



---

## Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 17 February 2026

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

by **G Sylvester BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4<sup>th</sup> March 2026

---

### Appeal Ref: 6000934

#### **Pulmer Water Caravan Site, St Albans Road, Codicote, Hertfordshire SG4 8SP**

- 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 Larry Connors against the decision of North Hertfordshire District Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/00979/FP.
  - The development is the change of use of land for residential caravan site for 8 gypsy families including hardstanding and existing lights.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change of use of land for a residential caravan site for 8 gypsy families including hardstanding and existing lights at Pulmer Water Caravan Site, St Albans Road, Codicote, Hertfordshire SG4 8SP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00979/FP, and subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The use of the appeal land as a residential caravan site appears ongoing and there were more than 8 caravans stationed on the appeal land at the time of my visit. I have assessed the effects of the appeal development based on the details shown on the submitted drawings, which differ to the condition of the land on the ground, including in respect of the areas covered by grass.
3. I sought the views of the parties as to the correct address of the appeal site as different addresses are stated in different documents. As the appeal development would read on the ground as an extension to the existing caravan site, I have used the address from the appellant's planning application form.

### Main Issues

4. The main issues in this appeal are:
  - Whether the development would be inappropriate in the Green Belt having regard to any relevant development plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework").
  - The effect of the development on the openness and purposes of the Green Belt.
  - Whether the future occupants of the appeal site would be within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities.

## Reasons

### *Whether inappropriate development in the Green Belt*

5. Policy SP5 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031, Adopted November 2022 (“the NHLP”) states that development will only be permitted in the Green Belt where it would not be inappropriate development or where very special circumstances have been demonstrated.
6. Although the appeal development would not meet any of the exceptions to inappropriate development in Framework paragraph 154, it should not be regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt provided all the criteria in Framework paragraph 155 would apply. Based on all that I have read and heard at the hearing, I am satisfied that the appeal development would accord with Framework Paragraph 155.a. as it would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.
7. The main parties dispute whether there is a 5-year supply of deliverable traveller sites in North Hertfordshire for the purposes of Framework Paragraph 155.b. The North Hertfordshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, Final Report June 2024 (“GTAA”) identifies a known need for 6 pitches for gypsies and travellers, arising from existing unauthorised pitches on land at Woodside Place, Danesbury Park Road, including future household formation on that land.
8. Of those 6 pitches, the GTAA identified that 4 pitches would be needed within 5 years, and the remaining 2 would not be needed for at least 7 years due to the timing of new households forming. The need for those pitches within the 5-year period would be met through the allocation of 4 pitches on land at Woodside Place through NHLP Policy CD6. For this appeal the author of the GTAA has submitted an updated 5-year supply position for the period to 2029/2030, stating that the need remains for 4 pitches which would be met by the allocated site. The 2 pitches arising from household formation on the allocated site would not be required for at least 6 years.
9. From those documents it can be inferred that the fifth pitch, which is known to be triggered by a person’s birthday, would not be required until some point in the year 2031, and the sixth pitch later still. At the GTAA base date of January 2024, the current rolling 5-year period would end in December 2030, before the need for that fifth pitch arises. If the date of this decision was used as the base date the 5-year period would run until more or less March 2031. As most of 2031 would fall beyond that date, it is more likely than not that the need for the fifth pitch would not arise until beyond the 5-year period.
10. The deliverability of the allocated site is a matter of planning judgement to be assessed in the context of Footnote 4 to paragraph 10 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). The allocated site does not have a planning permission, albeit a temporary permission had been granted but has since expired. Nonetheless, its status as an allocated privately owned site occupied by gypsies and travellers known to the Council and interviewed in the GTAA, is a strong indicator that the site is available now and offers a suitable location for those pitches. The allocation is, on the evidence before me, deliverable.

