



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 23 July 2024

Site visit made on 23 July 2024

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R3705/W/24/3338275

The Willows, Tamworth Road, Cliff, Kingsbury, Warwickshire B78 2DS

- 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 J Doherty against the decision of North Warwickshire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PAP/2023/0191.
 - The development proposed is described as "the change of use of land for a single pitch Gypsy site, installation of septic tank and relocation of the access".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change of use of land for a single pitch Gypsy residential site, installation of septic tank, creation of access, driveway, parking area and patio, construction of bunds and erection of gate at The Willows, Tamworth Road, Cliff, Kingsbury, Warwickshire B78 2DS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PAP/2023/0191, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the header is taken from the application form. At the hearing, the appellant confirmed the Gypsy site was to be used solely for residential purposes. Also, it was confirmed that the development includes the creation rather than relocation of an access as well as the creation of a driveway, a parking area and a patio, construction of bunds and the erection of a gate. All of these features are identified on the drawing submitted with the planning application leading to this appeal. As such, no prejudice would be caused to any party by treating these features as part of the proposal. The description of development in my decision was agreed to by the main parties at the hearing and it reflects the various elements to the scheme.
3. The extent of bunding as shown on the appeal drawings has already been constructed, although in places it would appear to be less than 2.5m in height as annotated. Also, a gap in the roadside hedgerow has been formed at the position of the proposed access. In these respects, the development has commenced.
4. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published since the appeal was lodged. On the same day, the government published an amendment to the national Planning Policy For Traveller Sites (PPTS) and the definition it contains for Gypsies and Travellers. I have had regard to these revised documents in my assessment. The intended occupants

of the site are the appellant and their family. The Council accepts that they meet the definition of Gypsies and Travellers as set out in the PPTS. My decision is made on this basis.

Main Issues

5. It is agreed between the Council and the appellant that the change of use to a Gypsy site represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt. In light of paragraph 16 of the PPTS, I find no reason to disagree with the parties on this matter. As such, the main issues are:-
 - the effect of the development on openness and on the purposes of Green Belt policy;
 - its effect on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify it.

Reasons

Planning history.

6. The appeal site is a single field. Since 2019, there has been 3 appeal decisions relating to the same site. Appeal decision reference number APP/R3705/W/19/3220135 (hereafter referred to as the 2019 appeal) relates to a proposed change of the land to equestrian use and as a Gypsy site comprising of 5 pitches with dayrooms, stable block and ménage. This appeal was dismissed in November 2019. Appeal decision reference APP/R3705/W/19/3242521 (referred to as the 2020 appeal) relates to a scheme for change of the land to equestrian use and as a single pitch Gypsy site with day room. This was dismissed in June 2020. Most recently, appeal reference number APP/R3705/W/20/3260829 (2021 appeal) relates to the change in the use of land for stationing of caravans for residential use for a Gypsy-Traveller family with associated development. This was also dismissed in December 2021. I have had regard to these decisions in my assessment.

Effect on openness and purposes of Green Belt.

7. Prior to the construction of the bunds, I understand the appeal site was fairly flat and open. The bunding follows parts of the field boundary, stretches across the field towards the rear and follows part of the route of the proposed driveway. As such, it has a significant overall length as well as a height and a width. The bunding's mass and volume has reduced the site's spatial openness.
8. I saw the bunds largely covered by ruderal plant species and so they appeared as lines of higher vegetation rather than defined earthworks. Moreover, the bunds are set back from the road and they are seen from the pavement against the backdrop of mature trees beyond the rear of the field. The bunding has reduced visual openness by obstructing views across the site. Nonetheless, the field still maintains a degree of openness as it contains no buildings.
9. Overall, I find the bunding has resulted in a moderate loss of openness. As such, the creation of the bunds has not preserved openness and so it does not accord with the provisions of paragraph 155 of the Framework. The creation of the bunds in itself constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

