



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 28 April 2026

Site visit made on 28 April 2026

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 May 2026

Appeal Ref: 6004319

Land Opposite Beech Tree Farm, London Road, Pasturefields, Stafford ST18 0RB

- 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 John Smith against the decision of Stafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/39049/FUL.
 - The development proposed is change of use of land to use as a residential caravan site for 3 Gypsy families each with one mobile home, one touring caravan and one day room and stable block, car parking, foul drainage, landscaping and hardscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use of land to use as a residential caravan site for 3 Gypsy families each with one mobile home, one touring caravan and one day room and stable block, car parking, foul drainage, landscaping and hardscaping at land opposite Beech Tree Farm, Pasturefields, Stafford ST18 0RB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/39049/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. Drawing numbered TDA.2936.03 revision C was submitted after the appeal was lodged but prior to the hearing. A drawing numbered TDA.2936.05 was also provided to me at the hearing. Both drawings show slight amendments and clarifications on the proposed day room and stable block buildings. Also, they ensure consistency with the proposed site layout and outline landscape scheme drawing. Accepting these revised plans would cause no injustice to any party.
3. Furthermore, a noise assessment dated April 2026 was submitted by the appellant prior to the hearing. A diagram under paragraph 4.4.2 of this document shows the line of a proposed acoustic fence near to the front and part of the side boundaries of the site. The Council has had the opportunity to comment on the noise assessment but there is no indication that the document has been the subject of any public consultation. Even so, the inclusion of a fence as shown would represent a minor change to the appeal proposal. Again, I am satisfied no prejudice would be caused to any party by accepting the noise assessment.
4. A plan showing the extent of the appeal site by a red line has been provided. A part of the defined site encroaches beyond the proposed pitches and onto land shown on the layout plan as being retained as existing equestrian paddock. A proposed drainage system would be provided within this paddock area, hence its inclusion within the red line site. At the hearing, the appellant's agent confirmed

that the proposed residential use would be restricted to the area of the pitches between London Road and the retained paddock. I have assessed the appeal on this basis as it would be reasonable to impose a planning condition that restricts the extent of the residential use with reference to the site layout plan.

5. While not a refusal reason, the submissions indicate the development may have an effect on the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (CCSAC) and the Pasturefields Salt Marsh Special Area of Conservation and Site of Special Scientific Interest (PSMSAC). Accordingly, I have consulted Natural England (NE) for views on the effects of the development on these protected habitat sites. The main parties have had the opportunity to respond to NE's comments.
6. I have had regard to the agreement (hereafter referred to as the section 111 agreement) provided by the appellant prior to the hearing. This refers to section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 as well as the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. It states that a payment has been made to the Council towards the costs of measures to mitigate the impact of the development on the CCSAC. No injustice would be caused to any party by taking the section 111 agreement into account.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are (i) the effect of the development on the CCSAC and PSMSAC, (ii) its effect on the character and appearance of the area, and (iii) the effect on the setting and the significance of the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area (the CA). If any harm is identified in these respects, it follows to consider whether other factors outweigh that harm to justify allowing the appeal.

Reasons

Effect on the protected habitat sites.

8. The CCSAC is designated as it includes important and rare heath habitats. The Council and NE refer to evidence that shows visitors and recreation activities at the CCSAC cause damage to its qualifying features. Also, policy N6 of the Plan for Stafford Borough 2014 (the PSB) is relevant. This indicates development that increases the number of residences within a 15km zone of influence around the CCSAC would have an adverse effect on its integrity unless avoidance and mitigation measures are in place. The proposed residential accommodation would be within the defined zone of influence and so it is likely the development, either alone or in combination with other projects, would have significant effects on the integrity of the CCSAC. Therefore, it is necessary for me to conduct an appropriate assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the Regulations).
9. As part of an appropriate assessment, the Regulations require me to consider measures that could be delivered so as to avoid adverse effects on the integrity of the CCSAC. The section 111 agreement explains that the financial contribution paid to the Council will be used to fund measures to mitigate the impact of the development on the protected site. Both the Council and NE accept the payment provides an appropriate level of mitigation to address the impacts of the development. I find no reason to disagree and so I conclude the proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of the CCSAC. Therefore, I find no conflict with PSB policy N6.

