
Appeal Decisions

Hearing held and site visit made on 15 September 2015

by Tim Belcher FCII, LLB (Hons), Solicitor (Non Practising)

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

Decision date: 29 October 2015

Appeal A Ref: APP/R3325/C/15/3003924 to 3003934

Land at OS 1074, Crosskeys, Ashill, Somerset

- The appeal is made under Section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991 (the 1990 Act).
 - The appeal is made by Aney Brazil, Sally Brazil, Mark Brazil, Dolly Brazil, Mathew Brazil, Bonnie Brazil, James Ayres, Michelle Ayres, David Tucker, Lisa Tucker, David Brazil and Denise Brazil, (the Appellants) against an Enforcement Notice issued by South Somerset District Council (the Council) on 15 January 2015.
 - The Council's reference is 14/00235/USE.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the Enforcement Notice is without planning permission, the operational development and change of use of the land from agricultural to residential by the siting of seven residential mobile homes and other domestic items on the land and the laying out of an internal access road on the land.
 - The requirements of the Enforcement Notice are: (i) Cease the residential use of the land. (ii) Remove from the land all of the unauthorised mobile homes and all other ancillary structures, domestic goods, services and materials associated with such services and all other materials or items associated with the residential use. (iii) Remove the internal access road within the site and restore the land to its former condition. (iv) Restore the whole area of land to its former state as agricultural land.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is six months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in Section 174(2) (a) and (g) of the 1990 Act.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/R3325/W/14/3005480

Cad Road, Ilton, Somerset, TA19

- The appeal is made under Section 78 of the 1990 Act against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by the Appellants against the decision of the Council.
 - The application Ref 13/04848/FUL, dated 16 April 2013, was refused by notice dated 28 August 2014.
 - The development proposed is the change of use of land to a private gypsy caravan site consisting of six pitches, associated development and the creation of a new access.
-

Decision – Appeal A

1. The Enforcement Notice is corrected by the deletion of the words in paragraph 3 and the substitution of the words, "Without planning permission the change of use of the land to a private gypsy caravan site consisting of six pitches". Subject to this correction the appeal is allowed and the Enforcement Notice is quashed and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under Section 177(5) of the 1990 Act for the development already carried out, namely the change of use of the land at Palm Drive, Cad Road, Ilton, Ilminster, TA19 as shown on the plan attached to the Enforcement

Notice, to a private gypsy caravan site consisting of six pitches subject to the conditions specified in the Schedule of Conditions below.

Decision – Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change of use of land to a private gypsy caravan site consisting of six pitches, associated development and the creation of a new access at Palm Drive, Cad Road, Ilton, Ilminster, TA19 in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 13/04848/FUL, dated 16 April 2013, subject to the conditions specified in the Schedule of Conditions below.

Procedural Matters

3. Whilst the addresses for the site differs in the headings above both appeals relate to the same land, namely land now known as Palm Drive, Cad Road, Ilton, Ilminster, TA19. I will refer to the appeal site as "Palm Drive" in my Appeal Decisions.
4. The Council and the Appellants confirmed that the Enforcement Notice relates to the same development as that proposed by the Section 78 Appeal. I have therefore considered the development to which the Section 174 Appeal relates as being part of the development proposed by the Section 78 Appeal.
5. With the permission of the owners and the agreement of the Appellants I viewed the exterior of Rowland's Farmhouse and Rowland's Mill on an unaccompanied basis.
6. As agreed by the Appellants and the representatives of Mr and Mrs Speke I also viewed:
 - a) The public gypsy caravan site at Gravel Lane near Ilton on an unaccompanied basis.
 - b) The gate piers, gates and metal railings at the entrance to Jordans from the public highway on an unaccompanied basis.
7. The Appellants explained that no mobile homes have been stationed at "Palm Drive" as alleged in the Enforcement Notice just touring caravans. At the time of my site visit there were nine touring caravans stationed at "Palm Drive". Further, there were about nine structures of various sizes used in connection with the residential use of "Palm Drive".
8. The Council issued a Stop Notice on 16 April 2015. I am advised that all work at "Palm Drive" ceased following the service of the Stop Notice.
9. The Appellants claim that they are gypsies or travellers as defined in Annex 1 to Planning Policy For Traveller Sites (PPTS). There were no oral representations made at the Hearing the Appellants were not gypsies or travellers. Further, the Council agreed the Appellants' gypsy or traveller status in the Statement of Common Ground¹. There is no evidence before me that the Appellants are not gypsies or travellers. Further, if permission were given on the basis that "Palm Drive" is only to be occupied by gypsies or travellers then the Council would be able to enforce that condition where it is expedient so to do.

