



Suite 9  
Grindleton Business Centre  
The Spinney  
Grindleton  
Clitheroe  
Lancashire  
BB7 4DH

Tel: 01200 449700  
www.ghaonline.co.uk  
email: info@ghaonline.co.uk

**PLANNING STATEMENT**

**IN RESPECT OF A RETROSPECTIVE PLANNING  
APPLICATION FOR OPERATIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT TO INCLUDE THE CREATION OF  
AN ACCESS TRACK, A CAR PARK,  
HARDSTANDINGS AND THE ERECTION OF A  
TOILET/SHOWER BLOCK**

**AT**

**CROASDALE FARM, WHINNEY LANE,  
LANGHO, BB6 8DQ**

**Prepared by:** Gary Hoerty BSc (Hons) MRICS FAAV  
**Our Client:** Mr & Mrs P Turner  
**Our Ref:** Tur/1046/3130/GH  
**Date:** March 2022



Chartered Surveyors ■■■ Planning & Development ■■■ Land Agents  
Valuers ■■■ Property Agency ■■■ Property Management



## **CONTENTS**

<b>1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION</b>	<b>Page 3</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>THE APPLICATION SITE</b>	<b>Page 4</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>Page 4</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>PLANNING HISTORY</b>	<b>Page 5</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>PLANNING POLICY CONSIDERATIONS</b>	<b>Page 6</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>OTHER SIMILAR DEVELOPMENT IN THE BOROUGH</b>	<b>Page 12</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF THE OFFICER REPORT FOR APPLICATION 3/2021/0751</b>	<b>Page 14</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>RELEVANT PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS</b>	<b>Page 15</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION</b>	<b>Page 16</b>

## **APPENDICES**

<b>APPENDIX 1</b>	<b>Planning Appeal Decisions</b>
-------------------	----------------------------------



## **1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

- 1.1 Gary Hoerty Associates has been instructed by Peter and Emma Turner to submit a planning application on her behalf for operational development that they have undertaken without the grant of planning permission at Croasdale Farm. The development was undertaken by the applicants to support a change of use of part of the farm from agricultural use to use as a caravan and camp site permitted under Part 5 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. Mr and Mrs Turner mistakenly believed that the development that is the subject of this application didn't need planning permission.
- 1.2 When it was brought to the applicant's attention that planning permission was required, they sought the advice of a planning consultant Paula Fitzgerald who they engaged to seek retrospective permission. Fitzgerald Planning and Design submitted planning application 3/2021/0751, which erroneously sought permission for the use of the land for camping and caravanning, uses which were already permitted and did not need to be included in the application. Application 3/2021/0751 was refused and its refusal has resulted in our appointment and the submission of a new planning application.
- 1.3 I have seen the extensive email communication between Mrs Turner and officers of the Council, and I make reference to this in Section 3 of this report. The planning application we have submitted seeks permission for the retention of a relatively short length of access track, which leads from the farmstead to the approved caravan and camping site, the retention of some gravel pathways, a parking area, hard standings and a toilet/shower block within the camping site
- 1.4 Croasdale Farm is a small working farm, until recently the main farming activity was dairy farming. The approved camping and caravan site is a genuine farm diversification which is crucial for the future viability of Croasdale Farm. It is important to note that one of the main objectives that the applicants wanted to achieve from their campsite was that it was accessible to disabled visitors and without the toilet block and the gravel pathway to it, it would not be accessible to wheelchair users. If they had to provide the toilet and shower facilities by way of moveable structures they would either no longer be able to cater for disabled visitors or they would have to have much larger and unattractive mobile facilities.
- 1.5 The close proximity of the farm to Langho Train Station and to local bus routes means that the site can be accessed by sustainable transport and this has been a major benefit to users of the site. Guests are able to use public transport to travel to Whalley and Clitheroe with quick and convenient services being available. The applicants are currently liaising with the senior economic development officer at Lancashire County Council to become members of the Sustainable Tourism Network. The applicants are already members of Visit Lancashire and Ribble Valley Tourist Board and were nominated for two tourism awards in their first year of operation.
- 1.5 We set out in this Planning Statement the recent planning history of the property, a description of the application site, a description of the proposed development, details of the relevant planning policies against which the development will be

assessed, details of other similar development approved by the Council, relevant appeal decisions and we set out clearly why the development is in accordance with the local plan and should be approved without delay.

## **2. THE APPLICATION SITE**

- 2.1 The application site forms a small part of Croasdale Farm, the total area covered by the development for which permission is sought is 0.4 acres while the farm extends to 96 acres. The application site prior to the development taking place formed a small part of two agricultural fields which are laid down to grass which had been used for grazing livestock.
- 2.2 The first field is adjacent to the settlement of Langho, to the north, where there are dwellings which front onto Whalley Road whose rear elevations overlook the field and the farmstead to the west. There is a gappy and overgrown hedgerow to the eastern boundary and a hedgerow to the southern boundary, on the other side of the southern boundary there is a cattle track which is enclosed by a second hedgerow to the south. Part of the application site is a strip of land mainly along the southern boundary of this field which is enclosed by a stockproof fence.
- 2.3 The second field is to the east of the first field and the permitted caravan and camp site is located in the south west corner of this field. There is an overgrown hedgerow at the northern boundary of this field and a railway line beyond this, the field is quite open to the east and the southern boundary is the same as that in the first field, a hedge with a track on the other side of it.
- 2.4 The application site is situated in very close proximity to Langho Train Station which is opposite the farm entrance.
- 2.5 With respect to the Council's adopted Core Strategy, the site is within Open Countryside and the Green Belt but outside of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (the AONB).

## **3. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

- 3.1 The proposed development in this case has already been carried out and it comprises the creation of an access track measuring approximately 200m long, the erection of a shower/toilet block measuring 5.6m x 2.9m with a ramp alongside which measures 1.3m x 4.2m, the creation of gravel pathways measuring 1.5m x 90m, the creation of five level gravel pitch sites each measuring 5m x 7m for caravans and a parking area measuring 17m x 10m.
- 3.2 The short length of track has been constructed with a dark coloured stone finish and has been fenced off from the rest of the field, it runs adjacent to the field boundary and is not particularly visible from any public vantage points.
- 3.3 The toilet/shower block has been built by the applicants and they have made an excellent job of constructing it, resulting in a very high-quality facility for their visitors. The building is constructed of tanalised timber with a black corrugated tin

sheet roof. The building does not have any foundations and is fixed in place using timber posts which have been driven into the ground to which the building is connected. The toilet/shower block is located adjacent to the existing hedgerow which provides some screening of it when viewed from the settlement boundary. A gravel pathway has been created from the caravan pitches and the parking area to the toilet/shower block.

- 3.4 Some relatively minor earthworks have been carried out to create level platforms for the caravan pitches and these level areas have had stone chippings placed on them.
- 3.5 With the exception of the toilet/shower block the development that has been undertaken for which permission is sought is not particularly visible and does not affect the openness of the Green Belt.
- 3.6 In addition to the operational development that has already been carried out the current application proposes landscaping which includes the establishment of 350m of new and improved hedgerows using native species which will provide screening of the new track and the camping area.
- 3.7 We note from the exchange of emails between our clients and the planning department that there is a suggestion that the application has to include the change of use of the land from agricultural use to use as a camping and caravan site. However, this is not the case because the use of the land for camping and caravanning is permitted development, the applicants have a certificate from a qualifying recreational organisation.
- 3.8 We note that in an email from the Councils enforcement officer, Jason Middleton, he gave our clients three options following the refusal of their application which were as follows:

*I would be grateful for confirmation of:*

*1. Whether you intend to reapply for planning permission and if so in what time frame- we are happy to talk directly to your newly appointed agent; or  
2. Whether you intend to appeal the refusal- following receipt of further advice; or  
3. You will remove all roads/ access tracks/ hardstanding areas/ buildings and provide a facility which wholly accords with any camping certificate you are granted. If so in what time frame this will be done.*

- 3.9 It is clear from Mr Middleton's email that it is only the operational development that can be subject to enforcement action not the permitted use of the site for camping and caravanning and it is therefore this development for which permission is sought.

#### **4. PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 We set out below the recent planning history in respect of the property.