11. Furthermore, the only sites occupied by gypsies and travellers in North Hertfordshire at the base date of the GTAA are the allocated site and the 12 pitches on land referred to during the hearing as 1a and 1b Pulmer Water. In that context, given the lack of alternative sites for gypsies and travellers it is reasonable to suppose that the occupiers of the allocated site will deliver all pitches to meet their needs within the 5-year period. That the Council is tolerating the unauthorised status of the allocated site is understandable in those circumstances.
12. As there is no requirement for absolute precision in reaching a judgement on the 5-year supply of pitches, I find that on the balance of probabilities the fifth and sixth pitches would not be needed within the next 5 years. Therefore, on the evidence before me, including all that I heard at the hearing, it is my judgement that the Council can demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable sites suitable to meet the known accommodation needs of gypsies and travellers in the NHLP's locally set target.
13. Consequently, there is no demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed in this appeal and it follows that the appeal development would not meet the terms of Framework paragraph 155.b. I therefore conclude on this main issue that the appeal development would constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt under the Framework and the PPTS. I need not consider the appeal development against Framework paragraph 155.c. as it would not alter that conclusion.
14. Despite having been granted a temporary 5 year planning permission on appeal in 2012<sup>1</sup> for occupation by gypsies and travellers, and a second temporary planning permission for 18 months in February 2021 for a caravan site for 8 gypsy families, the GTAA does not identify the appeal site as a gypsy or traveller site. The main parties at the hearing disagreed why the GTAA did not identify a need for pitches arising from the appeal site.
15. The Council explained that the temporary permission had expired at the point of undertaking fieldwork for the 2018 GTAA, and the appeal site had either never been occupied by gypsies and travellers who met the planning definition (as it was then) or had rarely been occupied by them. The appellant's position is that the Council should have known that gypsies and travellers were living on the appeal site, or at least assumed they were, and that the GTAA is based on the out-of-date definition that excludes those persons with a cultural tradition of living in a caravan.
16. The purpose of the GTAA is to identify the objectively assessed or known need for pitches for gypsies and travellers and for that need to be met through allocating land in the NHLP. Any need arising from gypsies and travellers that are not known to the Council through the GTAA is a matter left to the planning application process to be assessed against the criteria in NHLP Policy HS7.
17. From what I heard at the hearing the Council took reasonable steps through current and previous GTAAs to survey occupants of the appeal site. However, those occupants did not engage with the Council for reasons that appear disputed. Therefore, the Council was left in the position of being uncertain if the occupation of the appeal site generated a need for accommodation for persons who met the then planning definition of gypsies and travellers.

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/X195/C/11/2162956

18. Accordingly, any need from the appeal site does not form part of the objectively assessed or known need for accommodation for gypsies and travellers. Therefore, I shall deal with any need arising from the appeal site as part of my other considerations, including whether the occupants would meet the planning definition for gypsies and travellers.

*Effect on Green Belt openness and purposes.*

19. The Framework identifies that the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Openness has spatial and visual aspects.
20. The Council describes the baseline condition of the appeal site as devoid of development save for boundary fencing. The appellant explained that it should be treated as a cleared site. I find no reasons to consider otherwise. The extent of hardstanding shown on the drawings would enable the caravans to occupy the site along with parked vehicles and paraphernalia associated with residential occupation and activity. Taking account of the appeal site's baseline condition, those elements of the appeal development would inevitably cause a modest loss of openness in the spatial dimension.
21. The appeal development would be screened in public views given the generally low heights of the elements intrinsic to its occupation as pitches. This is because the appeal site is set back from the road and screened in public views by a combination of timber fencing and tall evergreen planting along most of its boundaries, together with the nearby buildings and mobile homes, and the topography of the surrounding land.
22. Although visible from nearby residential properties, the development would read as a modest and proportionate extension to the existing caravan site in those views. Consequently, there would be hardly any appreciable loss of openness in the visual dimension or visual intrusion into the Green Belt. As the appeal development would result in some limited encroachment into the countryside when compared to the baseline condition of the appeal land, it would conflict with that purpose of the Green Belt.
23. Taking all the above into account, I conclude on this main issue that the totality of the appeal development's harm to the Green Belt through a loss of openness and encroachment into the countryside would be modest in magnitude.

