

## **SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration**

**Application No :** 17/00655/RECON

**Ward:**  
**Darwin**

**Address :** Archies Stables, Cudham Lane, North  
Cudham, Sevenoaks TN14 7QT

**Objections: Yes**

**OS Grid Ref: E: 544582 N: 160998**

**Applicant :** Miss Charmaine Moore

### **Description of Development:**

Removal of the following conditions of application reference 17/00655/FULL1 (allowed at appeal):

(No 3) The occupation of the site hereby permitted shall be carried on only by the following and her resident dependants: Ms Charmaine Moore.

(No 4) When the land ceases to be occupied by those named in condition 3 above the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, materials and equipment brought on to or erected on the land, and/or works undertaken to it in connection with the use, shall be removed and the land shall be restored to its condition before the development took place.

(No 5) There shall be no more than 1 pitch on the site and on the pitch hereby approved no more than 2 caravans, shall be stationed at any time, of which only 1 caravan shall be a static caravan

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
Green Belt  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
London City Airport Safeguarding

### **Proposal**

This "Section 73" application seeks to vary conditions imposed under application reference 17/00655/FULL1, which was allowed at appeal in April 2018. This application is considered in tandem with application reference 19/04469/FULL which relates to proposed use of land / operational development within the site.

The basis of the application was initially outlined by the applicant in an Access Statement dated 21 October 2019. In summary, this set out the following:

- Archies Stables is now a registered gypsy site and there is now a need for more touring caravans to accommodate the applicant's two daughters

- The site was removed from the Green Belt in order to accommodate future development need
- The applicant, her son, her daughter and her new husband are currently living in a mobile home which has to be removed
- The applicant's other daughter is living in the other small touring caravan with her new husband
- The existing caravan will remain for the applicant's son

The applicant seeks to justify the removal of conditions 3, 4 and 5 on the following grounds:

- Condition 3 – condition contradicts the new site designation. It should relate to gypsies and travellers in general
- Condition 4 – Condition does not represent a permanent means of resolving gypsy traveller need. Condition is unnecessary and unreasonable
- Condition 5 – This condition prevents future development and is unreasonable and unnecessary

### **Location and Key Constraints**

The front part of the application site is designated as a *Traveller Site Only, Inset Within the Green Belt*. The rear part of the site falls within the Green Belt.

Cumulatively, the site measures approximately 0.25 hectares in area, with a 25.8 metre wide frontage to Cudham Lane North. A Girl Guide camp site adjoins southern site boundary whilst the area to the north is occupied by protected woodland. The surrounding area is generally open and rural in character with little built development within close proximity to the appeal site.

### **Comments from Local Residents and Groups**

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received, which can be summarised as follows:

- There would not be enough space for 2 more caravans on this small site
- There has been a long series of applications on this site
- The site has undergone changes of use from stabling to equestrian use to accommodating a mobile home and touring caravan with some hardstanding
- Relocation of stables to the back of the land would contradict the rationale for approval of the existing stables at the front of the site (convenience and visual amenity)
- Application forms part of a drip-drip plan which gradually allows the applicant to build a case for a much larger permanent home in the future
- Initial application for temporary residence has been abused over the years
- Site has suffered from illegal development creep
- Much larger traveller site than the one pitch originally agreed
- Site will increase from a single family site to a 3 or 4 family site

- Recently installed larger twin unit mobile home would be deemed more than sufficient for any other member of the community with similar care needs
- Proposal could lead to a condition precedent
- Adverse environmental impact caused by the proposal
- Until recently, wooden wall section was well looked after and in good condition but it has suddenly been damaged
- The idea of a brick wall would not be in keeping with the road and surrounding area.
- Buses would be damaged by a stone wall
- What classes a person as a gypsy?
- Balance of fairness in favour of Gypsy or Traveller applications
- Owners should be subject to same planning constrictions as everyone else
- Applicant originally stated she couldn't live in a house and yet part of this application is applying for permanent structures resembling houses
- Bromley already provides adequate provision for travelling families
- No valid reasons to lift conditions 3, 4 and 5
- Removal of conditions makes a mockery of the whole process
- Road is already overcrowded and constantly under repair
- Increasing use will make the area untenable
- Access to the site for a vehicle towing a caravan will block the road
- Previous application planned for enough space between the gate and Cudham Lane North to allow for a vehicle to pull off the road without blocking Cudham Lane, but the gates have not been located as per the approved application
- Harm to character and visual amenities
- This is an area of natural beauty
- There are plenty of residential caravan sites in the area to accommodate applicant
- Size of proposed day rooms appears to be larger than proposed mobile homes
- Mobile homes would have a kitchen and bathroom area within them, therefore, the need for utility rooms is not justified
- Removal of conditions will allow unlimited number of caravans on the site
- Proposal would result in a carte blanche for a full blow caravan site
- Site has a history of flouting planning rules
- Everyone has family members who need housing, if this proposal is allowed then the Council should be prepared for similar applications from residents who want to build new homes for their families in back gardens and farmland
- Why should a minority be given rights/privilege to live on Green Belt land forever when others that have got land are not allowed to do so?
- When was this approved as a gypsy site?