- 4.2 Planning application 3/2019/0642 was a planning application for the change of use of agricultural land to D2 for (assembly and leisure) and installation of up to six camping pods/holiday cabin accommodation and associated site works. The application was submitted on 5 July 2019 and was withdrawn on 23 September 2019.
- 4.3 Planning application 3/2021/0751 was a planning application for the change of use from agricultural to camping with resurfaced track, gravel pitches and amenities. The application was submitted on 16 July 2021 and was refused under delegated powers on 12 October 2021. The reasons for refusal were as follows:
1. *The proposed development is contrary to the provisions of Key Statement EN1 of the Ribble Valley Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework in that the proposal does not fit within one of the exception categories in the Green Belt and would fail to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and thus the proposal is considered to represent inappropriate development. No very special circumstances have been put forward which would outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness or any other harm caused to the openness of the Green Belt.*
  2. *The proposed development, by virtue of its siting, form and design, would form a prominent and incongruous feature that would be harmful to the visual amenity and landscape character of the area contrary to Core Strategy Key Statement EN2 and Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DMB3.*

## **5. PLANNING POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

- 5.1. Local Planning Authorities are required to determine planning applications in accordance with the Statutory Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. If it is to be approved, a development must satisfy as far as possible guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2021) and the relevant policies of the Council's Adopted Core Strategy.
- 5.2 The application site is located within an area designated as Green Belt in the approved Local Plan.
- 5.3 We set out below extracts from the relevant documents to facilitate the assessment of the application proposal against the principal appropriate policies and guidance.

### **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2021)**

- 5.4 The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 is now the main national planning policy guidance influencing planning decision making in England. It sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied and provides a framework within which locally prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced.

- 5.5 Paragraph 8 of the NPPF identifies the three overarching objectives of the planning system these are economic, social and environmental.
- 5.6 Paragraphs 11 – 14 of the NPPF highlight the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making and therefore proposed development that accords with an up-to-date development plan should be approved unless other material considerations indicate that the plan should not be followed.
- 5.7 Importantly, paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay. Paragraph 11 also clearly spells out the Government's presumption in favour of allowing development that accords with an up-to-date development plan unless any adverse impacts of doing so would demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
- 5.8 Under Section 6 of the NPPF, which deals with building a strong and competitive economy, there is a section that deals with supporting a prosperous rural economy and within this section paragraph 84 states:

Planning policies and decisions should enable:

- a) *the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings;*
  - b) *the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses;*
  - c) *sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside; and*
  - d) *the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.*
- 5.9 The proposed development complies with criteria a, b and c of paragraph 84 which as a consequence clearly supports the approval of the proposed development.
- 5.10 Section 13 of the NPPF deals with protecting Green Belt land and paragraph 137 states:

*The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.*

5.11 Paragraph 138 identifies the five purposes of the Green Belt which are as follows:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

5.12 The approval of the proposed development would not prejudice any of the purposes of the Green Belt, rather it would support their purposes by ensuring the continued success of the farming business at Croasdale Farm and the continued positive management of the rest of the property.

5.13 Paragraph 147 states:

*Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.*

5.14 Paragraph 149 identifies circumstances when the construction of buildings in the Green Belt will not be regarded as inappropriate and one of these is:

*b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;*

5.15 The development proposes the erection of one small scale building and the provision of infrastructure associated with a recreational use of land. A toilet/shower block is an appropriate facility for the outdoor recreational use of land for camping and the camping use is a lawful use of the land permitted by Part 5 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. Therefore, the toilet/shower block is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt because it is an identified exception. Further we would argue that if the building is appropriate for such use surely the access track, pitches, path and parking area should be acceptable on the basis that they will not have any adverse impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. The only time when there will be an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt will be when vehicles are using the track or car park and they would still be able to use the land albeit on a more restricted basis if the hard surfacing was not there, due to the permitted use of the land.

5.16 Paragraph 150 identifies that certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. We consider two of these to be relevant to this application they are:

*b) engineering operations;*

*e) material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds)*

- 5.17 The NPPF clearly supports the type of development proposed in this application and which is an appropriate use of land in the Green Belt.

**Council's Core Strategy 2008/2028 – A Local Plan for Ribble Valley Adoption Version**

- 5.18 We comment below on the Key Statements and Policies within the Adopted Core Strategy that we consider to be relevant to the determination of this application.

**Key Statement DS2: Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development.**

- 5.19 Key Statement DS2 identifies that the Council, when considering development proposals, should take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. The policy states that where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision, the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise, taking into account whether any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in NPPF taken as a whole; or specific policies in that framework indicate that development should be restricted.

**Key Statement EN1: Green Belt**

- 5.20 This key statement states:

*The overall extent of the Green Belt will be maintained to safeguard the surrounding countryside from inappropriate encroachment. The development of new buildings will be limited to the purposes of agriculture, forestry, essential outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of the designation.*

- 5.21 The development proposed at Croasdale Farm is for outdoor sport and recreation and it is therefore in accordance with this key statement.

**Key Statement EC1: Business and Employment Development**

- 5.22 Key statement EC1 states

*"Developments that contribute to farm diversification, strengthening of the wider rural and village economies or that promote town centre vitality and viability will be supported in principle".*

- 5.23 The proposed development will strengthen the rural economy creating employment and bringing visitor spend into the local economy.

**Key Statement EC3: Visitor Economy**

- 5.24 This Key Statement relates specifically to the visitor economy stating that:

*“Proposals that contribute to and strengthen the visitor economy of Ribble Valley will be encouraged, including the creation of new accommodation and tourism facilities through the conversion of existing buildings or associated with existing attractions. Significant new attractions will be supported, in circumstances where they would deliver overall improvements to the environment and benefits to local communities and employment opportunities.”*

- 5.25 This proposal will strengthen the visitor economy by enhancing a permitted caravan and camping site bringing visitors into the Borough who will contribute to and strengthen the visitor economy.

**Policy DMG1: General Considerations**

- 5.26 This is a general development management policy which states that, in determining planning applications, all development must satisfy a total of twenty criteria relating to matters of design, access, amenity, environment and infrastructure not all of the criteria will be applicable to the proposed development, however we comment on the relevant criteria below in respect of each of the five matters.

**Design**

- 5.27 The only aspect of the proposed development that is relevant for consideration is the toilet/shower block and we consider the building to be sensitively designed given its countryside location with timber walls and a corrugated sheet roof. The building is relatively small and is no larger than it needs to be in order for it to serve its intended purpose. The building has been designed so that it is suitable for disabled visitors.

**Access**

- 5.28 The proposed development will be used by visitors who will already be able to come to the site to camp or caravan whether or not the proposed development is approved and the approval of the development will not intensify the use of the access.

**Amenity**

- 5.29 We do not consider that the proposed development will adversely affect the amenities of the surrounding area, the use of the land for camping and caravanning does not require planning permission because it is permitted development and the use of the development for which permission is sought will not have any adverse impact on amenity.



## **Environment**

- 5.30 The application site is not in an area with any environmental designation and we do not anticipate there being any adverse environmental impact from the proposed development. The proposed development includes proposed hedge planting which will provide an enhancement to the environment.

## **Infrastructure**

- 5.31 The proposed development will not result in any loss of important open space and will have no impact upon key infrastructure.
- 5.32 Overall it is clear that the development complies with the relevant requirements of Policy DMG1.

## **Policy DMG 2: Strategic Considerations**

- 5.33 Policy DMG2 requires development to be in accordance with the Core Strategy Development Strategy and support the spatial vision and identifies certain forms of development that are acceptable outside of the settlement areas. We consider two of these to apply to this application, which are that the development “(4) *should be for small scale tourism or recreational developments appropriate to a rural area; and (5) should be for a small scale use appropriate to a local area where a local need or benefit can be demonstrated.*”
- 5.34 The proposed development is a small-scale tourism development that is linked to a permitted rural development. The proposed development does provide a local benefit, the applicants have held three fund raising events for the local community at the farm which have raised over a thousand pounds for Langho in Bloom who work hard to improve the village (litter picking, weeding, planting, and the watering of many planters they have introduced to the village). These events would not have been possible without the development that has taken place. The applicants are working with Langho in Bloom and the Parish Council to plan the next event which will be held to celebrate the Queen’s Jubilee with all profits going to Langho in Bloom.
- 5.35 The Policy also states:
- ‘Within the Open Countryside development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the area by virtue of its size, design, use of materials, landscaping and siting. Where possible new development should be accommodated through the re-use of existing buildings, which in most cases is more appropriate than new build.’*
- 5.36 The proposed development is in our opinion in keeping with the character of the landscape of the area, the toilet/shower block is constructed from tanalised timber and is in keeping and the other development is in keeping being similar to other tracks and hard standings found on other farms in the wider area.

- 5.37 The proposal satisfies those requirements of Policy DMG2.

**Policy DME 2: Landscape and Townscape Protection**

- 5.38 This policy identifies that development proposals will be refused which significantly harm important landscape features and sets out a list of relevant landscape features, however the proposed development does not affect any of them. The proposal does not therefore contravene any of the requirements of Policy DME 2.

**Policy DME 3: Site and Species Protection and Conservation**

- 5.39 This policy states that development proposals that are likely to adversely affect any of eight specified species or habitats that are granted special protection will not be granted planning permission. The Ecological Appraisal Report prepared by Verity Webster dated September 2021 submitted with the previous application covered all aspects of Policy DME 3 and found that there was no ecological harm arising from the proposed development.

