



Planning and Building (Jersey) Law 2002

Article 115(5)

Report to the Minister for the Environment

by

Jonathan G King BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Judicial Greffe.

Appeal

by

Ms Yeganeh Najafi

Site at Field J796 La Rue de la Mare des Pres, St John JE3 4DH

Hearing held on 7th February 2018 at the Tribunal Offices, International House, 41 The Parade, St Helier

An accompanied visit to the Appeal site and surroundings was held on the same day

Department of the Environment Reference: P/2017/0934

Site at Field J796 La Rue de la Mare des Pres, St John JE3 4DH

- The appeal is made under Article 108 of the Law against a decision of the Environment Department to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Yeganeh Najafi
 - The application Ref P/2017/0934 was granted permission by notice dated 19th October 2017.
 - The development is the *construction of 3 storage units to south west corner of site.*
-

Summary of Recommendations

1. I **recommend** that the appeal should be dismissed and that permission should be granted subject to the conditions set out in the Annex to this report.
-

Procedural Matters

Scope of the report

2. Article 116 of the Law requires the Minister to determine the appeal and in so doing give effect to the recommendation of this report, unless he is satisfied that there are reasons not to do so. The Minister may: (a) allow the appeal in full or in part; (b) refer the appeal back to the Inspector for further consideration of such issues as he may specify; (c) dismiss the appeal; and (d) reverse or vary any part of the decision-maker's decision. If the Minister does not give effect to the recommendation(s) of this report, notice of the decision shall include full reasons.
3. The purpose of this report is to provide the Minister with sufficient information to enable him to determine the appeal. It focuses principally on the matters raised in the appellant's grounds of appeal. However, other matters are also addressed where these are material to the determination, including in relation to the imposition of conditions; and in order to provide wider context.
4. The description of the development on the application form is *remove 8 shipping containers and construct 3 storage units to south west corner of site*. For the avoidance of doubt, I should make it clear that the containers referred to do not benefit from planning permission (see below under "planning history" for details). Consequently, permission is not required to remove them. In that context, it was agreed between the parties at the Hearing that, in the interests of accuracy and to avoid any misunderstanding, the reference should be removed from the description. I have used the revised description in my preamble.

5. Also in the interests of clarity, it is important to note that this appeal is solely concerned with the proposed development. I am aware that there are other matters in dispute between the appellant and the Department, notably in relation to the lawfulness of the use of the wider site for the storage of vehicles and boats. This is detailed later in the report. However, these matters are outside my remit and it is not the purpose of the appeal to resolve them. Insofar as I may be obliged to consider issues having a bearing on them, I make no formal recommendations.

Introduction and background

6. This is a "third party" appeal against the grant of planning permission.

The proposed development

7. It is proposed to erect a single-storey prefabricated building to include 3 storage units, each of approximately 60 sq metres (645 sq feet) in area on land formerly comprising part of a farm, but now operated as a commercial storage business. The building would be located at the south-west corner of the defined site adjacent to an larger L-shaped building originally constructed as an agricultural store. With some 975sq metres (10,500 sq feet) of floorspace, that building is very substantially greater in area and somewhat taller than the proposed building, and incorporates 7 storage units which are rented out. There is a pond in the south-east corner of the site. Access is from the north, from La Rue de la Mare des Pres, a country road which serves a few isolated properties, including *La Girette*, the only directly neighbouring dwelling, and that of the appellant, a short way to the west on the opposite side of the road. The site is enclosed on the frontage by close-boarded fencing and trees; to the east by trees and hedging; and to the south by trees and an earth bank. To the west, behind the existing building and the site of the proposed structure, the boundary is more open, though some planting has been undertaken. The site is hard surfaced. An area close to the eastern boundary is occupied by vehicles of various kinds and some boats; and between the front boundary and the existing building are more boats. On my site visit I estimated that there were in total approximately 30 vehicles and 12 boats on the site, though I understand that the numbers can fluctuate.

The planning history

8. The existing storage building was until 2001 / 2002 an agricultural store originally belonging to the occupiers of *La Girette*. In 2002 a temporary (3 year) permission was granted [ref P/2002/0373] for its use as a general store. This permission was renewed at intervals (in 2005, 2009 and 2013) and finally, a permanent permission [ref RC/2016/1044] was granted in April 2017. In April 2016, permission was granted [ref MS/2016/0257] for 8 shipping containers, also for use as storage, on that part of the site on which the development

presently at issue is proposed. That permission was time limited until August 2016, to coincide with the expiry of the last of the temporary permissions for use of the existing building. An application [ref MS/2016/1818] to retain the containers was refused in March 2017, though the applicant was allowed 12 months in which to remove them. That period expires on 23rd March 2018. At the Hearing I was told that they would shortly be taken away, though since I have been informed that a request has been made by the applicant for an extension of time to retain 3 of them pending the outcome of this appeal. At the time of writing, discussions are underway between the applicant and the Department on this matter.

9. Permission for the development which is the subject of this appeal was granted by the Planning Committee on 19th October 2017 subject to 4 conditions. The Department's report concluded that the proposed development was considered to amount to a permissible exception to Green Zone policy, responding appropriately to the site, its built and landscape context, the natural environment and the amenities and safety of neighbouring land users.

The grounds of appeal

10. The appellant's grounds of appeal, in brief, allege a failure in the decision process to consider and to apply (or take account of), properly and appropriately, the following:
 1. Policy NE 7 of the Island Plan (IP);
 2. the planning history of the site and in particular planning applications MS/2016/1818 and RC/2016/1044;
 3. IP Policy EIW 2; and
 4. all other relevant matters (and to exclude all irrelevant ones).

