

APPLICATION: MA/12/1772 Date: 9 November 2013 Received: 28 January 2013

APPLICANT: Murphy, Murphy, Harris, Berry, Doran

LOCATION: LAND REAR OF THE MEADOWS, LENHAM ROAD, HEADCORN,
HEADCORN, KENT, TN27 9LG

PARISH: Headcorn, Ulcombe

PROPOSAL: Use of land as residential to provide 5 plots for gypsy families, with
a total of 5 mobile homes, 10 touring caravans and 5 utility blocks
with associated works as shown on drawing numbers
MAI/29/PL/01A and WSP/ME/03 received on 30/1/13.

AGENDA DATE: 25th April 2013

CASE OFFICER: Peter Hockney

The recommendation for this application is being reported to Committee for decision because:

- it is contrary to views expressed by Headcorn and Ulcombe Parish Councils

1. POLICIES

- Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000: ENV6, ENV28, ENV34
- Government Policy: NPPF (2012), Planning Policy for traveller sites (2012)

2. HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

MA/12/0261	Formation of new access and removal of existing track – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
MA/10/0499	Planning application for change of use of land to residential to provide 5 plots for gypsy families, with a total of 5 mobile homes, 9 touring caravans and 5 utility blocks with associated works – REFUSED – GRANTED TEMPORARY PERMISSION AT APPEAL
MA/96/0501	Establishment of a 2 pitch private caravan site for one gypsy family including the construction of a new access track and associated works - re-submission of planning application MA/96/0198 – REFUSED.

MA/96/0198 Establishment of a 2 pitch private caravan site for one gypsy family including the construction of a new access track – REFUSED – DISMISSED AT APPEAL.

- 2.1 The history of the site includes an extant Enforcement Notice on the site for the change of use of the land to a use for the stationing of caravans, two children's play houses/sheds and a third shed used to house animals – SERVED 2nd July 1993 – DISMISSED AT APPEAL 11th April 1994.
- 2.2 The site is known as land to the rear of The Meadows. In March 2010 a gypsy site was created and the Council was granted an Injunction in the High Court to prevent further development or any additional caravans being moved on site. Two planning applications were submitted MA/10/1499 and MA/10/0560 for a total of 10 plots (five under each application either side of the access road). These applications were refused on three grounds being:-
- (1) The stationing of caravans, utility buildings and laying of hardstanding combined with associated domestic paraphernalia would result in a loss of openness to the site harming the character and appearance of the open countryside and the quality of the Low Weald Special Landscape Area contrary to policies ENV28 and ENV34 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan (2000), C4 of the South East Plan (2009) and guidance in PPS7 and Circular 01/2006.
 - (1) The combined use of this site together with other gypsy sites in the vicinity would result in harm to the character and appearance of the open countryside and the quality of the Special Landscape Area and would dominate the settled community contrary to policies ENV28 and ENV34 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan (2000), C4 of the South East Plan (2009) and guidance in PPS7 and Circular 01/2006.
 - (2) The use of the site for residential occupation would lead to an unsustainable form of development that due to the distance approximately 2.3 km from Headcorn, which would provide local services such as shops, doctors and schools and lack of public transport links would have a heavy reliance on the private car contrary to policies CC1 of the South East Plan (2009) and guidance in PPS7 and Circular 01/2006.
- 2.3 The decision was appealed and following a Public Inquiry the Inspector concluded that the development would not dominate the nearest settled community and would not be an unsustainable form of development. However, he did find that the development caused significant visual harm and concluded that permanent consent was not appropriate. However, due to the lack of alternative accommodation temporary planning permission was granted for a

two year period. I attach a copy of the Inspector's decision at Appendix 1 for Members information. This appeal decision is a key consideration in the determination of this application.

- 2.4 Since the appeal a further planning application MA/12/0261 has been approved for the creation of a new access onto Lenham Road at the end of track rather than it turning 90° left and utilising the existing access adjacent to Fiddlers Green.
- 2.5 This application relates to the plots on the left of the access track and a separate application (MA/12/2113) has been submitted for the five plots on the left hand side of the track. This application is also being considered on this committee agenda.

3. CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 **Headcorn Parish Council** wish to see the application REFUSED and reported to planning committee stating:-

"Would wish to see both applications refused on the following grounds and both reported to the planning committee.

- 1. The plans are incorrect as they fail to show the other gypsy sites in the close vicinity.
- 2. It is an extreme overdevelopment of the site which is a rural area away from the major settlement and is completely out of character with the area. It needs to be noted that if granted there would be a total of 10 plots with 13 mobile homes, 21 touring caravans and 13 utility blocks.
- 3. The stationing of the mobile homes, outbuildings and hardstanding with associated domestic paraphernalia would result in the loss of openness to the site harming the character and appearance of the open countryside and the quality of the Low Weald.
- 4. The combined use of this site together with other gypsy sites in the near vicinity would result in harm to the character and appearance of the open countryside and would dominate the settled community. There are already 15 gypsy/traveller pitches along this section of the Lenham Road. This back land development will overwhelm the permanent residents along this road.
- 5. Headcorn already has a considerable number of gypsies/ travellers, both long term settled and new incomers arbitrarily moving onto fields. There is a danger

that the excessive influx will lead to an imbalance in the community which will be detrimental to the whole village community.

6. It is noted that each family mobile home appears to have children –it has been the experience of Headcorn that this will result in a pressure for further sites when the children are in their teenage years. There are no existing boundaries that would constrain the future development of this site.
7. The use of the site for residential occupation would lead to an unsustainable form of development that due to the distance of Headcorn which provides the local services would have a heavy reliance on the use of the motor car as there are no public transport links.
8. Due to the sheer number of caravans and people on site, the reliance on the motor car plus the number of vehicles used by the travellers for business there will be a resulting excessive amount of traffic leaving the shared access, onto the Lenham Road which is a narrow country road where vehicles are frequently travelling in excess of 60mph. There has already been one recent fatality of a traveller from the neighbouring Martin's Garden site.
9. No ecological study has been submitted and my Council is concerned that the tributary stream at the rear of the site leading to the River Beult may be harmed as a result of this development. Foul water waste disposal is of serious concern with such a large development.

My committee note that when these applications were given temporary permission at appeal in 2011, a lack of current Maidstone Borough Council Gypsy and Traveller Policy was given as a reason for allowing this appeal. My committee would like to point out how difficult it still is to make recommendations with the lack of a MBC policy. We note that the governments planning policy for traveller sites will be relevant and we urge MBC to fully explore the impact of these applications with particular reference to policy 12, 22, & 23 of the planning policy for traveller sites. Moreover Headcorn Parish Councils initial evidence gathering process in support of their Neighbourhood Plan has identified that Headcorn Parish is already contributing above the national average in the provision of traveller sites. Therefore, Headcorn Parish Council support the recent announcement that Maidstone Borough Council support the dispersement of traveller sites throughout the borough."

- 3.2 **Ulcombe Parish Council** wish to see the application REFUSED and reported to planning committee stating:-

"With reference to the above planning application (Use of land as residential to provide 5 plots for gypsy families, with a total of 5 mobile homes, 10 touring

caravans and 5 utility blocks with associated works) please could you note that Ulcombe Parish Council wishes to see the application refused on the same grounds it cited in 2010 for application MA/10/0499, which applied to the same site. The Temporary Permission granted by the Inspector on appeal (APP/U2235/A/10/2129095/NWF) for MA/10/0499 was given on the basis that this would provide time for the Appellants to find an alternative site. He also said "(para 51) that "due to the harm to the countryside, Permanent Permission would not be appropriate in these cases." Ulcombe Parish Council therefore wishes to add the following:

The Inspector's report dated 4/2/2011 (as a result of the Appellants' appeal) says in para 20 "the developments, individually or taken together, would be severely harmful to both the character and the appearance of the countryside which is identified as a SLA. This would be contrary to the cited development plan policies" (ENV 28 and ENV 34). He also rightly refers to the lights from upwards of 39 caravans and vehicles using the drive (para 19) being "incongruous in their countryside surroundings".

He also says in para 22 that "the character of the area has undoubtedly been changed by the incremental increase in the number of caravan sites," and "the current proposals would take this change a very significant step further".

