

# Public Document Pack



## **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE B**

**DATE**      **Wednesday 28 September 2016**

**PLACE**      **Council Chamber, Council  
Offices, High Street, Needham  
Market**

**TIME**      **9:30 am**

Contact:                      Committee Services  
Direct Line:                 01449 724673/81  
Fax Number:                 01449 724696  
E-mail:committees@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

19 September 2016

**The Council, members of the public and the press may record/film/photograph or broadcast this meeting when the public and press are not lawfully excluded. Any member of the public who attends a meeting and objects to being filmed should advise the Committee Clerk.**

### **AGENDA**

1. Apologies for absence/substitutions
2. To receive any declarations of pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest by Members
3. Declarations of lobbying
4. Declarations of personal site visits
5. Confirmation of the minutes of the meeting held on 31 August 2016

#### **Report SA/20/16                      Pages A to D**

6. To receive notification of petitions in accordance with the Council's Petition Procedure
7. Questions from Members

The Chairman to answer any questions on any matters in relation to which the Council has powers or duties which affect the District and which fall within the terms of reference of the Committee of which due notice has been given in accordance with Council Procedure Rules.

8. Schedule of planning applications

#### **Report SA/21/16                      Pages 1 to 39**

**Note: The Chairman may change the listed order of items to accommodate visiting Ward Members and members of the public.**

9. Site Inspection

**Note:** *Should a site inspection be required for any of the applications this will be held on Wednesday, 5 October 2016 (exact time to be given). The Committee will reconvene after the site inspection at 12:00 noon in the Council Chamber.*

***Would Members please retain the relevant papers for use at that meeting.***

10. Urgent business – such other business which, by reason of special circumstances to be specified, the Chairman agrees should be considered as a matter of urgency

**(Note:** Any matter to be raised under this item must be notified, in writing, to the Chief Executive or District Monitoring Officer before the commencement of the meeting, who will then take instructions from the Chairman.)

**Notes:**

1. The Council has adopted a Charter on Public Speaking at Development Control/Planning Committees. A link to the Constitution and Charter (Part 3: Procedure Rule 33) is provided below:

<http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/UploadsMSDC/Organisation/Democratic-Services/Constitution/Revised-2016/2016-08-19-MSDC-Constitution-v17.pdf>

Those persons wishing to speak on a particular application should arrive in the Council Chamber early and make themselves known to the Officers. They will then be invited by the Chairman to speak when the relevant item is under consideration. This will be done in the following order:

- Parish Clerk or Parish Councillor representing the Council in which the application site is located
- Objectors
- Supporters
- The applicant or professional agent / representative

Public speakers in each capacity will normally be allowed 3 minutes to speak.

2. Ward Members attending meetings of Development Control Committees and Planning Referrals Committee may take the opportunity to exercise their speaking rights but are not entitled to vote on any matter which relates to his/her ward.

Galina Bloomfield  
Governance Support Officer

**Members:**

Councillor Kathie Guthrie – Chairman – Conservative and Independent Group  
Councillor Roy Barker – Vice-Chairman – Conservative and Independent Group

Conservative and Independent Group

Councillors: Julie Flatman  
Jessica Fleming  
Barry Humphreys MBE  
John Levantis  
Dave Muller  
Jane Storey

Green Group

Councillor: Keith Welham

Liberal Democrat Group

Councillor: Mike Norris

**Substitutes**

Members can select a substitute from any Member of the Council providing they have undertaken the annual planning training

**Ward Members**

Ward Members have the right to speak but not to vote on issues within their Wards

## Mid Suffolk District Council

### Vision

**“We will work to ensure that the economy, environment and communities of Mid Suffolk continue to thrive and achieve their full potential.”**

### Strategic Priorities 2016 – 2020

#### 1. Economy and Environment

**Lead and shape the local economy by promoting and helping to deliver sustainable economic growth which is balanced with respect for wildlife, heritage and the natural and built environment**

#### 2. Housing

**Ensure that there are enough good quality, environmentally efficient and cost effective homes with the appropriate tenures and in the right locations**

#### 3. Strong and Healthy Communities

**Encourage and support individuals and communities to be self-sufficient, strong, healthy and safe**

### Strategic Outcomes

**Housing Delivery** – More of the right type of homes, of the right tenure in the right place

**Business growth and increased productivity** – Encourage development of employment sites and other business growth, of the right type, in the right place and encourage investment in infrastructure, skills and innovation in order to increase productivity

**Community capacity building and engagement** – All communities are thriving, growing, healthy, active and self-sufficient

**An enabled and efficient organisation** – The right people, doing the right things, in the right way, at the right time, for the right reasons

**Assets and investment** – Improved achievement of strategic priorities and greater income generation through use of new and existing assets ('Profit for Purpose')

# Suffolk Local Code of Conduct

## 1. Pecuniary Interests

Does the item of Council business relate to or affect any of your/your spouse /partner's pecuniary interests?

Yes

No

No interests to declare

Declare you have a pecuniary interest

Leave the room. Do not participate or vote (Unless you have a dispensation)

Breach = criminal offence

## 2. Non-Pecuniary Interests

Does the item of Council business relate to or affect any of your non-pecuniary interests ?

Yes

No

Declare you have a non-pecuniary interest

Participate fully and vote

Breach = non-compliance with Code

This page is intentionally left blank

### MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE B** held at the Council Offices, Needham Market on 31 August 2016 at 09:30 am

**PRESENT:** Councillor Kathie Guthrie – Chairman – Conservative and Independent Group  
Councillor Roy Barker – Vice-Chairman – Conservative and Independent Group

#### **Conservative and Independent Group**

Councillor: Barry Humphreys MBE  
John Levantis  
Dave Muller  
Jane Storey  
Jill Wilshaw\*

#### **Green Group**

Councillor: Keith Welham

#### **Liberal Democrat Group**

Councillor: Mike Norris

#### **Denotes substitute \***

**Ward Members:** Derek Osborne

**In attendance:** Senior Development Management Planning Officer (JPG)  
Senior Legal Executive (KB)  
Senior Development Management Planning Officer (GW)  
Development Management Planning Officer (RB)  
Governance Support Officers (VL/GB)

#### **SA94 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/SUBSTITUTIONS**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Jessica Fleming. Councillor Jill Wilshaw was substituting for Councillor Julie Flatman.

#### **SA95 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY/NON-PECUNIARY INTEREST**

Councillor Jane Storey declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to Application 1795/16 by reason of being a Councillor at Suffolk County Council, which owned the site.

#### **SA96 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING**

All Members declared that they had been lobbied by email in relation to Application 1795/16.

**SA97 DECLARATIONS OF PERSONAL SITE VISITS**

There were no declarations of personal site visits.

**SA98 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 August 2016 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

**SA99 TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COUNCIL'S PETITION PROCEDURE**

None received.

**SA100 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

None received.

**SA101 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Representations from</b>
1795/16	Judith Forsdyke (Objector) Sam Robinson (Agent)

Item 1

Application	2890/16
Proposal	Install new block pave parking and track increase on existing tarmac area and install timber bollards
Site Location	<b>WALSHAM-LE-WILLOWS</b> – Grove Park
Applicant	Mid Suffolk District Council

Councillor Derek Osborne, Ward Member for Rickingham and Walsham, acknowledged that there were issues with parking on site currently and welcomed the proposed improvements to the parking area.

The Chairman clarified that the recommendation for approval was subject to conditions and that the final condition contained would address the comments by Suffolk County Council Highway Authority as stated in their letter on page 11 of the report.

During the course of a discussion on the application, Members considered the proposed layout and design of the parking area, and the recommendation to grant planning permission was duly proposed and seconded.

By a unanimous vote.



**Decision – Grant Planning Permission subject to conditions including:**

- Standard time limit for commencement
- Development shall be in accordance with the approved plan(s)
- As recommended by the Local Highway Authority

Informative note: small area of green space remaining and need for appropriate treatment.

Item 2

Application 1795/16  
Proposal Erection of 38 residential flats with associated parking, cycle stores and bin stores following the demolition of an existing two storey former residential care home (Revised red line site plan for changes to access)  
Site Location **STOWMARKET** – Wade House, Violet Hill Road IP14 1NH  
Applicant Havebury Housing Partnership

At the start of her presentation on the application, the Case Officer referred to the letter of 27 July 2016 from Suffolk County Council, which was included in full on pages 77-82 of the report. She clarified that the Section 106 contributions suggested were not being sought from the Applicant by reason that the development would be exempt from direct contribution due to it being affordable housing. However, contributions might be provided for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The Case Officer also advised that an additional condition for a lighting scheme was recommended.

Judith Forsdyke, speaking as an objector on behalf of residents of Evelyn Fison Mews, commented that the scale and size of the proposed development, lack of parking and light and noise pollution would result in a detrimental effect on the residents of Evelyn Fison Mews.

Sam Robinson, the Agent, commented that the new build would be more economical, in keeping with the existing building's footprint, sympathetic to the existing trees and shrubs on site and well designed and screened to prevent overlooking. The proposal would deliver much needed affordable housing in a sustainable location.

