



Civic Centre, Riverside, Stafford

Contact Jackie Allen  
Direct Dial 01785 619552

Email [jackieallen@staffordbc.gov.uk](mailto:jackieallen@staffordbc.gov.uk)

Dear Members

### **Planning Committee**

A meeting of the Planning Committee will be held on **Monday, 20 January 2025** at **6.30pm** in the **Craddock Room, Civic Centre, Riverside, Stafford** to deal with the business as set out on the agenda.

Please note that this meeting will be recorded.

Members are reminded that contact officers are shown in each report and members are welcome to raise questions etc in advance of the meeting with the appropriate officer.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "I. Curran".

Head of Law and Governance

## PLANNING COMMITTEE - 20 JANUARY 2025

**Chairman - Councillor B McKeown**

**Vice-Chairman - Councillor A Nixon**

### AGENDA

- 1 **Minutes**
- 2 **Apologies**
- 3 **Declaration of Member's Interests/Lobbying**
- 4 **Delegated Applications**

Details of Delegated applications will be circulated separately to Members.

	<b>Page Nos</b>
5 <b>Planning Applications</b>	-
6 <b>Planning Appeals</b>	3 - 14
7 <b>Enforcement Matters</b>	15 - 19

### MEMBERSHIP

**Chairman - Councillor B McKeown**

B M Cross	A R McNaughton
I D Fordham	A Nixon
A D Hobbs	M Phillips
E G R Jones	A J Sandiford
P W Jones	S N Spencer
B McKeown	

---

 PLANNING COMMITTEE - 20 JANUARY 2025
 

---

**Ward Interest - Nil**

### Planning Appeals

*Report of Head of Economic Development and Planning*

#### Purpose of Report

Notification of new appeals and consideration of appeal decisions. Copies of any decision letters are attached as an **APPENDIX**.

#### Notified Appeals

Application Reference	Location	Proposal
<b>24/39502/HOU</b> <b>Delegated Refusal</b>	363 Sandon Road Meir Heath Stoke-On-Trent	Demolition of existing single story rear garden building, erection of single story kitchen dining room extension to rear
<b>24/39525/FUL</b> <b>Delegated Refusal</b>	Cocknage Farm Barns Woodpark Lane Cocknage	Change of use of land (agricultural) for use as residential garden (retrospective) and associated fencing
<b>23/38535/FUL</b> <b>Committee Refusal</b>	Land Adjacent To 26 St Peters Gardens Mossnit	Demolition of existing garages and erection of 2 bungalows (use Class C3b)

#### Decided Appeals

Application Reference	Location	Proposal
<b>24/38984/HOU</b> <b>Appeal Allowed and Partial Costs Allowed</b>	18 Lapwing Place Doxey	Retrospective approval for garden frames for climbing plants
<b>22/36059/OUT</b> <b>Appeal Dismissed and Costs Refused</b>	Land Rear Of 66 Mount Road Stone	Outline application for a new dwelling (access and scale)

V1 09/01/2025 13:12

**Previous Consideration**

Nil

**Background Papers**

File available in the Development Management Section

**Officer Contact**

John Holmes, Development Manager, 01785 619302



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2024

**by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 08 January 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/D/24/3347608**

**18 Lapwing Place, Stafford, ST16 1FX**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Ragobar against the decision of Stafford Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/38984/HOU.
  - The development proposed is the erection of garden frames for climbing plants.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of garden frames for climbing plants at 18 Lapwing Place, Stafford, ST16 1FX, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/38984/HOU, and the plans submitted with it.

### Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Brian Ragobar against Stafford Borough Council and this will be the subject of a separate Decision.

### Procedural Matter

3. The garden frames are already in place and this appeal therefore relates to an application for permission retrospectively.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the garden frames on the character and appearance of the area around Lapwing Place.