¹ Paragraph 19 of Document 4

Relevant Background Matters

10. "Palm Drive" is within the open countryside. Prior of the development which has been carried out by the Appellants "Palm Drive" comprised a field typical of the surrounding area which was used for animal grazing.

Main Issues for the Section 78 Appeal and Ground (a) of the Section 174 Appeal

11. I consider the main issues in this case are:

- a) The impact of the proposal on the listed gateway, Rowland's Farmhouse and Rowland's Mill.
- b) The impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Policy

12. The Development Plan for the area includes the Policies SD1, HG7, Paragraph 10.50, EQ2 and EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (the Local Plan).

13. I was also referred to policies/advice in:

- a) PPTS.
- b) National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

14. Further still, I was referred:

- a) In general terms to "A Better Quality of Life, A Strategy for Sustainable Development in the UK".
- b) The letter dated 27 March 2015 from Brandon Lewis to the Planning Inspectorate ("the Brandon Lewis Letter").

At the Hearing I handed out a document entitled "Policy Referred to During the Appeal"² which details the policies and advice in PPTS and NPPF that I had been referred to.

Reasons

Impact on Heritage Assets

15. Local Plan Policy EQ3 explains that all new development proposals relating to the historic environment will be expected to safeguard the setting of heritage assets.

16. I am also aware of my duties under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed buildings.

17. The listed gateway comprises a pair of Ham-stone decorative piers with short lengths of cast iron railings set in a stone base. There is a cattle grid between the piers and a pedestrian gate within the railings to the east of the piers. The entrance through the piers in onto a driveway which leads to Rowland's Farmhouse and Rowland's Mill.

² Document 6

18. The entrance gateway is a Grade II listed building. Rowland's Farmhouse and Rowland's Mill are both Grade II* listed buildings. Details relating to these buildings are set out in their listing descriptions in the Somerset Historic Environment Record³.
19. The listed gateway is set back from the carriageway of Cad Road (a former turnpike road) behind a wide grassed verge. "Palm Drive" is on the opposite side of Cad Road to the listed gateway as is the existing entrance to "Palm Drive". From the listed gateway there are clear and unobstructed views in to "Palm Drive" and the following items can be clearly seen:
- a) Part of the internal roadway.
 - b) The upper parts of two caravans.
 - c) The upper parts of a partially constructed amenity building.
 - d) The upper parts of two sheds.
 - e) Part of the recently erected timber fence around Plot 1.
 - f) Part of a container and part of a tradesman's vehicle within Plot 1.
20. I have had regard to the definition of the "setting of a heritage asset" as set out in the NPPF. It is clear from my site visit that the setting of the listed gateway includes "Palm Drive". To a lesser extent, because the listed gateway provides the only realistic access to Rowland's Farmhouse and Rowland's Mill "Palm Drive" is also part of the setting of those listed buildings.
21. The Appellants' agent explained that the listed gateway:
- a) Comprise a pair of finely dressed, locally sourced Hamstone piers with coeval cast iron railings.
 - b) Mark the access to the important historic sites at Rowland's Farmhouse and Rowland's Mill.
 - c) Is an essential indicator of both the location and high status of Rowland's Farmhouse and Rowland's Mill.
 - d) Is a fine example of craftsmanship and design.
22. I agree with the Appellants' assessment of the listed gateway and its importance.
23. The impact of the current entrance to "Palm Drive" has a significant and harmful impact on the setting of the listed gateway because:
- a) It impacts on the sense of arrival at the entrance to Rowland's Farmhouse and Rowland's Mill.
 - b) It competes for the attention of passers-by, especially those travelling on foot or by bike who would have more time to take in the surroundings of the listed gateway.
 - c) What is seen through the existing access to "Palm Drive" is completely at odds with the elegance and craftsmanship of the listed gateway.