Councillors Barry Humphreys MBE and Dave Muller, Ward Members for Stowmarket North, commented that parking arrangements were a concern at times; however, the proposed development would provide accommodation much needed by the local community.

During the course of the debate, Members considered various aspects of the application, including in relation to the shared access way with the Police station, potential demolition, re-use and recycling of building materials, deck screening scheme and landscaping scheme. In addition and to address questions about potential overlooking, Officers offered to include as a condition obscure glazing to the windows facing Evelyn Fison Mews. However, Members did not consider this necessary as they felt that the proposed design and landscaping scheme were sufficient and there would not be significant harm from the proposal.

By a unanimous vote.

**Decision –**

**That the Professional Lead – Growth and Sustainable Planning be authorised to grant Full Planning permission:**

**(1) Subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation on appropriate terms to the satisfaction of the Professional Lead – Growth and Sustainable Planning to secure:**

- Affordable housing;

**and**

**(2) subject to conditions including:**

- Time limit
- Approved plans
- Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan to be agreed
- Construction management scheme implemented
- Working times restriction
- Access improvement
- Parking provision
- Recommendations contained in Section 5 of the Conservation Construction Ecology Survey including a Method Statement
- Surface water management strategy
- Landscaping scheme
- Materials
- Implementation of deck screening prior to first occupation
- External lighting scheme to be agreed

**(3) That in the event of the Planning Obligation referred to in Resolution (1) above not being secured that the Professional Lead – Growth and Sustainable Planning be authorised to refuse planning permission on appropriate grounds**

Informative note: Re-use and recycling of materials following demolition of Wade House

.....  
Chairman

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE B MEETING 28 SEPTEMBER 2016

SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE

Item	Ref No.	Location And Proposal	Ward Member	Officer	Page No.
1.	2707/16	4 Church Road Felsham IP30 0PN – Retention of concrete pad & addition of shingle to driveway	Cllr Mrs Otton	IW	1-12
2.	2357/16	Magpie Inn Norwich Road Stonham Parva IP14 5JY – Use of land for the stationing of 16 holiday lodges without compliance with condition 2b of planning permission 1054/15 which restricts the duration of occupancy	Cllr Morley	IW	13-39

This page is intentionally left blank

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 28 September 2016

---

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO</b>	1
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	2707/16
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Retention of concrete pad and addition of shingle to driveway
<b>SITE LOCATION</b>	4 Church Road, Felsham IP30 0PN
<b>SITE AREA (Ha)</b>	0.014
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Ms S Applin
<b>RECEIVED</b>	June 15, 2016
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	August 26, 2016

---

**REASONS FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE**

The application is referred to committee for the following reason :

- The property is owned by Mid Suffolk District Council

**PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE**

1. Pre-application advice has been given that planning permission is required for the retention of the existing concrete pad hardstanding and the extension of the driveway/forecourt in shingle. In other locations the shingle would be regarded as permeable and the work would be permitted development, however in this case the property is within the area covered by an Article 4 Direction and this reduces some permitted development rights. Felsham's Article 4 Direction refers to the 1995 Town and Country Planning Development Order that has been revoked and replaced by the 2015 Development Order. This does mean what may have needed permission before due to the Article 4 Direction has altered and it may be the case the Article 4 Direction should be reviewed and as needed updated. However, in this case for the avoidance of doubt a planning application has been made for both shingle and concrete hardstanding.

**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

2. The property is within the settlement boundary for Felsham as defined in the adopted Mid Suffolk Local Plan. It is also within the designated conservation area.

**HISTORY**

3. The planning history relevant to the application site is:

3545/11	Retention of front door canopies to properties 1, 2 & 4 Church Road, Felsham (following removal of existing). Replacement of front door canopy at 5 Church Road, Felsham	Granted 08/12/2011
0950/06	Retention of PVCU windows as installed	Granted 06/07/2006
0098/92/LB	DEMOLITION OF RUINED BRICK OUTBUILDING RANGE; RESITING OF MODERN TIMBER SHED AND ERECTION OF SINGLE-STOREY EXTENSION WITH LOBBY AND LINK BUILDING.	Granted 02/09/1992
0665/92	DEMOLITION OF RUINED BRICK OUTBUILDING RANGE; RESITING OF MODERN TIMBER SHED AND ERECTION OF SINGLE-STOREY EXTENSION WITH LOBBY AND LINK BUILDING.	Granted 02/09/1992

### PROPOSAL

4. It is proposed to retain an existing concrete pad to the front of the property and lay a gravel surface to form an extended driveway/forecourt to the front of the property.

The existing concrete pad measures 5m. x 3m. The proposed shingle extended driveway/forecourt will replace an existing lawn and extend this 'hard' surface to an area covering the front garden from the Church Road frontage to a point 14m. in from that frontage, where there is a slight change of level in the garden. The width of the new hardstanding (including the existing concrete) will diminish slightly over that distance from the 7m. at the street frontage to 5.5m at the new edge. The concrete path will remain.

### POLICY

5. **Planning Policy Guidance**

See Appendix below.

### CONSULTATIONS

6. **Felsham Parish Council** have no objection

**SCC Highways** have no objection subject to conditions covering the improvement of the existing vehicular access and surface water drainage

**MSDC Heritage** have not commented

**MSDC Asset Management** comment that permission for the alteration has not been granted 'but would more than likely be approved'

**LOCAL AND THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS**

7. None received

**ASSESSMENT**

8. This work is considered to be visually acceptable.

The comments of the highway authority are noted and the points have been secured by condition. As a further precaution the type of gravel to be used should be restricted to 20mm. guage and above, to prevent material being transferred onto the highway in tyre treads.

Similarly the comment of MSDC Asset Management is noted. This need not affect the grant of planning permission and an informative can be added to the decision notice.

On balance the development is not considered to result in significant harm and permission with conditions is recommended.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**That Full Planning Permission be Granted subject to the following conditions:-**

- 1 Standard time limit**
- 2 List of approved documents**
- 3 Highways: Access**
- 4 Highways: Surface water drainage**
- 5 Shingle to be min. 20mm. guage**
- 6 All new surfacing materials to be free draining.**

**Informative re- the tenant's need for alteration permission.**

Philip Isbell  
Professional Lead - Growth & Sustainable Planning

Ian Ward  
Senior Planning Officer

**APPENDIX A - PLANNING POLICIES**

- 1. Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the Core Strategy Focused Review**

**Cor5 - CS5 Mid Suffolks Environment**  
**CSFR-FC1 - PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**  
**CSFR-FC1.1 - MID SUFFOLK APPROACH TO DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

4

2. **Mid Suffolk Local Plan**

**GP1** - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF DEVELOPMENT

**HB8** - SAFEGUARDING THE CHARACTER OF CONSERVATION AREAS

**T9** - PARKING STANDARDS

3. **Planning Policy Statements, Circulars & Other policy**

**NPPF** - National Planning Policy Framework

**APPENDIX B - NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS**

Letter(s) of representation(s) have been received from a total of **0** interested party(ies).

The following people **objected** to the application

The following people **supported** the application:

The following people **commented** on the application:





**Title:** Constraints

**Reference:** 2707/16

**Site:** 4 Church Road Felsham IP30 0PN

Committee siteplan with Con Area & Listed Buildings shown



**MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
 131, High Street, Needham Market, IP6 8DL  
 Telephone : 01449 724500  
 email: customerservice@csduk.gov.uk  
 www.midsuffolk.gov.uk



SCALE 1:1250

Reproduced by permission of  
 Ordnance Survey on behalf of HMSO.  
 © Crown copyright and database right 2016  
 Ordnance Survey Licence number 100017810

AMENDED PLAN




**UK  
Planning  
Maps**

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING CONTROL  
RECEIVED  
30 JUN 2016  
ACKNOWLEDGED .....




4 Church Road, Felsham, Bury St. Edmunds, IP30 0PN



Map area bounded by: 594749.0,256998.0,594839.0,257088.0. Produced on 03 May 2016 from the OS National Geographic Database and incorporating surveyed revision available at this date. Reproduction in whole or part is prohibited without the prior permission of Ordnance Survey. © Crown copyright 2016. Supplied by UKPlanningMaps.com a licensed OS partner (100054135). Unique plan reference: b90b/90207/125157

LOCATION PLAN

AMENDED PLAN




**UK  
Planning  
Maps**

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PLANNING CONTROL  
RECEIVED  
  
30 JUN 2016  
  
ACKNOWLEDGED .....