### Reasons

5. No 18 is a brick-built detached house situated at the southern end of Lapwing Place. Lapwing Place is a cul-de-sac within a large modern residential estate. The property has a moderate-sized rear garden in which has been erected four wooden garden frames. Each frame is 3.5 metres high with a top beam stretching across almost the entire width of the rear garden. At the base of each of the support posts there is a large container housing a climbing plant that extends up to the top of the frame and partially across the top beam. At the time of my visit, the plants were bare but I have photographic evidence of leaves and fruit presumably from earlier in the year.
6. The Council's decision letter contends that the height and solid structure of the frames result in an unacceptable impact to the character and visual amenities of the local area. However, the frames are lower than the ridge heights of

adjacent garages at both the host property on one side and at the neighbouring No 16. Moreover, the four frames are individual slim structures that do not present as a solid structure from any perspective.

7. The frames are only readily visible from the public realm along Lapwing Place, across the rear garden of No 16, some distance from the road. As such, they are not conspicuous or prominent and, in any case, only the end posts are presented to view and are seen against a backdrop of garages and houses. There are no clear long-distance views across the rear of the properties around the appeal site, such that the frames do not obstruct any such views. During winter months the slim frames are of limited visibility, and when in leaf the climbing plants would effectively screen the posts, appearing similar to other forms of mature planting commonly found in residential gardens, and effectively softening the visual appearance of the area, to its benefit.
8. From the officer's report it would appear that the Council accepts that the development is largely unviewable from the street scene, and that it would not be considered to result in a prominent and incongruous addition to the street scene. I concur with that view. On this basis, and given that the overall structure does not present as 'solid' and is not enclosed in any way, including by way of a roof, I find that the garden frames, as constructed, are not harmful to the character or appearance of the area around Lapwing Place.
9. In the light of the above, I find that the garden frames do not conflict with Policy N1 of the Plan for Stafford Borough, which requires designs to have regard to the local context and to preserve and enhance the character of the area. Similarly, they do not conflict with Policy on design quality in the National Planning Policy Framework as outlined in Paragraph 135 a), b) and c). Accordingly, I allow this appeal.

### **Conditions**

10. Since the frames are already in place and have been erected in accordance with the submitted plans, there is no need for any conditions to be imposed in this case.

*J D Westbrook*

INSPECTOR



---

## Costs Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2024

by **J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 January 2025

---

### **Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/D/24/3347608 18 Lapwing Place, Stafford, ST16 1FX**

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), sections 78, 322 and Schedule 6, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
  - The application is made by Mr Ragobar for a full award of costs against Stafford Borough Council.
  - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for the erection of garden frames for climbing plants.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The application for an award of costs is allowed in the terms set out below.

### **Reasons**

2. The Planning Practice Guidance advises that costs may be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably and thereby caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process.
3. The proposed development related to 4 timber garden frames that were already erected in the rear garden of the appeal property. A previous retrospective application had been refused by the Council (ref: 23/38031/HOU) and an identical application was subsequently made which was also refused by the Council (Ref: 24/38984/HOU). It is the second application that has been appealed against and accompanied by an application for costs.
4. The appellant contends that the Council has misapplied and mis-referenced Policy N1 of the Plan for Stafford Borough (LP) as well as Policy from Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework); that the Council did not take into account a comparable fall-back development potential; and that it did not allow the appellant any opportunity to consider and respond to the reasons for refusal or to find common ground or to consider how the application could be altered to be considered acceptable.
5. With regard to the policy context, Policy N1 relates to design quality and relates to all development. Although the Council has incorrectly referred at one point to paragraph (e) in its rebuttal statement, it has correctly quoted from paragraphs (g) and (h) which are relevant to this proposal. In similar vein, policy on achieving well-designed places in Section 12 of The Framework refers to all forms of development. On the basis of the use of policy context, therefore, I find that the Council has not behaved unreasonably in the matter.