*Whether the site is within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities.*

24. NHLP Policy HS7, says planning permission will be granted for accommodation for gypsies and travellers where residents can access local services within a "reasonable distance". The supporting text to the Policy acknowledges that gypsy and traveller sites are usually permissible in the open countryside in recognition of the particular difficulties they have in obtaining land within settlements.
25. This is consistent with the PPTS which gives some flexibility to locating pitches outside of settlements by setting an expectation that decision makers should very strictly limit new traveller site development in the open countryside that is "away from" existing settlements.

26. Those considerations point away from the “*reasonable distance*” test in Policy HS7 relating solely to journeys by walking and cycling, let alone the walking and cycling distances in the guidance documents<sup>2</sup> that appear to be applicable to general needs housing. I am also mindful that Framework paragraph 110 requires decision makers to recognise that rural areas should not be treated the same as urban areas when it comes to the availability of opportunities for journeys by walking, cycling and public transport.
27. There is a range of services and facilities within the settlement of Codicote, a second-tier settlement in the NHLP, including a primary school, post office, convenience shop, pharmacy, public house, church and village hall. They are located some 1.7km away from the appeal site. The closest GP Surgery is some 3.4km away in Welwyn, which is roughly at the point where the A1M motorway can be accessed.
28. The road between the appeal site and those services and facilities in Codicote is for the most part a typical narrow country lane. It is mostly lined by high hedgerows and verges, and is devoid of lighting, footways and cycle lanes, with a relatively steep gradient in places. Given those conditions all occupants of the appeal development would be heavily reliant upon journeys by private vehicles to access the services and facilities in Codicote that they are likely to frequently use.
29. The development would therefore be at odds with the guidance documents<sup>3</sup> that seek for residential development to be within certain walkable distances of services and facilities. However, as NHLP Policy HS7 does not specify whether the “*reasonable distance*” test for accessibility to services should be applied to any particular mode of travel, it is a matter of judgement for the decision maker based on site and development specific factors as to whether that test is met.
30. In this instance, vehicle journeys into Codicote from the appeal site would be across a relatively short distance and the number of trips generated by the development would be at a low level, particularly by comparison to those associated with the lawful caravan sites nearby. It follows that occupants of the appeal site will be able to access the services and facilities they are likely to use frequently within a reasonable distance of travel from their homes.
31. The appeal site is not so far away from Codicote that it should be considered as being away from the nearest settlement within the terms expressed by the PPTS. Higher order healthcare facilities and the strategic road network are not an excessive distance away.
32. For those reasons, I conclude on this main issue that the occupants of the appeal site would be within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities, consistent with NHLP Policy HS7, the requirements of which are set out above.

### **Other considerations**

#### *Accommodation needs of the intended occupants*

33. The appellant’s statement of case lists the members of his family who occupy or would occupy pitches on the appeal site, which was updated at the hearing to include details such as the number of resident children. The appellant described

---

<sup>2,3</sup> Institution of Highways & Transportation and Manual for Streets

himself and his family as Irish travellers who have a tradition of nomadism and living in a caravan. They have, at times, travelled all over England and abroad to find work, with some family members currently away travelling. I am satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the occupiers of the appeal site meet the PPTS definition of gypsies and travellers, which does not require a nomadic habit of life.

34. The evidence indicates that 5 of those 8 households have occupied the appeal site for varying periods of time, one of them with 2 children. The remaining 3 households currently reside either in culturally appropriate lawful caravans on the adjacent site<sup>4</sup> or a house which is not culturally appropriate, each with between 3 and 5 children. It was explained at the hearing that they occupy overcrowded accommodation in the form of single type units with an insufficient number of bedrooms. In one case there are male and female children sharing a bedroom. Those households are waiting to move to larger units on the appeal site.
35. The evidence indicates that the lawful site accommodates more or less the maximum number of static caravans achievable under the site license. I saw that they are relatively tightly spaced, which appears to be consistent with the minimum separation distances between units that are established by the site licensing regime. Consequently, I see no basis to doubt the appellant's contention that those households with children are living in overcrowded and unsuitable conditions on the lawful site.
36. The Council and interested parties contend that the appeal development and the harms it would cause could be avoided if the appellant had properly explored options for accommodating his family on his lawful caravan site, including reducing the number of caravans to make space for larger units to meet the needs of those occupying families. However, the lawful caravan site appears to be run as a business. Apart from those gypsy and traveller households referred to above, it is said to be occupied by members of the settled community as their home. As it consists of tightly spaced rows of caravans set in somewhat austere surroundings it probably offers relatively low-cost housing to those occupiers.
37. Whilst the appellant's family members have a need for culturally appropriate accommodation and in some instances larger units, there is no binding obligation on the appellant to evict existing residents and offer those caravans to his family or reduce the number of them to accommodate larger twin units. As such, I do not regard the lawful site as being reasonably available to meet the accommodation needs of the gypsies and travellers in this appeal.