**4 Church Road, Felsham, Bury St. Edmunds, IP30 0PN**



Map area bounded by: 594749.0,256998.0,594839.0,257088.0. Produced on 03 May 2016 from the OS National Geographic Database and incorporating surveyed revision available at this date. Reproduction in whole or part is prohibited without the prior permission of Ordnance Survey. © Crown copyright 2016. Supplied by UKPlanningMaps.com a licensed OS partner (100054135). Unique plan reference: b906/90207/125157

BLOCK PLAN



9

**From:** Paula Gladwell [mailto:gladwellpp@aol.com]  
**Sent:** 26 July 2016 17:57  
**To:** Ian Ward  
**Subject:** 2707/16

Hi Ian

Apologies for the slight delay with a response on this application. If at all possible please could you add the following comments to the file for application 2707/16

many thanks

*"Felsham Parish Council have NO OBJECTION to this application based on the information available"*

Kind regards  
Paula Gladwell  
Felsham Parish Clerk

Your Ref: MS/2707/16  
Our Ref: 570\CON\2156\16  
Date: 21/07/2016  
Highways Enquiries to: kyle.porter@suffolk.gov.uk

10



**All planning enquiries should be sent to the Local Planning Authority.**  
Email: [planningadmin@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:planningadmin@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)

The Planning Officer  
Mid Suffolk District Council  
Council Offices  
131 High Street  
Ipswich  
Suffolk  
IP6 8DL

**For the Attention of: Ian Ward**

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 - CONSULTATION RETURN MS/2707/16**

**PROPOSAL: Retention of concrete pad and addition of shingle to driveway**  
**LOCATION: 4, Church Road, Felsham, IP30 0PN**

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority recommends that any permission which that Planning Authority may give should include the conditions shown below:

**1 AL 5**

Condition: No other part of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced until the existing vehicular access has been improved, laid out and completed in all respects in accordance with DM03; and with an entrance width of 3m. Thereafter the access shall be retained in the specified form.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety to ensure that the layout of the access is properly designed, constructed and provided before the development is commenced.

**2 D 2**

Condition: Before the development is commenced details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority showing the means to prevent the discharge of surface water from the development onto the highway. The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the access is first used and shall be retained thereafter in its approved form.

Reason: To prevent hazards caused by flowing water or ice on the highway.

**3 NOTE 02**

Note 2: It is an OFFENCE to carry out works within the public highway, which includes a Public Right of Way, without the permission of the Highway Authority.

Any conditions which involve work within the limits of the public highway do not give the applicant permission to carry them out. Unless otherwise agreed in writing all works within the public highway shall be carried out by the County Council or its agents at the applicant's expense.

The County Council's Central Area Manager must be contacted on Telephone: 01473 341414. Further information go to: [www.suffolk.gov.uk/environment-and-transport/highways/dropped-kerbs-vehicular-accesses/](http://www.suffolk.gov.uk/environment-and-transport/highways/dropped-kerbs-vehicular-accesses/)

A fee is payable to the Highway Authority for the assessment and inspection of both new vehicular crossing access works and improvements deemed necessary to existing vehicular crossings due to proposed development.

Yours sincerely,

||

**Mr Kyle Porter**  
**Development Management Technician**  
Strategic Development – Resource Management

Ian Ward

---

**From:** Allison Leathers  
**Sent:** 13 September 2016 13:38  
**To:** Ian Ward  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Application MSDC 2707/16 - 4, Church Road, Felsham

Hi Ian,

Tenant alteration permission has not been granted for this work but would be more than likely approved if an application was received

Can you please advise the tenant that the above must be granted before any works can proceed.

**Regards**

*Allison*

**Allison Leathers**  
**Admin & Technical Support Officer**  
**Babergh District Council**  
**Tel: 01473 825779**  
**E-mail: [allison.leathers@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:allison.leathers@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)**

---

**From:** Ian Ward  
**Sent:** 13 September 2016 10:38  
**To:** Allison Leathers  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Application MSDC 2707/16 - 4, Church Road, Felsham

---

**From:** Ian Ward  
**Sent:** 13 September 2016 09:20  
**To:** 'alison.leathers@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk'  
**Subject:** Planning Application MSDC 2707/16 - 4, Church Road, Felsham

Dear Ms. Leathers,

Further to our conversation this morning, can you please confirm whether or not you have any objection to the above proposal to create an enlarged hardstanding in gravel at the front of the above property.

The existing concrete pad is to be retained (it should have had permission before) and the proposed gravel surface will cover the remainder of the front part of the front garden up to the slight change of level (about half way between the front wall of the house and the road).

Regards,

Ian Ward



MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL  
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE - 28 September 2016

---

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO</b>	2
<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	2357/16
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	Use of land for the stationing of 16 holiday lodges without compliance with condition 2b of planning permission 1054/15 which restricts the duration of occupancy
<b>SITE LOCATION</b>	Magpie Inn, Norwich Road, Stonham Parva IP14 5JY
<b>SITE AREA (Ha)</b>	0.85
<b>APPLICANT</b>	Mr J Bahar
<b>RECEIVED</b>	May 24, 2016
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	September 3, 2016

---

**REASONS FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE**

The application is referred to committee for the following reason :

- the Head of Economy considers the application to be of a controversial nature having regard to the nature of the application

**PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE**

1. No pre-application advice has been given on this proposal

**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

2. This application concerns an area of land immediately to the rear (west) of the Magpie Inn, a well known landmark on the A140 at Stonham Parva.

The site is level and extends to some 0.85 Ha. The part of the site closest to the public house has been partially cleared of significant vegetation. However, beyond this, the larger part of the site is rather overgrown and unkempt. All of the site is bounded by an established hedgerow with mature trees.

The Magpie and its associated road gantry are listed buildings. Public footpath no. 7 runs along and outside the northern boundary of the site.

HISTORY

3. The planning history relevant to the application site is:

1054/15	Use of land for the stationing of 16 holiday lodges.	Granted 30/07/2015
0825/13	Erection of a motel and construction of car park.	Granted 24/01/2014
2136/11	Erection of detached dwelling and a store for manager of motel and holiday lodges (OUTLINE)	Refused 11/01/2012
2138/11	Erection of 25 room motel. Construction of car park and footbridge link to pub	Refused 11/01/2012
0028/03/LB	REPLACE EXISTING GANTRY SIGN, RE-USING EXISTING CROSSBAR AND FIXED/SWINGING SIGNS.	Granted 11/06/2003
0003/03/A	REPLACE EXISTING GANTRY SIGN, RE-USING EXISTING CROSSBAR AND FIXED/SWINGING SIGNS.	11/06/2003
0059/98/LB	INSERTION OF FRENCH CASEMENT IN NEW OPENING ON REAR ELEVATION. RECREATE OPENINGS IN WALL ADJACENT TO CHIMNEY IN BAR AREA. OPEN UP CHIMNEY BREAST TO INSET DOUBLE BACK WOOD BURNER. ERECT NEW STUD PARTITION TO FORM LOBBY, FOLLOWING REMOVAL OF EXISTING LOBBY.	Granted 08/07/1998
0251/98/	ERECTION OF BOLLARDS	Granted 08/07/1998
0065/96/OL	ERECTION OF 12 NO. LOW COST DWELLINGS FOR RENT, WITH CONSTRUCTION OF NEW, AND ALTERATION TO, EXISTING VEHICULAR ACCESS.	Refused 22/08/1996
0064/93/LB	INTERNAL ALTERATIONS INCLUDING REMOVAL OF TWO NON-LOADBEARING WALLS.	Granted 18/06/1993
0037/90/LB	PLACING OF ADVERTISEMENT BOARD.	Refused 02/10/1990
0007/90/A	PLACING OF ADVERTISEMENT BOARD.	02/10/1990
0056/77/LB	Erection of kitchen extension to public house	Granted 25/11/1977
0678/77	Erection of kitchen extension to public house	Granted 25/11/1977
070675	Alterations and two single storey additions to form new toilets.	Granted 24/03/1976
LB003075	Alterations and two single storey additions to form new toilets	Granted 24/03/1976
0062/16	Use of land for stationing of 19 holiday units	23/03/2016

**PROPOSAL**

4. Permission is sought to occupy the holiday lodges approved under application no. 1054/15 without compliance with part b) of condition no. 2 of that permission. The condition is reproduced in full below with the relevant clause in bold italics:-

- ***TIME / OCCUPANCY RESTRICTIONS ON HOLIDAY CARAVANS***

*The occupation of the holiday units shall, at all times, be not otherwise than in accordance with the following:*

*a) The units hereby approved shall not be occupied other than for holiday purposes and shall not be used as any person's principal domestic living accommodation or residential dwellings, including any use within Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) 1987 as amended.*

***b) No person/s shall occupy any of the units for more than 28 consecutive days or re-occupy any unit on the site at any time during the first 28 days following their most recent stay.***

*c) Details of the name, permanent home address, vehicle registration and duration of stay of all persons occupying the accommodation, shall be kept in a register, a copy of which shall be made available to the Local Planning Authority for inspection at any time.*

*Reason - The site of the permission is outside any area where planning permission would normally be forthcoming for residential development and is permitted only as units for short term holiday purposes in the interests of contributing to tourism and the economy of the area.*

**N.B No start has yet been made on the implementation of the permission granted**

**POLICY**

5. **Planning Policy Guidance**

See Appendix below.