10. The volume of the static caravan on the proposed residential pitch would lead to a loss of spatial openness. So too would the touring caravan, parked vehicles and the proposed gate. It is likely the development would lead to domestic paraphernalia on the garden area and patio, which would also erode spatial openness. The access, driveway, patio and drainage would be at or below ground level and so they would have no meaningful effect in these regards.
11. The pitch would be towards the rear of the site away from the road. Therefore, the caravans, parking and domestic paraphernalia would not be easily seen from off the site, particularly given the screening effect of the bunds and existing and proposed planting. Therefore, the pitch's effect on visual openness would be limited. The entrance gate would be more obvious from the road but it is likely to have only a minor effect on visual openness.
12. The introduction of a residential pitch into a field would go against the purpose of Green Belt policy to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. However, this would not be particularly obvious from public vantage points. The bunds themselves do not stand out as encroachment as their vegetated appearance is consistent with a rural area. The gate and access would indicate a non-agricultural use of the field and the development would generate activity typical of a residential property. Even so, the proposal would avoid a significant sense of encroachment as most of the front part of the field would be left open and planted. I find no conflict with any of the other purposes of Green Belt policy as set out at paragraph 143 of the Framework.
13. In summary, I consider the overall scheme would lead to a moderate loss of openness given its scale and its visual effects. The proposal would also slightly conflict with the purpose of Green Belt policy to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. I understand that other major developments in the area have already affected Green Belt openness but these have no influence on my assessment of the appeal development.

Effect on character and appearance.

14. The site lies in a predominantly rural area with roadside hedgerows, fields and belts of mature trees. Road traffic noise as well as several nearby properties all have an effect on its character and appearance but nevertheless the locality has an obvious countryside feel.
15. The North Warwickshire Landscape Character Assessment 2010 identifies the site as being in the Tamworth – Urban Fringe Farmlands area. This is described as predominantly open arable land with little tree cover, although it is also noted as being an indistinct and variable landscape with pockets of pastoral land and other uses. The Inspector for the 2019 appeal described the appeal site at that time as having an open and undeveloped rural character. As such, the evidence suggests the site prior to the construction of the bunds was consistent with a fairly open agricultural landscape.
16. The constructed earthworks follow fairly straight lines and so they do not appear as natural landforms as suggested by the appellant. Also, the bunds and the vegetation upon them have created a sense of enclosure, particularly to the rear part of the field. Therefore, to a degree they have diminished the open agricultural nature of the site.

17. At the same time, I understand from the evidence and discussions at the hearing that the adjoining field to the north of the site has also changed since the 2019 appeal decision. Whereas before it was an open field with little if any boundary hedgerow, I saw it now contains mowed grass and lines of sapling trees and hedges on the boundaries with Tamworth Road and Cliff Hall Lane. As such, the adjoining plot appears enclosed and not as open arable or pasture land. It is proposed to provide new native tree planting across most of the front part of the appeal site. Such landscaping would result in the site being similar in appearance to the neighbouring field when viewed from the highway.
18. The Council is concerned that the development would not preserve the pastoral character of the site and area. There is little evidence to indicate how the field was previously used and so I am uncertain whether the development would result in the loss of pasture land as claimed. In any event, the replacement of an open field with an area of trees and vegetated bunds would appear in keeping with the immediate surroundings to the site. Indeed, the provision of new tree planting as proposed would complement the existing area of saplings to the north. As they grow, the proposed trees would also supplement the belt of mature trees to the rear of the site.
19. The bunds and proposed planting would screen the residential pitch to the rear of the field so that it would not have any effect on views from the Tamworth Road. Also, it would not be visible from Cliff Hall Lane and the public footpaths to the north and south of the site due to the separation distances, local land form and intervening buildings and vegetation. The access and associated drive would be seen from the front of the site and from the upper floor windows of the house on adjoining land to the south. Such views and the associated coming and going of vehicles would undermine the site's sense of rurality. However, these would be fairly limited and localised visual effects that would be seen in the context of new tree planting.
20. In summary, I find the site overall would retain an obvious natural feel through new tree planting that would be consistent with features on adjacent land. The minor visual effects of the development would avoid significant harm to the qualities of the landscape and new tree planting would enhance the local landscape character. As such, I conclude the development would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. In these regards, it would accord with policies LP10 and LP14 of the North Warwickshire Local Plan 2021 (the LP). Amongst other things, these look for new Gypsy sites to be assimilated into their surroundings without significant adverse effects and so as to conserve, enhance or restore landscape character.
21. My conclusion on this matter differs from that of the Inspectors for the 2019, 2020 and 2021 appeals. However, those decisions relate to different developments to the proposal before me. Compared to the previous schemes, the proposed pitch would be smaller and further from the road and so it would be less obvious. Also, the context to the appeal site has since changed. Therefore, it is not inconsistent for me to arrive at a different view on this issue.

