

Minutes of a Meeting held in the Conference Room, Riverside, Lowestoft  
on **Tuesday, 11 December 2018** at **6.00pm**

**2(b)**

Members Present:

P Ashdown (Chairman), N Brooks, J Ceresa, G Elliott, J Ford, T Goldson, M Pitchers, C Rivett and K Robinson.

Officers Present:

L Beighton (Planning Development Manager), C Green (Senior Planning and Enforcement Officer), I Robertson (Area Planning and Enforcement Officer), M Van de Pieterman (Area Planning and Enforcement Officer) and S Carter (Democratic Services Officer).

In attendance:

Councillor M Rudd  
T Warnes (Planning Services Support Officer)

---

**1 APOLOGIES / SUBSTITUTES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Groom and Ladd.

Councillor Robinson attended the meeting as a Substitute for Councillor Ladd.

**2 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED**

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

In response to a Member's question, the Chairman confirmed that the minutes of the November meeting would be included with the Agenda for the Planning Committee meeting being held in January 2019.

**3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Goldson declared a Local Non Pecuniary Interest in Item 10 – DC/18/3395/FUL – 8 The Street, Wissett, Halesworth, as being County Councillor for the area.

**4 DECLARATIONS OF LOBBYING**

Councillor Ashdown declared that he had received communications in relation to Item 8 – DC/18/0813/COU – Broadland Sands Holiday Park, Coast Road, Corton and Item 9 – DC/18/4224/FUL – Ingate House, London Road, Beccles.

Councillor Brooks declared that he had received communications in relation to Item 9 – DC/18/4224/FUL – Ingate House, London Road, Beccles.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE – 11/12/2018**

Councillor Elliott declared that he had received communications in relation to Item 9 – DC/18/4224/FUL – Ingate House, London Road, Beccles.

### **5 APPEAL DECISIONS REPORT**

The report of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management advised the Committee that one appeal had been determined in October 2018 and that had been dismissed.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the report concerning Appeal Decisions in October 2018 be noted.

### **6 DELEGATED CHIEF OFFICER DECISIONS**

The report of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management informed Members of all the Chief Officer delegated planning decisions made during October 2018.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the report concerning the Chief Officer Delegated Planning Decisions made during October 2018 be noted.

### **7 ENFORCEMENT ACTION – CASE UPDATE**

The report of the Planning Development Manager provided Members with a summary of all outstanding enforcement cases sanctioned under delegated powers or through the Committee up until 23 November 2018. There were currently six cases.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the report detailing the outstanding Enforcement Matters up to 23 November 2018 be received.

### **8 DC/18/0813/COU – BROADLAND SANDS HOLIDAY PARK, COAST ROAD, CORTON**

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer presented the application which was for a change of use of agricultural land for the stationing of static holiday caravans and lodges, construction of footway/cycleway, church parking area and associated works. The proposal was for an extension to the existing facility of Broadlands Sands in Corton and was considered necessary to futureproof the business due to coastal erosion and roll-back.

The application was before Committee due to the scale of the development, and for economic, tourism, business and conservation issues regarding the proximity of the Grade II\* Listed church and the wider setting. Broadland Sands was a well-established holiday centre located to the eastern side of Coast Road, accessed via the A47 and the proposed expansion of the holiday park had been made possible by the purchase of the immediately adjacent farmland. The existing site had had planning permission in 2014 for a previous extension which was currently under construction and proving to be popular with owners and visitors alike.

Members were shown an aerial view, photographs and location plans of the site and its surrounds including views along Stirrups Lane, the boundary of the large western site (currently used for motor cross), the open space looking towards the church and views along Coast Road. A master plan was displayed which showed all sites and access arrangements and gave an indication of the 15 year planting proposal.

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer explained the key issues including the principle of the development, the setting of the Listed building, coastal erosion, ecology and various matters relating to the economy, employment and tourism. Highways had been consulted and they were satisfied with the proposals.