- Application is a forerunner to the enlargement of the site for more families to move to
- Contrary to Green Belt policy
- Inappropriate development
- No special circumstances to justify proposal
- Should stop making exceptions to planning rules
- Proposal will seriously damage openness and character of Green Belt countryside
- Extension of an inappropriate development in the Green Belt
- Other far more reasonable applications in Cudham Lane have been refused planning permission, whereas this property has pretty much been given carte blanche
- Concerns regarding the planning application consultation process

### **Comments from Consultees**

The following technical Highways objections have been raised:

*The use of the site for a residential unit has been established. The removal of condition 5 would allow a number of caravans onto the site with the associated traffic movements. The site is within the 40 mph section of Cudham Lane North and the sightlines from the access are sub-standard. It is not suitable for intensification of use. With no limit on the number of caravans on the site and with no indication of the current / future number of trips to / from the site using a sub-standard access, I would recommend refusing the application as being contrary to Policy 32, road safety, of the Local Plan*

### **Policy Context**

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:-

- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
- (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
- (c) any other material considerations.

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that any determination under the planning acts must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The development plan for Bromley comprises the London Plan (March 2016) and the Local Plan (2019). The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

The 'Intend to Publish' version of draft London Plan (December 2019) is a material consideration in the determination of this planning application.

The draft new London Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State (SoS) on 9 December 2019, following the Examination in Public which took place in 2019. This is the version of the London Plan which the Mayor intends to publish, having considered the report and recommendations of the panel of Inspectors. Where recommendations have not been accepted, the Mayor has set out a statement of reasons to explain why this is.

The London Assembly considered the draft new London Plan at a plenary meeting on 6 February 2020 and did not exercise their power to veto the plan.

Ahead of publication of the final plan, the SoS can direct the Mayor to make changes to the plan. This affects the weight given to the draft plan. At this stage, the Council's up-to-date Local Plan is generally considered to have primacy over the draft London Plan in planning determinations.

#### London Plan (2016)

Policy 3.8 Housing Choice  
Policy 6.13 Parking  
Policy 7.4 Local Character  
Policy 7.16 The Green Belt

#### Local Plan

Policy 12 Travellers' Accommodation  
Policy 30 Parking  
Policy 32 Road Safety  
Policy 37 General Design of Development  
Policy 49 The Green Belt  
Policy 53 Land Adjoining Green Belt or Metropolitan Open Land

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites published in August 2015 (first issued in March 2012) is also a relevant policy consideration in this application. This is to be read in conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

#### **Planning history**

There is a detailed planning history associated with the site since 2008 which is summarised below:

- In May 2008 planning permission was granted (under application ref: 08/00559) for a change of use of the site from agricultural land to the keeping of a horse and for the retention of a newly created access and hardstanding. The applicant indicated, in a supporting statement, that the site would be used by her daughter to practice riding her horse.