Other raised concerns.

22. A number of other concerns have been raised by interested parties. Visibility splays at the proposed access would allow satisfactory sight of on-coming

- traffic and so the development would not prejudice highway safety, despite the speed of cars on Tamworth Road going past the site.
23. I was advised at the hearing that the bunds have been constructed of topsoil taken from the site itself with no imported materials. Without evidence to the contrary I am satisfied the earthworks have not caused ground contamination. I envisage no significant additional noise from construction activity as the bunds have mostly been completed.
24. Foul water drainage that avoids pollution could be secured through the imposition of a planning condition. Similarly, a condition could reasonably be imposed to secure surface water drainage features that avoid flood risk to the site itself or surrounding land. The site is near to but well above the River Tame and so the development would be at a low risk of fluvial flooding.
25. A summary of a protected species appraisal provided by the appellant indicates the development would cause no risk to protected species. I am advised the appeal site is not near any land designated for its ecological or nature value. No external lighting is proposed and a planning condition could be imposed to ensure any future lighting is controlled so as to avoid disturbance to wildlife. Sensitive, native planting could also be secured by planning condition. As such, I am satisfied the development would have an acceptable effect on biodiversity.
26. The site would accommodate a single additional household and there is no evidence to show that this would have any unacceptable impacts on the provision of local services and infrastructure. A single pitch would not dominate any settled community and I see no reason why the intended occupants would fail to integrate with the local community. The site is away from Kingsbury, the nearest settlement where there are schools, medical services and shops. However, the village is a short car journey from the site and there are nearby bus stops within easy walking distance that provide access to public transport services between Tamworth and Kingsbury. Therefore, the site would be in a suitable location that allows reasonable access to facilities.
27. My assessment is based on the details of the development before me. There is no substantive evidence to indicate similar schemes in the area would be proposed in the event of me allowing the appeal. In any case, any such proposals would need to be considered having regard to their effects and the relevant circumstances at that time. Granting planning permission for this development would not set an irresistible precedent to be followed in the consideration of any future proposals.
28. I have noted the representations made to the effect that the rights of local residents under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 would be violated if the appeal is allowed and the development carried out. However, the pitch would be set away from the nearest properties and so it would not harm the living conditions at existing residences by reason of noise, loss of light, loss of privacy or overbearing effects. I fail to see how the development would directly affect the health or well-being of any nearby residents. Therefore, I am satisfied that granting planning permission would not unacceptably interfere with any person's right to a private family life and home. As such, it would be proportionate in the circumstances to allow the appeal.
29. None of the above concerns provide reason to refuse planning permission. As such, they do not affect my overall assessment.

Considerations in favour of the development.

Need for and supply of pitches.