**CONSULTATIONS**

6. **Stonham Parva Parish Council** object to the proposal. They consider that non-compliance with the condition will diminish the lodge's contribution to the holiday trade as they may be sold as second homes. It would also make it more likely they would be occupied on a more permanent basis which they do not consider to be appropriate.

**MSDC Tourism Development** support the application, which they consider will better support the local tourist trade. They consider the condition should be replaced with one that allows more flexibility (see 'Assessment' below)

### LOCAL AND THIRD PARTY REPRESENTATIONS

7. One letter of objection has been received from a local resident. This makes the point that most holidays are for 1 - 3 weeks duration and the existing condition is sound in that respect. It concludes that MSDC must ensure that permanent residential development is not achieved through the back door.

### ASSESSMENT

8. **Introduction and Background:**

The existing condition has been Mid Suffolk's accepted method of restricting occupancy to holiday use for some time and in both wording and principle is very similar to that used by many other local planning authorities.

The condition as framed has two basic purposes; to prevent permanent occupation of the units and to seek to ensure their availability to a continuously changing series of visitors who will contribute to the local economy.

Members of this particular committee may recall a recent application in Wortham seeking a similar variation to the occupancy condition (4226/15) where officers recommended approval and which members refused. The decision has been appealed but no decision has yet been issued. Material to officer's recommendation in that case was a 2014 appeal decision in the Tendring District Council Area. A copy of that appeal decision is enclosed with the committee papers and reference to the conditions imposed by the Inspector is made at '*Planning Balance/Conclusion*' below.

**The Current Proposal:**

The applicant is not disputing the need for a condition restricting occupancy to holiday use. However, it is understood they are offering the site to developers or seeking a development partner and claim that the condition is deterring interest in the project. As an alternative, they suggest the condition framed and used by East Riding of Yorkshire Yorkshire Council which was included in the government's now withdrawn 2006 publication 'Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism'. **This condition is the alternative suggested by the MSDC Tourism Officer in supporting the proposal and reads:-**

***i) the caravans/(cabins/chalets) shall be occupied for holiday purposes only.***

***ii) the caravans/(cabins/chalets) shall not be occupied as a person's sole, or main place of residence***

***iii) the owners/operators shall maintain an up-to-date register of all***

**owners/occupiers of individual caravans/(cabins/chalets) on the site, and of their main home addresses, and shall make this information available at all reasonable times to the local planning authority.**

Variation of the condition as proposed would basically enable the lodges to be owned and occupied by persons//families who could then effectively use them as 'weekend cottages'

Included in the reasoning to grant permission for the lodges in 2015 was the perception that their presence would help sustain The Magpie, which has suffered from diminishing trade in recent years.. There is no evidence available as to whether the proposed form of occupation would make a significantly different contribution to the local economy than that secured by the existing condition. However, with regard to occupancy conditions, the aforementioned Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism also advises ...'Planning authorities will frame these conditions according to local circumstances...', and it is the clear view of your Tourism Development Officer that more flexibility is required.

The Good Practice Guide, which was withdrawn in March 2014, has not been replaced by further specific guidance. The National Planning Policy Framework, at para. 28 encourages local planning authorities in more general terms to ..'support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural area, communities and visitors...'

**Planning Balance/Conclusion:**

Overall, it is considered that the amendment as proposed secures the occupation of the units for holiday purposes and contains sufficient safeguards to prevent permanent occupation.

However, it is noted that in the appeal decision referred to above, that the Inspector, whilst varying the local planning authority's decision in the manner proposed, reinforced the principle of holiday use by imposing a further condition (no. 4) precluding occupation for a brief period each year. Members may recall that, until recently, that was a feature of Mid Suffolk's existing condition. An additional clause precluding occupation during February is proposed in this recommended revised condition.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**That Approval without compliance with part (b) of condition no. 2 be Granted subject to condition no. 2 of the permission granted under 1054/15 being replaced with the following new condition:-**

**2. i) the lodges shall be occupied for holiday purposes only.**

**ii) the lodges shall not be occupied as a person's sole, or main place of residence**

**iii) the owners/operators shall maintain an up-to-date register of all owners/occupiers of individual lodges on the site, and of their main home addresses, and shall make this information available at all reasonable times to the local planning authority.**

*iv) The lodges shall not be occupied during the month of February in any calendar year*

Philip Isbell  
Professional Lead - Growth & Sustainable Planning

Ian Ward  
Senior Planning Officer

## **APPENDIX A - PLANNING POLICIES**

### **1. Mid Suffolk Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the Core Strategy Focused Review**

**Cor2** - CS2 Development in the Countryside & Countryside Villages

**Cor5** - CS5 Mid Suffolks Environment

**CSFR-FC1** - PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

**CSFR-FC1.1** - MID SUFFOLK APPROACH TO DELIVERING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

### **2. Mid Suffolk Local Plan**

**HB1** - PROTECTION OF HISTORIC BUILDINGS

**GP1** - DESIGN AND LAYOUT OF DEVELOPMENT

**RT12** - FOOTPATHS AND BRIDLEWAYS

**RT17** - SERVICED TOURIST ACCOMMODATION

**RT19** - STATIC CARAVANS AND HOLIDAY CHALETS

### **3. Planning Policy Statements, Circulars & Other policy**

**NPPF** - National Planning Policy Framework


## **APPENDIX B - NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS**

Letter(s) of representation(s) have been received from a total of 1 interested party(ies).

The following people **objected** to the application

The following people **supported** the application:

The following people **commented** on the application:



Stonham Parva

**Title:** Constraints

**Reference:** 2357/16

**Site:** Magpie Inn Norwich Road Stonham Parva IP14 5JY  
Committee siteplan



**MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
 131, High Street, Needham Market, IP6 8DL  
 Telephone : 01449 724500  
 email: customerservice@csduk.gov.uk  
 www.midsuffolk.gov.uk




SCALE 1:2500

Reproduced by permission of  
 Ordnance Survey on behalf of HMSO.  
 © Crown copyright and database right 2016  
 Ordnance Survey Licence number 100017810

# PHIL COBBOLD

PLANNING CONSULTANCY

42 BEATRICE AVENUE FELIXSTOWE IP11 9HB Tel: 07775962514 Email: philipcobbold@btinternet.com



USE OF LAND FOR STATIONING 16 HOLIDAY LODGES  
LAND AT THE MAGPIE INN, STONHAM PARVA IP14 5JY



Phil Cobbold BA PGDip MRTPI - Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute - Chartered Town Planner




ARCHITECTS  
 7th Floor, 112-114  
 100 Broad Street, London, SE1 1HT  
 Tel: 020 7463 4000  
 www.architects.com

1. Concept Design  
 2. Planning Application  
 3. Planning Approval  
 4. Construction Phase  
 5. Completion

Revision 1: 15th May 2011 - 20% - Revision to scheme design  
 Revision 2: 15th May 2011 - 30% - Revision to scheme design  
 Revision 3: 15th May 2011 - 40% - Revision to scheme design  
 Revision 4: 15th May 2011 - 50% - Revision to scheme design  
 Revision 5: 15th May 2011 - 60% - Revision to scheme design  
 Revision 6: 15th May 2011 - 70% - Revision to scheme design  
 Revision 7: 15th May 2011 - 80% - Revision to scheme design  
 Revision 8: 15th May 2011 - 90% - Revision to scheme design  
 Revision 9: 15th May 2011 - 100% - Final scheme design

SITE PLAN



21

22

# STONHAM PARVA PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Marilyn Bottomley CILCA

Tel: 01284 789303

8 Church Close,  
Rede,  
Bury St. Edmunds,  
Suffolk IP29 4BG

e-mail: [marilyn.bottomley@btinternet.com](mailto:marilyn.bottomley@btinternet.com)

Planning Department  
Mid Suffolk District Council  
131 High Street  
Needham Market  
Nr Ipswich  
Suffolk  
IP6 8DL

<p>MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING CONTROL <b>RECEIVED</b></p> <p>04 AUG 2016</p> <p>ACKNOWLEDGED .....</p> <p>DATE .....</p> <p>PASS TO <u>  JW  </u> .....</p>
--

3<sup>rd</sup> August 2016.

Dear Sirs

## RESPONSE TO PLANNING APPLICATION 2357/16

Whilst the response of Stonham Parva Parish Council was an Objection to the original planning application 1054/15 for holiday cabins located on land behind The Magpie Public House, it was understood and accepted the reasons for the grant of planning permission: in particular, the promotion of tourism in the area and the likelihood of occupants of the holiday cabins providing a source of trade for the Magpie Inn. The Parish Council is somewhat surprised and alarmed by the application to remove the residency condition 2b. Councillors understand that the 28 day residency limit is a standard established planning clause for tourist accommodation.

The Parish Council notes from the Planning Permission Grant 1054/15 that the reason for the planning conditions are stated :

*Reason - The site of the permission is outside any area where planning permission would normally be forthcoming for residential development and is permitted only as units for short term holiday purposes in the interests of contributing to tourism and the economy of the area.*

The Council notes that the applicant is making this application because he states he has been unable to sell the plot with this condition attached. It seems to the parish council that this is a business issue pertaining to the applicant and not a Planning Matter.