#### *Alternative sites*

38. Whilst the Council can demonstrate an up to date 5-year supply of deliverable sites for gypsies and travellers, the evidence before me shows that the intended occupiers of the appeal site need pitches now. As it is highly unlikely that those pitches in the NHLP's allocated supply would be available to them, they have an unmet need for pitches that could not reasonably be met by any available suitable alternative accommodation. It is a strong indicator of an inequality of opportunity for the gypsies and travellers in this appeal to access accommodation compatible with their traditional cultural way of life and in a suitable location. This weighs significantly in favour of the appeal.

---

<sup>4</sup> Certified in 2015 ref. 13/1454/1EUD as lawful for use a residential caravan site

*Equalities, human rights and best interests of children*

39. Dismissing the appeal would be expected to result in the gypsies and travellers currently occupying the appeal site, including a family with children, being made homeless and resorting to a roadside existence. Those households with children on the lawful site would remain in overcrowded accommodation. This would not be a good outcome for the health and wellbeing of those persons, and particularly children for whom a settled base at the appeal site would provide good access to regularly attend education at the primary school in Codicote.
40. The appellant has lived at Pulmer Water all his life and spoke of children from the family attending the primary school. There is a familial relationship between the current occupiers of the appeal site and those which intend to move onto it which would allow for a high degree of mutual support which is considered necessary to the gypsy and traveller way of life.
41. The modest level of harm to the Green Belt could be avoided at the expense of several households of gypsies and travellers in this appeal being made homeless. This would represent a significant level of interference with their human rights under Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights, as incorporated by the Human Rights Act 1998. This includes the best interests of the children which is a primary consideration and caselaw has held that no other consideration is inherently more important.
42. The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires me to have due regard to eliminating unlawful discrimination and to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, and to foster good relations between them. Gypsies and travellers share a protected characteristic for the purposes of the PSED. The proximity of the appeal site to community facilities in Codicote provides opportunities for integration and fostering good relations between gypsies and travellers and the settled community.
43. Together, those considerations, including the best interests of the several children involved, weigh very significantly in favour of the appeal development.

*Suitability of the appeal site for gypsies and travellers, including PPTS paragraph 13*

44. The appeal development scores well against the criteria in NHLP Policy HS7 for developments that are not required to meet needs identified in the GTAA. The appeal site would provide its occupants with a safe, inclusive and secure environment in an appropriate location for a settled base to meet their traditional cultural lifestyle, within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities. Assessed against NHLP Policy HS7, which appears consistent with PPTS paragraph 13, the appeal site can demonstrate a strong degree of suitability for use as a gypsy and traveller site, which weighs significantly in its favour.
45. Whether the harm to the Green Belt amounts to a conflict with other development plan policies (namely Policy SP5 in this instance) and the Framework, sufficient to bring it into conflict with NHLP Policy HS7 criterion e) i., depends upon whether it, and any other planning harms, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify it. I shall return to that matter in my Green Belt balance.