30. The PPTS promotes the provision of more private Gypsy and Traveller sites. The appeal development would help meet the government's aim in these regards.
31. LP policy LP5 says the Council will make provision for a minimum of 19 permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitches between 2019 and 2033. A list provided with the statement of common ground indicates that planning permission has been granted for 24 pitches since 2019. Even if I accept the appellant's contention that 3 of these pitches should not be counted, the evidence suggests that planning permission has been granted for more than the minimum number of new pitches required under the LP.
32. However, it is clear from LP policy LP5 that 19 pitches is a minimum target. Paragraph 8.21 of the LP explains the Council's intention to bring forward a Gypsy and Traveller Plan (GTP) that will include pitch allocations. The Council's representative at the hearing accepted that this is required to meet an on-going need for more Gypsy and Traveller sites. While work has started on the GTP no document has yet been published for consultation. The Council's Local Development Scheme indicates that this would have happened in August 2023 and so progress towards the adoption of the GTP is significantly delayed. These factors point to the Council accepting a need for more Gypsy and Traveller pitches that currently is not recognised or identified in the LP.
33. Moreover, the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) that informed LP policy LP5 is now of some age having been issued in 2019 with an update in 2020. Furthermore, in an appeal decision from December 2021 relating to a proposal for a Gypsy site at Wishing Well Farm, Fillongley¹, an Inspector states that there has been a significant in-migration which was not anticipated at the time the GTAA was published. The Inspector notes at that time the Council's acceptance of a general need for Gypsy and Traveller sites. The Council's representative at this appeal hearing raised no issue with the previous Inspector's criticism of the GTAA and also accepted there is still a need for more pitches.
34. At paragraph 10, the PPTS states local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites against their locally set targets. Footnote 4 to the PPTS states that sites should be available now to be classed as deliverable. I am advised the sites granted planning permission as identified in the statement of common ground have all been provided and are occupied. As such, they are not now available. Accordingly, there is no supply at all of deliverable sites to address any current need, yet alone a 5 years' worth of supply. The Council accepts there is no alternative and suitable site available for the intended occupants of the appeal development. The apparent unmet need for Gypsy and Traveller sites weighs significantly in favour of allowing the development.

Personal circumstances of the intended occupants

35. The appellant, their spouse and their children intend to live on the proposed site. Two of the children are over 18 years old but the others are of school age.

¹ Appeal reference number APP/R3705/W/20/3255527

After the 2021 appeal decision, the family left the appeal site as it did not benefit from planning permission for residential use. Since then, they have been unable to find another permanent settled residential base to accommodate caravans. Instead, they have had a highly transient lifestyle, either living on the side of roads, on driveways and occasionally on holiday caravan parks. The appellant explained at the hearing that they have had to move nearly every week. This lifestyle has caused significant interruptions to the education of the children of school age as well as difficulties for all family members in accessing health care facilities.

36. The current uncertainty over the appellant's accommodation is clearly unsatisfactory, particularly as their family includes children. The benefits of the development to the intended occupiers in terms of facilitating access to schools and medical services are in themselves significant. In addition, the settled base would be in the best interests of the children involved.

Green Belt Balance

37. The Framework and the PPTS state that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. These will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm as a result of the proposal is clearly outweighed by other considerations. LP policy LP3 is generally consistent with the Framework and PPTS in these regards. LP policy LP10 is referred to but this contains no provisions on how proposals for inappropriate development in the Green Belt should be determined.
38. The Framework dictates that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. In this instance, harm would be caused by reason of inappropriateness, loss of openness and failing to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. I have found no unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
39. The PPTS states that, subject to the best interests of children, personal circumstances and unmet need are unlikely to clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt and other harm so as to establish very special circumstances. Even so, it does not follow that this will always be the case.
40. The development would help address an unmet need for more private Gypsy and Traveller sites as recognised at a national level under the PPTS and more locally as acknowledged by the Council. The benefit of a single additional pitch in addressing this general need attracts significant weight but this in itself is insufficient to outweigh the identified harm of the development.
41. However, I attach substantial weight to the benefits of a settled base to the intended occupants in terms of facilitating regular access to medical facilities, schools and other services. In arriving at this view, I am mindful that Article 3 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child requires a child's best interests to be a primary consideration. Also, I am conscious that dismissing the appeal is highly likely to lead to a continuation of the appellant's existing transient lifestyle and its undesirable effects on the children's education and the health of all of the intended occupants.
42. Planning permission runs with the land. However, I find the circumstances of this case represent an exceptional occasion where development that would not