6. With regard to the potential fall-back development position, it is clear that the 4 garden frames are intended for the specific purpose of supporting climbing plants as part of an overall garden design. On this basis, there would not appear to be any realistic prospect of the fall-back building, referred to by the appellant, actually being constructed. I do not consider, therefore, that the Council has acted unreasonably by not taking the fall-back permitted development potential into account.
7. In making the second identical planning application relating to the construction of the garden frames, the appellant would have had the opportunity to make any amendments to the scheme considered necessary to overcome the earlier reasons for refusal given by the Council. It would appear that no such amendments were directly discussed or subsequently made. I acknowledge that it is unfortunate that the decisions on the two applications were made in such a way that the appellant was surprised by the outcome, but this does not mean that a Council is unable to continue considering a proposal until late in the process, including at the committee stage, if circumstances warrant such an approach. This, in itself, is not unreasonable.
8. However, in this case, the Council's decision appears as vague and inaccurate in its assertions about the proposal's impact, and these assertions are unsupported by any consistent objective analysis. The decision notice refers to the development as a solid structure when it consists of 4 separate slim garden frames with neither solid sides nor roof. In the planning officer's report it is referred to in one place as 'an inappropriate prominent addition within the site' which 'detracts away from the character and visual amenities of the local area', but in another place it is stated that the development is 'largely unviewable from the street scene, although it can be partially viewable from some vantage points from Lapwing Place. Nevertheless, given the distance between the development and the public vantage points, officers would not consider it to result in a prominent and incongruous addition to the street scene'.
9. There is a significant contradiction here, in that it would appear impossible for a development to detract from the visual amenities of an area if it is largely unviewable from outside of the site and is neither prominent nor incongruous. In addition, the officer's report concludes that the proposal would not be harmful to the amenities of surrounding residents by way of outlook or light. On this basis, the Council has not clearly identified any harm to the visual amenities of the area from the regard of either the public or private realm.
10. Furthermore, subsequent to the statement that the Council officers would not consider the development to be a prominent and incongruous addition the street scene, the report concludes that 'the structure would therefore have a detrimental impact, detracting from the character and visual amenities of the local area'. Again the assertions by the Council appear as contradictory and based largely on inaccurate, inconsistent or incomplete analysis. For this reason, I consider that the Council's behaviour has been unreasonable in this particular matter.
11. I therefore find that unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense, as described in the Planning Practice Guidance has been demonstrated and that a partial award of costs is justified.



### **Costs Order**

12. In exercise of the powers under section 250(5) of the Local Government Act 1972 and Schedule 6 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended, and all other enabling powers in that behalf, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Stafford Borough Council shall pay to Mr Brian Ragobar the costs of the appeal proceedings described in the heading of this decision, limited to those costs incurred with regard to countering vague and inaccurate assertions about the proposal's impact which were unsupported by clear objective analysis; such costs to be assessed in the Senior Courts Costs Office if not agreed.
13. The applicant is now invited to submit to Stafford Borough Council, to whom a copy of this decision has been sent, details of those costs with a view to reaching agreement as to the amount.

*J D Westbrook*

INSPECTOR



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2024

**by H Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 16 December 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/W/24/3342492**

**Land rear of 66 Mount Road, Stone, Staffordshire ST15 8LJ**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Sarah Tolley against the decision of Stafford Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 22/36059/OUT.
  - The development proposed is a new dwelling on land off Whitebridge Lane, Stone.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Application for costs

2. An application for an award of costs was made by Sarah Tolley against Stafford Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

### Procedural Matters

3. The application was submitted in outline with only access and scale being considered at this stage. All other matters, namely appearance, landscaping and layout have been reserved for a subsequent application.
4. Prior to the determination of this appeal, a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. The substantive matters of the case before me are not however affected thereby. I do not therefore feel any of the main parties' cases would be prejudiced by me proceeding without further consultation thereon.

### Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the health of a protected tree, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of future occupiers.

### Reasons

6. The Copper Beech tree in question is substantial in size and located in the rear garden of No 66 Mount Road and close to its rearmost boundary as it abuts the appeal site. It is an attractive specimen of some considerable maturity, height and canopy spread. These factors mean the tree makes a significant and positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area, being seen from a number of vantage points around and over surrounding dwellings. It is subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).