Whilst the application was finely balanced given the potential impact of the development relating to the issues within the wider setting of the Listed building, the proposal had to be considered against the potential investment in coastal improvements, coastal roll-back and the benefits that the park extension would bring to tourism, employment and the local economy. It was the officers' opinion that the proposal broadly complied with local planning policy and the proposed extension was acceptable. The benefits would outweigh the potential harm to the setting of the listed building, particularly given the level of landscaping and the creation of additional parking for the church for which there was currently under provision.

Mr P Armstrong – Corton Parish Council

Mr Armstrong advised that the Parish Council's main concern was the traffic and access to the site; all the roads were narrow, winding and unsuitable for extra traffic. The survey conducted had been undertaken in January and was not a reflection of daily or summer traffic when visitors to the area increased traffic on the roads. There were no local sources where provisions could be purchased and the nearest supermarket was Tesco's. Corton Long Lane was the main route leading to the site and the average daily use was 3,466 vehicles in October and that was in one direction only. The proposal would create an additional traffic overload on an already busy road. The proposed new entry points to the sites were opposite each other and the proposed parking area for the church was on a sharp bend which would cause issues for the congregation and visitors alike. Coast Road had no street lights, there was a 60mph limit which was not adhered to, and the site was in a water stressed area which was already subject to low water pressure. The whole proposal would have a detrimental effect and damage the local habitat. In addition, there was no provision for such a development in the Local Plan.

Mr I Constable – Hopton Parish Council

Mr Constable thanked Members for being given the opportunity to address the Committee and he explained the objections relating to traffic and ecology. Suffolk County Highways originally objected to the proposal but the new route for traffic through Hopton was more unsafe than via Stirrups Lane. It was the main route to Potters which had some 700 traffic movements per day in the height of the season. Mr Constable explained that Hopton on Sea, with its holiday village similar to Corton, had a population that doubled or trebled in the summer season. He commented on the speed awareness analysis and that Hopton was the main route for residents. Traffic could be directed from the A47 along another route so that the traffic infrastructure would not be over-burdened. The traffic survey in January 2017 did not give accurate usage and would not take into account the peak season traffic during

Easter and the summer holidays. At peak times there was a traffic moment every 40 seconds. With proposed developments in the adjoining district, were the views of Norfolk County Highways actually sought?

Mr J Nichols – Objector

Mr Nichols' objections included the fact that the development would be taking place on prime grade one agricultural land which should enjoy protection from development. It was a greenfield site that should remain as such and it was not cited in the Local Plan for development. It might be acceptable for additional caravans on the existing site but encroachment on the land to the west was unacceptable with the already adequate holiday accommodation in the area. Additional 400 units would have a serious local impact on the residents and the surrounding roads were already inadequate. Stirrups Lane was a narrow, single track with a few passing places and its junction with the A47 was dangerous. There would likely be fatal accidents. The proposal failed at every hurdle and the site should be protected from development. The Planning Committee should not approve an application which was outside the Council's guidelines.

Councillor M Rudd – Ward Member

Councillor Rudd thanked Members for being given the opportunity to speak. The villagers in Corton were concerned about road safety, additional traffic and unlit roads with no footpath. She questioned how any new caravans would be delivered to the site with Stirrups Lane not being appropriate and if the A47 was used the turning at the top of the lane was unsuitable; it would be impossible for HGVs to get to the site. When was the traffic survey undertaken? Whilst appreciating the conditions in the recommendation, Councillor Rudd commented that there was no new clubhouse on the western site and there was a further issue with buses. It was surprising that the County Highways were happy with the proposal.

Mr I Butter - Agent

Mr Butter explained that Broadlands was a local important business in the area and the proposals in the application would ensure the preservation of the site. The scheme proposed a number of things including new improved holiday accommodation and it would relieve pressure on the existing park as a result of coastal erosion. There would be benefits for the local community including safe walkways/cycle path, footpath links and improvements to the roads. In addition, there would be a new car park for the church and the scheme would be fully landscaped so as not to affect the views. The application site was the only option available for improving Broadlands and it would meet local needs. Mr Butter asked that Members support the application.

Questions for Agent

Members asked specific questions relating to:

- Reducing the use of Stirrups Lane.
- Pedestrian crossing on Coast Road.
- Expansion on the east side affected by coastal erosion.