³ Document 5

24. The NPPF explains that:

- a) The significance of the heritage assets can be harmed by development within its setting.
- b) Where development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- c) Decision makers should look for the opportunities for new development within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve the elements of the setting and make a positive contribution to, or better reveal, the significance of the heritage asset should be treated favourably.

25. The proposal seeks to:

- a) Close the existing access in to "Palm Drive".
- b) Plant up the gap created by the existing entrance to "Palm Drive" so as to match the hedgerow on either side of that entrance.
- c) Reinststate the wide grass verge over which access to "Palm Drive" is currently achieved.

26. There is a dispute about the length of time that it would take to establish an hedgerow within the gap created by the existing entrance in such a way that it would effectively screen the development within "Palm Drive" that can currently be seen. It is clear from the site visit and the proposed internal layout that there is sufficient land within the control of the Appellants to plant a hedgerow which would, in time, reflect the existing hedgerow and which would effectively screen the development within "Palm Drive". I have no doubt that this may take several years to achieve but I have no doubt that when the proposed hedgerow becomes established it will effectively screen the development at "Palm Drive" when viewed from or near the listed gateway.

27. It is proposed to introduce a new access to "Palm Drive" at a point about 65m to the west of the existing access. That access would be slightly wider than the existing access. I am of the view that the proposed access would have no impact on the setting of the listed gateway and other heritage assets referred to above because:

- a) Of the distance between the new access and the listed gateway.
- b) The new access is not in that part of the widened Cad Road (with its wide grassed verges) which creates the sense of arrival at the historic entrance and listed gateway to the Rowland's Farmhouse and Rowland's Mill.

28. I am aware that there are many other listed buildings in the area but I do not consider that the proposal to be within the setting of any of these.

29. I conclude that:

- a) Moving the entrance to "Palm Drive" will safeguard and preserve the setting of the listed gateway, Rowland's Farmhouse and Rowland's Mill.

- b) Reinstating the grass verge where the existing access to "Palm Drive" currently is would make a positive contribution to, and better reveal, the significance of the listed gateway.
- c) The proposal accords with the relevant part of the Local Plan.

Character and Appearance

- 30. Local Plan Policy EQ2 applies to all development. It explains that development will be designed to achieve a high quality which preserves South Somerset's local distinctiveness and / or enhances the character and appearance of the district. Development proposals would be considered against a list of matters specified in Policy EQ2.
- 31. Local Plan Policy HG7 relates specifically to gypsies and travellers and sets out the criteria to guide the location of gypsy caravan sites. The relevant criterion in this case is that the development of gypsy caravan sites should not have a significant adverse impact on the landscape character and visual amenity of the area.
- 32. PPTS explains that:
 - a) Decision makers should very strictly limit new traveller sites in open countryside.
 - b) Sites should be well planned or soft landscaped in such a way to positively enhance the environment and increase its openness.
 - c) Opportunities for healthy lifestyles should be promoted by ensuring adequate landscaping and play areas for children.
- 33. The Brandon Lewis Letter explains that the impact of development on the landscape can be an important material consideration.
- 34. The proposal does not positively enhance the environment in as much as it would replace an agricultural field with a six-pitch gypsy caravan site but nonetheless it meets other criterion set out in PPTS.
- 35. "Palm Drive" is well screened by roadside hedging from Cad Road and Butts Lane. I have explained the situation regarding the existing access to "Palm Drive" and I have no doubt that the current use of "Palm Drive" has an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area when viewed from the existing access point. However, the harm caused by views into "Palm Drive" will eventually be eliminated by the proposed planting within the entrance. When this is achieved there would be no adverse impact on the character or appearance of the landscape from that public vantage point.
- 36. There is no evidence before me to suggest that the unauthorised works carried out at "Palm Drive" have:
 - a) Resulted in the raising of land levels within the site.
 - b) Damaged the roadside hedge.
- 37. Having seen the size of the individual plots at "Palm Drive" I have no doubt that there is sufficient room to enable significant areas of soft landscaping to be carried out. Further, there is no reason why the use of "Palm Drive" as a gypsy caravan site would result in damage to such planting.