- Under a subsequent application approved in November 2008 (ref: 08/03254), planning permission was granted for a stable and a store room and hardstanding area for horsebox and trailer parking. This application was submitted in relation to the equestrian use of the site which had been granted 6 months prior. Planning permission was also granted for a detached WC building in December 2009 (under ref. 09/02833) to be used by the applicant and her children when visiting the site.
- In April 2009 the applicant appealed against the refusal to remove Condition 12 of application ref: 08/03254 which restricted uses within the site, including the stationing or storage of a caravan or caravans (including for the setting up or preparation for such uses or activities) at any time. The Planning Inspector considered the condition to be justified and dismissed the appeal in August 2009. The Inspector commented *“I consider that the use of the Land as it has been permitted by the Council represents its maximum capacity as an acceptable enterprise within the green belt.....To add to its intensification of its use for up to 28 days a year would be materially harmful to the openness of the area, and its character and appearance, in breach of the relevant policies of the UDP”*.
- In April 2010 the Council refused a further application which sought to vary the above planning condition in order to permit the stationing of a caravan on the site (ref: 10/00192). The applicant explained that she sought to vary the condition should she wish to place a caravan on the site at a later date. A further application for an additional storage building was refused by the Council in June 2010 (ref: 10/00834) on the basis that this was not considered necessary to facilitate equestrian activities on the site and that this would result in a disproportionate level of site coverage by buildings, thereby representing an undesirable intensification of development in the Green Belt.
- On 9 July 2010 two caravans were moved on to the site, comprising a mobile home which was occupied as a dwelling by the applicant and her family and a smaller touring caravan which was understood to be used for travelling. An application (ref: 10/02059) was registered on 26 July 2010, in which retrospective planning permission was sought for the change of use of the equestrian site to a gypsy and traveller caravan site. The application included one mobile home measuring 3.6m x 9.7m and a touring caravan measuring 1.8m x 5.4m which were shown to be located adjacent to the southern site boundary, together with an enlarged tarmac hardstanding area located mainly within the eastern side of the site. The Council refused permission by Notice dated 14 September 2010 for the following reasons:

*“1. The proposal constitutes an undesirable form of urbanised development located in the Green Belt wherein there is a general*

*presumption against inappropriate development, and no very special circumstances have been demonstrated to justify making an exception to Policy G1 and H6 of the Unitary Development Plan and Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 'Green Belts'.*

*“2. The continued residential occupation of this site and the stationing of caravans will cause unacceptable visual harm to the character and appearance of the area and undermine the openness and character of the Green Belt, therefore contrary to Policies G1 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and PPG2.*

*“3. The additional hardstanding, boundary fencing and entrance gate detract from the visual amenities and openness of this rural and open area, by reason of their prominent siting, unsympathetic materials excessive height and unsympathetic design, contrary to Policies BE1 and G1 of the Unitary Development Plan.*

*“4. In the absence of information to the contrary, the means of vehicular access is unsuitable for larger vehicles/trailers manoeuvring on to the site and is prejudicial to the free flow of traffic and general conditions of safety within the highway, contrary to Policy T18 of the Unitary Development Plan.”*

- A subsequent appeal concerning the change of use of the equestrian site to a gypsy and traveller caravan site was dismissed in June 2011; however, this Appeal Decision was subsequently overturned by the High Court, a decision upheld by the Court of Appeal. The High Court judgement dated 16 November 2012 quashed the Inspector’s decision but only relating to temporary permission. The Council issued two enforcement notices in July 2013 to put an end to the use of the land as a gypsy and traveller site and to remove various associated operational development.
- A re-determined appeal concerning the change of use of the equestrian site to a gypsy and traveller caravan site as well as the 2013 enforcement notices was issued in July 2015. The appeals were allowed and planning permission was granted for the change of use of the land from the keeping of horses to a mixed use for the keeping of horses and for use as a single pitch Gypsy and Traveller site accommodating one residential mobile home and one touring caravan used for ancillary residential purposes, together with additional hardstanding area, concrete post and timber panelled fence (max height 1.98m), steel gates (max height 1.98m) and detached shed subject to conditions. Key considerations made by the Inspector in determining these appeals are set out below:

*“The Traveller policy makes it clear that gypsy sites are inappropriate development in the GB and the Framework provides that substantial weight will be attached to such harm. This is common ground between the parties.”*  
(Paragraph 38)

*“The fact that all existing sites in the borough are presently in the GB, as is all of the non-urban area, does not diminish the weight to be accorded to the harm resulting from inappropriate development caused by the appeal development. This is substantial and, therefore, contrary to UDP Policy G1 and paragraph 88 of the Framework.” (Paragraph 39)*

*“However, I accept that if the appellant were to vacate the site and set up a roadside encampment, this would also be likely to be in the GB. Not only would this also be inappropriate, but roadside encampments can aggravate tensions between travellers and the settled community and cause as much, if not greater, environmental harm than unauthorised development. This is a material consideration which I afford some weight to.” (Paragraph 40)*