- Timing of traffic surveys.
- Road widening in Longfullans Lane and Stirrups Lane.
- Pressure on roads.
- The use of agricultural land.
- The disused railway line.
- Issues associated with the 200+ houses proposed on Longfullans Lane.

Mr Butter advised that there was no control over how people arrived and left the site, there had been discussions on reducing the speed limits on some roads, the need for footway/cycleway had been identified and the type of pedestrian crossing at the entrance to the site had yet to be determined. There was a need to relocate some caravans away from the coast as it receded and this was the first phase of a long term plan. Figures on erosion were not to hand but Mr Butter could confirm that two years ago, 20m had been lost. The result of the traffic survey had been discussed with County Highways and it was recognised that there would be peak periods in the summer. Road widening could be undertaken by using the verge to provide a purposeful two way route. A full signage strategy was being proposed and, at the present time, there had been no proposal to close the central reservation near Stirrups Lane for safety reasons; however, that could be considered.

Mr Butter explained that the northern end of the western site was not grade I agricultural land and currently such land was not necessarily protected. The old railway line was outside the development site. Both Suffolk and Norfolk County Highways had been consulted and the proposal was not an issue with Norfolk County Council.

#### Questions to Officers

In response to questions, the Planning Development Manager confirmed that Norfolk County Council was consulted on the application and it would have considered this application in conjunction with proposed developments in its area. No objections had been received; they were content with the proposal. The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer explained and displayed the proposed planting in conjunction with the church.

#### Debate

Members expressed some serious concerns over the proposed development, particularly on the western side of the site. Although it was necessary to combat coastal erosion, the need for the proposed development was questionable particularly with regard to the traffic, the impact on the heritage site and the loss of an area classed as a strategic gap. There would be a significant effect on both settlements at Corton and Hopton and other proposed developments in the Waveney and Great Yarmouth areas. Whilst recognising the positives with regard to tourism and economic development matters, the coastal erosion could not be ignored. However, the capacity on the existing roads was a major concern and having site entrances on opposite sides of the road was a disaster waiting to happen.

The Chairman proposed a proper detailed site visit be arranged should Members so wish before making their decision. Members were unsure that a site visit would add value to their consideration of the application. The effect on the setting of the Grade II Listed church should seriously be taken into consideration and the entrance to the new car park, although

beneficial, could create other difficulties. The roads were currently unsuitable and the traffic survey had not given a true reflection of volume of traffic. It was suggested that Highways England could be consulted with regard to the junction of Stirrups Lane with the A47.

There being no further discussion, it was proposed and duly seconded that the application should be refused and it was unanimously

**RESOLVED**

That, contrary to the officer's recommendation, permission be refused for the following reasons, the final wording of which has been agreed with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee:

1. The site is within the setting of the Church of St Bartholomew's a Grade II\* listed building. The proposed development would result in the partial loss of the rural setting of the church and have a negative impact on the setting of the church contrary to paragraphs 189, 190, 193, 194 and 195 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy CS17 and Policy DM30 of the adopted Waveney Local Plan. In this instance the benefits of creating additional tourism accommodation identified are not considered to outweigh the harm that would be caused as required under the Listed Building and Conservation Area Act 1990.
2. The proposed addition of 347 caravans to the existing site represents overdevelopment and significant intensification of the existing use. This in turn would have implications on the local highway network, particularly Stirrups Lane, Longfullans Lane and Coast Road which are narrow, unlit rural roads. The application has not been supported by sufficient evidence to demonstrate to the local planning authorities' acceptability that this harm can be mitigated i.e. through road improvements, signage strategy and appropriate crossing points of the roads. The proposal is therefore contrary to paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact and the residual cumulative impacts on the road network. In this particular instance the Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the potential impact on the surrounding network has not been sufficiently considered.
3. The proposed change of use of land noted as site 2 within the application would intrude into the open countryside and associated strategic gap and would impact on the current open character of the site contrary to policy DM28 - Strategic Gaps and Open Breaks which states that in order to prevent coalescence of settlements, development will not be permitted where it would prejudice the aims of maintaining the open character of the Strategic Gaps and Open Breaks, between Corton to the south and Hopton to the north, as identified on the adopted Waveney Local Plan Proposals Map.