The Inspector does not disagree with many of the reasons for refusal cited by both Headcorn and Ulcombe Parish Councils and MBC in 2010, and admits that there are compelling arguments to refuse approval. The basis of the Temporary Permission ruling was MBC's lack of provision of alternative sites and the "unmet need". However (para 49) he also says **"The temporary period, 2 years, is sufficient to allow the appellants to seek alternative sites** or the Council to produce and act upon a Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). The key word is "or" and the fact that MBC may not have a Sites DPD does not absolve the Appellants from finding an alternative site. **On this basis, as the Appellants have not found an alternative site, they have failed to fulfill the requirement behind granting the Temporary Permission in the first place, and thus their application should be refused.**

If this application is refused, and if the proposal goes to appeal, then Ulcombe Parish Council will fully support Maidstone Borough Council in the defence of the appeal proposals.

Referral to MBC planning committee is requested by the parish council, if it has not been requested by Headcorn Parish Council."

- 3.3 **Southern Water** have commented that foul drainage may have to be licensed by the Environment Agency.

3.4 **Environment Agency** state:-

"We have no objection to this proposal at this location however we have the following advice to share:

Drainage that has the potential to be contaminated by fuels, chemicals or other polluting material must be connected to the foul sewer. The Environmental Permitting Regulations make it an offence to cause or knowingly permit any discharge that will result in the input of pollutants to ground or surface waters.

Please also note that the soakaways might not be effective in this area due to the weald clay geology of the site."

3.5 **MBC Environmental Health Manager** raises no objections subject to conditions in relation to foul drainage.

3.6 **Kent Highway Services** raise no objections to the application on highway safety grounds.

4. REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 **Weald of Kent Preservation Society** raise objections stating:-

"Very substantial in their total impact, they are either side of the track, supposedly open to all walkers seeking safe and comfortable access to the amenities of the countryside. They indeed appear to be already in occupation, in effect creating a large gypsy or traveller site development, not easily passed through by others.

Once again, although we do understand the law, people's housing needs, the sites situation in the Maidstone borough, and other realities of the situation, we must ask the Borough Council at last to face up to the serious Lenham Road situation."

1 letter of objection has been received on the grounds that permanent permission should not be granted.

5. CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Site Description

5.1.1 The site is within the open countryside and is in an area designated as part of the Low Weald Special Landscape Area due to the scenic quality of the landscape. It

is located on the north west side of Lenham Road approximately 2.3km from the village of Headcorn.

- 5.1.2 The site is predominantly part of a field located approximately 250 metres back (north west) from Lenham Road. The lawful planning use of this field was for agriculture but was granted temporary consent for gypsy accommodation under MA/10/0499. The remainder of the site comprises the access road from the site of the caravans to Lenham Road. A public footpath runs on a north west/south east axis parallel with the site boundary and is located approximately 150m south west of the site boundary.
- 5.1.3 The overriding character of the area is open agricultural fields with traditional field boundaries interspersed with sporadic development. The development that is in the surrounding area is predominantly residential (traditional bricks and mortar housing and Gypsy caravan accommodation) or agricultural and is generally located adjacent to Lenham Road fronting the road. There is no significant backland development in the area.
- 5.1.4 There are a significant number of other Gypsy caravan sites in the immediate vicinity including 'The Meadows', 'Greengates' and 'Acers Place'. Some of these are permanent features, others are temporary and some are restricted to a specific person(s). The overriding characteristic of these caravan sites are that they accommodate a limited number of caravans and are located close to the Lenham Road frontage.

5.2 Proposal

- 5.2.1 The application is for 5 pitches for gypsy accommodation that would contain five mobile homes, ten touring caravans and five utility blocks. There would be no additional operational development over and above that considered under the previous application and appeal.
- 5.2.2 The occupiers of the pitches would be the same as those granted consent at appeal under MA/10/0499.

5.3 Principle of Development

- 5.3.1 There are no saved Local Plan Policies that relate directly to this type of development. Policy ENV28 of the Local Plan relates to development in the countryside stating that:

"Planning permission will not be given for development which harms the character and appearance of the area or the amenities of surrounding occupiers"

ENV28 then outlines the types of development that can be permitted. This does not include gypsy development as this was previously covered under housing Policy H36 but this is not a 'saved' policy.