*“The permitted structures on the land, including the stable building, toilet building and some of the fencing, already result in some loss of openness with the appeal development, as a whole, resulting in a further loss of openness. Even if this is more limited today than when the previous appeal was determined, any harm to the GB, no matter how limited, has to be afforded substantial weight, as required by paragraph 88 of the Framework. The loss of openness may be relatively limited but it is not minimal; two caravans have been sited on the land, a shed constructed on it, a high, solid timber fence erected along its southern boundary and additional areas of hardstanding have been laid within the site.” (Paragraph 42)*

*“The appeal development is visible against a wooded backdrop when viewed from the south. Its visual impact would have been greater were it not for the landscaping carried out which predominantly screens the development. However, this landscaping itself has resulted in some visual harm. The solid timber fence and fast growing laurel hedge now visible above it are features more appropriate to a suburban setting not the appeal site’s rural setting.” (Paragraph 43)*

*“Overall, the appeal development has resulted in some harm to the character and appearance of the countryside, contrary to UDP Policy BE1. However, I am satisfied that the harm identified could be mitigated over time and by more sensitive landscaping than that carried out. The native trees planted between the timber fence and the permitted fence along the site’s southern boundary will mature to provide an effective and more natural form of landscaping than the laurel hedge planted behind it and the appellant has also offered to remove the fence. These matters could form part of a landscaping scheme which could be a condition of any planning permission granted.” (Paragraph 45)*

*“Having regard to the provisions of the Traveller policy, the fact that any new sites would also be in the GB and that there would be no need to remove any frontage planting as a consequence of implementing proposed improvements to the current access arrangements (which I turn to next), I consider that the visual harm caused by the appeal development is limited. I am also satisfied that this limited visual harm could be reduced and the appeal development made acceptable such that the requirements of UDP Policy BE1 could be met.” (Paragraph 46)*

*“Given the circumstances, there can be no guarantee that the Council’s proposed strategy would deliver the additional pitches required to meet the*

*significant level of current and future need identified, beyond allowing the size of families occupying existing sites to expand. Whilst this would meet some of the identified future need it would not meet the wider general need for pitches in the borough.” (Paragraph 58)*

*“National policy advice and guidance is quite clear: Inappropriate development in the GB should not be approved except in very special circumstances. It is, by definition, harmful and the harm caused by it should be afforded substantial weight. Likewise, the harm caused by the loss of openness, even though the loss may be limited by virtue of the small scale of the development carried out and the fact that the appeal site is previously developed land. Consequently, the appeal development conflicts with UDP Policy G1 and relevant provisions of the Framework and the Traveller policy.” (Paragraph 74)*

*“I have found that alternative forms of landscaping would reduce the harm caused to the character and appearance of the area, and this could be secured by condition. The Council now accepts that its concerns about highway safety could be similarly addressed. Consequently, I conclude that, other than the harm to the GB, the appeal development causes little harm, subject to appropriate conditions and that there would be no material conflict with UDP Policies BE1 and T18. If these matters do not necessarily weigh, or weigh very much, in the appeals’ favour they do not weigh against it.” (Paragraph 75)*

*“Personal circumstances are also material. The appellant’s aversion to bricks and mortar means that temporary housing or hostel accommodation would not be suitable alternative accommodation, even in the short term, and there is a very real likelihood that a refusal of planning permission would result in her resorting to a roadside existence. This would be harmful to the family’s quality of life and would adversely impact on their health and education. It would also result in the loss of the family’s home, in serious interference with their Article 8 rights [of the Human Rights Act 1998] and would clearly not be in the best interests of the children. As most of the borough is either urban or GB a roadside existence would also be likely to be just as harmful to the GB and, potentially, more harmful to the countryside than the appeal development.” (Paragraph 78)*

*“In these circumstances, I conclude that the harm by reason of inappropriateness and the limited loss of openness that has occurred is clearly outweighed by other considerations such that very special circumstances exist to justify the grant of a permanent planning permission for the appeal development, personal to the appellant and her resident dependents, subject to other conditions discussed below. Consequently, there is no need for me to consider the appeals under ground (g)” (Paragraph 81)*