**Policy DMB 1: Supporting Business Growth and the Local Economy**

- 5.40 Policy DMB1 indicates that the Council will support proposals that are intended to support business growth and the local economy provided such proposals are in conformity with other relevant policies of the local plan. The proposed development is in full conformity with all the relevant policies and policy DMB1 clearly supports the proposed development.

**Policy DMB 3: Recreation and Tourism Development**

- 5.42 Policy DMB3 states that planning permission will be granted for development proposals that extend the range of tourism and visitor facilities in the Borough subject to a number of criteria being met. As far as the criteria are concerned, the proposed development does not conflict with other policies of the plan. The site is well related to the settlement of Langho and Langho train station. The proposed development does not undermine the character, quality, or visual amenities of the plan area by virtue of its scale, siting, materials or design. The proposal is particularly well related to the highway network and would not create any adverse traffic problems.
- 5.43 The proposed development will support the permitted tourism development that can lawfully take place at the property.

**6. OTHER SIMILAR DEVELOPMENT IN THE BOROUGH**

**Application 3/2021/1057 – Doggy Day Care Facility – Land at Mytton Golf Club**

- 6.1 We are aware of this recent retrospective planning application in relatively close proximity to the application site which was approved under delegated powers on

3 February 2022. The application was for the change of use of land including the extension of existing access track, installation of fencing, planting and shelter to provide dog day care area and halfway house for golf course with associated infrastructure with ancillary facilities. The development involved the creation of a new access onto the public highway but this was not included in the description of development.

- 6.2 Although there is no reference to it in the description the application is in fact a retrospective application with the proposed development already having taken place before the application was submitted. It is concerning that the Planning Statement dated October 2021 talks about the proposed development when in actual fact the development would appear to have either already started or in fact been completed by the time the application was submitted.
- 6.3 The important thing with regard to this development is that like the proposed development at Croasdale Farm it is located within the Green Belt and has been treated as a development for recreational purposes and will therefore be subject to assessment against the same policies of both the National Planning Policy Framework and the adopted Core Strategy 2008 – 2028 A Local Plan for Ribble Valley. Furthermore, the proposed development was very similar.
- 6.4 The proposed development involved the creation of a new length of access track which we have assessed to measure 120m, the erection of a timber building with a mono pitch roof measuring 11m x 3.6m with a maximum height of 2.7m and a minimum height of 2.2m (the building therefore has an area of 39.6m<sup>2</sup>) and a car park area measuring 5m x 10m. I assume the car park to be larger than the area referred to as this would not be large enough to allow vehicles to turn around and I doubt that they reverse along the access track and out of the site.
- 6.5 I have reviewed the officers delegated report for this application and there are numerous statements in it that support the interpretation of policy that is set out in Section five of this Planning Statement. The officer under the heading principle of development states:

Applications which support the local economy and recreation attractions in the borough would be supported in principle by policies EC1, DMB1 and DMB3 however this must not conflict with other policies of the plan.

Policy EC1 states: *Proposals that strengthen the wider rural and village economies will be supported in principle.*

Policy DMB1 states: *Proposals that are intended to support business growth and the local economy will be supported in principle.*

- 6.6 The report states Policy DMB3 but does not say how the proposed development complies with its requirements and we note that there was no ecology report to support the application. The officer simply stated that the proposal will provide a small-scale dog day care facility.
- 6.7 With regard to Policy DMG2 the officer considered the proposal to comply with criteria 4 and 5 as have I in respect of the Croasdale Farm application.

- 6.8 The report considers the appropriateness of the development in the Green Belt with reference to paragraph 149 of the NPPF, the officer acknowledges that not all new development is prohibited by Green Belt policies. The assessment is that the exercising of dogs could be considered to be linked to outdoor recreation and that the building measuring just shy of 40m<sup>2</sup> is modest in scale and will not impact upon the openness of the Green Belt or on the purposes of including land within it. While the words “could be” introduce an element of doubt into whether or not this was a correct interpretation of Green Belt policy overall I do not disagree with the officer’s interpretation of planning policy. However, I do expect the Council to be consistent in their interpretation of policy when our client’s application is considered.

## **7. OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF THE OFFICER REPORT FOR APPLICATION 3/2021/0751**

- 7.1 Having just considered the positive delegated report in respect of application 3/2021/1057 which has resulted in a new length of access road, a new parking area and a building measuring nearly 40m<sup>2</sup> in the Green Belt and the change of use of land from agriculture to dog walking I now comment on how this compares to the officer report in respect of application 3/2021/0751. It must of course be borne in mind that the application incorrectly sought permission for a camping and caravan use which is in fact permitted development.

- 7.2 Interestingly the first part of the officer’s assessment of the proposal against the local plan policies is very positive:

*Core Strategy Key Statement EC1 supports in principle developments that contribute to farm diversification and strengthening of the wider rural economy. Key Statement EC3 relates specifically to the visitor economy stating that proposals that contribute to and strengthen the visitor economy of Ribble Valley will be encouraged. The proposed development would contribute to the tourism economy and would also provide an additional source of income for the occupants at Croasdale Farm. As such, the proposal accords with the general intentions of Key Statements EC1 and EC3.*

*The application site is located outside any settlement boundary in the Green Belt. Core Strategy Policy DMG2 requires development outside of defined settlement areas to meet at least one of six considerations one of which is “4) The development is for small scale tourism or recreational developments appropriate to a rural area.” The proposal is for a small-scale tourism development of a type that is appropriate to a rural area.*

- 7.3 The officer goes on to acknowledge that the application is compliant with Policy DMB3.
- 7.4 The assessment of the application becomes negative when the officer assesses it against Green Belt policy. However, to a large extent the assessment is flawed because it relates to the use of the land for caravans and tents which is a

permitted use, notwithstanding this there are still very significant differences in the interpretation of policy when compared to the doggy day care application.

- 7.5 The officer correctly identifies the fact that the toilet/shower block is a building, but he fails to identify that the building is for appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and recreation connected with the permitted use of the land for camping. This is at odds with the approval of a building twice the size in application 3/2021/1057, which was considered not to affect the openness of the Green Belt.
- 7.6 The officer assessed the car park and access track and states that this would result in a loss of openness with cars being parked on the car park, however this was not the case in respect of application 3/2021/1057 where a similar size car park and track was approved.
- 7.7 The access track, car park and hard standings are not essential to enable the use of the certified caravan and camp site, they merely enhance the use of the camp site, therefore there will still be cars in the field and tents and shepherds' huts. The high quality toilet/shower block could be replaced with mobile facilities but this would not be an improvement over the existing situation. We are of the opinion that the permitted use has an impact upon the openness of the Green Belt but not the development for which permission is sought.

## **8. RELEVANT PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS**

**Appeal Reference:** APP/Y3940/C/10/2139334 & 2142020 & 2136994  
**Address:** Land at Stonehenge Campsite/Summerfield House,  
Berwick Road, Berwick, St.James, Wiltshire, SP3 4TQ  
**Appellant:** Mr W F Grant  
**Local Authority:** Wiltshire Council

- 8.1 We have included this appeal because it confirms our position that the applicants do not need to apply for planning permission to use their land for camping and caravan use because the use is permitted by Part 5 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. We attach below an extract from the decision notice which sets out the fallback position in respect of the appeal site, you will note that the inspector attached considerable weight to the fallback position.

### *Fallback position*

*50. The appellants have permitted development rights which enable them to make use of the site for camping<sup>9</sup> and caravanning. For the days that such activity would be covered by these rights the numbers of tents and caravans at the site would be fairly uncontrolled and could be significantly greater than those suggested in the schemes now before me with the suggested conditions. There is a reasonable likelihood that some of the problems brought to my attention by uncontrolled camping and caravanning in the past would re-occur under this fallback position. Consequently I can attach considerable weight to it in my overall balance of considerations.*

9. Under Part 4 Class B of Schedule 2 and Part 27 of Schedule 2 to the GPDO

- 8.2 Furthermore, the appellants had carried out development which was similar to that which has been undertaken at Croasdale Farm, which included:

*The carrying out of engineering and other operations on the land, including materially altering the landform by excavating and re-profiling the ground to form levelled areas; formation of hardstandings; formation of earth bunds and associated fencing; installation of a cesspool/waste disposal point and enclosing fencing, installing electrical hook-ups and lighting; materially altering the position of and widening an access onto a classified road and resurfacing and improvements to an existing track; partial construction of a new track, formation of a pathway and erection of a toilet block and washing up building.*

- 8.3 We note that the appeal was allowed, and the works listed above were retained. We note that the appeal site was not in the Green Belt and that there was an application which imposed restrictions on the amount of camping that could take place, however Mr and Mrs Turner do not want to exceed the amount of development permitted in the certificate for their site and so the approval of the development that has taken place will not result in an intensification of the use of the site.