normally be permitted may be justified on grounds of who would benefit from the permission. As such, a condition limiting occupancy to the appellant and named persons and their resident dependents would be reasonable and justified. In effect, such a condition would allow a temporary permission, although the length of occupancy is unknown. Even so, a requirement for the restoration of the site at the end of the occupancy would ensure no permanent harm to the Green Belt and character and appearance of the area.

43. Therefore, I conclude the total harm as a result of the development would be clearly outweighed by other factors. As such, very special circumstances exist to justify allowing the appeal. The development would accord with the Framework's and the PPTS's provisions on Green Belt as well as LP policy LP3.
44. I note that my overall conclusion differs from that made by Inspectors for the 2019, 2020 and 2021 appeals. However, my views have been formed having regard to the evidence before me and the current circumstances faced by the appellant and their family. The case for allowing the development is now notably different, particularly in terms of the position on need and on the undersupply of sites as well as the appellant's particular accommodation difficulties. Also, the other appeals related to different developments with different effects on openness and the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, I am not bound to arrive at the same conclusions to those arrived at under the previous appeal decisions.

Human rights and Public Sector Equality Duty.

45. By allowing the appeal subject to a personal condition, my decision would not interfere with the appellant's and their family's rights to respect for private and family life and their home. As such, there would be no interference with the occupiers' human rights under Article 8 of the European Convention of Human Rights as enshrined in the Human Rights Act 1998 (Article 8).
46. I have considered whether it would be appropriate to impose a condition that allows the development for a temporary time period and thereafter requires cessation of the use, regardless as to whether the intended occupants still reside on the site. However, granting temporary planning permission could lead to an interference under Article 8. To my mind, the uncertainty that would hang over the occupants' living arrangements would be a disproportionate response to the level of harm caused by the development. In arriving at this view, I have had regard to the particular merits of the case, the specific effects of the development and the occupiers' circumstances.
47. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. This sets out the need to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This includes those of a particular race and so the occupants of the development. Granting planning permission would allow the opportunity for the intended occupants to foster good relationships with the local community. Therefore, my decision advances opportunity in line with the PSED.

Conditions

48. The list of suggested conditions included as part of the statement of common ground as well as other conditions were discussed at the hearing. Where

appropriate I have amended the wording in light of the comments made and for reasons of precision.

49. For clarity purposes, I attach a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings. There is no need for this condition to refer to the existing site layout plan, the soakaway assessment or storm sewer design. Conditions 2 and 3 require site restoration once the intended occupants cease to reside at the site so as to avoid permanent harm to Green Belt openness. The development is only acceptable due to the personal circumstances of the occupiers and so condition 3 limits occupancy accordingly. The suggested condition that would require a permanent cessation of the use after a short period of non-occupancy would be unreasonable and so it has not been imposed. Also, a condition that would limit the proposed use for a defined temporary period of time would be an unacceptable interference with the intended occupants' human rights. Therefore, this condition is not included.
50. Condition 4 is required to ensure a satisfactory effect on landscape character and appearance. Conditions 5 and 6 are imposed to ensure foul and surface water is disposed of without causing pollution or flood risk. Conditions 7, 8, 9 and 10 are imposed in the interests of highway safety.
51. My assessment is based on the development being occupied by Gypsy and Travellers and there is no evidence to indicate the development would be acceptable for any other group. Accordingly, I attach condition 11 that restricts occupancy. Conditions 12 and 13 are attached to minimise the effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt and the character and appearance of the area. Condition 14 is attached to ensure the development causes no unacceptable light pollution to the detriment of wildlife and the character and appearance of the locality. Condition 15 is imposed to minimise the visual impact of the proposed driveway.
52. As the proposed use is residential there is no requirement for a condition that places limits on the size of vehicles to be parked on the site. At the hearing, the Council's representative accepted the suggested condition on ground contamination was not needed. Therefore, this condition is not included.