10. The PSMSAC lies near to the site albeit on the other side of the Trent and Mersey Canal. It is designated due to rare inland salt meadow and associated ecological features. NE's initial response to the planning application leading to this appeal raised concerns over the lack of information on the disposal of foul water associated with the appeal development. However, comprehensive foul drainage information has since been submitted. Both NE and the Council are satisfied the system would appropriately deal with foul water and without causing harm to the qualifying features of the protected site.
11. Therefore, I conclude the development is unlikely to have significant effects on the integrity of PSMSAC. As such, the proposal would avoid unacceptable effects on both of the protected habitat sites.

Effect on the character and appearance of the area.

12. The appeal site forms part of an open grassed field that lies between London Road and the aforementioned canal. Similar fields adjoin the site. In some of these I saw various low-level buildings and other structures, seemingly associated with equestrian or recreational uses of the land and with the canal. Directly opposite the site is a dwellinghouse at Beech Tree Farm, whilst further to the south on the other side of the road is a line of residential and commercial buildings. At the time of my visit, the road was busy and traffic noise could be heard from across the field. However, despite the nearby buildings, road and signs of human activities within adjoining fields, the pastoral nature of the site means it appears as part of the open countryside.
13. The proposed development would primarily affect the front part of the site. There would be views of the pitches from the highway through the site entrance and through gaps in the roadside hedge, particularly during times of leaf fall. It would also be seen from upper floor windows in the house opposite and from the private fields on either side through gaps in existing and proposed vegetation. The development would be set away from the canal and screened to a degree by existing and proposed hedges. Even so, it seems likely the upper parts of the buildings and caravans would be visible by people on boats travelling along the canal and from pedestrians on the towpath on the opposite side of the canal to the appeal site. Therefore, the development would be noticeable from various vantage points. However, it would not be visually prominent due to the low height of the buildings and the caravans and the screening effect of vegetation.
14. The introduction of walls at the entrance, acoustic fencing, extensive areas of hardstanding, 3 buildings as well as mobile homes, touring caravans and vehicles would lead to a significant change in the appearance of the site. The development would cause a loss of openness so as to undermine the site's contribution to the rural aspects of the area. The residential use would not be entirely unusual as the pitches would be opposite a dwellinghouse. However, the proposal would go against the local pattern of development where most residences and other notable properties lie on the opposite side of the road to the appeal site. For these reasons, the development would appear incongruous and unsympathetic.
15. The proposed dayroom/stable buildings would be of a size, form and design that reflects equestrian buildings that are typically seen in rural areas. Nonetheless, the regimented layout of the pitches plus the presence of hardstanding, mobile homes, caravans, vehicles, domestic paraphernalia and lighting would give the

development a formal residential character. In these regards, the pitches would appear different to the adjacent fields where buildings, structures and surfacing are informal in style and positioning. It is suggested that Gypsy and Traveller sites are common in the countryside but I saw no residential caravan sites similar to the appeal proposal within the surrounding area.

16. To a degree, the proposed planting would soften the visual effects of the development. Indeed, the new hedgerow along the side boundary of the field and new trees near to the canal would add to the natural aspects of the site. However, the proposal would lead to the sub-division of the field through the provision of a new hedge to the rear of the pitches. This would be at odds with the local field pattern where hedgerows tend to run in straight lines between the road and the canal rather than parallel to the road. Also, this new straight hedge across the appeal site would emphasise the shorter depth of the retained paddock area compared to the adjoining fields.
17. The acoustic fence would be along most of the front and parts of the side boundaries. Its visual effect would be softened by existing and proposed planting. The development would be served by the existing access onto the field but walls to the side of the site's entrance would be noticeable from the road. However, these would reflect similar features at the entrance to Beech Tree Farm. As such, the development would not appear enclosed by inappropriate hard landscape features.
18. To summarise, the development would not be visually prominent and it would be seen within a countryside location where the rural qualities are already affected by traffic noise and the sight of buildings. Even so, the pitches would erode the openness of the site and the pastoral feel to the field and so they would not safeguard the intrinsic qualities of the countryside. Moreover, the location of the site on the canal side of the road, the formal layout and appearance of the pitches as well as the sub-division of the appellant's land would go against the local development and field pattern. Proposed planting would contribute to the natural qualities of the area and with existing vegetation it would partially screen and soften the visual impacts of the development. However, the benefits of the proposal in these regards would not fully offset the detriment caused to the visual and rural qualities of the site and its surroundings.
19. Therefore, I conclude the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In these respects, it would not accord with PSB policy N1. Whilst not included in the Council's refusal reasons, it has been accepted by the appellant through the submissions that PSB policy N8 is also relevant to this issue. I find the proposal would also not accord with this policy. Policies N1 and N8 together seek to ensure development has regard to its context and is sympathetic to landscape character and quality.
20. The Council also refers to PSB policy C6 that looks for the development of Gypsy and Traveller sites to minimise the impact on the surrounding landscape rather than preserve the appearance and character of an area. The proposed planting aims to limit the visual effects of the development but the formal layout of the pitches and formal subdivision of the field would not ensure the development has the minimal effect on the landscape. As such, I also find the proposal would conflict with part (b) of PSB policy C6.