5.3.2 A key consideration in the determination of this application is central Government guidance contained with 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' (PPTS) published in March 2012. This places a firm emphasis on the need to provide more gypsy sites, supporting self-provision and acknowledging that sites are likely to be found in rural areas.

5.3.3 Work on the Local Development Framework is progressing; however there is, as yet, no adopted Core Strategy. Local authorities have the responsibility for setting their own target for the number of pitches to be provided in their areas in their Local Plans. To this end Maidstone Borough Council, in partnership with Sevenoaks District Council procured Salford University Housing Unit to carry out a revised Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA). The GTAA concluded the following need for pitches over the remaining Core Strategy period:-

Oct 2011-March 2016	105 pitches
April 2016- March 2021	25 pitches
April 2021- March 2026	27 pitches
Total Oct 2011 – March 2026	157 pitches

These figures were agreed by Cabinet on the 14th March 2012 as the pitch target to be included in the next consultation version of the Core Strategy. However, an amended target was agreed by Cabinet on 13th March 2013 of **187 pitches** (30 additional pitches) to reflect the extension of the new Local Plan period to 2031.

5.3.4 Draft Policy CS12 of the Regulation 25 version of the Core Strategy outlines that the Borough need for gypsy and traveller pitches will be addressed through the granting of planning permissions and through the Development Delivery DPD.

5.3.5 Since this, the Local Development Scheme approved by Cabinet on 13th March 2013 approved the amalgamation of the Core Strategy Local Plan and the Development Delivery Local Plan, to be called the Maidstone Borough Local Plan. The single local plan would contain policies together with the balance of all land allocations (including gypsy and traveller sites). The timetable for adoption is July 2015.

5.3.6 Issues of need are dealt with below but, in terms of broad principles Central Government Guidance clearly allow for gypsy sites to be located in the countryside as an exception to the general theme of restraint.

5.3.7 In the case of this specific site, use as a gypsy site has been accepted previously, albeit for a temporary period for personal use only. The view of the Inspector being that the significant harm was outweighed by personal circumstances including the lack of alternative accommodation but the harm was considered too severe to grant a permanent consent.

5.4 Gypsy Status

5.4.1 Annex 1 of the PPTS defines gypsies and travellers as:-

"Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling show people or circus people travelling together as such."

5.4.2 The proposed occupiers would be the same as those that received temporary consent at appeal. The gypsy status of the occupiers was accepted by both the Council and the Inspector at the appeal (and throughout the course of the planning application).

5.4.3 There have been no changes in circumstances or any available evidence to indicate that the gypsy definition does not now apply to the occupiers.

5.5 Need for Gypsy Sites

5.5.1 The PPTS gives guidance on how gypsy accommodation should be achieved, including the requirement to assess need.

5.5.2 The latest GTAA (2011-2026) provides the projection of accommodation requirements as follows –

Oct 2011-March 2016	105 pitches
April 2016- March 2021	25 pitches
April 2021- March 2026	27 pitches
Total Oct 2011 – March 2026	157 pitches

However, an amended target was agreed by Cabinet on 13th March of **187 pitches** (30 additional pitches) to reflect the extension of the new local plan period to 2031.

5.5.3 Taking into account this time period, since 1st October 2011 the following permissions for pitches have been granted (net):

30 Permanent non-personal permissions

6 Permanent personal permissions

0 Temporary non-personal permissions

11 Temporary personal permissions

Therefore a net total of 36 permanent pitches have been granted since 1st October 2011.

- 5.5.4 It must be noted that the requirement for 105 pitches in the initial 5 year period includes need such as temporary consents that are yet to expire (but will before the end of March 2016) and household formation. Therefore although the pitch target is high for the first five years, the immediate need is not, in my view, overriding. However, the latest GTAA clearly reveals an ongoing need for pitches.