## **Other Matters**

46. The development would be successfully screened and contained within clearly defined boundaries and would not have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of occupiers of nearby developments. There is nothing to suggest it could not be serviced with water, electricity, sewerage or waste disposal. It is material that the appeal development would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the countryside, thus falling well short of the significant adverse effect needed to conflict with criterion e) i. of Policy HS7.
47. Although not a refusal reason, the Council's appeal statement contends there would not be adequate vehicle parking, turning and servicing space within the appeal site, citing a conflict with criterion e) iii. of Policy HS7. However, based on the drawings before me and my observations at the site visit, I am satisfied that there is sufficient space on the appeal site for the development comply with that criterion. No such concerns were raised in respect of the previous applications on the appeal site, and the Local Highways Authority raised no objection with regard to highway safety.
48. Although not an explicit criterion of NHLP Policy HS7, the scale of the development would read as a modest and proportionate extension to the existing caravan site. In terms of the PPTS it would not be of a scale that would dominate the nearest settled community be that Codicote or the collection of residences on and around Pulmer Water.

## **Green Belt Balance**

49. The development is inappropriate in the Green Belt and would result in some modest harm to openness and its purposes through encroachment into the countryside. The Framework mandates that substantial weight must attach to the totality of those harms.
50. Notwithstanding the Council's ability to demonstrate an up to date 5-year supply of deliverable sites for gypsies and travellers, the occupiers of the appeal development have an immediate demonstrable need for suitable and culturally appropriate accommodation. On the evidence before me there is no reasonably available alternative accommodation either within the Green Belt or outside of it that would meet their needs. There is nothing before me to indicate that the review or replacement of the NHLP, which it was explained at the hearing had reached the regulation 18 stage, is seeking to allocate sites to meet the needs of the gypsies and travellers in this appeal.
51. Weighing in favour of the appeal is the suitability of the appeal site for pitches when assessed against NHLP Policy HS7, together with the personal circumstances of the intended gypsy and traveller occupants of the appeal development. Dismissing the appeal would be expected to result in them being made homeless, which would interfere with their human rights, including with reference to the best interests of the children.
52. In this case, those considerations each weigh significantly in favour of the appeal development. When set against the magnitude of harm to the Green Belt, the interference with those rights would not be proportionate in this instance, and there would also be negative consequences when set against the equality objectives of the PSED.

53. Together all the above considerations are of sufficient cumulative weight to clearly outweigh the substantial weight that must be attached to the identified harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, loss of openness and encroachment into the countryside. It is my judgement that the other considerations amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the appeal development even though the appellant makes no explicit case for them.
54. Consequently, as the development accords with NHLP Policy SP5 and the Framework in respect of the Green Belt there would be no conflict with NHLP Policy HS7 criterion e) i., and it would be consistent with that Policy as a whole.

### **Conditions**

55. The Council has suggested several planning conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed, which have been agreed with the appellant. I have considered them in accordance with the tests for imposing conditions set out in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. Where necessary, I have amended the wording of the suggested conditions to ensure compliance with the tests.
56. As the personal circumstances of the occupiers of the appeal site is a key part of the justification for granting planning permission, it is necessary to impose a condition limiting occupation to those persons and to require the land to be restored to its baseline condition should their occupation cease. Restricting occupancy to persons meeting the PPTS definition of gypsies and travellers is unnecessary as those named occupiers meet it.
57. To control the effects of the development to those considered acceptable, including on Green Belt openness, conditions are necessary to limit the scale of the development in terms of the number of caravans and to ensure the site is laid out in accordance with details to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority. They include vehicle parking and turning space, bin storage, any boundary treatments including means of enclosure, landscaping, lighting and any CCTV columns. A condition is necessary to ensure that the development will enhance biodiversity in accordance with development plan policy.
58. Conditions securing details of foul water drainage and surface water drainage are necessary to protect the environment and manage flood risk. However, I have omitted references to the documents of third-party organisations as they are not before me and to give flexibility over the details that need to be addressed.
59. In the interests of controlling the effects on the Green Belt and the living conditions of nearby occupiers it is necessary to impose conditions prohibiting commercial activities and storage of materials, plant and machinery, and the erection of buildings and structures that I was advised by the main parties could otherwise be permitted development, including under any caravan site license. The condition need not prohibit businesses as they would be restricted by the umbrella term of commercial activities.