Should the residency condition be lifted, then the parish council could foresee a possibility of the holiday cabins being repurposed as permanent residential accommodation (whether owned by the occupier or by someone who leases it to the occupier) or even as second homes .

The Parish Council considers that holiday lodges/cabins/static caravans are not suitable as permanent residential accommodation within the village for the following reasons:

- This type of permanent accommodation within Little Stonham is not in keeping with the village surroundings and is outside the main settlement area.
- The holiday cabins do not offer any private outdoor space within their location. Whilst this is very acceptable for a holiday let, we consider that it is not acceptable for permanent residential accommodation.

**STONHAM PARVA PARISH COUNCIL**


- The building density of 16 units in the space would be inappropriate for a permanent housing estate to which different considerations apply when compared with short term holiday lets.
- There are no immediate facilities (doctors, schools, shops, minimal public transport, mains services, etc.) within Little Stonham to support 16 permanent or near permanent households.
- The original Planning Permission grant was to help to promote tourism in the area. Second home owners are less likely to support the attractions (They might visit them once), and bring less revenue to the area than genuine holidaymakers that stay for a short time. This includes support for the collocated and now reopened Magpie Public House.
- In the event that the cabins are sold as second homes, removing the condition 2b will mean that there is less likelihood of the caravans being let to the widest market of genuine holidaymakers.
- There is a concern about the maintenance of the site if the cabins and surrounds are forgotten and not maintained by multiple absentee owners at certain times of the year.
- The Parish Council perceives a greater risk of the cabins becoming permanent residences if the 28 day limit is lifted.

Finally councillors think it appropriate to point out that they have seen a plethora of applications in respect of the development of land in and around the Magpie Public House; these constantly look to extend the scope of previous applications, which themselves were only just acceptable from a planning and village viewpoint. The Parish Council feels that proposals for development of this land have been nudged forward a number of times and that the current position is already a compromise between the owner's aspirations commercially and what would be tolerated by the village community. To push this boundary yet again would move the development way beyond a compromise from the village's view point. Surely an application for the consent that is now sought would have had no chance of success if presented as a single application from the start?

Yours faithfully

*Marilyn Bottomley*

Clerk



24

**From:** marilyn.bottomley@btinternet.com [mailto:marilyn.bottomley@btinternet.com]  
**Sent:** 31 July 2016 17:24  
**To:** Planning Admin  
**Subject:** Application2357/16  
**Importance:** High

Stonham Parva Parish Council has considered application 2357/16 –Magpie Inn, Norwich Road, and **objects** to this for the reason as under:-

To allow would make "holiday lodges" name a mockery and extremely misleading. "Holiday Lodges" should mean exactly that. Even without 2b 1054/15 would not stop occupants "playing musical chairs" with the duration of occupancy.

Marilyn Bottomley  
Clerk

**From:** Tracey Brinkley  
**Sent:** 27 July 2016 12:57  
**To:** Planning Admin  
**Cc:** Ian Ward  
**Subject:** 2357 / 16 Magpie Inn, Stonham Parve - Removal of Condition

**PROPOSAL:** Use of land for the stationing of 16 holiday lodges without compliance with condition 2b of planning permission 1054/15 which restricts the duration of occupancy

**LOCATION:** Magpie Inn, Norwich Road, Stonham Parva IP14 5JY

I would like to confirm support for the above application.

The current visitor destination plan (amongst many recommendations) emphasises the need to encourage more overnight stays, and families to visit, and for visitors to come all year round. This development has the potential to help address these areas. The VDP and other supporting documents can be found on our website.

<http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk/business/economic-development/tourism-development-in-babergh-and-mid-suffolk/>

The current condition which is in place would be difficult to monitor and enforce effectively, and, as well as appearing to have an impact on the viability of the project, it conflicts with the aim of encouraging visitors to come all year round, and is therefore counter-productive. I would recommend a flexible condition is used as detailed below which restricts the use and occupancy to holiday accommodation which is the essential element, without imposing rigid timescales when it can be occupied.

'The accommodation shall be occupied for holiday purposes only. The accommodation shall not be occupied as a person's sole or main place of residence. The site owners/ operators shall maintain an up-to-date register of the names of all occupants of the accommodation and of their main home addresses; the site owners/ operators shall make this information available at all reasonable times to the local planning authority.'

Kind Regards

*Tracey Brinkley*

Tourism Development Officer

T 01449 724637

E: [tracey.brinkley@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk](mailto:tracey.brinkley@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk)

Tourism Development Webpages: <http://www.babergh.gov.uk/business/economic-development/tourism-development-in-babergh-and-mid-suffolk/>

Open for Business Team

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils - Working Together

w: [www.babergh.gov.uk](http://www.babergh.gov.uk) [www.midsuffolk.gov.uk](http://www.midsuffolk.gov.uk)

<http://heartofsuffolk.co.uk/>



---

## Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened on 30 July 2013

Site visits made on 1 and 2 August 2013

**by Clive Hughes BA (Hons) MA DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 7 January 2014

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P1560/A/12/2176728**

**Starena Lodge, Clacton Road, Weeley, Essex CO16 9DH**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr T Doran against the decision of Tendring District Council.
  - The application Ref 11/00897/FUL, dated 29 July 2011, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2012.
  - The development proposed is 20 pitch static holiday caravan park together with peripheral and supplemental landscape planting.
  - The inquiry sat for 3 days on 30 and 31 July and 1 August 2013.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 20 pitch static holiday caravan park together with peripheral and supplemental landscape planting at Starena Lodge, Clacton Road, Weeley, Essex CO16 9DH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 11/00897/FUL, dated 29 July 2011, subject to the 16 conditions set out in the Annex to this Decision.

### Application for costs

2. At the Inquiry an application for costs was made by Mr T Doran against Tendring District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

### Procedural matters

3. A Hearing into this appeal was opened on 23 October 2012. It was adjourned due to the high volume of public interest and the limitations of the venue. During the adjournment it was agreed with the principal parties that the appeal should proceed by way of a Public Inquiry.
4. The *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) was published on 27 March 2012, after the planning application the subject of this appeal had been determined. The reasons for refusal refer to *Planning Policy Statements 1 and 4*, both of which have now been replaced by the Framework. The Framework was referred to extensively in the written evidence and at the Inquiry. I have determined this appeal in the context of current national planning policy.
5. As the Inquiry was held during school holidays, I made further unaccompanied visits to the site on 9 and 10 September 2013 at the request of the main parties in order to observe traffic conditions in the slip road and around the Clacton Road/ Gutteridge Hall Lane junction. The first visit was in the afternoon to observe school collection time; the second was at the start of the school day. On both occasions the weather was poor with light rain falling.

6. Paragraph 2.09 of the signed Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) says that the appeal site can be considered as being in a sustainable location. This is clearly an error as it contradicts the reasons for refusal and the Council's case. By email dated 7 March 2013, concerning amendments to the (then) draft SoCG, the Council notified the appellant that it did not agree that the site was in a sustainable location. Based upon the reasons for refusal, the proofs of evidence of the Council's witnesses and the email dated 7 March 2017, I am satisfied that the appellant could not reasonably have regarded this paragraph in the SoCG as accurately reflecting the Council's position.

**Main Issues**

7. The main issues arising from the Council's reasons for refusal are :
- Whether the proposed development accords with national and local policies concerning the provision of holiday accommodation;
  - The effect of the proposed development on the character and the appearance of the area;
  - The effect of the proposed development on highway safety in the vicinity of the site;
  - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of nearby residents and on the amenity of the nearby school and other community facilities, with particular regard to noise and disturbance arising from traffic movements;
  - Whether the proposed development would accord with policies in the development plan and Government advice concerning sustainable forms of development;
  - Whether satisfactory provision can be made for the disposal of surface water;
  - Whether access to the site would be made available to all potential visitors and users; and
  - Whether any tourism benefits arising from the proposals would be sufficient to outweigh any identified harm.
8. At the Inquiry the Council raised further issues concerning foul water drainage and the internal layout of the site. These factors are also considered below.

**Reasons**

*Background*

9. The appeal site is located outside the built confines of Weeley and is a little less than 1km from the village centre. It lies adjacent to the Clacton-Colchester railway line and is accessed down a long private access drive lined by tall evergreen trees. The access served Starena Lodge, a substantial dwelling immediately to the west of the appeal site, which has now been demolished. There is an extant planning permission for its replacement. The access also serves 4 caravans/ mobile homes, which have the benefit of a Certificate of Lawful Development (CLD) that lie between the site of Starena Lodge and the appeal site (although it appears that they may well be sited a little too far to the west).