5.6 Visual Impact

- 5.6.1 The latest guidance in the PPTS states that Local Planning Authorities should strictly limit new traveller development in open countryside (paragraph 23) but goes on to state that where sites are in rural areas, considerations are that sites do not dominate the nearest settled community and do not place undue pressure on local infrastructure. No specific reference to landscape impact is outlined, however, this is addressed in the NPPF and clearly under Local Plan policy ENV28.

- 5.6.2 As well as being located within the open countryside this area is further designated as part of the Low Weald Special Landscape Area. The policy that seeks the protection of the Special Landscape Area's is ENV34 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan (2000) and is a saved policy. It states that:-

"Particular attention will be given to the protection and conservation of the scenic quality and distinctive character of the area and priority will be given to the landscape over other planning considerations."

- 5.6.3 The Low Weald has been recognised as a landscape of county level importance due to its distinctive character. There is a consistent presence of characteristic features such as small, intimate pastures, contained by strong hedgerows, mature trees, shaws and woodlands, meandering streams, farm ponds and winding country lanes and a particular concentration of fine domestic architecture and attractive, small villages and farmsteads.

- 5.6.4 The particular character of the area is generally open agricultural fields with sporadic development along the Lenham Road frontage. There is no significant backland development within the area and the pattern of development is clearly of agricultural fields with traditional fencing and hedgerow separation.
- 5.6.5 The development of five plots of gypsy accommodation with the stationing of fifteen caravans and the construction of five utility buildings would cause significant visual harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In paragraph 18 of the Inspector's decision he indicates that the existing touring caravans are not particularly noticeable from Lenham Road. However, he acknowledges that the introduction of a significant number of mobile homes and day rooms may increase the visibility of the development. The visual impact has increased due to the fact that a new entrance has been created and a large opening created in the hedgerow onto Lenham Road. The Inspector went on to consider the visual impact of the site when viewed from the footpath. Again he concludes that the caravans are clearly visible and that the level of visibility would be likely to increase with the introduction of mobile homes. The overall conclusion by the Inspector in paragraph 20 was that the developments individually or taken together would be severely harmful to both the character and the appearance of the countryside which is identified as a Special Landscape Area. This is still the case and there have been no changes to the surrounding area to mitigate this.

5.5 Residential Amenity

- 5.5.1 A residential use is not generally a noise generating use unlike for example an industrial use. The proposed residential plots would be located a significant distance away from the nearest residential plots, almost 200m from the gypsy sites closest to Lenham Road and approximately 260m from the dwelling of 'Fiddlers Green'. These distances are sufficient to prevent any significant impact on residential amenity in terms of privacy, light or overwhelming as well as adequate to prevent general noise disturbance. Any excessive noise from the site that does have a significant impact should be dealt with under Environmental Health legislation.
- 5.5.2 Inappropriate lighting at the site may lead to an impact on the amenity of nearby residential occupiers, however, this could be dealt with by way of a condition.
- 5.5.3 A residential use is not generally a crime generator and I do not consider crime or public safety to be a significant issue in the determination of this application. Any issues of trespass are not a matter for the planning process.

5.6 Highways

- 5.6.1 The proposed access would extend from the site of the residential plots to join an existing access point onto Lenham Road. The access was recently permitted and was adequate in terms of the visibility.
- 5.6.2 The visibility splays onto Lenham Road are acceptable and vehicles utilising this access would not pose a hazard to highway safety. I acknowledge that the proposal would increase the frequency of use of this access and also result in more vehicles using Lenham Road. However, this intensification of use of the access and traffic onto this C classified road would not result in a hazard to highway safety.