7. There is some debate in the evidence as to whether the tree is a veteran. If this were to be so, and the Council's officer presents a reasonably compelling case in favour, the Root Protection Area (RPA) would be wider than the 15 metres set out by the appellant. Their RPA, though supported by measurements of the trunk diameter at the required height and taking into account the specimen's age, species and overall size, does not give a sufficiently compelling case for limiting it to such. With this in mind, and erring on the side of caution, the RPA could be wider, truncating any developable space if a dwelling were to be erected completely clear of a RPA even further.
8. Built form can take place within a RPA and there are construction methods suggested to be able to facilitate such. Without knowing more precise detail on the one for the Copper Beech in question however, taking account of its age and quality, it is difficult to commit to which one might be the most appropriate, if indeed any would be at all. Granting a planning permission and dealing with such matters later might thus be akin to trying to lock the door after the horse has bolted. Such works would then lead to future problems for the tree's health due to compaction or severance of key parts of the root system closest to the soil's surface. Any damage to the longer-term health of the tree, leading to its demise in the future, would be significantly detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
9. If I were to take it that a dwelling could be developed entirely outside of the RPA, assuming it were to be 15m as suggested, it would be squeezed entirely to the boundary of the plot closest to the road edge. The Council has not alleged any harm in this regard and putting the potentially contrived nature of such a solution aside, any garden space for the unit would be entirely within the crown spread of the tree. It would therefore, during significant periods of time when the tree would be in leaf, would be in almost permanent shade given the density of the tree's canopy and foliage. Without a final design I could not be sure where windows on such a unit would be placed but should it have more than one aspect then the rooms they would serve would be similarly affected.
10. The density of the tree's canopy would result in significant leaf fall and by the appellant's own admission this has created issues for their own and neighbours' dwellings and gardens. It is difficult to see that the same nuisance would not befall occupiers of a dwelling on the appeal site. This would lead to future pressure for overly substantial pruning or complete removal. In any case, for this and the above reasons, the proposed development would result in an unacceptably poor standard of living conditions for future occupiers.
11. The above harms to both the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of future occupiers, owing to the effect the scheme would have on the longer term health of the Copper Beech tree, would result in conflict with Policies N1 and N4 of the Plan for Stafford Borough 2011-2031 (2014) and Policy H2 of the Stone Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031, which together and amongst other matters seek to ensure the development protects and conserves the natural environment and respects trees. Although Policies N1 and H2 are concerned with design, they also require development to take account of local character and respect trees. Whilst the application was in outline, these matters are directly relevant to development of the site due to the presence of the protected tree.

### **Other Matters**

12. I have been provided with other examples of outline proposals for development on sites which include trees in the local area. Whilst I do not have the full details of the proposal before me, they do not appear to be comparable to the appeal site, due to the size of the trees and space available for development. I am also not certain that they include trees protected by a TPO. In any event I have determined the appeal on the site-specific circumstances of the case.
13. I am also aware that the appeal scheme would be acceptable in a number of other areas. Such as the site being within the settlement, not in a flood zone and there being no objections on highways grounds. These matters would however be a lack of harm in each case and not therefore weigh in the proposed development's favour. They would be neutral in any balance.

### **Planning Balance and Conclusion**

14. The appeal scheme would not accord with the development plan in relation to the health of the protected tree within the site in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and living conditions of future occupiers. It would however provide an additional dwelling, that could both contribute to the supply of self and custom build plots and to the mix and supply of homes in the area. This would support the social and economic objectives of the Framework. However, given the magnitude of the development, these benefits would attract limited weight in favour of the proposal. This leads me to conclude that the proposal would not accord with the development plan when considered as a whole and that the benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the substantial harms identified. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

*H Senior*

INSPECTOR



## Costs Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2024

**by H Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 16 December 2024**

---

### **Costs application in relation to Appeal Ref: APP/Y3425/W/24/3342492 Land rear of 66 Mount Road, Stone, Staffordshire ST15 8LJ**

- The application is made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, sections 78, 322 and Schedule 6, and the Local Government Act 1972, section 250(5).
  - The application is made by Sarah Tolley for a full award of costs against Stafford Borough Council.
  - The appeal was against the refusal of planning permission for a new dwelling on land off Whitebridge Lane, Stone
- 