*“I have considered the Council’s list of suggested conditions in the light of the discussion which took place during the inquiry. There is a need for a condition restricting occupation of the land to gypsies and travellers, in the interests of protecting the GB. A further occupancy condition is necessary to make any permission personal to the appellant and her resident dependents, in the interests of protecting the GB and because the appellant’s personal circumstances are a significant factor in my decision to grant planning permission.” (Paragraph 82)*

*“There is a need for conditions restricting the number and types of caravans on the land, preventing any commercial activities taking place on the land, restricting the weight of vehicles kept on the land and requiring details of any external lighting to be approved in advance, all in the interests of appearance. There is also need for a condition requiring the permitted use to cease unless details of the layout of the site and alternative landscaping, including boundary treatment, are approved and implemented within a given period, again, in the interests of appearance.” (Paragraph 83)*

- Under application reference 17/00655/FULL1, planning permission was granted at appeal in April 2018 for the following: *Use of land for private Gypsy and Traveller caravan site comprising 1 pitch accommodating one mobile home and one touring caravan. (Revision to planning application ref. 10/02059/FULL2 allowed at appeal comprising removal of existing mobile home and its replacement with twin mobile home unit in a re-sited position within the site with associated slab and access ramps, without compliance with Condition 5).* In allowing the appeal, the Inspector concluded that the harm that would arise to the openness of the Green Belt would be outweighed by other matters, including that applicant’s medical condition and needs, such that very special circumstances exist to allow the appeal.

## **Considerations**

As Members will note, the site is the subject of a detailed planning history dating back to 2008. In the intervening years the site has gained lawful use as a gypsy and traveller caravan site comprising 1 pitch accommodating one mobile home and one touring caravan, following the grant of planning permission at appeal in 2015. More recently, following the adoption of the Council’s current Local Plan in January 2019, the status of the front part of the site has changed to a *Traveller Site Only, Inset Within the Green Belt*. The rear part of the site falls within the Green Belt. The change of designation has been aimed at addressing the accommodation needs of travellers in the borough. Accordingly, this new designation forms an important material consideration.

The key considerations in this case are: (1) whether the site should remain subject to a personal planning permission for the applicant and her resident dependents; (2) whether, when the land ceases to be occupied by the applicant and her resident dependents, the land shall be restored to its condition before the development took place; (3) whether there should be a restriction in relation to the number of pitches and caravans stationed on the site. Further considerations relate to the effect of the proposal on neighbouring amenity and local highways conditions.

### Whether the site should remain subject to a personal planning permission for the applicant and her resident dependents

Whilst the site is presently occupied by the applicant and her family, it does form part of a tranche of traveller sites across the borough whose status has been

changed to: *Traveller Site Only, Inset Within the Green Belt*, in order to address the accommodation needs of travellers in the borough. Given this change in status, it is no longer considered appropriate to impose a personal condition. Notwithstanding this change, the site would remain subject to a condition (No 1 of application reference 17/00655/FULL1 – as allowed at appeal) which requires that the site shall not be occupied by any persons other than gypsies and travellers as defined in Annex 1: Glossary of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (or its equivalent in replacement national policy).

Whether, when the land ceases to be occupied by the applicant and her resident dependents, the land shall be restored to its condition before the development took place

As stated at paragraph 2.2.5 of the Bromley Local Plan, the PPTS highlights the Government aim to promote more private traveller site provision and advises that, whilst reiterating that the Green Belt should be protected from inappropriate development, the PPTS does allow, in exceptional circumstances, for the limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary to accommodate a site inset within the Green Belt to meet a specific, identified need as “a traveller site only”. The PPTS advises that this can only be undertaken through the plan-making process. Policy 12 of the Local Plan also states that, given the allocation of the sites as insets within the Green Belt for Traveller Sites only, only appropriate uses in the Green Belt will be permitted should the site no longer be needed for traveller purposes.

Given the conclusions raised in relation to Condition 3 (personal condition), whilst it would no longer be applicable to link this condition to a named person, it is considered that the terms of the condition can be amended to apply to gypsies and travellers in general, so that the site would have to be restored to its original condition if such persons no longer reside on the land.

Whilst the site remains occupied by gypsies and travellers, it would continue to serve a very specific purpose. Should they vacate the site at a future date and the site no longer serves an identified traveller need, it is considered that the site should return to its original state.

