The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 28 January 2020

Site visits made on 27 & 28 January 2020

**by K R Saward Solicitor**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 19 February 2020**

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/W/18/3198550**
**Land to the rear of Pear Tree Farm, Furners Lane, Woodmancote, West Sussex**

- 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 George Corfield against the decision of Horsham District Council.
- The application Ref DC/17/1374, dated 21 August 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2017.
- The development proposed is described as a settled gypsy accommodation site comprising 3 pitches and associated utility building.

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a settled gypsy accommodation site comprising 3 pitches and associated utility buildings at land to the rear of Pear Tree Farm Furners Lane, Woodmancote, West Sussex in accordance with the terms of the amended application, Ref DC/17/1374, dated 21 August 2017, subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule at the end of this Decision.

## Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr George Corfield against Horsham District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

## Preliminary matters

3. The address given in the planning application form is for Turnhams Gill in Furners Lane which differs from the address of Pear Tree Farm in the Appeal Form. The land is most accurately described as being to the rear of Pear Tree Farm which is how it appears in the Council's decision notice. I have therefore used that address with the appellant's consent.

4. For clarity, I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice having noted that amendments were made to the planning application after submission. Originally, the application was for four pitches. It was revised to three pitches with a 15m wide 'buffer zone' to prevent incursion into the designated ancient woodland to the eastern side of the appeal site. The Council's decision was taken on the basis of those revisions and I shall do likewise with one further amendment. The proposal encompasses a utility building on each of the three pitches as shown on the site layout plan rather

than a single building as the description suggests. The description should refer to "associated utility buildings".

5. The Council's decision notice refers to the application having been submitted on 19 June 2017. The declaration on the application form is dated 21 August 2017 and this is the date I have used.

6. The appeal was linked to other appeals against the issue of an enforcement notice affecting the same site concerning the stationing of caravans for residential purposes and storage containers on the land. The enforcement notice has since been withdrawn lapsing the other appeals. The appeal proceeds under section 78 only for a gypsy accommodation site.

7. I undertook an unaccompanied site visit the day before the Hearing opened to observe the surroundings from public vantage points. During this visit I walked along Furners Lane from the High Street and back in Henfield. I did the same the following day after the Hearing had closed. On that occasion I entered the appeal site accompanied by the landowners and representatives of the parties.

8. The Council refers to the access track being more recently split into two distinct parts. The proposal involves use of the original track as shown in the submitted plans. It was this track which I viewed.

*Policy background*

9. National policy is contained within the Government's Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, 2015 ('PPTS') and the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') and these are material considerations. Since the date of the Council's decision the Framework has been updated. It is the latest document that falls to be considered. Despite the word 'settled' being used in the description of development, the application and appeal concern a site for gypsies and travellers within the meaning of PPTS.

10. The Horsham District Planning Framework, 2015, ('HDPF') contains the Council's adopted policies on the provision of gypsy and traveller accommodation. Policy 22 thereof states that the provision of sites to meet the objectively assessed needs beyond 2017 will be identified in a Site Allocations DPD. It goes on to say that further sites may be provided in prescribed circumstances including on windfall sites through the planning process in accordance with the criteria in this policy.

11. The Council acknowledges that its Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Draft Site Allocations Development Plan Document ('DPD') has suffered delay and the draft DPD of 2017 will no longer be progressed. Instead, the Council has started afresh with a renewed call for sites which ended in August in 2019. This identified three potential sites which will be assessed as part of the Local Plan Review. However, this is still in the very early stages and adoption is not expected until late 2021 if there is no slippage.

12. It is common ground that the most up-to-date independently tested figure which the Council has for gypsy and traveller need in the district is 39 pitches as set out in HDPF Policy 21, but this figure only covered the plan period until 2017. The draft DPD of 2017 had identified a need for 86 pitches until 2031 including an existing need of 44 pitches as backlog. That document was not tested and has since been abandoned. The last Gypsy and Traveller Sustainability Appraisal of November 2017 identified a total of 78 pitches

required until 2022. Thus, there is no up-to-date figure which has been subject to examination. Nevertheless, it is agreed that the Council cannot demonstrate a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites against their locally set target, as required by PPTS and envisaged by Policies 21 and 22. The quantum of undersupply is unclear, but on any measure may be regarded as substantial and that has been the position for some time. On the face of it, there will be no allocations for some while so there will be reliance on windfall sites.