5.7 Personal Circumstances

- 5.7.1 The Inspector gave considerable weight to the personal circumstances of the applicants including health and education needs. There have been no significant changes to these circumstances in the intervening two years. In the appeal decision, there was considerable criticism of the Council's 2006 GTAA and the Inspector concluded it was inadequate. Given the inadequacy of this document in identifying the level of need for gypsy accommodation the Inspector gave weight to the national, sub-regional and local immediate need for sites, the lack of available sites and the lack of any policy relating directly to Gypsies and Travellers in the Local Plan and the lack of a five year supply of deliverable sites.
- 5.7.2 The Council has undertaken a new GTAA and has a robust evidence base with regard to need. The GTAA shows a requirement for 105 pitches in the initial 5 year period, which includes need such as temporary consents that are yet to expire (but will before the end of March 2016) and household formation. Therefore although the pitch target is high for the first five years, the immediate need is not, in my view, overriding. However, the latest GTAA clearly reveals an ongoing need for pitches. In view of the work done by the Council to undertake a quantitative assessment of need within the Borough in the new GTAA I do not give significant weight to the national and sub-regional immediate need for sites. The Council has also secured funding for the provision of a new 15 pitch public gypsy site which will be complete in March 2015. In addition, the proposed local plan would contain policies together with the balance of all land allocations (including gypsy and traveller sites). The timetable for adoption is July 2015.
- 5.7.3 There is no information submitted in relation to any search for an alternative site that has been undertaken by the occupiers, although there is no local policy at this time to guide their search.

5.8 Other Matters

- 5.8.1 There have been no significant changes in terms of ecology since the appeal decision and the Inspector did not consider it to be a significant issue.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The proposed development would result in severe visual harm to the character and appearance of the countryside and Special Landscape Area. This harm would result in an unacceptable development in the countryside. Therefore a permanent consent would not be appropriate and this is the same conclusion that the Inspector came to in the previous appeal.
- 6.2 The Council has undertaken work to ensure that there is now an up to date needs survey and funding has been secured for a new public gypsy site. This is in addition to progressing the emerging policy and allocations through the Local Plan. However, there are no alternative sites available now and no local policy to guide the search for an alternative site. This position is likely to change in the near future with the site allocation document due for adoption in July 2015 (2 years and 3 months away). Following adoption of this document there would need to be some time to secure planning permission and implement those permissions.
- 6.3 Taking the above into account and the judgement of the previous Inspector I conclude that due to the current policy position a further temporary planning permission would be appropriate. I consider that a three year permission would enable adequate time for the adoption of the policy document and the site selection (by occupiers), planning permission gained and for permission to be subsequently implemented. As a result my recommendation is for permission to be granted with a condition limiting it to a temporary three year period.

7. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:

1. The use hereby permitted shall be carried on only by:-
Plot 1: Lisa, Anne Marie & Tommy Murphy; Plot 2: Michael Murphy & Elizabeth Connor; Plot 3: Mark Harris, William Harris & Rose Purcell; Plot 4: Miles & Patrick Berry; Plot 5: Michael James & Marie Doran
and their resident dependants and shall be for a limited period being the period of 3 years from the date of this decision, or the period during which the premises are occupied by them, whichever is the shorter.

Reason: The site is in an area where the stationing of caravans/mobile homes is

not normally permitted and an exception has been made to reflect the personal need of the applicant and other occupiers. This is in accordance with Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan (2000) policy ENV28, the NPPF 2012 and the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012.

2. When the site ceases to be occupied by those named in Condition 1 (above) or at the end of 3 years, whichever shall first occur, the use hereby permitted shall cease, all materials and equipment brought on to the premises in connection with the use, including the amenity blocks hereby approved, shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition in accordance with a scheme of work submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority;

Reason: To appropriately restore the site in the interests protecting the character and appearance of the countryside and Special Landscape Area in accordance with policies ENV28 and ENV34 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan (2000), the NPPF 2012 and the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012.

3. No more than 15 caravans, as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 (of which no more than 5 shall be a static caravan or mobile home) shall be stationed on the site at any time.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the countryside in accordance with policies ENV28 and ENV34 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan, the NPPF 2012 and the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012.

4. No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials;

Reason: To prevent inappropriate development and safeguard the amenity, character and appearance of the countryside and nearby properties in accordance with policy ENV28 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000, the NPPF 2012 and the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012.

5. No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on this site.

Reason: To prevent inappropriate development and safeguard the amenity, character and appearance of the countryside and nearby properties in accordance with policy ENV28 of the Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000, the NPPF 2012 and the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2012.

The proposed development, subject to the conditions stated, is considered to comply with the policies of the Development Plan (Maidstone Borough-Wide Local Plan 2000) and there are no overriding material considerations to indicate a refusal of planning consent.