for the families. This security, with associated schooling and healthcare benefits, is in the current best interests of the children living on the appeal site. No other consideration can be inherently more important than the best interests of the children, and in this case I attach substantial weight to this material consideration as they will be homeless if they have to leave the site. However, in the longer term, it would not be in the best interests of any children to be living on a site which has a high flood risk.

Policy DM8 of the 2026 Framework

46. The appellants accept that the development was intentionally unauthorised. As such, Policy DM8 of the 2026 Framework advises that fact should be given

substantial weight in considering whether to grant planning permission, although any mitigating circumstances, for example the lack of alternative available pitches, will weigh in favour of the deemed planning application.

Other matters

47. The issue of the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal site due to its proximity to the water sewage plant was raised by the Council. However, there was no specific evidence presented regarding this issue. I also note that the Council's Environmental Protection Team had not raised previously raised objections regarding the erection of 4 dwellings on the adjoining site, which is closer to the plant, from a contaminated land or air quality point of view. I therefore accord this issue little weight.
48. Concerns were raised that the settled community would not be able to have a residential permission for the appeal site. However, the Framework which sets out national policy differentiates between the settled and for the gypsy and traveller communities, and this is a material consideration of critical importance.

Planning balance and conclusion

49. Policy S3 of the 2026 Framework states that decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In this case, the development would be located outside a settlement, where Policy S5 states that only certain forms of development should be approved, unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the Framework's national decision-making policies.
50. Policy S5(1)(g) provides support for development outside settlements which would address an evidenced unmet need for gypsy, traveller or travelling showpeople accommodation, providing it meets the criteria in policy HO12 of the Framework. In this case, the Council accepts there is not a 5 year supply of deliverable sites, and so there is an unmet need for the development, and I have already found that the development would comply with Policy HO12 of the Framework.
51. Therefore, the proposal is a form of development that is supported by Policy S5(1)(g) of the Framework, which should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the Framework's national decision-making policies.
52. In terms of benefits, the development would provide a home for three households and three new pitches in the district where there is an unmet need and I attach great weight to this consideration. In addition, there are personal circumstances and a personal need for the families, including for the children to remain on the site which would be in their best interests currently, and there is a lack of alternative accommodation options. I attach significant weight to these factors.
53. However, the unauthorised development was intentional, and I attach substantial weight to this consideration. In addition, the development is in a location that is vulnerable to a high risk of flooding, and so there is conflict with national decision-making policies F6(1)(a) and F7 of the Framework, which consequently indicate that permission should be refused. This would also be a circumstance in which Policy S5(2) would indicate that permission should be refused.

54. Nevertheless, in my planning judgement, a temporary consent for up to a period of ten years would reduce the identified harms and policy conflicts due to the limited lifespan of the development. Also in this case, the predicted flood risk increases over time. Whilst there is still an issue regarding the vehicular access which has to pass through Flood Zones 2 and 3, it would be possible to mitigate this risk on a short-term basis by upgrading the access to the footpath to the north, and ensuring that the Environment Agency's Flood Warning Service is used as part of an evacuation plan as set out in the FRA.
55. A temporary permission will also allow time for additional pitches to come forward, or for the appellant to make other arrangements whilst providing stability to the occupants, including the children, of the site.
56. Therefore, taking all these points together, the benefits of granting temporary permission would substantially outweigh the adverse affects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies of the Framework.
57. Consequently, the development is in conflict with the development plan. However, material considerations indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan.
58. Therefore, the appeal is allowed and I will grant a temporary permission to the appellant and other occupiers of the site for a period of ten years. This will be restricted to the current occupiers as I have taken into account their personal circumstances and interests of the children in granting this permission.

Conditions

59. I have imposed the planning conditions as set out in the schedule below based on the suggested conditions submitted by the parties which were discussed during the hearing. I am satisfied that they meet the statutory and policy tests.
60. I have imposed Condition 2 to restrict the use of the site to the named individuals and their dependents as the appeal has only been successful due to their personal circumstances. A condition is not therefore required limiting occupation to Gypsies and Travellers as the use is secured through the personal condition.
61. Conditions 7 and 10 are imposed to mitigate the flood risk. The period of ten years for the temporary permission is proportionate and reasonable given the nature of the flood risk and proposed mitigation measures, and the school-age occupants.
62. Condition 1 provides for the submission, approval and implementation of schemes to secure the site layout plan, landscaping, drainage, and foul waste water disposal, waste storage, biodiversity, noise attenuation measures and external lighting and provides for them to be done in a timely manner. These measures, along with those set out in Conditions 3, 5, 6, 8 and 9, are intended to limit the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area and countryside and secure satisfactory living conditions for occupants of the site.
63. Condition 4 is imposed in order to contribute to the sustainability and accessibility of the site

Conclusion

64. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal succeeds in ground (a) and a temporary condition is granted on the deemed planning application.