38. I have noted the proposed positions of the static homes and amenity buildings as shown on the application plans. Apart from the proposed access and the time taken for the screening to become established in the gap created by the existing access I consider that these structures will largely be screened by new landscaping from public views along Cad Road or Butts Lane.
39. I am also aware that the screening of "Palm Drive" afforded by the roadside hedge along Cad Road is not as comprehensive when the leaves on the trees and hedges have gone. I accept that but even then the trees and hedgerows are effective in breaking up the outline of those structures. I was also advised that when the photographs in Mr Harris's evidence were taken the roadside hedge was much lower than it currently is and the Appellants intend to retain the hedge at a height which would effectively screen the mobile homes and the amenity buildings.
40. All the existing external lighting within "Palm Drive" is currently placed at a low level and I do not consider that this low level lighting results in any significant adverse impact when viewed from outside the site.
41. I have given considerable thought to the impact of opening up views into "Palm Drive" from the proposed access point. If the layout plan is adhered to and the indicative landscape planting is carried out then views of caravans, amenity blocks, vehicles and general activity will, over time, be significantly reduced.
42. It is obvious that the activity generated by the use will be far greater than that which existed when "Palm Drive" was agricultural grazing land. However, I do not consider that this location is tranquil and quiet. The road carries a steady flow of fast moving noisy traffic and on the afternoon of my site visit there were a lot of helicopters flying overhead. The Appellants' agent explained prior to going to "Palm Drive" that helicopter activity in this area was not unusual.
43. I therefore conclude, for the reasons explained above, that the proposed development of the private gypsy caravan site at "Palm Drive" if carried out in accordance with the application plans would not have a significant adverse impact on the landscape character and visual amenity of the area. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with the relevant Local Plan policy.

Other Matters

44. PPTS explains that when assessing sites in rural areas decision makers should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community.
45. It was suggested that the gypsy caravan site at "Palm Drive" will dominate the nearest settled community. However, there is simply no evidence before me to support that assertion. "Palm Drive" is in open countryside. There are a scattering of houses along Cad Road but I do not consider that these comprise a settled community. In my judgement the nearest settled communities are at Ilton, Ashill and Broadway.
46. The appeal proposal would provide six pitches for a family group who traditionally have lived and travelled together. The Council's Housing Officers have expressed the view that the Appellants should, if possible, be housed on the same site. Amongst other things, the members of the family groups work together and offer support for members of the other family groups thus creating a cohesive related community.

47. Currently there is no secure boundary treatment around the proposed children's play area within "Palm Drive". I was informed that this was because the Stop Notice prevented that work being carried out. The Appellants confirmed that they were not going to allow children to use the play area until it was made completely safe.
48. I noted at my site visit to the Gravel Lane gypsy caravan site that there appeared to be land available for further pitches. However, the Statement of Common Ground explains that there are no vacant pitches at that site. Further, I was advised that there is no extant planning permission or proposal for the expansion of that site.
49. Concerns were raised about:
- a) The numbers of people that would occupy "Palm Drive". The agent for the Appellants explained that the use would be limited to the named individuals and their dependents.
 - b) The sewage disposal system installed at "Palm Drive". Again, the Appellants' agent explained that a package treatment works had been installed at "Palm Drive" and the works were acceptable to the Council's Environmental Health Officer and the Environmental Agency. Further, the Appellants were willing to accept a condition that would allow the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, to assess the acceptability of the package treatment works.
50. There is no evidence before me that "Palm Drive" has ever flooded. I am aware that Cad Road has and that residents of houses along that road have been stranded. The Appellants' agent explained that they would be willing to agree and implement a Flood Emergency Plan. In the event that it became probable that "Palm Drive" would flood the Appellants would be able to move off "Palm Drive" in their touring caravans until that risk had gone.
51. Cad Road:
- a) Is unlit.
 - b) Does not benefit from a footway.
 - c) Is busy and carries large vehicles that travel to and from nearby business parks.
 - d) Is not a suitable place for children to play.
52. However, the Highway Authority raised no objection to the proposed use of "Palm Drive" on highway safety grounds subject to the visibility splays being provided and maintained. As mentioned already "Palm Drive" would also contain a reasonably sized play area for the children living on site to use and, in my assessment, there would be no reason for young children to use Cad Road on an unaccompanied basis.
53. The imposition of a gypsy occupation condition would not require a daily check as suggested by some interested parties. I would be no different to the imposition of other occupancy conditions. If it became apparent that "Palm Drive" was not being occupied in accordance with the occupancy condition the Council have the necessary powers of ensure that such conditions are complied with where it is expedient so to do.