## 9. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 9.1 The proposed development comprises the creation of a farm track, a car parking area, hardstanding areas for tents/caravans, the erection of a toilet/shower block and a gravel path to it.
- 9.2 The application site is situated in an area designated as Open Countryside and is within the Green Belt.
- 9.3 We consider that we have demonstrated in this Planning Statement and the separate Ecological Appraisal (insofar as it is relevant to this application) that the proposal represents sustainable development that is in compliance with NPPF and the relevant Policies of the Council's adopted Core Strategy.
- 9.4 Therefore, in order to comply with paragraph 11 of NPPF and Core Strategy Key Statement DS2 we consider that permission should be granted without delay subject to any reasonable conditions that the Council considers to be necessary.
- 9.5 If, however, the Council requires any amendments to the proposal, and/or the submission of any additional information in order for permission to be granted, we would ask that you give us the opportunity to address the same prior to the determination of the application.

Si

Date

22.3.2022

Gary Hoerty BSc (Hons) MRICS FAAV

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **Planning Appeal Decisions**



---

## Appeal Decisions

Inquiry held on 17-18 May 2011

Site visit made on 19 May 2011

**by K Nield BSc(Econ) DipTP CDipAF MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 11 July 2011**

---

### **Appeal A Ref: APP/Y3940/C/10/2139334**

**Land at Stonehenge Campsite/Summerfield House, Berwick Road, Berwick St. James, Wiltshire, SP3 4TQ**

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is made by Mr W F Grant against an enforcement notice issued by Wiltshire Council.
- The Council's reference is S/2010/1661
- The notice was issued on 24 September 2010.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the use of the land for temporary events (in particular the use as a temporary camping site for the stationing and human habitation of tents) in excess of that permitted by Part 4, Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.
- The requirements of the notice are:
  - (a) Remove any tents stationed on the Land in excess of that permitted by Part 4, Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995; and
  - (b) Cease permanently the use of the Land for temporary events, in particular the use as a temporary camping site for the stationing and human habitation of tents, in excess of that permitted by Part 4, Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is one month from the date the notice takes effect in respect of both (a) and (b) above.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) and (e) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

**Summary of Decision: The enforcement notice is quashed and planning permission is granted as set out in the Formal Decision below.**

---

### **Appeal B Ref: APP/Y3940/C/10/2142020**

**Land at Stonehenge Campsite/Summerfield House, Berwick Road, Berwick St. James, Wiltshire, SP3 4TQ**

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is made by Mr W F Grant against an enforcement notice issued by Wiltshire Council.
- The Council's reference is S/2011/0001.
- The notice was issued on 15 November 2010.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: without planning permission, the carrying out of engineering and other operations on the land, including materially altering the landform by excavating and re-profiling the ground to form levelled areas; formation of hardstandings; formation of earth bunds and associated fencing; installation of a cesspool/waste disposal point and enclosing fencing, installing electrical



hook-ups and lighting; materially altering the position of and widening an access onto a classified road and resurfacing and improvements to an existing track; partial construction of a new track, formation of a pathway and erection of a toilet block and washing up building.

- The requirements of the notice are:
  - (a) Permanently demolish all the hardstandings, remove the new vehicular access and track surfacing materials, pathway surfacing materials, cesspool/waste disposal point and associated fencing, lighting and electrical hook-up points from the Land;
  - (b) Return the excavated and re-profiled parts of the Land to its former landform, levels and profiles prior to development took place, i.e. to match that of the land immediately adjacent;
  - (c) Permanently demolish the toilet/shower block and washing up building and reinstate the land to its condition before development took place, i.e. to match the levels and profile of the land immediately adjacent;
  - (d) Reduce the height of the earth bunds and associated fencing so that where adjacent to Berwick Road as shown between the approximate points X-X on the plan attached to the Notice, the height of the bunds or the fences or their combined height does not exceed one metre;
  - (e) Permanently remove the partly constructed track formed between the approximate points Y-Y as shown on the plan attached to the Notice and reinstate the Land to its condition to match the levels and profiles that of the land immediately adjacent;
  - (f) Permanently remove all demolition materials arising from steps (a)-(e) from the Land;
  - (g) Re-seed all the reinstated areas with grass.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is 3 months in respect of items (a) – (f) listed above and 3 months or by the end of the next planting season following the date the notice takes effect, whichever date is the later of the two in the case of item (g) listed above. The planting season is stated by the Council to run from 1 November to 31 March the following year.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (c), (e), (f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

**Summary of Decision: The enforcement notice is quashed and planning permission is granted as set out in the Formal Decision below.**

---

#### **Appeal C Ref: APP/Y3940/A/10/2136994**

**Stonehenge Campsite, Berwick Road, Berwick St. James, Salisbury, SP3 4TQ**

- 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 W F and S R Grant against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
- The application Ref S/2010/7/FULL, dated 24 December 2009, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2010.
- The development proposed is described as the retention of access, driveway, hardstandings and change of use of land to touring caravan site.

**Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted as set out in the Formal Decision below.**

---

#### **Application for costs**

1. At the Inquiry an application for full costs in respect of Appeal B was made by Mr W F Grant against Wiltshire Council and in respect of Appeal C by W F and S R Grant against Wiltshire Council. The application is the subject of a separate Decision.

### **Procedural matters**

2. At the opening of the Inquiry the appellants withdrew the appeals under ground (e) in respect of both Appeal A and Appeal B. No evidence was called in respect of those appeals by either party.
3. In respect of Appeal C the Council had amended the description to "*Change of use of land to touring caravan and camping site, including retention of access, driveway, hardstandings, shower/wc block, chemical toilet disposal area, cess pit and electric hook-up points*". As the appellants have applied this revised description in the appeal documentation and I consider it describes the extent of the development more fully I intend to determine the s78 appeal on that basis.
4. The oral evidence at the Inquiry was taken on oath.

### **The enforcement notices**

5. There are some minor errors in the notice in respect of Appeal B. Within the requirements of the notice under sections (b) and (e) words appear to be omitted which reduce the clarity of the requirements. I can make corrections to the notice without injustice to the parties.

### **Preliminary matters**

6. The parties submitted an agreed Statement of Common Ground (SCG) at the opening of the Inquiry. The SCG agreed relevant planning policy guidance applicable to the development and other matters including some agreed conditions.
7. The SCG also contained Plan WGDP 01 prepared to assist the description and assessment of the parts of the site as a whole. This termed the area to the north of the site comprising the access, track and main caravan site with laid out pitches as "Campsite" (or Red Land) on the Plan. A field area broadly to the south of the access and west of the Red Land is termed "Rally Fields" (or Blue Land) and a further area to the south of the Rally Fields is termed "Parkland and Summerfield" (or Green Land).
8. These descriptive terms are used, with some variation, throughout the evidence by both parties and have relevance to some of the matters agreed by the parties and suggested conditions. As this subdivision of the site assists with the description of the scheme I will apply those terms.
9. The plans attached to the two enforcement notices include all the above listed areas. However, the application site boundary for Appeal C includes all the Campsite area but only (the eastern) part of the Rally Fields.
10. There is a single appellant in respect of both Appeal A and Appeal B but two appellants in respect of Appeal C. For clarity in the overall decisions I shall use the term "appellants" throughout.

### **The appeal under ground (c) (Appeal B)**

11. The appeal under ground (c) is that the matters described in the notice (if they occurred) do not constitute a breach of planning control. I noted at my visit, and it was not in dispute at the Inquiry, that the operational development comprising the alleged breach had occurred.

12. The appellants accept that several items of the alleged breach require planning permission. Broadly these comprise the toilet/shower block and washing up building, cesspool/waste disposal point and associated fencing, lighting and electrical hook-up points. The appellants have not raised matters under this ground in connection with these items of operational development itemised in the Appeal B notice where there is a breach of planning control.
13. The appellants' case under this ground is in respect of two matters identified in the alleged breach. Firstly, earth bunds with a mesh fence either side of the access, slightly inset from the site frontage with Berwick Road (B3083) and secondly in respect of an access track leading from Berwick Road into the site and providing vehicular and pedestrian access mainly to caravan pitches in the eastern part of the site.
14. The earth bunds are grassed with some additional landscaping. A green coloured flexible mesh fence has been positioned mainly along the forward face of the bunds which in some places exceeds the height of the bunds (but in other places does not). The combined effect of the bunds and fence is to form a means of enclosure to The Rally Fields and it also provides a partial visual screen into the site from the public domain along the highway. The bunds are inset from the highway by varying but fairly short distances. In the following assessment I shall describe the combined height of the bunds and where higher the fence as together comprising "the bunds".
15. There is some disagreement between the principal parties regarding the total height of the bunds. The Council has provided measurements from ground level at the edge of the highway indicating that the height varies from 1.1 metres (m) to 1.65m. The appellants have taken measurements from the mid-point of the highway where the camber is highest and indicate that the height of the bunds above that point vary from less than 1m to 1.32m. Without doubting their accuracy, I find the basis of the appellants' measurements from the camber to be rather contrived and I am more persuaded by the Council's measurements in providing a total height of the bunds.
16. The appellants contend that the bunds are permitted development under Part 2 Class A of Schedule 2 to the General Permitted Development Order 1995 (as amended) (GPDO). That permits "*The erection, construction, maintenance, improvement or alteration of a gate, fence, wall, or other means of enclosure*" subject to compliance with a number of specified criteria.
17. However, criterion (a) of Class A does not permit such development adjacent to a highway used by vehicular traffic where the height of any gate, fence, wall or means of enclosure exceeds 1m above ground level.
18. In this case although the bunds are inset slightly from Berwick Road they clearly perform a function of separating the appeal site from that highway. In the context of this site they act as a boundary to the highway. Notwithstanding their inset from the highway I consider that it is positioned adjacent to them. As they exceed 1m in height they are not permitted development under Part 2 Class A.
19. With regard to the access there is no dispute that until (at least) 2008<sup>1</sup> there was a simple grass farm track leading from Berwick Road. Additional photographs show that reasonably extensive engineering operations to remove

---

<sup>1</sup> Photographs in Appendices 3 and 11 of evidence of Stephen Hawkins

the surface and create a base and apply scalplings were undertaken. These works also appear to have widened the track (from its appearance in earlier photographs) and altered the position of its junction with Berwick Road.