**Main Issue**

13. The main issue is whether the site is in a suitable location for the development proposed having regard to access to services and facilities, accessibility and relevant policies relating to the location of gypsy and traveller sites.

**Reasons**

14. The appeal site is located in a rural area outside any development boundary. Access would be via an existing vehicular track off Furners Lane. The access passes through a yard known as 'Pear Tree Farm' which is used for tyre storage and is occupied by two profile-sheet barns. It proceeds between fields to reach the main body of the appeal site. Currently there is a row of steel containers on the site, an earth bund and vast quantities of tyres. Other parts of the site are occupied as an unauthorised caravan site which extends beyond the appeal site. I understand the containers and use as a caravan site are the subject to an ongoing enforcement investigation. Two stable buildings on the site would be demolished to accommodate the new development.

15. The proposal is for the site to be sub-divided into three 15m wide pitches each containing a utility building.

16. The Council's reasons for refusal identify the site location as unsustainable due to its remoteness from local services and facilities, poor quality access and failure to provide suitable access to sustainable transport modes.

17. Policy C (paragraph 14) of the PPTS acknowledges that gypsy sites may be located in rural or semi-rural areas provided that such sites do not dominate the nearest settled community. Policy H (paragraph 25) states that local planning authorities should very strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan. However, it does not preclude them.

18. HDPF Policy 2 is a strategic policy which seeks to maintain the district's unique rural character whilst ensuring that the needs of the community are met through sustainable growth and suitable access to services and local employment. HDPF Policy 23 is identified as the most relevant development plan policy for gypsy and traveller sites. It sets criteria to be taken into consideration when determining planning applications for non-allocated gypsy and traveller sites. The Council maintains that the proposal fails to meet two criteria; b and d which respectively concern safe and convenient access and the location of development.

19. Criterion 23d. requires that the site is located in or near to existing settlements within reasonable distance of a range of local services and community facilities, in particular schools and essential health services.

*Location of development*

20. Turning first to location, the appeal site is located approximately 850m to the east of the built-up area boundary of Henfield. In refusing the application the Council's Planning Committee considered the distance to the nearest village was walkable. On the Council's figures, the High Street is approximately 1.2km from the gate leading into the appeal site. It is acknowledged that the village centre provides public transport links, services and facilities sufficient to meet the needs of prospective occupants of the appeal site. Indeed, I noted a wide range of shops along with eating/drinking establishments, post office, pharmacy all in the High Street and a library sign posted off it.

21. In the circumstances, the appeal site cannot reasonably be described as 'remote' from services in terms of the distances involved. The Council contends that the appeal site is not 'near to' an existing settlement or 'within reasonable distance' of local services and community facilities because the access is not convenient. At the Hearing the Council argued that the policy should be interpreted more widely than considering just distance. In its view the appeal site is not near to Henfield as their physical relationship gives a sense of separation.

22. To my mind Policy 23d is clear on its face and the words should be given their ordinary and natural meaning. Whether a site is 'near to' an existing settlement is concerned with distance. The term would ordinarily denote something being a short distance away. To give any other interpretation is seeking to ascribe a meaning which does not reflect the words used. At 850m I am satisfied that the appeal site is located near to the existing settlement of Henfield.

23. In terms of local services and facilities, Policy 23d explicitly refers to them being within reasonable 'distance'. This must surely mean how far away those services and facilities are. The Council calculates that it is 1.4km to a supermarket although I saw a nearer food convenience store. There are two dentists within 1.8km and the medical centre is 1.7km. The primary school is 2km. Nursery and secondary schools are further afield. There is a wide range of services available in Henfield, none of which are far away. They are all within a reasonable distance, so there is no conflict with Policy 23d.