Note: Councillor Rudd left the meeting at 6.58pm.

**9 DC/18/4224/FUL – INGATE HOUSE, LONDON ROAD, BECCLES**

The Senior Planning and Enforcement Officer presented the application which was for the conversion of and extension to existing outbuildings to form a new dwelling. The application before Members followed earlier applications which had been refused on the grounds of overdevelopment, harm to the outbuildings which were in the extended Conservation Area and the loss of an undesignated asset might become a material consideration.

Members were shown an aerial view, photographs and location plans of the site and its surrounds including views of the site, Ingate House, current entrances one of which would be widened to 4.5m, the stable area and shed, former kitchen garden and the proposal to sub-divide the garden to allow spaciousness.

The Senior Planning and Enforcement Officer explained the site plan and elevations would result in no loss of privacy. The windows had been realigned to avoid overlooking towards the older persons home. The design itself respected the heritage of the area. He outlined the key issues with regard to visual amenity, street scene, landscape, heritage considerations and residential amenity. County Highways had considered the safety aspects and parking provision to be sufficient. It was considered that the revised proposal made better use of the existing outbuilding retaining much of the elements facing the street and approval was being recommended subject to the removal of permitted development rights.

Ms Page – Objector

Ms Page, a local resident, thanked the Committee for being given the opportunity to speak. She lived opposite the rear of Ingate and explained that this was not appropriate as the site was in the Conservation Area. Despite the plans incorporating an existing building, the proposal was no more than another new build due to its size. The three large apartments in Ingate House were provided with a total of 3 parking spaces. None were occupied, so how could that cope with residents with a minimum of two cars per apartment and visitors needing parking too. It would mean additional cars on the already congested roads. It was already a struggle for residents to get in and out of their driveways and the development would only increase road safety issues. Ambulances needing to access the immediately adjacent care home already had many problems reaching the building. The site was not appropriate for another dwelling, the heritage should be respected and the Council needed to conserve and protect the Conservation Area.

Questions

It was suggested that the building could be classed as a new residence and not a converted building. In response to that, the Senior Planning and Enforcement Officer advised that the volume was increased in the central section of the stable block, but the footprint was increased by under 10sqm.

Debate

Members commented on their reservations due to previous historic issues, whether the proposal could be considered as overdevelopment of the site in a Conservation Area, the additional entrance and the fact that one parking space per flat was insufficient.

However, it was suggested that it was a good plan to utilise a derelict outbuilding with a character design. On a proposal to approve the application which was duly seconded, it was

**RESOLVED**

That permission be granted on the amended plan with permitted rights removed for roof windows etc. on the east elevation (the north elevation fronts the highway and so is covered by the conservation area controls) and subject to:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in all respects strictly in accordance with drawings 111 revision A and 120 revision E and 110; received 31st October 2018, for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.
3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order) (with or without modification), no windows, roof windows, roof-lights or dormers [other than those expressly authorised by this permission] shall be constructed on any upper floor elevation.
4. The first floor east facing roof-lights shown in the amended plans serving the master bedroom shall be glazed with opaque glass, or other appropriate screening and shall be fixed shut if the lowest part of the glazing to the windows falls below a height 1.7m measured vertically from the finished floor level in that room, and shall be retained in that condition, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
5. Before occupation of the new residence here approved, written and drawn details of the means by which the widened entrance in the boundary wall shall be detailed and shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and before use too the works shall be enacted to the approved details. The information shall include details of piers, brick type and mortar mix to be employed.
6. The new vehicular access shall be laid out and completed in all respects in accordance with Drawing No. DM03; and with an entrance width of 4.5m and made available for use prior to occupation. Thereafter the access shall be retained in the specified form.
7. Prior to the development hereby permitted being first occupied, the vehicular access onto St Georges Road shall be properly surfaced with a bound material for a minimum distance of 5 metres from the edge of the metalled carriageway, in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
8. Before the development is commenced details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the County Planning Authority showing the means to prevent the



discharge of surface water from the development onto the highway. The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the access is first used and shall be retained thereafter in its approved form.