20. Taken together those are engineering operations which cumulatively are significant in scale and exceed works that could reasonably be regarded as incidental to the provision of a means of access. As a matter of fact and degree, I find the proposed works beyond that which is permitted by Part 2 Class B, neither are they permitted by any other Class of the GPDO. The proposed works, in my opinion, are such that they fall within the meaning of "development" under s55 of the Act for which an express grant of planning permission is required.
21. In a ground (c) appeal the burden of proof lies with the appellants and since this has not been discharged in respect of the matters in dispute the appeal under ground (c) fails.

### **The appeals under ground (a) (Appeal A and Appeal B) and the s78 appeal (Appeal C)**

#### Background

22. It is not in dispute that the areas termed "Campsite" and "Rally Fields", all formerly comprising agricultural land, have been used for camping and caravanning activities to varying degrees for some 2-3 years<sup>2</sup>. The Campsite area initially contained 5 hard surfaced standings used with various facilities/buildings provided in connection with that use. This area previously contained a number of modest agricultural buildings now mostly demolished. Until December 2010 this area had certification firstly from the Caravan & Camping Club and then the Caravan Club to use that part of the site as a Certified Location.
23. The Rally Fields comprise two paddocks. The upper paddock (nearest Berwick Road) has been used for temporary touring and camping "events" under permitted development rights provided under Part 4 Class B of Schedule 2 and Part 27 of Schedule 2 to the GPDO. Use of the lower paddock for camping and caravanning took place when there was high demand such as around the summer solstice.

#### Main issues

24. There is no dispute between the parties that planning policies at both national and local level, whilst seeking (in general terms and subject to various criteria) the protection of the countryside from inappropriate development, support tourist related development in the countryside including the development of caravan and camp sites.
25. Saved policy T9 of the adopted Salisbury Local Plan (LP) is in line with the general thrust of SP<sup>3</sup> policy RLT10 and policy EC7 in PPS<sup>4</sup>. It is a permissive policy allowing the provision of new touring caravan/camping sites adjacent to the main holiday routes subject to a number of criteria. Amongst other matters the criteria require the site to be well screened from vantage points, highways and residential development and that trees and other landscaping are

---

<sup>2</sup> Evidence of Anthony Allen

<sup>3</sup> Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan (SP)

<sup>4</sup> Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth (PPS4)

planted within and around the site. In addition the policy requires that the use should not be detrimental to the amenities of residents of the area. The site of the appeals lies in close proximity to the A303 and the parties agree that it is a main holiday route as required by policy T9.

26. In the light of the above I consider that the main issues in these appeals are:

- (i) the effect on the character and appearance of the locality including its effect on the Special Landscape Area (SLA) within which the site is located and the nearby Winterbourne Stoke Conservation Area (CA),
- (ii) the effect on the living conditions of occupants of nearby dwellings through potential noise and disturbance, and
- (iii) whether other considerations including economic benefits outweigh any harm that is identified.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

27. The appeal site adjoins the south-western extent of the CA which in that area comprises a meadow and other open land near the river. The parties agree that the proposed development preserves the elements of the setting and character of the CA that make a positive contribution to that heritage asset. I see no reason to differ. Consequently, there is no conflict with national policy HE 10 in PPS5<sup>5</sup>.

28. The wider area around the appeal site falls within both the Salisbury Plain West High Chalk Plain and the Wylde Chalk River Valley landscape character areas described in the Wiltshire Landscape Character Assessment. The appeal site is situated on the valley floor of the River Till.

29. A recent Landscape Character Assessment was undertaken for Salisbury District<sup>6</sup>. That indicates that the appeal site lies within Character Area A1: Till Narrow Chalk River Valley which is situated towards the north-east of Salisbury and running through adjacent areas of chalk downland (Area D). Within that area the overall condition of the landscape is good with moderate to high landscape character sensitivity and moderate visual sensitivity. I acknowledge that within the general description of the landscape character of the area there are pockets exhibiting some variation to the general landscape characteristics. I have noted the evidence of interested parties in this regard who pointed out some local variations in the area near the appeal site.

30. The appeal scheme contained proposals for enhancing the planting both at the site boundaries and within the site. The Council confirmed that this contained an appropriate mix and size of species for this location. The Council also confirmed that assumed growth rates to maturity for the suggested species were acceptable.

31. A detailed assessment of the visual effect of the cumulative effect of the appeal schemes from various viewpoints within the Till Valley and on the surrounding downland was undertaken by the appellants' landscape consultant. The Council's assessment was of a more limited nature. In addition, I was able to

<sup>5</sup> Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (PPS5)

<sup>6</sup> Salisbury Landscape Character Assessment: Chris Blandford Associates (February 2009)

look at the site from various viewpoints at my site visit and reach my own conclusions on the visual effect of the schemes on the landscape.

32. In the main the appellants' photographic evidence, assessment, and its conclusions were not disputed by the Council. It was accepted by the Council that the visual envelope of the Campsite and Rally Fields areas is very limited with only a few areas of land in the public domain from which clear views of the site can be gained.
33. In the short to medium term persons using a public right of way alongside the River Till to the east of the site would be able to see (the upper parts of) caravans stationed in the nearest pitches alongside the eastern edge of the Campsite area although a steep embankment serves to restrict views into the site from the path. In the longer term planting within and outside the site would provide screening for much of the year.
34. Views into the proposed development in the Rally Fields would be gained from a section of the public right of way to the south-east of Summerfield House, and from a section of bridleway to the west of the B3083. In the medium term it would be possible to see substantial numbers of tents in the Rally Fields from the bridleway but views into that area would reduce towards the longer term due to growth in the landscaping that has taken place or is further proposed.
35. I agree with the Council that glimpses of tents in the Rally Fields would be gained from the hillside position of a byway to the east (Viewpoint 22). However, that would be at a distance of approximately 1.5 km from the site. At the time of my (spring) visit those views were restricted by vegetation and, as the photographic evidence indicates, they would not be prominent even in the winter time when there would be less leaf growth.
36. Views into the site from the B3083 are currently limited to a section of about 300m leading south from the A303. The site entrance, part of the access track and earth bunds with fencing would be clearly visible from the road. I am satisfied that planting of the earth bunds along the site frontage, some of which has taken place, would provide reasonable short term visual screening which would be enhanced over the medium term by additional planting such that only the top parts of tents in the upper paddock area of the Rally Fields would be visible. Over the longer term those views into the site would diminish further.
37. The parties agree that the fence along the bunds is prominent in some views and I do not differ in that respect. I consider that its removal, secured by a planning condition if all other matters are acceptable, would be in the interest of the visual amenity of the area.
38. Planting alongside the northern boundary would also provide substantial screening of the site from the B3083. The Council expressed doubts at the Inquiry that there was sufficient space between the access track and the site boundary to allow for sufficient plant growth. Although I saw on my visit that the width of the planting strip varied I consider that there is adequate space to allow planting which would provide a screen over a period of between 5 – 10 years. Planting has taken place alongside the boundary outside the appellants' land but no scheme is before me that would allow for the management of that area which reduces the weight I have attached to it in contributing to a screen.