Setting and significance of the Conservation Area.

21. The CA is a long and generally narrow area based around the line of the canal. From paragraph 2.14 of the Trent and Mersey Canal Conservation Area Appraisal 2014 (the Appraisal) it is apparent that the CA is significant as it includes an early narrow canal, engineered by James Brindley with a wealth of original associated bridges, canal features and canal side historic buildings. The Appraisal also highlights the predominantly rural setting with trees, hedgerows and meadows.
22. Existing views from the waterway and towpath across the open appeal site include the top of buildings on the opposite side of the road. Also, on my visit traffic noise could be heard from the towpath, which detracts from the tranquillity of the canal. The stretch of fields between the road and the canal are not entirely unspoilt due to the presence of buildings and other structures. Also, this area of land is no longer being used for traditional farming activities. Even so, the openness and pastoral nature of the appeal site field contributes positively to the rural setting of the canal. The current undeveloped nature of the site can be readily appreciated from the CA and it provides a sense of the original countryside setting to the waterway when it was constructed.
23. The proposed pitches would lie outside and away from the CA boundary. However, it is likely the uppermost parts of the development would be seen from the canal and the towpath, notwithstanding the screening effects of the proposed planting. Also, the sub-division of the field and signs of residential activities would be appreciated from the canal. As such, the development would affect the setting of the CA.
24. A significant part of the field would be unaffected by the proposal and the additional tree and hedge planting would reinforce the natural aspects of the locality. Even so, the development would be read as a visual intrusion into the rural setting of the canal, particularly by those looking out from the CA towards the site.
25. I am referred to other appeal decisions where planning permission has been granted for Gypsy and Traveller sites in the setting of heritage assets. However, none of these relate to the appeal site and so they do not affect my views on the appeal proposal.
26. For the above reasons, I conclude the development would have a detrimental effect on the setting and the significance of the CA. In these regards, it would not accord with PSB policies N1, N9 and C6, which together look to ensure development preserves and has regard to heritage assets. Only a small part of the overall CA would be affected by the proposal. Also, the impact would be on the setting rather than the character and appearance of the CA itself. As such, the proposal would cause a limited level of harm to the significance of the 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 CA. As such, paragraph 215 of the Framework dictates the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The heritage balance exercise is covered later in this decision.

Concerns raised by interested parties.

27. Interested parties have raised a number of different objections to the proposal. The development would be outside any defined settlement boundary and on land that

forms open countryside. Even so, it would be close to, rather than set away from, the villages of Pasturefields and Hixon. Residents may rely on private car travel to get to and from the villages due to separation distances. However, drive journey times would be short and so the development would allow residents to support the facilities within the nearest rural communities. Like the Council, I consider the development would be in a suitable location having regard to accessibility to services as well as relevant local and national planning policies.

28. During my visit, I saw London Road was busy with traffic. However, there is satisfactory visibility in both directions from the access and the submitted drawings indicate splays could be retained without significant works to roadside vegetation. The pitches would generate a fairly modest level of vehicular movements and so associated traffic would not pose an unacceptable risk to highway safety. I see no reason why waste could not be safely collected from the site.
29. Full details of the proposed private foul drainage system have been provided. There is little evidence to suggest that this would cause problems due to odours or that it would lead to pollution of the water environment. Also, a residential use is unlikely to cause excessive noise. The development would be visible from the dwelling opposite but it would avoid unacceptable harm to the living conditions at this or any other residence.
30. The site would include suitable parking and turning facilities. Also, a condition could be imposed to ensure noise mitigation measures are provided and retained to ensure the development provides a satisfactory living environment.
31. Whilst I have found the development would cause a minor level of harm to the significance and setting of the CA, it does not follow that the proposal would dissuade people from using the canal and the towpath. Also, there is little information before me to indicate that additional similar residential caravan site developments would be proposed on the remainder of the field or anywhere else in the locality. In any event, such proposals would need to be considered on their own merits. A decision to allow this appeal would not set an irresistible precedent that would have to be followed in the consideration of any future schemes.
32. The above factors do not justify the refusal of planning permission. As such, they fail to affect my overall conclusion.