65. The appeals on grounds (f) and (g) do not therefore fall to be considered.

Zoë Frank

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Michael Rudd, Counsel

Tony White, White Planning

George Cullen, White Planning

Rhodri Crandon, Tirlun Design

Tom Quigg, Flume Consulting Engineers

Michael Connors

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Edward-Arash Abedian, Counsel

Mike Coates-Evans, Principal Planning Enforcement Officer

Benjamin Marshall, Planning Officer

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Nigel Waters, Southborne Parish Council

Councillor Hickson

DOCUMENTS

Draft Conditions

Gypsy and Traveller supply: current 5-year supply position dated June 2026 submitted by the Council

Unilateral undertaking dated 29 June 2026

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1. Site development scheme

The use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, equipment and materials brought onto the land for the purposes of such use shall be removed and the land restored to a condition to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority within 6 months of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in (i) to (iv) below:

- (i) Within three months of the date of this decision, submit schemes for:
 - (a) The internal layout of the site hereafter referred to as the Site Development Scheme (SDS), the layout of the pitches, hard standings, access road, the siting of the caravans, external lighting, the design and layout of play areas, amenity areas, parking and manoeuvring areas, means of enclosure and the proposed materials to be used;
 - (b) Ecological Management and Enhancement Plan;
 - (c) Foul and surface water drainage;
 - (d) Waste disposal including collection point and storage areas;
 - (e) Hard and soft landscaping, including details of species, plant sizes and proposed numbers and densities and to include ecological enhancements;
 - (f) Sustainable drainage scheme for the whole site including details of discharge rates which should be equivalent to greenfield run off rates.
 - (g) A restoration plan for the site following the cessation of the development

The schemes shall have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for their written approval and shall include a timetable for their implementation.

- (ii) If within 11 months of the date of this decision, the Local Planning Authority refuse to approve the schemes or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to and accepted as validly made by the Secretary of State.
- (iii) If an appeal is made in pursuance of (ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted schemes shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.
- (iv) The approved schemes shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable.

Upon implementation of the approved schemes specified in this condition, the schemes shall be retained for the duration of the use of the site. Any tree, hedge or shrub that is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies within 5 years of planting or, in the opinion of the local planning authority, becomes seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced in the same position with another of the same species and size as that originally planted.

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

2. Personal Permission

The use hereby permitted shall be carried on only by Michael Connors, Eileen Connors, Roseanna Connors, Jim Connors, Bridgey Connors and their resident dependants.

3.No. of Caravans

The use hereby permitted shall be limited to 3no. pitches. No more than two caravans, as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 (as amended) shall be stationed on each pitch at any time and no more than one caravan shall be a static caravan.

4.Cycle Parking

Within 6 months of the date of this decision details of covered and secure cycle parking spaces shall be submitted for approval by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the cycle parking shall be implemented in full, within 3 months of the approval of details, in accordance with the approved scheme and shall be retained for that purpose for the lifetime of the development.

5.Commercial vehicles

No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on the site, and no commercial activity shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials, plant or equipment.

6.No further means of enclosure

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any other order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modifications), no additional gates, walls or fences or other means of enclosure, including bunding, shall be erected or placed within the site or at the boundaries of the site, unless details of their size, materials and location have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.

7.Flood risk mitigation

Notwithstanding the details in the 'Flood Risk Assessment', prepared by Flume Consulting Engineers and dated 02/2026 the finished floor levels shall include no less than 600mm of freeboard above the defended climate change modelled level.

Within 12 months of the date of this decision, the flood risk mitigation measures set out in the submitted 'Flood Risk Assessment', prepared by Flume Consulting Engineers and dated 02/2026 including the 600mm of freeboard above the defended climate change modelled level shall be carried out in full and shall thereafter be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

8.Hours of construction

The construction of the development and associated works shall not take place on Sundays or Public Holidays or any time otherwise than between the hours of 0700 hours and 1800 hours Mondays to Fridays and 0800 hours and 1300 hours on Saturdays.

9.External Lighting

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order) no external illumination shall be provided on the site other than in accordance with the Site Development Scheme referred to in condition 1.

10.Temporary Use

The use hereby permitted shall be for a limited period of ten years from the date of this permission, or the period during which the caravans and site are occupied for the approved use; whichever is the shorter.