54. I have noted the concerns that the planning system creates a form of discrimination against the settled community in the sense that it would be highly unlikely that open market residential development would be permitted at "Palm Drive". As explained above there are national and local policies for the provision of gypsy caravan sites and in my judgement this proposal meets those policy requirements.
55. I have had regard to other matters raised by local residents many of which were discussed at the Hearing and/or addressed in the Council's Committee Report. None of these weigh against the proposal.

Conditions

56. At the Hearing the Appellants' agent confirmed their agreement to all of the conditions suggested by the Council. The reasons for those conditions were explained in the documentation presented by the Council. I consider that those conditions are reasonable and necessary. I have made certain minor amendments to the wording of some of the conditions to reflect the evidence presented at the Hearing.
57. The occupation of "Palm Drive" would be limited to the named individuals and their resident dependents. This will ensure that the numbers of gypsies or travellers at "Palm Drive" are controlled and that the sewage treatment plant is able to cope with the number of occupiers and thus avoid any potential pollution of the nearby watercourse. Further, a condition is imposed which in effect requires "Palm Drive" to be restored to its undeveloped state if the use ceases.

Overall Conclusions – Appeal A

58. It is clear from the representations, and from my inspection of "Palm Drive", that the description of the development in the Enforcement Notice is incorrect in that the use of the land comprises a private gypsy caravan site of six pitches. All the operational development carried out at "Palm Drive" is part and parcel of that change of use. The Appellants and the Council agreed at the Hearing that it was open to me to correct the allegation in the Enforcement Notice. I am satisfied that no injustice will be caused by this and I will therefore correct the Enforcement Notice as explained above, in order to clarify the terms of the deemed application under Section 177(5) of the 1990 Act.
59. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed on Ground (a) and I will grant planning permission in accordance with the application deemed to have been made under Section 177(5) of the 1990 Act, which will now relate to the corrected allegation. In these circumstances the appeal under the Ground (g) does not need to be considered.

Overall Conclusions – Appeal B

60. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Tim Belcher

Inspector

Schedule of Conditions

1. The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than gypsies and travellers as defined in Annex 1: Glossary of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.
2. The use hereby permitted shall be carried on only by the following: Aney Brazil, Sally Brazil, Mark Brazil, Dolly Brazil, Mathew Brazil, Bonnie Brazil, David Brazil, Denise Brazil, James Ayres, Michelle Ayres, David Tucker and Lisa Tucker and their resident dependants.
3. When the site ceases to be occupied by those named in Condition 2 above, the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, buildings, structures, fences, materials, vehicles and equipment brought on to the land, or works undertaken to it in connection with the use, shall be removed and the site restored to its condition before the development took place.
4. There shall be no more than six pitches on the site. On each pitch no more than two caravans shall be stationed at any time, of which only one caravan shall be a static caravan.
5. No vehicle over 3.5 tonnes shall be stationed, parked or stored on the site.
6. No commercial activities shall take place on the site including the storage of materials.
7. No buildings or structures shall be constructed on the site other than those allowed by this permission.
8. No external lighting shall be installed within the site other than that agreed pursuant to Condition 13 below.
9. The parking and turning areas agreed pursuant to Condition 13 below shall be kept available for such uses at all times during the duration of the development.
10. In respect of the new vehicular access, there shall be no obstruction to visibility greater than 0.9m above the adjoining road level in advance of a line drawn 2.4m back from the carriageway edge on the centre line of the access and extending to a point on the nearside carriageway edge 215m to the west and 120m to the east of the access. Such visibility shall be fully provided within two months of the date of this Appeal Decision and shall be maintained at all times thereafter.
11. The existing access to the site shall be abandoned and its use permanently ceased within two months of the date of this Appeal Decision.
12. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 01219/1A REV8 – Block Plan; 01219/2 REV1 – Site Location Plan; 01219/3 REV 2 – Amenity Block; 01219/4 REV 3 - Access & Visibility; 01219/6B Rev 4 – Access Visibility to the East; 01219/6A Rev 4 – Access Visibility to the East.
13. The use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, equipment and materials brought on to the site shall be removed within 28