General need and supply of Gypsy and Traveller pitches.

33. Paragraph 4e of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) states the government's aim is to promote more private Gypsy and Traveller site provision. The appeal development would contribute towards meeting that aim.
34. Furthermore, the PPTS says local authorities should set pitch targets that would address the local accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers. Also, they should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites against these targets.
35. The Council has submitted a Position Statement as of 31 March 2026 (the Position Statement). Table 1 of this statement includes pitch requirement figures taken from the Council's Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showperson Accommodation Assessment 2022 (the GTAA). At the hearing, the officers confirmed that the requirement figures as set out in Table 1 represent the Council's pitch targets.

These indicate a requirement of 9.95 new pitches for the 5 year period from 1 April 2026 to 31 March 2031, including a small uplift to address an under supply from previous years. The Position Statement also identifies a supply of 22 pitches that have planning permission but are not yet completed. As such, the Council claims it can demonstrate in excess of a 5 years' worth supply of deliverable sites.

36. I have a number of concerns over the Council's claims in terms of the need and supply of pitches. Firstly, since the GTAA was published a revised version of the PPTS has been issued. This includes a widened definition of Gypsies and Travellers compared to the previous version of the same document. At the hearing, the author of the GTAA accepted it did not address the needs of "all other persons with a cultural tradition of ... living in a caravan". As such, the GTAA does not address the accommodation needs of all persons defined as Gypsies and Travellers in the PPTS.
37. Secondly, the GTAA assesses the demand and supply of pitches in the short term period 2021/22 to 2025/26 separately from the longer term period from 2026/27 to 2039/40. It is clear looking at Table 7.1 of the GTAA that the established short term pitch requirement takes account of needs deriving from in-migration into the Borough as well as from Gypsy and Traveller households living in conventional housing that wish to move to a residential caravan site. However, it was confirmed at the hearing that the only factor considered in the GTAA in predicting the longer term need is emerging households from those already living on pitches within the Borough. Factors such as in-migration and movement from conventional housing to pitches have not been considered in assessing the longer term need. As such, the GTAA is likely to under-estimate the longer term need for pitches. This is particularly relevant at the current time as the pitch requirement for the next 5 years as set out in the Position Statement relies heavily upon the longer term need figures from the GTAA.
38. Thirdly, in arriving at the level of need, the GTAA takes into account future supply factors such as turnover on public Gypsy and Traveller sites and the potential of an unnamed new site development providing 25 pitches. This approach creates a difficulty as it deflates the real level of need or demand for pitches. Moreover, footnote 4 of the PPTS states that for a site to be deliverable and counted towards future supply it should be available now. There is no information before me to show that any public pitches are currently available be it through turnover or any other manner. Also, the officers at the hearing confirmed that the potential 25 pitch site referred to in the GTAA does not benefit from planning permission. The figures in Table ES1 of the GTAA demonstrate the level of need for new pitches would be much higher without the claimed supply through turnover and the potential site.
39. Finally, Table 7.1 of the GTAA includes a figure of 20 at row 6b for current authorised pitches which are vacant. These pitches are counted as current supply in the table and reduce the figure for short term need of pitches to 26. It is evident from Table 4.6 of the GTAA and confirmed at the hearing that 17 of these vacant authorised pitches are at Blakedown Meadows, St Albans Road in Stafford. However, it is also evident that 14 of the same 17 pitches are included in Table 2 of the Position Statement that lists sites that contribute towards future supply. The Council's representatives at the hearing accepted that this represents double counting of vacant authorised pitches as they are included in both current supply in Table 7.1 of the GTAA and future supply in Table 2 of the Position Statement. As

such, it is unreasonable to treat the committed and yet to be developed pitches at St Albans Road as contributing towards supply for the next 5 years.