9. The use shall not commence until the area(s) within the site shown on Drawing No. 110 for the purposes of Loading, Unloading, manoeuvring and parking of vehicles has been provided and thereafter that area(s) shall be retained and used for no other purposes.

10. Site Investigation

No development (including any construction, demolition, site clearance or removal of underground tanks and relic structures) approved by this planning permission, shall take place until a site investigation consisting of the following components has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority:

1) A desk study and site reconnaissance, including:

- a detailed appraisal of the history of the site;
- an inspection and assessment of current site conditions;
- an assessment of the potential types, quantities and locations of hazardous materials and contaminants considered to potentially exist on site;
- a conceptual site model indicating sources, pathways and receptors; and
- a preliminary assessment of the risks posed from contamination at the site to relevant receptors, including: human health, ground waters, surface waters, ecological systems and property (both existing and proposed).

2) Where deemed necessary following the desk study and site reconnaissance an intrusive investigation(s), including:

- the locations and nature of sampling points (including logs with descriptions of the materials encountered) and justification for the sampling strategy;
- explanation and justification for the analytical strategy;
- a revised conceptual site model; and
- a revised assessment of the risks posed from contamination at the site to relevant receptors, including: human health, ground waters, surface waters, ecological systems and property (both existing and proposed).

All site investigations must be undertaken by a competent person and conform with current guidance and best practice, including BS10175:2011+A1:2013 and CLR11.

11. Remediation

No development (including any construction, demolition, site clearance or removal of underground tanks and relic structures) approved by this planning permission, shall take place until a detailed remediation method statement (RMS) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The RMS must include, but is not limited to:

- details of all works to be undertaken including proposed methodologies, drawings and plans, materials, specifications and site management procedures;
- an explanation, including justification, for the selection of the proposed remediation methodology(ies);

- proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria; and
- proposals for validating the remediation and, where appropriate, for future maintenance and monitoring.

The RMS must be prepared by a competent person and conform to current guidance and best practice, including CLR11.

**12. Implementation of remediation**

Prior to any occupation or use of the approved development the RMS approved under condition 2 must be completed in its entirety. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification prior to the commencement of the remedial works.

**13. Validation**

A validation report must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any occupation or use of the approved development. The validation report must include, but is not limited to:

- results of sampling and monitoring carried out to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met;
- evidence that the RMS approved under condition 2 has been carried out competently, effectively and in its entirety; and
- evidence that remediation has been effective and that, as a minimum, the site will not qualify as contaminated land as defined by Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

**14. Unexpected contamination**

In the event that contamination which has not already been identified to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) is found or suspected on the site it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. Unless agreed in writing by the LPA no further development (including any construction, demolition, site clearance, removal of underground tanks and relic structures) shall take place until this condition has been complied with in its entirety.

An investigation and risk assessment must be completed in accordance with a scheme which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and conform with prevailing guidance (including BS 10175:2011+A1:2013 and CLR11) and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Where remediation is necessary a detailed remediation method statement (RMS) must be prepared, and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The RMS must include detailed methodologies for all works to be undertaken, site management procedures, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria. The approved RMS must be carried out in its entirety and the Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification prior to the commencement of the remedial works. Following completion of the approved remediation scheme a validation report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation must be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA.

**10 DC/18/3395/FUL – 8 THE STREET, WISSETT, HALESWORTH**

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer presented the application which was for an additional static caravan at an existing site situated to the rear of The Plough public house.

The Committee was reminded that, in January 2017, approval had been granted for three static caravans to support the public house which had previously been closed. Having been refurbished, the pub was now open and subsidised by the income received from the caravans. The application was before the Committee due to a Member call-in.

Members were shown an aerial view, photographs and location plans of the site and its surrounds including a cross section and site layout, an elevational view, the post and rail fence, views to and from the entrance, the proposed site for the fourth caravan and the location of neighbouring properties.