*Access*

24. Criterion 23b requires that the site is served by a safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access and that the proposal should not result in significant hazard to other road users. At the Hearing the parties disagreed on whether it applies and, if so, how.

25. The Council's case was not advanced on safety grounds as such, but the accessibility of Furners Lane. From the explanation given by the Council Officer it is in essence a convenience argument and the likelihood of Furners Lane being used by means other than private vehicle. The issues identified by the Council at the Hearing as contributing towards the conclusion that the lane is inconvenient are its lack of lighting, narrow width including lack of pedestrian refuge, sight lines and surface. Road safety was a matter raised by numerous residents and this also falls to be considered in the context of HDPF Policy 23.

26. In addition, HDPF Policy 40 expects development to provide safe and suitable access for all vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists horse-riders, public transport and

delivery of goods. Policy 40 also promotes development which provides opportunities for sustainable transport and which is located in areas where there is a choice in the modes of transport available. It should also minimise the distance people need to travel and minimises conflicts between traffic, cyclists and pedestrians.

27. The appellant submits that the access in this case is the track linking the main body of the appeal site to Furners Lane whereas the Council say it includes the lane. The only means of access to the appeal site is via Furners Lane, but it is not included within the red line application site. From its junction with the High Street in Henfield the first part of the lane is publicly adopted highway. After a way, Furners Lane becomes a private single-track lane which is also designated as a public footpath. Members of the general public therefore have the right to use the lane on foot. Any other use, including with vehicles, depends upon private rights of way. The appellant maintains those rights exist and whilst that is questioned by third parties, it is not for me to explore and decide.

28. In my view, the access for the purposes of Policies 23b and 40 is the means by which the appeal site connects with a highway suitable for vehicular traffic. The 'access' would logically include a private unadopted road as it is the means by which the appeal site links with the public highway. The policies seek safe *and* convenient access and so both must be met. If an access is safe but inconvenient, then the policy requirement is not met and vice versa. It follows that the safety/convenience of Furners Lane falls to be considered.

29. At the start of Furners Lane there are numerous residential properties with other roads leading off. As the lane narrows much of it is lined with hedgerow and trees and development becomes sporadic with the occasional dwelling and farm buildings.

30. Whilst I noted some potholes, the hard surface appeared in reasonable order. I heard how this was thanks to local residents clubbing together to provide a maintenance fund. The organiser fears that residents will be reluctant to contribute in future if this proposal goes ahead. Furners Lane is in use as a public footpath and if it is maintained by the local highway authority then it would only need to be to a standard required for pedestrian traffic. The future maintenance of Furners Lane for other forms of traffic is a private matter.

31. My unaccompanied site visit was undertaken during rainfall and after a wet spell. Surface water had pooled in several places, but the same had occurred along a number of roads in the area. The following day, the amount of surface water had subsided despite rainfall overnight indicating that the lane does drain. Photographs were produced by third parties showing the lane flooded and muddy. It appears from the photographs that cars were still able to pass. It is not within a flood zone. With any country lane there may be occasion when some level of flooding occurs. When it happens there may be some users who would continue to walk/cycle regardless with the appropriate clothing and footwear. For many others it would be a deterrent and prompt use of their private vehicle in the same way as other residents might.

32. As set out in Paragraph 103 of the Framework, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.

33. Various references are made to Furners Lane as a winding single-track lane. There are some bends, but there are also long stretches with clear sight lines. Vehicular traffic can be heard from some way off given the peaceful locality. The low and thin strip of vegetated bank alongside much of the lane may offer refuge for some pedestrians facing an oncoming vehicle but would not suit everyone. For instance, those with pushchairs. Some of the incidents involving traffic along the lane which were described at the Hearing took place many years ago. I heard how a dog was killed although the full circumstances were unclear. A recent account was given of an elderly horse-rider suffering injury after a fast-moving transit van heading in the opposite direction caused her gelding to buck. Clearly, this will have been a traumatic experience for the individual concerned. However, this incident does not mean that the lane is unsuited to more vehicular traffic. According to the appellant, there have been nor recorded incidents in the past 3 years. This was not contested by the Council who reported that no concerns were expressed by the local highway authority. Whilst I am sympathetic to the concerns of local residents, ultimately there is no substantive evidence to demonstrate a safety risk arising from current use of the lane which would be exacerbated or created by the proposal.