39. The A303 is in an elevated position to the north-west of the appeal site where there is an exposed section following the removal of trees and vegetation by the Highways Agency and which allows views towards the site from passing vehicles. However, traffic on that road is reasonably heavy and moving at considerable speed so such views as there are from that position are likely to be fleeting in the short term but would reduce with screening from the existing and proposed landscaping .
40. There are a number of residential properties within the visual envelope of both the caravan site and the Rally Fields. In the short term views of the Rally Fields from Scotland Lodge, which is at a slightly elevated position above the A303 can be gained. These views would significantly reduce in the medium term as the landscaping matures. Views from the other dwellings are limited. However, I noted that parts of the site can be seen presently from Over the Hill to the south and parts of the gardens of Till Cottage and Keepers Cottage.
41. In all these cases the limited views that exist at present would reduce in the medium to long term as the existing and proposed landscaping at the edges of the site matures. Control of the extent of the camping and caravanning to minimise the visual impact and to ensure adequate landscaping can be secured through planning conditions, if all other matters are acceptable. Consequently, both the use of the site for camping and caravanning together with the related operational development would be well screened in the medium to long term (5-9 years).
42. Overall, I found the appellants' assessment of visual impact persuasive in indicating that there would be very limited visual impact of the appeal schemes on both the local and wider areas of the landscape. It is, in any event, based on a worst-case scenario of all the proposed caravan pitches being occupied and tents present in both paddocks of the Rally Fields. However, I agree with the appellants that the situation for most of the period being considered would be less than that further reducing the likely visual impact.
43. I note the Council's concern that the assessment does not fully consider the visual effect of vehicles at the site entrance (either entering or leaving) or on the access track. I accept that vehicles and caravans in those positions could be visible particularly from some of the elevated viewpoints. Such activity is likely in most cases to be of a transient nature and even at the busiest times is not likely to be harmful to the landscape character for anything other than a short time. Consequently, I have not attached significant weight to that concern.
44. Taking all the above factors into account I consider that there would be limited conflict with SP policy RLT10 and LP policy T9. I do not consider that the harm to the character and appearance of the locality including the SLA from the appeal proposals would be material and it would not of itself lead me to dismiss the appeals.

#### *Living conditions*

45. The Council has raised objections in this regard only in respect of the enforcement notice issued in respect of the alleged change of use (Appeal A) and not the scheme comprising the s78 appeal (Appeal C). Notwithstanding that, compelling evidence was given at the Inquiry by a number of the interested parties who live near the site (and others) to indicate that at various times the use of parts of the site for camping and caravanning had led to noise



and disturbance to their living conditions at unsocial hours. The evidence provided indicated that this was primarily from music (both amplified and non-amplified) played late at night particularly from those parts of the Rally Fields and Summerfield House closest to the dwellings. Some of the interested parties indicated that the music and other noises could be heard over a wide area.

46. I have no doubt that much of the problem in this regard stemmed from the fairly uncontrolled use of the site at that time. Suggested planning conditions discussed at the Inquiry to limit the area for camping and caravanning (and the numbers of caravans and tents) together with limitations on amplified and non-amplified music and greater visual screening would, in my opinion, go a very considerable way to resolving the concerns that were aired. Such conditions can be attached to a planning permission, if all other matters are acceptable.
47. Subject to the imposition of planning conditions as discussed above attached to any permissions granted in respect of these appeals I conclude on this issue that the development proposed in Appeal A and Appeal C would not be materially harmful to the living conditions of occupants of nearby dwellings and would accord with the overall aims of LP policy T9(iv).

*Economic benefits*

48. The parties agree that the use of the site for tourist related purposes would lead to economic benefits both to the immediate and wider areas. The scheme would provide one FTE<sup>7</sup> job and there was agreement that there would be some visitor spend, albeit unquantified, in the area.
49. The proposed development, taken as a whole, accords with national planning policy in PPS4 (policy EC7) which urges Councils to support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments to help deliver the Government's tourism strategy. It is also supported by the Government's commitment to promote sustainable growth and jobs<sup>8</sup>.

*Fallback position*

50. The appellants have permitted development rights which enable them to make use of the site for camping<sup>9</sup> and caravanning. For the days that such activity would be covered by these rights the numbers of tents and caravans at the site would be fairly uncontrolled and could be significantly greater than those suggested in the schemes now before me with the suggested conditions. There is a reasonable likelihood that some of the problems brought to my attention by uncontrolled camping and caravanning in the past would re-occur under this fall back position. Consequently I can attach considerable weight to it in my overall balance of considerations.

*Other matters*

51. A number of other matters are brought to my attention by the interested parties. There is concern that the appeal schemes would have a harmful effect on nature conservation interests in particular the nearby SSSI<sup>10</sup> along the River Till. However, no substantive evidence was produced to support that contention and I cannot attach significant weight to it.

<sup>7</sup> Full time equivalent (FTE)

<sup>8</sup> Ministerial Statement dated 23 March 2011 by Greg Clark, Minister of State for Decentralisation

<sup>9</sup> Under Part 4 Class B of Schedule 2 and Part 27 of Schedule 2 to the GPDO

<sup>10</sup> Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)



52. Concern was also expressed by interested parties and the local Parish Councils in respect of the effect of the schemes on highway safety, particularly slow moving large vehicles and some vehicles towing caravans seeking to exit the site onto the B3083. The initial consultation responses of the Highways Agency and the Highways Department of the Council<sup>11</sup> did not raise objections in this respect, however shortly before the Inquiry an objection was received<sup>12</sup> indicating the view of the relevant highways officer that visibility from and of vehicles leaving the site access is restricted by a hedge that had recently been planted along the roadside site frontage. The principal parties agree that greater visibility can be secured by re-positioning the planting along the bunds and that this could be secured through a condition, if all other matters are acceptable.
53. I have had regard to other matters raised including the effect on archaeology, and sewerage and waste water disposal. None alters my view as to the main issues on which these appeals turn.

#### *Conditions*

54. The parties have both suggested<sup>13</sup> a number of conditions in the event that the appeal is successful. A number of the suggested conditions are common to the individual appeals, notwithstanding differences in site boundaries. Conditions relevant to the individual appeals are set out in the Annexes to this decision.
55. A number of conditions are suggested mainly to safeguard the visual amenity of the area. For this reason a condition is required for details of any existing and proposed landscaping to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. In connection with Appeals B and C I will attach a condition requiring the removal of the mesh fence. I also agree that a number of conditions should be attached in respect of all the appeals for the provision and maintenance of landscaping including a requirement for a landscape management plan. These landscape conditions require the permitted use to cease and all tents and other incidental development to be removed in the event that the conditions are not satisfied.
56. I agree that a condition is required to put a restriction on the siting and number of caravan pitches. Whilst the parties agreed in principle that they should only be within the area notated as "Campsite/Red Land" on Drawing WGDG 01 contained in the SCG to the easternmost part of the site, to protect the visual amenity and character of the area and also help to safeguard the living conditions of occupants of nearby dwellings, they differed as to the number of pitches and caravans that would be appropriate in that area.
57. The appellants have suggested that that part of the site could accommodate 15 caravans laid out as illustrated on Drawing: Landscape Plan 2010. The Council considers that the area should be restricted to the northern part of that area such that it would accommodate 11 pitches and caravans (Plots 1-8 and 13-15 on Drawing: Landscape Plan 2010). The disputed area is well contained by earth embankments following the excavation and re-profiling of the ground in that area and it is reasonably well screened by existing vegetation. It is the nearest area to the garden of Keepers Cottage across the public right of way but a considerable distance from the house and the most private part of the

---

<sup>11</sup> Evidence of Charlie Bruce-White

<sup>12</sup> Document 13 to the Inquiry

<sup>13</sup> Contained in the Statement of Common Ground

garden. In consequence, I lean to the view of the appellants that there would not be a materially harmful effect on the amenities of the occupants of Keepers Cottage from the use of pitches 13-15 on Drawing: Landscape Plan 2010 and the condition I will impose will reflect that conclusion.

58. Conditions are suggested to limit the area for tented camping, the number of tents and the number of days that the use would be permitted. The area to be used is not in dispute by the parties (the area notated as Rally Fields/Blue Land on drawing WGRP 01) but the number of tents and number of days that would be available for camping are in dispute.
59. The appellants suggest that the defined area for tented camping should only be used for such purposes between 19 March and the 30 September inclusive within any calendar year and that it should be used for a maximum of 20 tents on any day within that time period save for 10 days when a maximum of 100 tents would be permitted and a further 14 days when a maximum of 40 tents would be permitted.
60. The Council has suggested a more restrictive approach within the same area. It suggests that that land could be used for tented camping for up to a maximum of 100 days between 1 March and 1 October inclusive within any calendar year. Within that period the Rally Fields should not be used for the stationing of more than 20 tents in total on any day save for between 18 - 25 June inclusive when no more than 100 tents in total could be stationed there and no more than 40 tents in total on Bank Holiday weekends. As the Council's suggested period for use is similar in span to that suggested by the appellants I do not see any particular benefit to the overall visual amenity of the area to limiting the number of days to 100 when the area could be used for a limited use of a maximum of 20 tents. The location of those tents away from dwellings is not likely to lead to harm to the living conditions of occupiers of nearby dwellings. Further such a limitation of use suggested by the Council would, to my mind, be difficult to monitor either by itself or by local residents.
61. The further limitations in respect of use by up to a maximum of 100 tents (8 days) and use by up to a maximum of 40 tents on Bank Holiday weekends suggested by the Council do not differ markedly from the limitations suggested by the appellants and which would, in my view, be simpler to monitor. For those reasons I will impose conditions along the lines suggested by the appellants in respect of these matters.
62. To support the above conditions I agree that an up-to-date written record of all persons visiting the site is maintained and permitted development rights that would otherwise allow camping and caravanning on other parts of the site should be removed. Circular 11/95<sup>14</sup> advises that such permitted rights should only be removed in exceptional circumstances and I consider that this is such a case to safeguard the living conditions of occupants of nearby dwellings and also as uncontrolled camping and caravanning on the remainder of the site would cause harm both to the visual amenity and character of the area.
63. Conditions to restrict the location and number of fire pits and to prevent the playing of amplified music at any time in the appeal sites and to place a time limit of 2300 hours for the termination of the playing of unamplified music on any day will help to prevent noise and disturbance to nearby residents of the site at unsociable hours.