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer explained the key issues with regard to possible impact on the Conservation Area, landscape, neighbours amenity and the need for an additional caravan. Complaints had been received with regard to invasion of privacy, noise from traffic, additional lighting and headlights and the quality of the planted hedge. Comment had been made that the caravans were not being used for holiday lets only. The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer explained the proposal complied with local plan policies, particularly tourism and the economy, the benefits of providing holiday accommodation and the financial support for the public house which was considered an asset to the local community. The permission was for a five year period only, so any continuation of the site would need to be subject to a further application after January 2022.

Local residents had complained about some disturbance possibly from workers having been in occupation and making an early morning start. It was considered that appropriate monitoring and a log of guests for short term lettings would resolve any problems that might have occurred. It was considered that the limited harm from an additional caravan was outweighed by the benefits of the proposal and approval was being recommended.

**Mrs Duran – Objector**

Mrs Duran spoke on behalf of those people who had written in objecting to the proposal. It was a rural area, dark and quiet, now spoilt with bright cream caravans. They were overbearing in a Conservation Area and had a large impact on the surrounds as the site was within green gardens and fields, leaving a scar on the valley. The light pollution from bulkhead lights and other lights was considerable on a dark night and the noise in a quiet area affected local properties. One more caravan would create even more impact to the detriment of the neighbourhood. Issues had arisen with transient strangers in the area and there had been anti-social behaviour with tree climbing and footballs being kicked around, which showed no respect for the area. There was no manager on site, so nothing was being controlled.

**Questions**

Members asked specific questions regarding access, planting and the appearance of the caravans.

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer explained that the adjoining land was not part of the application site; a gate in the fencing allowed access. The boundary had been planted with natural species hedging during 2017 which was not yet well established. Members noted that it had been a difficult season with little water. The original application had been approved with a condition to control the appearance of the caravans and that had been complied with.

### Debate

Members noted that the public house had been run successfully in recent months and understood the importance of it being subsidised by the income provided by the quality caravans. It would be disappointing to lose such an important village asset. Even though the planting had been undertaken as requested, it was disappointing that the hedge had not grown sufficiently to provide further screening.

The Planning Development Manager confirmed that condition 7 would ensure the caravans could not be sold or used independently; they would remain in the ownership of the public house. Members requested that it be made clear to the applicant that the caravans should be used for tourism only as per the relevant condition and that the enforcement officers should keep a strict check on the site. A local Member explained that the caravans had been rented to workers in the area and that type of letting might become necessary again with the forthcoming Sizewell project. The Planning Development Manager referred to condition 3 in that no unit should be occupied for more than 28 consecutive days in any calendar year by the same person(s) and a log of lettings would need to be maintained and available for inspection. That would comply with the 'holiday' letting criteria. There was little difference between a holiday let and a short term let and, in fact, there might be more traffic if people were using the caravans for holidays.

Members agreed that the conditions should be reiterated and enforced accordingly and there being no further discussion, it was unanimously:

### **RESOLVED**

That permission be granted, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be until 18 January 2022, to coincide with the temporary period specified on planning permission for the caravan park ref: DC/16/4494/FUL, after which time the caravan shall be removed and the land reinstated to its former condition to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be completed in all respects strictly in accordance with drawing nos. AWC/18/755-202 and 201; received 22 August 2018, 102C and 103B received on 21 November 2018 for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.
3. The approved holiday unit(s) shall be occupied solely as holiday accommodation and for no other purpose whatsoever including residential use. No unit shall be

occupied for more than 28 consecutive days in any calendar year by the same person or persons. The owner shall maintain, and keep available for inspection at all reasonable times, an up-to-date register of lettings.

4. Details of any lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the first occupation of the development. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
5. A plan indicating the positions, species, sizes and mix of hedging plants to be erected along the eastern boundary to supplement the existing planting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details
6. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the first occupation of the caravan or in accordance with a programme agreed with the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or plants which, within a period of 3 years from completion of the development, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation; all works shall be carried out in accordance with the relevant provisions of appropriate British Standards or other recognised Codes of Good Practice.
7. The additional caravan permitted shall form part of the caravan site, the site shall not be sold or leased independently of the property known as 'The Plough Public House' 8 The Street, Wissett.

The meeting concluded at 7.48pm.

Chairman