10. This access drive is off the end of a slip road that, for the first part, runs parallel with Clacton Road (B1441; the Weeley by-pass). The slip road also serves the village hall, which is used by the Rainbow Pre-School, and the village recreation ground which includes a children's play area, a scout hut and the former British Legion Hall. The Weeley St Andrew's Primary School is also served by this slip road; it lies immediately to the west of the junction of this slip road with Gutteridge Hall Lane, very close to its junction with Clacton Road.
11. Gutteridge Hall Lane has a cluster of dwellings around its junctions with the slip road and Clacton Road. It is a narrow, single track road that heads west in a straight line into the flat countryside, running parallel to the railway. For much of its length there are mature hedges either side; beyond the cluster of dwellings and the school the road only serves a couple of dwellings, school playing fields, a 3-pitch traveller site, stables and fields. As the road heads west, its character changes as it becomes a track with vegetation down the centre. It is a cul-de-sac.
12. The site itself has an area of about 0.9ha, is flat, and is disused. It is mainly overgrown with scrub and grass with a large area of overgrown hardstanding and an open fronted building. There is some open storage of rubble and building materials and a low mound along the northern boundary adjacent to the railway. There is a recently constructed close boarded fence to the south separating the site from a traveller site and an open field. Generally the land to the south and west is agricultural. Previous uses of the site include use in connection with a cattery, kennels and as a plant nursery. It has also been used for car boot sales.
13. It is proposed to redevelop the appeal site as a holiday park providing 20 static caravans arranged either side of a central access drive and around a vehicle turning circle, the centre of which would provide an open amenity area. The access would run beside a re-built Starena Lodge and enter the site from the east. It would not provide access to any other land. The submitted plan shows that the existing boundary planting to the north and south would be retained and supplemented; new hedgerows would be provided to the western and eastern boundaries. No detailed landscaping scheme has been submitted, but the layout plan shows additional planting between the caravans. It is intended that the site would be private with the caravans sold to owner/ occupiers for holiday use. The purchasers of the caravans would take 30-year licenses on the pitches.
14. Also of relevance to this appeal is a recent refusal of planning permission for an extension to the nearby traveller site to increase the number of pitches from 3 to 8 (ref 12/00692/FUL; refused on 16 November 2012 and now the subject of an appeal). This site is located immediately to the south of Starena Lodge and is accessed from Gutteridge Hall Lane. The reasons for refusal included harm to residential amenity due to noise, disturbance and traffic movements; the inadequacy of Gutteridge Hall Lane to cater for the existing and additional traffic; and the increase in slowing and turning vehicular traffic movements at the Gutteridge Hall Lane/ slip road/ Clacton Road junctions.

*Policy considerations – holiday accommodation*

15. The development plan for the area is the *Tendring Local Plan 2007*. The site lies in the countryside outside the built confines of Weeley where policies that seek to protect the countryside apply. The impact on the character and the



appearance of the countryside is considered in greater detail in the second issue.

16. The key policy for tourism and leisure uses is Local Plan Policy ER16. This is a "permissive" policy insofar as it says that proposals for tourism and leisure uses will be permitted provided that five criteria are all met. These criteria relate to its accessibility to all potential visitors and users; there being suitable vehicular and public transport access; the use not causing disturbance by reason of noise; there being no adverse effect on agricultural holdings; and that appropriate opportunities are taken to improve damaged and despoiled landscapes. The first three criteria are considered in greater detail below where I conclude on each of these issues that there would be no unacceptable harm arising from these proposals. Concerning criterion (d) the development would not have any adverse effect on agricultural holdings or result in the loss of any high quality agricultural land. Indeed, the land is in poor condition with a substantial amount of hard surfacing that has become rather overgrown. Subject to satisfactory landscaping, the current proposals would improve its appearance. I conclude that the proposals would accord with the development plan policy concerning tourism and leisure uses.
17. Concerning the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework), Chapter 3 relates to "Supporting a prosperous rural economy". It says that to promote a strong rural economy, plans should support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas. It supports the provision of tourist facilities in appropriate locations. As argued below, this is an appropriate location as it is close to the settlement of Weeley and is in a highly sustainable location.
18. I have had regard to the emerging *Draft Tendring Local Plan* and in particular to Policy PR09. This policy takes a very different approach to adopted Policy ER16. Indeed, the starting point concerning static caravans is that such proposals will be refused other than those that are being created for the relocation of an existing site away from flood risk areas. The justification for this approach is set out in paragraph 3.41 of the Plan and refers to the high number of static caravans in the District and the desire to promote a diverse range of visitor accommodation. This plan, however, is at an early stage. While the policy indicates the desired direction of travel by the Council, there are objections to the proposed policy and it may well be subject to change as the plan proceeds towards adoption. It carries only very limited weight.
19. The Council commissioned the *Tendring: Holiday Park Sector Review* (HPSR) from Hotel Solutions. Their Final Report (October 2009) is still used by the Council and has not been superseded by more recent research. The HPSR says that there is a strong future for the holiday park sector in Tendring and that demand for holiday home ownership and rental is increasing and generally exceeds supply. While this document is not Council policy, it does identify a strong demand for such facilities. It suggests that the Council will need to have in place policies for, amongst other things, the expansion of existing parks and the development of new holiday parks.

#### *Character and appearance*

20. The appeal site is well screened from most public viewpoints. The boundary trees can be seen through a mature hedge and across fields from Gutteridge Hall Lane, but this is some distance away. There are views of the site from the

railway line, but again the views are significantly filtered by the evergreen trees along this boundary. There is a reasonably clear view of parts of the site from an elevated section of the A133 but this is some distance away to the west. From this road the caravans at the rear of Starena Lodge are visible although mature trees to the west of the site restrict views. In any case, this is a fast road with no footway so views are likely to be fleeting. The site is also seen in the context of the railway line and Weeley Station and, most noticeably, against the backdrop of high rows of evergreen trees.

21. In terms of the impact on the character of the area, the HPSR says that the District has 26 holiday parks providing 6,816 owner holiday homes; 744 holiday homes for hire; and 543 touring pitches. Indeed, the substantial Weeley Bridge Caravan Park, with 219 caravans, is sited immediately to the north of the appeal site on the opposite side of the railway line. It is clear, therefore, that mobile homes make a significant contribution to the character of the area.
22. There are also 4 caravans, not in holiday use, that have the benefit of a CLD immediately to the rear of Starena Lodge and a further 6 caravans, with the benefit of planning permission, on the adjoining 3-pitch traveller site. While the appeal site is in the countryside and also adjoins fields, the proposed mobile homes would undoubtedly reflect the prevailing character of development in both the immediate vicinity and the wider area.
23. Concerning the effect of the proposals on the appearance of the area, as the development would only be glimpsed from public viewpoints its visual impact would be very limited. The proposals involve a relatively low density of development and there is ample scope for the inclusion of additional landscaping to the boundaries and within the site. The indicative site layout shows further landscaping and this can be conditioned to ensure that appropriate native species are planted. The only visual impact arising from the development in the immediate area is likely to be the traffic using the slip road and Clacton Road. This is considered in greater detail below. However, once the mobile homes have been sited on the land they are unlikely to need replacing very frequently and the traffic generated by 20 mobile homes is likely to be relatively modest compared to that generated by the Weeley Bridge Caravan Park or the Primary School.
24. In these circumstances there would be no harmful impact on either the character or the appearance of the area or any unacceptable conflict with Policy QL9 of the Local Plan. The low density nature of the development and the proposed landscaping would enable the development to improve the damaged landscape and enhance this aspect of the character of the area in accordance with Policy ER16 (e) of the Local Plan.

#### *Highway safety*

25. There are two elements to this reason for refusal; the delivery of static holiday caravans and vehicular movements to and from the site. Concerning the delivery of new static caravans, and the collection of old ones, the appellant produced swept path analyses to demonstrate that delivery vehicles could negotiate the tight bends in the slip road access between the B1441 and the site. It would be difficult to enforce any conditions concerning the times of deliveries as it would be difficult to predict arrival times due to potential congestion and delay on main roads. Such a condition could have a perverse

outcome as vehicles waiting to deliver mobile homes would be entitled to wait on the slip road which could itself be a cause of congestion.