---

<sup>14</sup> Circular 11/95: The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions

64. A condition to restrict access to and egress from the land used for tented camping from the southernmost access to the site will safeguard the living conditions of the occupants of Over the Hill. A condition requiring the provision of an alarm system installed to the cesspit will help to prevent pollution to water courses.
65. Finally I will attach a condition to require a written scheme of investigation of archaeological remains and to implement a programme of work based on the findings prior to any ground works being undertaken.

*Balance of considerations and conclusion on the ground (a) and s78 appeals*

66. Although I have found some limited conflict with SP policy RLT10 and LP policy T9 in respect of the effect of the schemes I do not consider that the proposed development would have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the locality including the SLA. Any resulting harm would be significantly outweighed by direct and indirect economic and tourism benefits to the locality and the wider area. In addition I found that the scheme would not, subject to conditions, have a harmful effect on the living conditions of occupants of nearby dwellings.
67. I conclude that for the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised the appeals under ground (a) and s78 should succeed.

**The appeal on grounds (f) and (g) (Appeal B)**

68. As there is success on ground (a) which leads to the corrected notice being quashed, there is no need to go on to consider the appeals on grounds (f) and (g).

**Formal decisions**

**APP/Y3940/C/10/2139334 (Appeal A)**

69. I allow the appeal, and direct that the enforcement notice be quashed. I grant planning permission, on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended, for the development already carried out, namely the use of the land for temporary events (in particular the use as a temporary camping site for the stationing and human habitation of tents) in excess of that permitted by Part 4, Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 at Land at Stonehenge Campsite/Summerfield House, Berwick St. James, Salisbury, SP3 4TQ, shown on the plan edged red attached to the enforcement notice, subject to conditions attached at Annex A to this decision.

**APP/Y3940/C/10/2142020 (Appeal B)**

70. I direct that the enforcement notice be corrected by the deletion of "to development took place " and the substitution therfor of the words "to the development taking place" in paragraph 5 requirement (b) and by the deletion of "profiles that" and the substitution therfor of the words "profiles to that" in paragraph 5 requirement (e).
71. Subject to the above corrections I allow the appeal, and direct that the enforcement notice be quashed. I grant planning permission, on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended, for the development already carried out, namely the carrying out of engineering and other operations on the land, including materially altering

the landform by excavating and re-profiling the ground to form levelled areas and formation of hardstandings; formation of earth bunds and associated fencing, installation of a cesspool/waste disposal point and enclosing fencing, installing electrical hook-ups and lighting; materially altering the position of and widening an access onto a classified road and resurfacing and improvements to an existing track; partial construction of a new track, formation of a pathway and erection of a toilet block and washing up building at Land at Stonehenge Campsite/Summerfield House, Berwick St. James, Salisbury, SP3 4TQ, shown on the plan edged red attached to the enforcement notice, subject to conditions attached at Annex B to this decision.

**APP/Y3940/A/10/2136994 (Appeal C)**

72. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for a change of use of land to touring caravan and camping site, including retention of access, driveway, hardstandings, shower/wc block, chemical toilet disposal area, cess pit and electric hook-up points at Stonehenge Campsite, Berwick Road, Berwick St. James, Salisbury, SP3 4TQ in accordance with the terms of the application (Ref S/2010/7/FULL, dated 24 December 2009) and the details submitted therewith and thereafter and subject to conditions set out at Annexe C to this decision.

*Kevin Nield*

INSPECTOR

## **ANNEXE A**

### **SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS FOR APPEAL A: APP/Y3940/C/10/2139334**

1. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved plans insofar as they fall within the area of land outlined in red on the enforcement notice (Landscape Plan 2010 and drawing WGDG 01).
2. The land notated as "Campsite/Red Land" on drawing WGDG 01 shall only be used to accommodate a maximum of 15 caravans on any day of the calendar year.
3. No amplified music shall be played or broadcast at any time on any day of the calendar year on the land notated "Campsite/Red Land" or land noted as Rally Fields/Blue Land or land notated as Parkland and Summerfield/Green Land on drawing WGDG 01.
4. No unamplified music shall be played after 2300 hours on any day of the calendar year on the land notated "Campsite/Red Land" or land notated as "Rally Fields/Blue Land" or land notated as "Parkland and Summerfield/Green Land" on drawing WGDG 01.
5. The use of the land for tented camping shall be strictly limited to that part of the site within the area notated as "Rally Fields/Blue Land" on drawing WGDG 01 and shall be used only in connection with the use of the area notated as "Rally Fields/Blue Land" as a whole. No caravans, motorhomes, campervans or other vehicle or structure adapted for human habitation which would fall within the definition of a caravan shall be stationed or parked on this land, which shall not be used for any camping other than for tented camping purposes between 19th March and the 30th September inclusive within any calendar year. That part of the application land within the area notated "Rally Fields/Blue Land" on drawing WGDG 01 shall be used only in connection with the use of the area notated as "Rally Fields/Blue Land" as a whole for a maximum of 20 tents on any day within the time period specified above, save for 10 days when a maximum of 100 tents and also a maximum of 40 tents on 14 additional days can be stationed within the period prescribed above. For the avoidance of any doubt, any day or part thereof when a tent or tents are stationed on the land or when activities incidental to camping are continuing (for example, the stationing of portaloos) is to be regarded as a day's use for the purposes of this condition.
6. Notwithstanding the provisions of any Class of the Schedule to Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), there shall be no stationing of any tents on any part of the land other than on the area referred to as Rally Fields/Blue Land on drawing WGDG 01 or within the approved caravan site, and there shall be no stationing of caravans outside of the approved caravan site.
7. A maximum of 10 fire pits shall be permitted within the land notated as "Rally Fields/Blue Land" on drawing WGDG 01 within the site and no other fires (excluding domestic barbecues and domestic garden/maintenance fires) shall be lit within any part of the site.

8. Within seven days of the date of implementation of the permission hereby granted the applicant/site manager shall keep an up-to-date written record of all persons visiting the site for the purposes of recreation and the number of caravans and tents there on any day. The written record shall be maintained daily thereafter and made available to the Local Planning Authority for inspection at reasonable notice.
9. There shall be no vehicular access and egress to and from the land used for tented camping from the southernmost vehicular access to the site (adjacent to Over the Hill).
10. Within one month of the date of implementation of the permission hereby granted, the details of any existing external lighting installed on the land and any additional external lighting proposed, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include the type of light appliance, the height and position of fitting, illumination levels and details of measures to reduce light pollution including any external cowls, louvres or other shields to be fitted to the lighting. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and maintained as such thereafter. Other than those agreed, there shall be no further lighting of the site, unless otherwise agreed through a new planning permission.
11. The use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, tents and other incidences of the use shall be removed within three months of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in (i) to (iv) below:
  - (i) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, a landscape management plan, including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas together with details of all existing planting and proposed planting to be undertaken including details of planting locations, size, densities and times of planting and arrangements for aftercare and maintenance, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the plan to include a timetable for its implementation;
  - (ii) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, if the Local Planning Authority refuses to approve the scheme submitted under (i) above or fails to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State;
  - (iii) An appeal is made in pursuance of (ii) above, and that appeal has been finally determined and the submitted scheme has been approved by the Secretary of State.
  - (iv) The approved landscape management plan has been implemented in full in accordance with the approved timetable.
12. Within 3 months of the date of this decision details of a scheme for an alarm system to be fitted to the cess pit to provide warning against overflowing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The system shall be installed within 3 months of the approval by the Local Planning Authority and shall thereafter be retained and maintained.
13. Within one month of the date of the permission hereby permitted visibility splays of 4.5m x 75m measured from the centre line of the access adjacent to the northern site boundary shall be provided across the site frontage. The

visibility splays shall be maintained permanently thereafter free from obstruction above a height of 300mm.

14. The fence along the side and top of the earth bunds fronting the Berwick Road (B3083) and within the site shall be removed within three months of the date of the permission hereby granted.