40. If the 14 pitches at the St Albans Road site as referred to in Table 2 of the Position Statement are discounted, the supply of deliverable pitches as of 31 March 2026 falls to just 8 in number. This figure is below the 5 year requirement of 9.95 pitches as set out in row G of Table 1 of the Position Statement. As such, even if using the requirement targets derived from the GTAA, I find the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 years' supply of deliverable Gypsy and Travellers sites. The shortcomings of the GTAA I have identified indicate a higher level of need for pitches and so a more significant shortfall in supply.
41. The appeal development would help address the local need for more pitches. The public benefit in helping to address a shortfall in Gypsy and Traveller site provision attracts very significant weight in my assessment.

Other public benefits.

42. The reinstatement of the field boundary hedge and the provision of the proposed planting could be secured through the imposition of a planning condition if the appeal is allowed. These would not only add to the natural appearance of the site but they would also enhance its biodiversity value. The level of enhancement would be fairly modest but it represents an environmental and public benefit.
43. The development of the site would support construction employment and related services. Also, it is likely residents would contribute to local businesses and the vitality of Pasturefields and Hixon. These economic benefits attract modest weight.
44. It is evident from the discussions at the hearing that the proposal would be highly beneficial to the intended occupants for personal reasons. However, there is a general public benefit in ensuring people have an appropriate place to live that allows regular access to facilities such as schools and medical facilities. Also, the provision of authorised Gypsy and Traveller sites reduces the likelihood of unauthorised encampments. 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. The benefits in these regards attract moderate weight in my assessment of the appeal.

Heritage and Planning Balances.

45. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets, even when a development would cause less than substantial harm to their significance. In this case, only a limited level of harm would be caused to the significance of the CA through the proposal's effect on its rural setting. The main parties agree the development would avoid harm to the significance of any other heritage asset.
46. Overall, I find the public benefits of the development are of considerable 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 setting and significance of the CA. Therefore, in applying the heritage

balance, I find the development would have an acceptable effect on the CA, despite the identified harm to its setting and significance.

47. I have found the Council is unable to demonstrate a supply of 5 years' worth of deliverable Gypsy and Traveller sites against its own targets. As such, paragraph 28 of the PPTS says paragraph 11(d) of the Framework should be applied. This states that planning permission should be granted unless the circumstances as laid out in sub-paragraphs 11(d)(i) or (ii) exist. In light of my heritage balance conclusion above, the policies of the Framework that protect heritage assets do not provide strong reason to refuse the proposal. Accordingly, sub-paragraph 11(d)(i) is not engaged. It follows to consider sub-paragraph 11(d)(ii) and to weigh the benefits of the proposal against the harm it would cause in light of the policies of the Framework taken as a whole.
48. The development would help meet a local need for more Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in line with the government's objective set out in paragraph 61 of the Framework. In light of the current shortfall in supply, this attracts very significant weight in support of allowing the appeal.
49. To allow the proposal would go against the advice at paragraph 187 of the Framework for planning decisions to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. However, the visual effects of the development would be fairly localised, particularly once the proposed planting has matured. Therefore, I attach moderate weight to the harm that would be caused in these regards.
50. Even when considering the sensitivity of the site due to its relationship with the canal and the CA, I find the adverse impacts of allowing the development would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The circumstances as set out under sub-paragraph 11(d)(ii) of the Framework do not exist. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development and granting planning permission as laid out under paragraph 11 of the Framework is engaged.
51. I have found the proposal would not accord with PSB policies when read as a whole. However, the support from the Framework for allowing the development justifies granting planning permission contrary to development plan policies.

Other Matters

52. The appellant has forwarded a number of other points in support of allowing the appeal, including factors relating to the personal circumstances of the occupants and a contention that there has been a local failure of policy. These points are noted but I have found sufficient justification to grant planning permission in any event. As such, there is no need for me to consider these other matters any further.

Conditions

53. I have considered the list of planning conditions provided by the main parties. Where appropriate I have made amendments to the wording for reasons of precision and to remove unnecessary pre-commencement requirements.
54. 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.