26. However, the appellant is prepared to accept a condition preventing the delivery or collection of static caravans to/ from the site on weekdays. This would ensure that there was no conflict with school arrival and departure times. While there might still be conflict with traffic accessing the other community facilities in the slip road, the potential for congestion or conflict with other road users would be limited. It must also be borne in mind that only 20 static caravans are proposed and that they have a lifetime of 25/ 30 years so, once the site was developed, deliveries and collections would be unlikely to be frequent occurrences.
27. Concerning vehicular movements to and from the site, the Council considers that the holiday caravans would each be likely to generate about 6-8 vehicle movements per day. It identified a worst case scenario of 12 trips per caravan per day resulting in 240 vehicle movements per day. This is, however, based upon the likely generation by a dwelling house and increased to allow for two families sharing a caravan and for all the caravans to be occupied. With a dwelling house it seems reasonable to expect that there would be deliveries, including post, groceries and couriers; visitors; and routine journeys such as driving to work and the school run. There is no evidence to suggest that holiday caravans would generate this volume of traffic. It also seems unlikely that they would all be occupied all the time and while they could potentially accommodate two families with two vehicles there is no evidence to demonstrate that this would be the norm.
28. Indeed, the British Holiday & Home Parks Association magazine (March – April 2012; Document 12) says that the average number of days that privately-owned static caravans are used is 108 days per year (about 30% of the time), with an average group size of 3 persons. This would give a likely traffic generation of around 50 vehicle movements per day. This is in line with the appeal Decisions submitted by the appellant concerning trip generation from holiday caravans. While the circumstances of the individual sites are likely to differ, the other Inspectors considered that a figure in the region of 2.5 trips per caravan per day to be appropriate. This would result in about 50 trips per day generated by the appeal site and seems reasonable.
29. The Inquiry was held during the school holidays and so I returned to the site to observe traffic conditions in the slip road and Gutteridge Hall Lane during term time. As is usual at primary schools, I saw that parking was more congested at school collection time than in the early morning as parents/ guardians arrived in good time before school closed for the day. The car park was filled beyond capacity and there was parking along much of the length of the slip road. This latter parking makes the slip road into a single lane carriageway which would be likely to make access/ egress to the appeal site more difficult. Traffic speeds in the slip road were inevitably slow and there is a footway along the western (school) side.
30. There would undoubtedly be times when a greater proportion of the caravans would be occupied but it seems fair to assume that these times would be more likely to coincide with school holidays when the school would not be generating traffic. It is also probable that, as the static caravans would be owner-occupied, the owners would quickly learn the times to avoid using the access. The traffic generation would be limited and would be less than the daily

variation in traffic flows to and from the school. In all these circumstances, it seems unlikely that the volume of traffic generated by the appeal site would be noticeable. There is no reason to suggest that there would be any unacceptable increase in hazards to road users or harm to highway safety.

31. There is no serious accident record on the slip road or at the junctions. The single accident in the slip road involved a youth running down the bank and into the path of a vehicle. The accidents on the B1441 were away from the junction. The development would not generate large traffic volumes so there would be no conflict with Local Plan Policy ER16 (b). It has not been argued by the Council that the access does not have sufficient capacity. Access is clearly practicable so there is no conflict with Local Plan Policy QL10 (i).

*Traffic noise and disturbance*

32. Local Plan Policy QL11 relates to environmental impacts and compatibility of uses. Criterion (iv) includes reference to noise and to additional road traffic. No detailed evidence concerning noise was put forward by the Council. The relevant reason for refusal refers to the impact on various community facilities including the primary school and on residents in Gutteridge Hall Lane.
33. As set out above, the development would be likely to generate around 50 vehicle movements per day. Assuming some holiday makers go out for evening meals, the traffic would be likely to be spread over some 14 or 15 hours, making for an average of 3 or 4 vehicle movements per hour. The periods of peak use would be likely to coincide with school holidays. Even in term time the school would usually be closed from mid-afternoon and a good proportion of the anticipated traffic would be later in the day than that. The slip road runs parallel with the B1441; there are no sound barriers to protect the school from noise from this source. This road is much busier than the slip road and its traffic is generally travelling at a faster speed. It seemed to me at my site visits that noise levels from this traffic was considerably greater than from traffic on the slip road.
34. In these circumstances I am not convinced that any additional noise arising from traffic generated by the appeal proposals would be discernible. There would be some noise arising from vehicles delivering and collecting caravans from the site but such movements would be relatively rare and their timing could be controlled by condition to ensure that they did not take place on school days.
35. The same considerations broadly apply to the impact on the community facilities. The level of traffic generation from the appeal site would not be so great as to cause any unacceptable noise nuisance or undue disturbance to the users of those facilities.
36. Traffic generated by the appeal site would not pass any dwellings in the slip road apart from Starena Lodge itself, when it is rebuilt. Concerning the impact on the occupiers of dwellings fronting Gutteridge Hall Lane, traffic entering the slip road from the B1441 or exiting the site would only pass part of the frontage of one dwelling, Little Oaks. This dwelling is set back some 30m from the Lane behind substantial planting. It is much closer to the busier B1441, to which it has a side elevation. There is no evidence to show that noise from the limited amount of traffic generated by the appeal site would be noticeable in

this context. There would be no reason for exiting traffic to turn right from the slip road into Gutteridge Hall Lane as this is a cul-de-sac.

#### *Sustainable development*

37. The third reason for refusal says that the site is remote from the local facilities of Weeley. In any case these facilities are limited to a shop/ post office, bakery/ café; public house; and garage. These shop facilities are about 850m from the appeal site while the public house is about 1.1km away. In addition, there is a filling station, hotel and McDonald's restaurant at the junction of the A133 and Colchester Road, to the north of the appeal site. The railway station is about 500m and the bus stops are about 675m from the appeal site.
38. While the shops and public house are within walking distance, it is reasonable to assume that most trips from the site will be by car. The route to the shops has no footways or illumination within the appeal site or between the site and the slip road. The journey on foot involves the use of stairs from the slip road to the B1441; these can only be avoided by extending the length of the journey. Nonetheless, the site has good public transport connections with busses and trains within walking distance. Local Plan Policy ER16 (b) requires there to be public transport access to the site; Policy QL2 requires development to be accessible by a choice of means of transport. This site clearly meets both those policy requirements.
39. The Framework identifies three dimensions to sustainable development; economic, social and environmental. While the economic benefits of the development would be modest due to its small scale, it would bring holiday makers to the area. Not all their spending would be in the rural area, but there would be some limited economic benefits. The 2009 Study indicated a need for more facilities like that now proposed in the District. The social dimension would be likely to be neutral as the site would be separated from the rest of the community due to its location. For the reasons set out above, the development would have some, albeit limited, environmental benefits. These include the proposed landscaping and the fact that its location is close to a choice of transport modes.
40. I conclude on this issue that the proposals would accord with the Framework and the Local Plan and represent a sustainable form of development.

#### *Surface water and foul water disposal*

41. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 as defined in the *Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework* (the TG). The TG says that this zone comprises land assessed as having a less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of river flooding and that all uses of land are appropriate in the zone. Nonetheless it is clear from the evidence to the Inquiry and the site visit that the land immediately to the west of the appeal site is prone to surface water flooding. Although the site, and the land to the west, was dry at the time of my visit, the nature of the problem was clear from the presence of marsh plants. However, these were mostly on the adjoining land, close to the culvert under the railway line, rather than on the appeal site itself.
42. Evidence from the Council's witness, and not disputed, was that this flooding is due to the imperviousness of the subsoil such that surface water cannot drain away. The percolation tests in 2011, in respect of a site described as "land off Gutteridge Hall Lane, Weeley", (and which I understand to relate to the land to

the south of the appeal site) encountered standing water close to the surface. It was then concluded that soakaways would not be a viable means of surface water disposal due to the high water table. This report referred to the use of the ditch to the rear of the site as an alternative. There are drainage ditches to the appeal site and the land to the west but these are in urgent need of clearing. I saw that the culvert under the railway is almost completely blocked with debris.

43. The Officer's report says that there are ditches and streams close to the site to which surface water would drain or could be discharged, subject to appropriate consents. The report suggests the imposition of a suitable condition. The Council's witness agreed that a solution is achievable. The reason for refusal cites Local Plan Policy COM31a in respect of surface water drainage, but as this specifically relates to sewerage and sewage disposal it is not relevant.
44. Concerning foul sewage, this was not cited as a reason for refusal in the Council's decision notice. Nonetheless, it is accepted that the best solution is to connect to the mains drainage. The Officers' report refers to Anglian Water having confirmed that there is no issue with capacity and that the Highway Authority has confirmed that such a connection would be acceptable in the public highway. There is no doubt that this is achievable and can be the subject of a condition. The outstanding question in this regard is whether such a condition would be reasonable, given the potential cost of the necessary work. However, no detailed costing for the work has been submitted and the estimates were a long way apart (a range of £20/30,000 to £100,000). The cost would be able to be spread across the static caravans, the 4 caravans the subject of the LDC and the rebuilt Starena Lodge.
45. I have noted that the planning permission for the rebuilding of Starena Lodge included a condition concerning foul water drainage. This condition was discharged on 11 December 2012, the approved plan showing a self-contained sewage treatment plant. The cost of this could be saved by also connecting Starena Lodge to the mains drainage. In these circumstances the development would comply with Policy COM31a which requires that provision be made for the proper disposal of sewage waste and effluent. A condition requiring the submission and approval of details would not be unreasonable.