34. Undoubtedly, it is a relatively narrow and unlit lane with no footway and only the occasional passing place for vehicles. There are frequent traffic movements associated with several residential properties located intermittently along the lane which extends for some distance. The Council identified 21 postal addresses along the entirety of the lane. From photographs supplied by third parties the lane can be used by trucks. There are also farms and stables along the lane and so it will be used by some farm traffic, horseboxes and suchlike. This was confirmed by local residents who mentioned tractors and other agricultural machinery using the lane. Clearly, there is occasion when the lane floods and the surface condition may vary. This combination of factors could deter walkers or cyclists, but that is not supported by the evidence.

35. The Woodmancote Parish Council describes the lane as "a well-used footpath". Local residents are also consistent in stating that the lane is regularly used by pedestrians (including dog walkers), cyclists and horse-riders. Those comments were made in objection to demonstrate the impact of more vehicular traffic along the lane, but they nevertheless provide clear evidence of the type and level of use of Furners Lane. Indeed, I saw both dog walkers and a horse rider during my visits along with a pedestrian carrying shopping.

36. If the prospect of encountering road traffic was such a concern, it would not be expected to be as well used as it clearly is. Moreover, if the lane is convenient for the settled community living in houses which it serves then there is no reason why it would not also be convenient for the gypsy and traveller pitches.

37. Therefore, occupants would not be reliant upon the private vehicle to reach the range of services which are not far away in Henfield. They could walk or cycle the relatively short distance along Furners Lane to reach the High Street in the same way that other residents do. There are bus stops conveniently located in the High Street near to Furners Lane. Buses go to a variety of locations including Horsham which is a 30-minute journey. From there, connections can be made by rail to other destinations. Although it is a 10-minute or so walk to the station, it is not so far and provides another option to travel further distances by public transport.

38. Like any resident, the future occupiers may choose to use their own vehicle instead of the more sustainable options available, but they would not depend upon it. There is a choice of sustainable transport modes. If occupiers decide to drive, then it will only be a short trip to reach services and facilities.

39. The appellant sought to argue that the level of traffic movements generated from occupation of the three pitches would reduce from the current use as a caravan site. This is a poor argument because the use as a caravan site is unauthorised and so I cannot be satisfied that it represents a lawful baseline from which to draw comparisons. There is no reason to suppose that the stables which are used for storage would be brought back into use for the stabling of horses or that any such use could be done commercially to generate more trips than the proposal.

40. In my view, the proposal will result in an increase in traffic along Furners Lane, but the amount of vehicular traffic which can be expected to be generated by the occupiers of three pitches will not be significant. In the context of the number of properties served by the lane, not all of which are residences, the increase will be of very limited intensity. Indeed, the Officers report to the Planning Committee described the potential for impact between pedestrians and vehicles as 'minimal'. Third parties question the suitability of the lane for large vehicles and caravans. Given that farm traffic uses the lane this should not be an issue, but precluding the stationing, parking or storage of large vehicles on the appeal site, which can be made the subject of a condition, should ensure that large vehicle traffic generation by the development is low.

41. Moreover, the question of the suitability of the location is not confined to accessibility. Policy B (paragraph 13) of the PPTS reinforces that traveller sites should be sustainable economically, socially and environmentally and lists various other factors pertinent to the sustainability of traveller sites which local planning authorities should ensure are addressed in their policies. These factors are relevant because the Council's policies should be consistent with this national policy. The Council acknowledged that each is met, and the proposal thus fulfils paragraph 13 which includes, at paragraphs 13b) and c), promoting access to health services and ensuring that children can attend school on a regular basis. It does not follow automatically that planning permission should be granted, but compliance with paragraph 13 is an important consideration.