## **ANNEXE B**

### **SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS FOR APPEAL B: APP/Y3940/C/10/2142020**

1. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved plans insofar as they fall within the area of land outlined in red on the enforcement notice (Landscape Plan 2010 and drawing WGD P 01).
2. Within one month of the date of implementation of the permission hereby granted, the details of any existing external lighting installed on the land and any additional external lighting proposed, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include the type of light appliance, the height and position of fitting, illumination levels and details of measures to reduce light pollution including any external cowls, louvres or other shields to be fitted to the lighting. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and maintained as such thereafter. Other than those agreed, there shall be no further lighting of the site, unless otherwise agreed through a new planning permission.
3. The use hereby permitted shall cease and all tents and other incidences of the use shall be removed within three months of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in (i) to (iv) below:
  - (i) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, a landscape management plan, including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas together with details of all existing planting and proposed planting to be undertaken including details of planting locations, size, densities and times of planting and arrangements for aftercare and maintenance, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the plan to include a timetable for its implementation;
  - (ii) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, if the Local Planning Authority refuses to approve the scheme submitted under (i) above or fails to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State;
  - (iii) An appeal is made in pursuance of (ii) above, that appeal has been finally determined and the submitted scheme has been approved by the Secretary of State.
  - (iv) The approved landscape management plan has been implemented in full in accordance with the approved timetable.
4. Within 3 months of the date of this decision details of a scheme for an alarm system to be fitted to the cess pit to provide warning against overflowing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The system shall be installed within 3 months of the approval by the Local Planning Authority and shall thereafter be retained and maintained.
5. Within one month of the date of the permission hereby permitted visibility splays of 4.5m x 75m measured from the centre line of the access adjacent to the northern site boundary shall be provided across the site frontage. The visibility splays shall be maintained permanently thereafter free from obstruction above a height of 300mm.



6. The fence along the side and top of the earth bunds fronting Berwick Road (B3083) and within the site shall be removed within three months of the date of the permission hereby granted.

## **ANNEXE C**

### **SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS FOR APPEAL C: APP/Y3940/A/10/2136994**

1. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved plans (Site location Plan, Planning application plan: PV 316/WFG/TA, Landscape Plan 2010 and drawing WGDG 01).
2. The land notated as "Campsite/Red Land" on drawing WGDG 01 shall only be used to accommodate a maximum of 15 caravans on any day of the calendar year.
3. No amplified music to be played or broadcast at any time on any day of the calendar year on the land notated "Campsite/Red Land" or land notated as "Rally Fields/Blue Land" on drawing WGDG 01.
4. No unamplified music to be played after 2300 hours on any day of the calendar year on the land notated "Campsite/Red Land" or land notated as "Rally Fields/Blue Land" on drawing WGDG 01.
5. The use of the land for tented camping shall be strictly limited to that part of the site within the area notated as "Rally Fields/Blue Land" on drawing WGDG 01 and shall be used only in connection with the use of the area notated as "Rally Fields/Blue Land" as a whole. No caravans, motorhomes, campervans or other vehicle or structure adapted for human habitation which would fall within the definition of a caravan shall be stationed or parked on this land, which shall not be used for any camping other than for tented camping purposes between 19th March and the 30th September inclusive within any calendar year. That part of the application land within the area notated "Rally Fields/Blue Land" on drawing WGDG 01 shall be used only in connection with the use of the area notated as "Rally Fields/Blue Land" as a whole for a maximum of 20 tents on any day within the time period specified above, save for 10 days when a maximum of 100 tents and also a maximum of 40 tents on 14 additional days can be stationed within the period prescribed above. For the avoidance of any doubt, any day or part thereof when a tent or tents are stationed on the land or when activities incidental to camping are continuing (for example, the stationing of portaloos) is to be regarded as a day's use for the purposes of this condition.
6. Notwithstanding the provisions of any Class of the Schedule to Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), there shall be no stationing of any tents on any part of the land other than on the area referred to as Rally Fields/Blue Land on drawing WGDG 01 or within the approved caravan site, and there shall be no stationing of caravans outside of the approved caravan site.
7. A maximum of 10 fire pits shall be permitted within the land notated as "Rally Fields/Blue Land" on drawing WGDG 01 within the site and no other fires (excluding domestic barbecues and domestic garden/maintenance fires) shall be lit within any part of the site.
8. Within seven days of the date of implementation of the permission hereby

granted the applicant/site manager shall keep an up-to-date written record of all persons visiting the site for the purposes of recreation and the number of caravans and tents there on any day. The written record shall be maintained thereafter and made available to the local planning authority for inspection at reasonable notice.

9. There shall be no vehicular access and egress to and from the land used for tented camping from the southernmost vehicular access to the site (adjacent to Over the Hill).
10. Within one month of the date of implementation of the permission hereby granted, the details of any existing external lighting installed on the land and any additional external lighting proposed, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include the type of light appliance, the height and position of fitting, illumination levels and details of measures to reduce light pollution including any external cowls, louvres or other shields to be fitted to the lighting. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and maintained as such thereafter. Other than those agreed, there shall be no further lighting of the site, unless otherwise agreed through a new planning permission.
11. The use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, tents and other incidences of the use shall be removed within three months of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in (i) to (iv) below:
  - (i) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, a landscape management plan, including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas together with details of all existing planting and proposed planting to be undertaken including details of planting locations, size, densities and times of planting and arrangements for aftercare and maintenance, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the plan to include a timetable for its implementation;
  - (ii) Within 3 months of the date of this decision, if the Local Planning Authority refuses to approve the scheme submitted under (i) above or fails to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State;
  - (iii) An appeal is made in pursuance of (ii) above, and that appeal has been finally determined and the submitted scheme has been approved by the Secretary of State.
  - (iv) The approved landscape management plan has been implemented in full in accordance with the approved timetable.
12. Within 3 months of the date of this decision details of a scheme for an alarm system to be fitted to the cesspit to provide warning against overflowing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The system shall be installed within 3 months of the approval by the Local Planning Authority and shall thereafter be retained and maintained.
13. Within one month of the date of the permission hereby permitted visibility plays of 4.5m x 75m measured from the centre line of the access adjacent to the northern site boundary shall be provided across the site frontage. The visibility plays shall be maintained permanently thereafter free from obstruction above a height of 300mm.

14. The fence along the side and top of the earth bunds fronting Berwick Road (B3083) and within the site shall be removed within three months of the date of the permission hereby granted.

## **APPEARANCES**

### **FOR THE APPELLANTS:**

Richard Turney of Counsel	Instructed by Washbourne Greenwood Development Planning Limited (WGDP)
He called	
Anthony Allen, MRTPI	WGDP, Appellants' Agent
Mark Gibbins, BA(Hons) CMLI	Director, Indigo Landscape Architects Limited

### **FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:**

Richard Banwell of Counsel	Instructed by Head of Legal and Democratic Services, Wiltshire Council
He called	
Stephen Hawkins MA MRTPI	Planning Enforcement Team Leader, Wiltshire Council
Maxine Russell, BA DipLA CMLI	Landscape Officer, Wiltshire Council
Charlie Bruce-White, MRTPI	Planning Officer, Wiltshire Council

### **INTERESTED PERSONS:**

Richard Brasher	Berwick St James Parish Council
Stephen Bush	Local Resident
Mark Hopkins	Local Resident
Mike Hearn	Local Resident
Martin Gairdner	Local Resident
Councillor Westmoreland	Ward Councillor, Wiltshire Council
Grace Douse	Local Resident

## DOCUMENTS

- 1 The Council's Inquiry Notification letters dated 1 March 2011 and list of consultees together with copies of earlier correspondence to consultees in respect of procedural arrangements for the appeals
- 2 Statement of Common Ground signed by the principal parties
- 3 Drawing 211.01 dated April 2006 from Indigo Landscape Architects Ltd for the appellants showing landscape proposals at Wisma Farm (now called Summerfield House)
- 4 Written submission from Stephen Bush (Lieutenant Colonel SJD Bush)
- 5 Copy of internet web pages for Stonehenge Campsite
- 6 Written submission from Councillor Fred Westmoreland
- 7 Written submission from Martin Gairdner
- 8 Written submission from Mark Hopkins
- 9 Written submission from Mike Hearn
- 10 Written submission from M Sayer
- 11 Written submission from Councillor Ian West
- 12 Written submission from Caroline Mills, Freelance Writer and Author
- 13 Copy of e-mail correspondence dated 13 May 2011 from Caroline Walford, Customer Support Manager, AA Hotel Services to Stephen Hawkins, Wiltshire Council
- 14 Copy of e-mail correspondence dated 13 May 2011 from John Harding, Development Control Engineer, Sustainable Transport, Wiltshire Council to Stephen Hawkins, Wiltshire Council
- 15 Draft planning condition in respect of highway visibility submitted jointly by the appellants and the Council
- 16 Photograph of planting strip along northern boundary of the site
- 17 Plan (Ref:MG/RT) submitted by the appellants showing measured distances between the track and the northern site boundary
- 18 Photographs of a comparison of the appellants' and the Council's impression of the site
- 19 Photographs showing hedgerow images