### **Decision**

1. The application for an award of costs is refused.

### **Reasons**

2. Parties in planning appeals normally meet their own expenses. However, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that costs may be awarded against a party who has behaved unreasonably and thereby caused the party applying for costs to incur unnecessary or wasted expense in the appeal process. The PPG states that awards may be either procedural in regard to behaviour in relation to completing the appeal process or substantive, which relates to the planning merits of the appeal.
3. The applicant alleges that the Council acted unreasonably in reaching a delayed decision with no agreed extensions of time, asking for a hypothetical design of a dwelling and arboricultural report and considering matters outside the scope of the outline application as it was proposed.
4. The Council in their response have outlined the factors which led to the delay, including changes in planning officers and mutually accepted delays caused by dialogue between the parties and the submission of further information. However, there is no information on the progress of the application between the validation date of 18 July 2022 and the beginning of 2023. An additional delay occurred due to additional information not reaching the appropriate person in a timely manner. Further delays appear to have taken place when the case officer who determined the application took over the case. These delays have caused stress to the applicant and their family.
5. Although the application was in outline with only scale and access to be determined, due to the presence of a protected tree on the site an arboricultural report was necessary to establish the spread of the tree canopy and extent of the Root Protection Area (RPA) to ensure that any development would not harm the long-term health of the tree. The illustrative plans for the location of the proposed dwelling were also necessary to determine whether a dwelling could be located in such a way as to avoid the RPA and be appropriate

in its setting even though the application as made in outline. I do not consider this to be unreasonable behaviour by the Council.

6. The applicant was inconvenienced for the delay in determining the application. It is regrettable that this caused a deal of stress. It would certainly have been helpful for the Council to have kept the applicant up to date and/or agreed extensions of time for the scheme's determination. Be this as it may, a successful application for costs relies on satisfying a two stage test so even if the Council's lack of assistance were to be considered unreasonable, which I remain to be convinced it was, it is difficult to see how the delays have led to unnecessary or wasted expense for the applicant.

**Conclusion**

7. Unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense has not occurred and an award of costs is not justified. It is therefore hereby refused.

*H Senior*

INSPECTOR

---

PLANNING COMMITTEE - 20 JANUARY 2025

---

**Ward Interest - Nil**

**Enforcement Matters**

*Report of Head of Economic Development and Planning*

**Purpose of Report**

To consider the following reports:

	<b>Page Nos</b>
(a) <b>USE/00218/EN24</b> - Land Lying To The East Of Stallington Road, Blythe Bridge, Stoke-On-Trent	16 - 19

**Previous Consideration**

Nil

**Background Papers**

File available in the Development Management Section

**Officer Contact**

John Holmes, Development Manager, 01785 619302

---

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 20 JANUARY 2025

---

**Ward - Fulford**

**SITE ADDRESS**

Land Lying To The East Of Stallington Road, Blythe Bridge

**Purpose of Report**

To consider the change of use of the land from Agricultural to residential and the associated Operational Development without planning permission.

**Detail**

1. On Friday 6 December 2024 multiple complaints were received by the Council regarding works being carried out on the Site.
2. It was ascertained that there is no planning permission for the development of the land, and therefore a planning enforcement case was opened under reference USE/00218/EN24 for the "Unauthorised Material Change of Use to residential and associated storage of caravans and associated operational development".
3. On 11 December 2024 a Temporary Stop Notice (TSN) was issued under delegated powers and served on the Site. The purpose of the TSN was to stop the continued development of the site where a new gypsy and traveller site was in the process of being set up.
4. The Site is agricultural land in the North Staffordshire Green Belt.
5. The Site is accessed from Stallington Road by a small single vehicle width track between two of the houses. The site, which is part of a larger agricultural field, is enclosed by a close boarded fence and the land levelled with some type of road surfacing material.
6. Following service of the TSN on 11 December 2024, many complaints were received from local residents about large lorries delivering aggregate to the site and about plant and machinery on site.
7. On 16 December 2024 Council Officers and Staffordshire Police attended a public meeting organised by Fulford Parish Council, at which numerous complaints were made about the development of the site including additional complaints about large lorries of aggregate being delivered, and noise caused by the development works and a generator running on the site.
8. On 17 December 2024 Enforcement Officers conducted another visit to the Site, to assess any changes in the occupancy and whether any additional works had been carried out to the site since the service of the TSN.