55. Condition 3 seeks to minimise the effects of construction works on the environment, the road and nearby residences. Condition 4 is imposed to ensure a satisfactory living environment at the development. Condition 5 is required to protect the integrity of the PSMSAC. Conditions 6 and 7 are imposed in the interests of highway safety and to ensure the development includes a safe access. As no gates are proposed the suggested condition on gates being set back from the road is not needed.
56. Conditions 8, 9, 10 and 11 are included to limit the visual effects of the development on the landscape and the setting of the CA. Whilst not a suggested condition, I impose condition 12 for the same reason and for clarity purposes. I have considered the proposal on the basis the residential caravan site would be occupied by Gypsies and Travellers. There is no evidence before me on the acceptability of the site being occupied by other persons. Therefore, I have included condition 13.
57. There was a discussion at the hearing on potential conditions that would limit the appeal development for a temporary period or to restrict occupancy to the persons identified in the appellant's submissions. However, I find sufficient justification to grant permanent planning permission and the personal circumstances of the occupants have not been determinative in reaching my decision. Therefore, such conditions are unnecessary.

Conclusion

58. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Dr Angus Murdoch	Chartered Town Planner
Mrs Nichola Burley	Heritage Vision Ltd
John Smith	Appellant
Bob Watton	Intended occupier of one of the proposed pitches

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Tom Cannon	Interim Principal Planning Officer
Hannah Cross	Senior Planning Officer
Samantha Moss	Planning and Conservation Officer
Dr Michael Bullock	Arc4
Cllr Brendon McKeown	Local Councillor
Alex Yendole	Planning Policy Manager

INTERESTED PARTIES

Tony Smith	Supporter
------------	-----------

LIST OF DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING:

1. Letter from S Renshaw, Behaviour and Inclusion Manager, Marshlands School.
2. Drawing number TDA.2936.05 and titled Proposed Day Room and Stable Block – Pitch 2 (Plans and Elevations).
3. Flume Consulting Engineers Construction Environmental Management Plan November 2024.

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 and touring caravans allowed shall be positioned, in accordance with drawing nos TDA.2936.01 revision B, TDA.2936.02 revision D, TDA.2936.03 revision C, TDA.2936.04, TDA.2936.05 and CIV 001 revision 2.
- 3) The construction of the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Flume Consulting Engineers Construction Environmental Management Plan November 2024.
- 4) The residential use of the site hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the position and specification of a 2m high acoustic barrier/fence near the front and side boundaries of the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved acoustic barrier/fence shall be installed prior to the first occupation of the development and thereafter it shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details for the lifetime of the development.
- 5) The residential use of the site hereby permitted shall not commence until foul and surface water management arrangements have been implemented in accordance with the schemes as detailed in the Flume Consulting Engineers Drainage Strategy (Job Number 1537 and dated November 2024) and the enclosed drawing number CIV 001 revision 2. The drainage systems shall thereafter be maintained and retained for the lifetime of the development.
- 6) The residential use hereby permitted shall not commence until visibility splays as shown on the approved drawing numbered TDA.2936.04 have been provided. The visibility splays shall thereafter be kept free of all obstructions over a height of 600mm above the adjacent carriageway level.
- 7) The residential use hereby permitted shall not commence until the access to the site within the limits of the public highway and the parking, servicing and turning areas as shown on the approved plans have been provided. Thereafter these areas shall be retained and they shall only be used for the purpose of parking and turning of vehicles.
- 8) The residential use of the site hereby permitted shall not commence until the following have been submitted 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;
 - (ii) details of all proposed boundary and hard landscape surface treatments including proposed levels and soil retention/retaining walls that may be required;
 - (iii) a timetable for the implementation of the proposed landscaping and planting; and
 - (iv) a 5 year landscape maintenance schedule covering the establishment of all new planting (including watering).

- The provision and maintenance of landscaping and planting shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 9) No external lighting shall be installed on the residential caravan 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.
 - 10) There shall be no more than 3 pitches on the land subject of this permission and within each individual pitch 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) shall be stationed at any one time.
 - 11) No commercial activities shall take place on the residential caravan site hereby permitted, including the storage of materials, a livery, a riding school or any other business.
 - 12) The residential caravan site use hereby permitted shall be limited to the part of the site between the road and the line of proposed native hedgerow planting running across the site as shown on the approved drawing number TDA.2936.02 revision D. No part of the land shown on this drawing as being “existing equestrian paddock retained” or the strip of land between this paddock and the canal shall be used for residential purposes.
 - 13) The residential caravan 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.