42. PPTS and the Framework must be read together. The Framework has a presumption in favour of sustainable development at its heart. Both documents indicate that there are economic, social and environmental dimensions rather than simply the narrow question of how far the site is from local services and facilities and whether there would be undue reliance on the car.

*Conclusion on main issue*

43. Occupants are likely to use private cars to access the nearest services at least to some extent. Those journeys will be short. This is a rural location and the accessibility of the appeal site should not be judged by urban standards. Furners Lane clearly can and is used on foot as a public footpath. A broad range of services and facilities are located within walking distance.

44. The Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of specific deliverable sites for gypsy and travellers as required by the PPTS and envisaged by HGPF Policy 21.

In delivering much needed gypsy/traveller pitches, this weighs firmly in favour of the social dimension of sustainability.

45. There will be economic benefits from the use by the future occupiers of local services and facilities albeit limited. Social benefits will accrue from the provision of three gypsy and traveller pitches in circumstances where the Council has a significant shortfall in its supply of gypsy/traveller accommodation. The appeal site is already within gypsy family ownership and the proposal is therefore deliverable within the foreseeable future. The provision of a settled base will help to avoid the harm that arises from unauthorised encampment or roadside existence.

46. Given the wider consideration of sustainability in the Framework and the specific considerations of gypsy and traveller sites in the PPTS, the appeal site is not in an unsustainable location. Furthermore, I have found that the proposal does accord with the development plan in terms of HDPF Policies 2, 23 and 40 which all promote sustainable development.

***Other matters***

47. Various other matters have been raised by interested third parties and I have taken all of these into consideration.

48. They include matters concerning drainage and amenity areas which are capable of being addressed through the imposition of planning conditions.

49. Whether or not the appellant has a vehicular right of way over Furners Lane in order to access the appeal site is a private law matter outside the scope of this appeal. Similarly, whether it was ever intended that the lane be used in the manner which has evolved is not a matter that can influence my decision.

50. Ancient woodland to the east of the site and other hedgerow/trees around the surrounding fields screen the site from wider view. The proposal does not reflect how the site currently appears with a multitude of caravans and steel containers. Once laid out and landscaped as required by appropriate conditions, there will not be a material adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

51. The appeal site is not within the setting of any listed building or Conservation Area to give rise to harm. Given the distance from dwellings and low number of pitches, there is unlikely to be noise disturbance to residents. There is no substantive evidence that the proposal will affect house prices in the vicinity. This is a private matter anyway.

52. There are overhead powerlines above the appeal site, but there is no reason to conclude that these would present an unacceptable health risk.

*Conditions*

53. The Council suggested several conditions which were discussed, altered and added to at the Hearing. I have considered those draft conditions in accordance with Paragraph 55 of the Framework and the national Planning Practice Guidance. Where appropriate, I have adjusted the conditions for greater clarity and precision.

54. Apart from the standard time limit for commencement, I have specified the approved plans for certainty. Given the nature of the application, it is

appropriate to limit the occupation of the site to gypsies and travellers as defined in PPTS. It is also necessary to limit the number of caravans per pitch, restrict the size of any commercial vehicles kept on it and prevent any commercial activities on the site, the storage of materials to limit the impact on the surroundings.

55. The Woodland Trust withdrew its objection subject to the imposition of conditions to ensure there is a 15m buffer clear of any development or hardstanding and to ensure no encroachment into the ancient woodland. The condition is necessary to secure compliance with Paragraph 175c) of the Framework which seeks to protect against the loss of ancient woodland.

56. To ensure a satisfactory appearance, details of the external materials for the utility buildings need to be submitted to and approved by the Council.

57. Rather than several conditions dealing with hard and soft landscaping, parking, turning areas, bin storage and drainage, the parties agreed that a single condition for the submission and approval of a site development scheme would suffice. It would allow all factors to be taken into account in the final layout. The appellant opposed any restriction on external lighting, but this is a rural location abutting ancient woodland and open fields. Whilst external lighting was not raised as an explicit concern, if left uncontrolled it could have significant implications for the character and appearance of the area which is a specific concern of residents. For that reason, it is reasonable and necessary to include external lighting within the details required for the site development scheme.