9. At the site visit on 17 December 2024 the Enforcement Officers noted that the following works appear to have been carried out since the service of the TSN: The laying off a significant amount of aggregate and the laying of soil pipe to the toilet block and around the perimeter, the import of a number of additional caravans and the installation of a generator. The site owner advised that all 5 of the caravans and the motorhome were occupied.
10. With the evidence that the TSN was not being complied with legal advice was sought on the potential to seek an injunction. The Head of Economic Development and Planning in consultation with the Head of Law and Governance authorised the institution of legal proceedings for an injunction and an application was made to the County Court at Stoke-on-Trent.
11. A District Judge granted an interim injunction, which was served on 23 and 24 December 2024. The interim injunction orders that it is forbidden to: carry out any further development of the land, and storing or parking any additional caravans, facilities, plant or machinery on the land. It also forbids the storing or parking of any commercial vehicles on the land.
12. Since the service of the Injunction, numerous breaches have been reported to the Council.
13. None of the occupiers of the site have indicated that they have protected characteristics as defined under the Equalities Act 2011.

## **Policies**

The Plan for Stafford Borough - Policy Spatial Principle 7 – Supporting the Location of New Development; Policy C6 - Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show-people; Policy N1 - Design.

National Planning Policy Framework December 2024 (NPPF) Paragraph 60 states, Effective enforcement is important to maintain public confidence in the planning system. Enforcement action is discretionary, and local planning authorities should act proportionately in responding to suspected breaches of planning control.

NPPF paragraphs 153, 154, 155 - Proposals affecting the Green Belt

Planning policy for traveller sites (December 2024)

The Council has had due regard to the circumstances of the traveller community and has considered its obligations under the relevant planning policy and guidance. While recognising the obligation of public authorities to act compatibly with the European Convention on Human Rights and under the provisions of the Race Relations Act 1976 (as amended in 2000) the Council should actively seek to eliminate unlawful discrimination, and it should promote good race relations between Gypsies/Travellers and the settled population. However, having this in mind the Council cannot ignore the harm to the Green Belt as a result of this unauthorised development. Furthermore, the Council acknowledges its obligations under the Race Relations Act, the European Convention on Human Rights and Equalities Act. It is considered that in its actions to date, the Council has acted in accordance with appropriate Government guidance and development plan policies and has complied with the Public Sector Equality Duty in its decision making to take enforcement action. Its objections to the use of land for such a purpose are based on the unsuitability of the site given its location within the Green Belt and no evidence to support a contrary view. This decision is made with all due regard to the travellers' special characteristics and their personal circumstances which have been identified but the Council does not believe this outweighs the planning harm and as such considers that the issuing of an enforcement notice is a proportionate response to the planning harm caused.

### **Conclusion**

The unauthorised development and use of the site is inappropriate development which, by definition, is harmful to the Green Belt. Substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt and it is expedient to take enforcement action to remove that harm. Having considered all the above and having had due regard to the special characteristics of the traveller community, it is considered that it is expedient to issue an enforcement notice and furthermore it is a proportionate response in light of the planning harm caused.

### **Recommendations**

That formal enforcement action be taken through the issue and service of an Enforcement Notice to remove the unauthorised use and any associated operational development including any hardcore or other materials imported on to the site, and to include authority to take all steps, thereafter, including the instigation of court proceedings and any work required to secure the removal of the unauthorised use and development as appropriate.

### **Background Papers and History**

USE/00218/EN24

### **Contact Officer**

Jeanette Oates Planning Enforcement Officer

### USE/00218/EN24

## Land Lying To The East Of Stallington Road

### Blythe Bridge