### **Conclusion**

60. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal development is consistent with NHLP Policies SP5 and HS7, and the development plan as a whole. There are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework

and the PPTS, to indicate otherwise. Consequently, the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted, subject to the attached conditions.

*G Sylvester*

INSPECTOR

### Schedule of conditions

- 1) The use hereby permitted shall be carried on only by:
  - Jackser Connors and their resident dependents.
  - Miles and Bridget Connors.
  - Margaret Connors and their resident dependents.
  - Kathleen Connors.
  - John and Bridget Connors and their resident dependents
  - Jackser and Caroline Connors and their resident dependents
  - Archie and Ellen Connors and their resident dependents
  - Jackser and Mary Connors and their resident dependents
- 2) In the event that the site ceases to be occupied by those named in condition 1 above, the use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, equipment and materials in connection with the use shall be removed from the site or pitch within 28 days of that date and the land restored in accordance with the details approved in condition 4.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Site Location Plan and Site Layout Plan, except where details are required to be submitted and approved under condition 4.
- 4) The use hereby permitted shall cease and all caravans, structures, equipment and materials brought onto the land for the purposes of that use shall be removed within 3 months of the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in (i) to (iv) below:
  - (i) Within 3 months of the date of this decision and notwithstanding the details shown on the Site Layout Plan a site development scheme (SDS) shall be submitted to the local planning authority for their written approval and shall include:
    - a) the layout of the site including the locations of the mobile homes, vehicle parking and any CCTV poles and cameras;
    - b) details of the landscaping of the site, including a planting schedule and specification consisting of species, plant sizes and numbers, and details of any boundary treatments including heights and materials;
    - c) a surface water drainage scheme including details of its maintenance and management scheme, with evidence of a viable means of discharge off site. The drainage scheme shall be effective in all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100-year event (+40%CC). Where existing drainage is to be retained, details to demonstrate it is of suitable condition and capacity shall be provided;
    - d) a scheme for foul wastewater disposal;
    - e) details of the storage of waste and recyclables;
    - f) a scheme to demonstrate that biodiversity will be enhanced over and above the baseline condition of the appeal land;
    - g) a scheme for all external lighting;
    - h) details of the restoration of the site to its condition before the development took place (or as otherwise agreed in writing by the local

planning authority) at the end of the period when the site is occupied by those permitted to do so;

i) a timetable for the implementation of the SDS;

(ii) If within 9 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve the SDS or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State.

(iii) If an appeal is made in pursuance of ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.

(iv) The approved SDS shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable.

Upon implementation of the approved SDS specified in this condition, that scheme shall thereafter be maintained and retained. Any plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season by others of a species and position first approved by the local planning authority, and thereafter retained.

In the event of a legal challenge to this decision, or to a decision made pursuant to the procedure set out in this condition, the operation of the time limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

- 5) There shall be no more than 8 gypsy and traveller pitches on the site and no more than 1 caravan as defined in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968 as amended, shall be stationed on each pitch at any time.
- 6) No commercial activities shall take place on the land, including the storage of materials, plant or machinery.
- 7) No external lighting other than approved under Condition 4 above shall be installed except in accordance with a detailed lighting scheme that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The detailed lighting scheme shall be carried out, retained and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.
- 8) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no gates, walls or fences or other means of enclosure shall be erected on the site other than those approved pursuant to Condition 4 above, and no amenity/utility buildings, or other buildings shall be erected on the site.

**End of schedule**

## **APPEARANCES**

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Larry Connors – Appellant

Mr Philip Brown BA (Hons) Urban and Regional Planning - Philip Brown Associates Limited

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Phillip E Hughes BA (Hons) MRTPI FRGS FRSA Dip Man MCIM - PHD Chartered Town Planners

Mr Steve Jarman BSc PGDip PGCert - Head of Traveller Assessments for Opinion Research Services Ltd

Mr Thomas Howe – North Hertfordshire District Council

### INTERESTED PARTIES:

Mr and Mrs Shiach – Local residents

## **DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING**

Statement of Common Ground dated 7 January 2026

Council's suggested list of planning conditions

Lawful development certificate 13/01454/1EUD

Updated list of occupiers of the appeal development