58. The Council seeks to remove permitted development rights for the erection of fences, gates and walls. In accordance with Paragraph 53 of the Framework planning conditions should not be used to restrict national permitted development rights unless there is clear justification to do so. The gates and fencing to be erected can form part of the site development scheme to be approved, which is sufficient control. In the circumstances therefore, I consider that the removal of those permitted development rights is not warranted.

59. A condition should not be used to circumvent enforcement action by prohibiting any development until the existing storage containers, mobile homes and caravans have been removed from the appeal site. They would be incompatible with the development proposed in any event and as there would be a site development scheme anyway, a separate condition is unnecessary. A condition is necessary to ensure that the existing stable buildings are removed as proposed in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

**Conclusion**

60. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other submissions made, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*KR Saward*

INSPECTOR

## APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr Alan Masters | Of Counsel |
| Phil Rowe, BA Hons, BTP | Appellant's agent |
| Tracey Tingey | Landowner |
| Charlie Tingey | Landowner |
| Sam Tingey | Landowner |

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

| | |
|---|---|
| Nic Pettifer | Senior Planning Officer |

INTERESTED PERSONS:

| | |
|---|---|
| Councillor Mike Morgan | District Councillor & Ward Member |
| Richard Boddie | Local resident |
| David Campion, MRICS | Chartered Surveyor representing interested third parties |

## DOCUMENTS submitted at the Hearing

1. Notice of Appeal and Hearing including circulation list
2. Statement of Richard Boddie with photographs of Furners Lane
3. Statement of Mrs Jan Ennor
4. Supplemental Statement of David Campion with photographs of Furners Lane
5. Statement of Common Ground
6. Appeal Decisions APP/Q3115/W/16/3156409 & APP/Q3115/W/18/3205628

## SCHEDULE OF 11 CONDITIONS

1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: red line site location plan (dated 13 June 2017); proposed site plan No. PRR1 Rev A; elevations & floor plan; and proposed utility building plan.

3) The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than gypsies and travellers as defined in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, August 2015, (or any subsequent definition that supersedes that document).

4) There shall be no more than three pitches on the site and on each of the three pitches hereby approved no more than two caravans, shall be stationed at any time, of which only one caravan shall be a static caravan.

5) The existing stable buildings shall be removed from the land before the development hereby approved commences.

6) No development shall take place until a scheme, hereafter referred to as the Site Development Scheme, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Site Development Scheme shall include a timetable for its implementation and details of:

   (a) the means of foul and surface water drainage of the site.

   (b) the facilities for, and location of, the storage and collection of refuse and recycling.

   (c) external lighting on the boundary of and within the site.

   (d) the internal layout of the site (notwithstanding application plan No. PRR1 Rev A), including: the siting of caravans and pitches; hardstanding; access road; parking; amenity areas; gates, fencing and boundary treatments; vehicle turning space of sufficient size to accommodate a waste/recycling vehicle and that of emergency/fire services.

   (e) tree, hedge and shrub planting and where appropriate earth mounding including details of species, plant sizes and proposed numbers and densities.

   The approved Site Development Scheme shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable. Upon implementation of the approved Site Development Scheme, that scheme shall thereafter be retained.

7) If, within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, any tree or shrub planted as part of the landscaping approved under Condition 6 (or any tree or shrub planted in replacement for it) is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies or becomes, in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, another tree of the same size and species as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place within the first planting season following the removal, uprooting, destruction or death of the original tree unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

8) No development above ground floor slab level of any part of the development hereby permitted shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the utility buildings hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

9) No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on the site.

10) No industrial, commercial or business activity shall be carried on from the site including the storage of materials.

11) There shall be no development (including the creation of any hardstanding) or siting of caravans, vehicles or structures within a 15-metre buffer strip, as shown on the proposed site plan No. PRR1 Rev A, alongside the eastern site boundary with the adjoining ancient woodland. The buffer strip shall not be used for grazing or paddock land unless fenced in accordance with details previously submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority, to prevent straying into the adjacent woodland.

-END-