*Public access to the site*

46. Criterion (a) of Local Plan Policy ER16 requires that the development be accessible to all potential visitors and users. The Council has interpreted this development as being contrary to that policy as, according to the fourth reason for refusal, "the proposed site will be private with no access provided to the general public". There are, however, other dimensions to accessibility. It has already been established that satisfactory vehicular access to the site can be achieved. It has also been established that the site is accessible by a choice of transport modes.
47. I acknowledge that it would be a private site accessed from a private drive. In that sense it, along with many other private holiday caravan parks, would only be accessible by site residents, their visitors and potential site occupiers. The Council's concerns about potential purchasers of caravans on the site needing access do not seem reasonable. Caravans would be likely to be advertised for sale in the usual way and potential purchasers could make appointments to view. Caravan sites usually have telephone numbers prominently displayed at

their entrance; it would be in the interests of the site owners to ensure that potential purchasers had ready access.

48. It seems to be wholly reasonable for there to be no access to the general public as the site would not have any relevant on-site facilities. Any public access would harm security and be potentially dangerous for site residents. In this regard there would be no unacceptable conflict with the Policy ER16 (a).

*Other material considerations*

49. I have taken into account the Council's concerns regarding the internal layout of the site, particularly in terms of vehicle parking and access by emergency vehicles. The site layout as submitted is broadly acceptable and there is ample space on the site to provide any necessary additional parking; to widen the access road to accommodate parked vehicles and a fire tender; and to meet the Council's other requirements. These can all be covered in the terms of the site license which would be issued by the Council. The Officers' report did not indicate that this was a problem; it certainly does not imply that such requirements cannot be met. Indeed, the Highway Authority raised no objections to the proposals.
50. I have had regard to the fact that in the emerging local plan the Weeley Bridge Caravan Park would be included within the settlement boundary of Weeley. While this may confer some "hope" value on that land in terms of possible future housing development, notwithstanding its intended protected status, due to the early stage that the plan has reached it carries very limited weight.

*Conditions*

51. The list of conditions submitted by the Council at the time of the Hearing in October 2012 was discussed at the Inquiry. The number, type and size of the caravans need to be controlled in order to comply with the terms of the planning application and to ensure that the site is not too crowded. A site layout plan needs to be submitted and approved to ensure that the layout can accommodate the caravans together with adequate parking and sufficient landscaping. Conditions concerning the occupation of the caravans are necessary to ensure that they are used as genuine holiday accommodation and that they are not used for unauthorised all-year-round residential occupation. The conditions need to ensure that this occupation can be adequately monitored and so the conditions set out in the *Tourism Practical Guide Annex B* have been imposed. A management plan is necessary to control the tenure of the caravans in order to comply with the terms of the proposals as submitted at the appeal.
52. Conditions concerning landscaping, lighting and public address systems are necessary as the site is in a countryside location and in the interests of the amenities of the area. Foul water and surface water disposal needs to be the subject of conditions as no acceptable schemes have yet been submitted and due to the known high water table in the area and the distance from mains sewers. The approved plans need to be identified for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of the proper planning of the area.
53. Vehicular access to and from the site needs to be controlled to prevent an access being formed across other land in the appellant's ownership to Gutteridge Hall Lane which, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, may be inadequate to accommodate the likely traffic generated by this development.

The days when the delivery and/ or the collection of caravans may take place need to be specified to avoid the potential for conflict between delivery vehicles and school traffic.

54. I have not imposed conditions concerning land contamination and there is no evidence or matters in the planning history of the site that demonstrate such conditions are necessary. Details of on-site CCTV do not need to be approved by the local planning authority as the provision of such facilities would not result in any identified harm. The suggested conditions concerning construction traffic and wheel washing facilities are not necessary as very little construction is involved and the first 400m or so of the access is along a private drive.

#### *Conclusions*

55. I have taken into account all the other matters raised at the Inquiry and in the written representations. Concerning the recent importation of hardcore to the site, this material was not apparent at the site visit. The aggregate referred to may be the material that has been used for the long access drive linking the appeal site with the slip road. I have found nothing in the other matters that outweigh my conclusions on the main issues.
56. Overall, therefore, I conclude that the development would accord with adopted policy in the Local Plan and national advice in the Framework. There would be no harmful impact on the character or appearance of the area, on highway safety, on the living conditions of nearby residents or the amenity of the nearby primary school and other community facilities. Subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

*Clive Hughes*

Inspector



**APPEARANCES**

## FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

David Whipps LARTPI	Solicitor; Partner, Holmes & Hills LLP instructed by Tendring DC
He called	
Philip Cobbold BA(Hons) MRTPI	Planning consultant
Keith Berriman I Eng FIET FIHE	Director, The HTTC Ltd
FCIHT CMILT	
Michael Sarling HNC	Earth Moving Solutions Ltd

## FOR THE APPELLANT:

Alan Masters	Of Counsel; instructed by the appellant
He called	
David Middleton BSc (Hons)	Partner, Charles F Jones & Son LLP
MRICS	
Jeremy Hurlstone BSc (Hons)	Managing Director, The Hurlstone
CMILT MCIHT	Partnership

## INTERESTED PERSONS:

Cllr Peter De Vaux Bilbirnie	District Councillor and local resident
Carol Bannister	Parish Councillor and local resident
Mike Brown	Chair of Parish Council and local resident
John Groom	Local resident
Peter Collins	Local resident

**DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY**

- 1 Copy of application for costs on behalf of appellant prepared for Hearing
- 2 Email concerning highways details and Drawing No TR001 – swept path analysis – mobile home
- 3 Opening statement on behalf of Tendring DC
- 4 Plan showing potential number of caravans/ mobile homes in vicinity of site – John Groom
- 5 Statement of Common Ground relating to highways issues and attached emails
- 6 3 plans showing swept path analysis for large rigid truck entering/ leaving site and negotiating 90° bend in road
- 7 Plan showing "highway land"
- 8 Planning decision notice for replacement of Starena Lodge (12/00556/FUL)
- 9 Approval of details pursuant to Conditions 3, 4, 6 and 8 of permission 12/00556/FUL
- 10 Plan accompanying details pursuant to condition 8 of permission 12/00556/FUL
- 11 Statement by Carol Bannister, Weeley Parish Council
- 12 British Holiday & Home Parks Association magazine March-April 2012 pp 25/7
- 13 Extract from Planning Encyclopaedia – *Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960* – pp 20237-20240

- 14 Emails dated 07.03.13 and 11.03.13 between David Middleton and Phil Cobbold
- 15 Closing submissions on behalf of Tendring DC
- 16 Closing submissions, incorporating application for costs, on behalf of Tom Doran
- 17 Costs rebuttal by Tendring DC

#### **PLANS**

- A Location plan scale 1:5000
- B Plan 1 – location plan scale 1:2500
- C Plan 2 – proposed layout plan
- D Drawing No 3738.01 rev A - Location plan & vehicle turning paths – access road
- E Drawing No 3738.02 - Location plan & vehicle turning paths – development site

#### **Annex – Schedule of conditions (16 conditions)**

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) No more than 20 static caravans shall be stationed on the site at any time. No more than 10 of the caravans on the site shall be twin units (maximum size 14m by 6m); the remainder shall be single units (maximum size 12m by 3.7m).
- 3) No touring caravans shall be sited or stored on the site at any time.
- 4) The caravans shall only be used for the provision of holiday accommodation and shall not be occupied between 14 January and 1 March in any calendar year.
- 5) The caravans shall be occupied for holiday purposes only. The caravans shall not be occupied as a person's sole or main place of residence. The site owners/ operators shall maintain an up-to-date register of the names of all owners/ occupiers of individual caravans on the site and of their main home addresses; the site owners/ operators shall make this information available at all reasonable times to the local planning authority.
- 6) No development shall take place on the site until details of the proposed foul sewerage drainage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. None of the caravans shall be occupied until the approved drainage system is completed and available for use. The approved system shall be kept available for use for the duration of the development.

- 7) No development shall take place on the site until details of the proposed surface water drainage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted scheme should include the results of percolation tests. None of the caravans shall be occupied until the approved method of surface water drainage has been completed and is available for use. The approved method of surface water drainage shall be kept available for use for the duration of the development.
- 8) No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a scheme of landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development.
- 9) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the commencement of development or in accordance with any other phased arrangements that have previously been agreed in writing by the local planning authority; any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the local planning authority gives written approval to any variation.
- 10) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Plan 1, Plan 2, Drawings No 3738.01 rev A and 3738.02.
- 11) There shall be no external illumination of the site except in accordance with details that have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 12) No public address system shall be installed at the site except in accordance with details that have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 13) The sole means of vehicular access to/ from the site shall be by way of the existing access to the site of Starena Lodge, parallel to the railway line and shown on Drawings No 3738.01 rev A and 3738.02.
- 14) Prior to the commencement of development, a site layout scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This scheme shall include details of the siting of the caravans; car parking; and pedestrian visibility splays. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of any of the approved caravans and shall be retained thereafter. The approved visibility splays shall be kept clear of obstruction over 0.6m in height at all times.
- 15) Prior to the first occupation of any of the caravans hereby permitted, a site management scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The site shall thereafter be managed in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 16) Caravans shall only be delivered to or collected from the site on Saturdays or Sundays. There shall be no delivery or collection of caravans on Mondays to Fridays (inclusive).

This page is intentionally left blank