Whether there should be a restriction in relation to the number of pitches and caravans stationed on the site

In light of the site’s new designation, there is no objection in Green Belt terms to the site being occupied on a more intensified basis by the applicant and her family as is proposed. However, given the objections which have been raised by the Council’s Highways Engineers, as well as the need to take account of any increase on neighbouring amenity and local character, it is considered that the Council should retain control over the number of pitches and caravans within the site. Moreover, as the accompanying application (19/04469/FULL1) demonstrates, the presence of the existing condition does not preclude the applicant from applying for further caravans or pitches within the site.

Specifically in relation to highways matters, the existing site access is substandard and fails to achieve the necessary sightlines. Although the access gate is set back to enable vehicles to wait off the road whilst the gates are opened or closed, this does not address the sight line issue. This is accepted as an existing situation, but the intensification of use is of significant concern in the absence of suitable sightlines. Without a restriction controlling the number of pitches and caravans within the site – and therefore the intensity of the use of the site – situations could arise where the safety of vehicles along Cudham Lane North is compromised. The site is within the 40 mph section of Cudham Lane North and with no indication of the current / future number of trips to / from the site using a sub-standard access the proposal is considered unacceptable.

## **Conclusion**

Having had regard to the above, it is accepted that the site should no longer be subject to a personal condition, on the basis that it constitutes a *Traveller Site* as defined in planning policy terms. However, it is considered that the retention of a condition limiting the site to occupation by travellers and gypsies is necessary and relevant. Moreover, it is considered necessary to ensure that, should the site no longer be occupied by gypsies and travellers, that it should revert to its previous condition, since the very basis for its exclusion from then Green Belt would have been removed. Finally, the absence of controls over the number of pitches and caravans within the site could deprive the Council to assess the impact over any increase in the intensity of use in relation to highways safety, residential amenity and local character. In conclusion, it is considered that the present planning conditions should be amended in line with the above considerations.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the files set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

## **RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION**

### **Subject to the following conditions:**

- 1 The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than gypsies and travellers as defined in Annex 1: Glossary of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (or its equivalent in replacement national policy).**

**Reason: In order to comply with Policy 12 of the Local Plan and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.**

- 2 When the land ceases to be occupied by those named in Condition 1 above the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, materials and equipment brought on to or erected on the land, and/or works undertaken to it in connection with the use, shall be removed and the land shall be restored to its condition before the development took place.**

**Reason:** In order to comply with policies 12 and 49 of the Local Plan, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, and in the interests of the amenity of the area and the openness of the Green Belt.

- 3** There shall be no more than 1 pitch on the site and on the pitch hereby approved no more than 2 caravans, shall be stationed at any time, of which only 1 caravan shall be a static caravan.

**Reason:** In order to comply with the requirements of policies 12, 32, 37 and 49 of the Local Plan, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, and in the interests of the amenity of the area, local highways conditions and the openness of the Green Belt.

- 4** No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials and no vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on this site.

**Reason:** In order to comply with the requirements of policies 12, 32, 37 and 49 of the Local Plan, and in the interests of the amenity of the area and the openness of the Green Belt.

- 5** Details of any external lighting to be installed shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained in that form.

**Reason:** In order to comply with the requirements of policies 12, 37 and 49 of the Local Plan, and in the interests of the amenity of the area and the openness of the Green Belt.

- 6** If any tree is cut down, uprooted or destroyed in order to implement this permission trees of a size and species to be agreed by the local planning authority in writing, shall be planted as replacements and shall be of such size and species as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority. Any trees which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species to those originally planted.

**REASON:** In order to comply with Policy 73 of the Local Plan and to secure a visually satisfactory setting for the development.

- 7** The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans (whilst acknowledging that some minor variation in the siting of the mobile home will be required to accommodate the rear ramp): CUDHA 400 D; R.105; O.S. based site plan; 170602/01 floor plan; 170602/01 elevations.

**REASON:** In order to comply with the requirements of policies 12 and 37 of the Local Plan, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, and in the interests of the amenities of the area.

- 8** Before the replacement mobile home hereby permitted is first occupied, the existing mobile home and adjacent wooden shed, as denoted on Drawing No R.105 shall be removed in their entirety from the site.

**Reason: In order to comply with the requirements of policies 12, 32 and 37 of the Local Plan, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, and in the interests of the amenity of the area and local highways conditions.**