Conclusion

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

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Alex Bruce	Planning agent
John Doherty	Appellant

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Andrew Collinson

INTERESTED PERSONS

Carol Davis	Objector
Robert Williams	Agent acting on behalf of Mr and Mrs Goodall, Objector

LIST OF DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING:

1. Extract of Map entitled Rights of Way - Warwickshire.

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos SA47316-BRY-ST-PL-A-0001 and SA47316-BRY-ST-PL-A-0005 revision A.
- 2) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, a site restoration scheme in the event of the Gypsy residential site use hereby permitted not commencing or commencing but then ceasing shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval in writing. If no scheme in accordance with this condition is approved within 12 months of the date of this decision, the Gypsy residential site use shall cease until such a time as a restoration scheme is approved in writing.
- 3) The Gypsy residential site use hereby permitted shall be carried out only by the following persons and their resident dependents – Mr John Doherty and Mrs Theresa Doherty and their children John Doherty and Roseanne Doherty. If the site is not occupied by these persons within 2 years of the date of this decision, or when the site ceases to be occupied by these persons, the use hereby permitted shall cease and the land shall be restored in accordance with the site restoration scheme approved under condition 2 above.
- 4) The Gypsy residential site use hereby permitted shall not commence until a landscaping scheme for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include an implementation timetable and the approved landscaping scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved timetable. Thereafter, the

landscaping scheme shall be maintained and any tree, hedge or shrub that is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies within five years of planting or becomes seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced with another of the same species and size as that originally planted.

- 5) Notwithstanding the details as shown on the approved plans, the Gypsy residential site use hereby permitted shall not commence until details of a foul water drainage scheme to serve the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include an implementation timetable and details on how the drainage system is to be maintained. A foul water drainage system shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and timetable and thereafter it shall be retained and maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) The Gypsy residential site use hereby permitted shall not commence until a surface water drainage scheme to serve the whole of the development, including the tarmac part of the access drive, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include an implementation timetable and details on how the drainage system is to be maintained. A surface water drainage system shall be provided in accordance with the approved details and timetable and thereafter it shall be retained and maintained in accordance with the approved details.
- 7) The Gypsy residential site use hereby permitted shall not commence until the access to the site for vehicles from the public highway as indicated on the approved plans and associated visibility splays also shown on the plans have been completed and created. Thereafter the access shall be retained and the visibility splays shall be kept clear of obstruction that prevents sight of vehicles on the road.
- 8) The Gypsy residential site use hereby permitted shall not commence until details of a bin collection point have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. A bin collection point shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the first use of the site for residential purposes and shall thereafter be retained.
- 9) The Gypsy residential site use hereby permitted shall not commence until the existing access within the highway and not included in the permitted means of access as defined on the approved plans has been closed and the footway/verge has been re-instated.
- 10) No gates or barriers or means of enclosure shall be erected across the approved vehicular access within 12 metres of the highway boundary and all such features should open inward away from the highway.
- 11) The site 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, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.

- 12) There shall be no more than one pitch on the site and no more than two caravans (as defined by the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1990 as amended by the Caravan Sites Act 1968 as amended), shall be stationed at any one time, of which only one caravan shall be a static caravan.
- 13) The extent of the Gypsy residential site use hereby permitted shall be restricted to the areas defined on the approved plans as static pitch, touring pitch, patio area, garden area and parking area. No residential use including the stationing of caravans, parking or erection or provision of domestic paraphernalia shall take place on any other part of the site as defined by the dash red line on the approved plans.
- 14) No external lighting shall be installed or provided within the site unless full details of its design, location and the specification of the illuminance have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 15) The grass parking grids as shown on the approved plans to be used to the driveway shall not at any time be replaced with any other type of surfacing.