days of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out below:

- a) Within 1 month of the date of these Appeal Decisions schemes for:
- (i) Foul and surface water drainage of the site,
 - (ii) External lighting on the boundary and within the site,
 - (iii) Parking and turning areas within the site,
 - (iv) The consolidation of the surface of the proposed vehicular access to the site,
 - (v) Tree, hedge and shrub planting within the site and to close up the existing vehicular access to the site and to reinstate the grass verge in front of the existing access, and
 - (vi) Flood Emergency Plan.

hereafter referred to as "the Site Development Schemes" shall have been submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority and the Site Development Schemes shall include timetables for their implementation.

- b) Within 11 months of the date of these Appeal Decisions the Site Development Schemes shall have been approved by the Local Planning Authority or, if the Local Planning Authority refuses to approve the Site Development Schemes, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State.
- c) If an appeal is made in pursuance of (b) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted Site Development Schemes shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.
- d) The approved Site Development Schemes shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetables.
14. At the same time as the Site Development Schemes required in Condition 13 (v) above are submitted to the Local Planning Authority there shall be submitted a schedule of maintenance for a period of five years of the proposed planting commencing at the completion of the final phase of implementation as required by that Condition; the schedule to make provision for the replacement, in the same position, of any tree, hedge or shrub that is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies or, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, becomes seriously damaged or defective, with another of the same species and size as that originally planted. The maintenance shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANTS

Dr Angus Murdoch	Director of Murdoch Planning Limited
Rhodri Crandon	Tirlun Design Associates Limited
Nichola Burley	Heritage Vision Limited
David Brazil	Appellant
Aney Brazil	Appellant
Sally Brazil	Appellant
Denise Brazil	Appellant
Maggie Smith-Bendell	Romani Gypsy Liaison Officer

FOR SOUTH SOMERSET DISTRICT COUNCIL

David Norris	Planning Manager
Adron Duckworth	Conservation Manager

INTERESTED PERSONS

Pauline Ellis	Local Resident
Jane Simmonds-Short	Interested Party
Henry Best	Local Branch of the Campaign to Protect Rural England
Linda Vijeh	County and District Councillor
Peter & Joan Speke They instructed:	Rowland's Farm
David Jones	Senior Partner at Evans & Jones Limited
Michael Heaton	Michael Heaton Heritage Consultant
Paul Harris	Director of MHP Design Limited

DOCUMENTS

- Document 1 – Map showing the boundary between Landscape Areas 143 and 140 taken from Natural England website – presented to the Hearing by Mr Harris.
- Document 2 – English Heritage – Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning – Note 3 – The Setting of Heritage Assets – paragraph 10 - presented to the Hearing by Ms Burley.
- Document 3 – Natural England’s National Character Area 143 - Mid Somerset Hills presented to the Hearing by Mr Crandon.
- Document 4 – Statement of Common Ground.
- Document 5 – Listing Descriptions for the listed gateway, Rowland’s Farmhouse and Rowland’s Mill.
- Document 6 – “Policy Referred to During the Appeal”.

PHOTOGRAPHS

- 1 to 4 Broadlands North West Planting, Bridgend, South Wales presented to the Hearing by Mr Crandon.
- 5 to 7 Photographs of entrance gates to Jordans & map showing their location - presented to the Hearing by Ms Burley.