Main Issues

11. From my assessment of the papers submitted on behalf of the appellant, the Department and the applicant, and from what was given in evidence during the Hearing and seen and noted during the site visit, I consider that there are 2 main issues in this case. These are, having regard to the history of the site and all other material considerations:
 - (a) *Whether the proposed development is acceptable having regard to the provisions of IP Policy NE 7 relating to development in the Green Zone and any other relevant policies; and.*
 - (b) *In the event that it is concluded that the proposed development is inconsistent with the provisions of the Island Plan, whether sufficient justification exists to grant permission.*

Reasons

Policy NE 7

12. The site lies in the Green Zone, where IP Policy NE 7 applies. This accords the zone a high level of protection from development and there is a general presumption against all forms of development. However, there are a number of exceptions that may be permissible including some relating to employment development. The Planning and Building (General Development) (Jersey) Order 2011 (GDO) does not define "employment", nor is employment a formally-defined Use Class. The GDO does, however, define "warehouse" as a repository for dry storage. As the existing building has permission for use as a general store and is used for the storage of various items, I take the view that it may reasonably be regarded as being a "warehouse". I consider that as such it provides an element of employment. This is notwithstanding that condition 3 of its current planning permission says that there shall be no employees working permanently on the site. Although the meaning of "*permanently*" must be open to interpretation, it is clear that the condition does not prevent employees working there for some of the time. On that basis, I believe it is appropriate to consider Exceptions 5 and 6 in relation to the proposed development.
13. Exception 5 includes the extension and / or intensification of use of employment buildings and land, but only in certain circumstances having regard to the planning history of the site. These are where (a) the requirement for a coastal or countryside location can be adequately justified; (b) an extension, well related to the existing building in design and scale; (c) an intensification does not create undue noise, disturbance or a significant increase in travel and trip generation; and (d) it does not cause serious harm to landscape character.
14. Under Exception 6, the development of an ancillary (employment) building and / or structure may be permissible, but only where it: (a) is modest and proportionate to other buildings on the site; (b) is well-sited and designed, relative to other buildings, the context, size, material, colour and form; and (c) does not cause serious harm to landscape character.

Exception 5

15. With respect to Exception 5, the proposed building cannot, to my mind, be regarded as an extension either to the existing building or to the land on which it sits, as it would comprise a separate, free-standing building within the same site. Similarly, it could not intensify the use of the existing building, which would continue as before. However, it is arguable that the proposed building could intensify the use of the land (ie the site as defined on the application plan).

16. First, it seems to me reasonable to conclude that the use of the land would be intensified simply in the sense of increasing the proportion of it that would be covered by buildings. Second, a degree of intensification could also occur if the use of the wider site for other lawful activities were to increase as a result of the proposed building. With respect to the latter, there is general agreement between the parties that, in order for a storage building on the site to operate effectively, it would be necessary for vehicles to pass over land in order to effect access; for loading and unloading to take place and for vehicles to be parked on the land for periods of time. It is reasonable to conclude that these activities and the use of land for them should be regarded as lawful.
17. At the Hearing there was considerable discussion about the existing use of the wider site. In short, the applicant takes the view that, by virtue of the permission for the use of the existing building for storage, the remaining land within the site may also be used for that purpose, including the storage of vehicles and boats. Additionally, or alternatively, it is argued that the use of the land for parking may have acquired immunity from enforcement by reason of the passage of time. It is also suggested that the maintenance of an existing car park is development permitted under the provisions of the GDO. The Department disagrees, referring in particular to condition 1 of the permission for the building, which says that "*No materials, goods, plant, machinery, equipment, skips, crates, containers, waste or any other item, shall be placed, stacked, deposited or stored outside the store building on the site*".
18. Since the Hearing, the Department has served an Enforcement Notice on the applicant, alleging a breach of this condition and requiring the removal of all vehicles, boats, materials and or goods including but not restricted to, plant, machinery, equipment, skips, crates, containers, waste or any other item, from all external areas of the site. The applicant has queried the Notice on a procedural point (whether the Notice was served under the correct Article of the Law), but the Department has responded that it sees no reason to rescind or replace the current notice. In the meantime I have been informed that the applicant intends to submit an application for retrospective permission for the storage of vehicles and boats at the site.
19. I do not intend to take up time with seeking to determine which view should prevail – not least because it is not part of my remit with respect to this appeal. Moreover, especially having regard to the question of immunity from enforcement, I do not have in my possession sufficient detail to conclude confidently on the matter. But principally I do not need to make any determination because it is clear to me that, irrespective of the lawful or established use of the land, the proposed development would in any case bring about an intensification of its use to some degree.
20. With respect to criterion (a) of Exception 5, I appreciate the representations made at the Hearing by the Minister for Economic

Development, Sen. Lyndon Farnham and of the CEO of Jersey Business, Mr Graeme Smith. These concerned the general need for storage facilities to support small and medium sized businesses which are important to the economy of the Island. I have also had regard to the applicant's evidence concerning the regular and frequent requests that he has received enquiring about the availability of storage units at a reasonable price; and the representations made in writing and at the Hearing by those who value the existing storage provided on the site and their inability find alternatives. I do not doubt that these concerns are genuine but, as evidence, it lacks any detailed analysis in relation to justifying the location. In particular I would have expected to see quantitative evidence in relation to existing provision for storage concerning its (un)availability and (lack of) affordability or to its locational (dis)advantages; and of unfulfilled need. The supporting text to the policy (para 2.136) says that the case for a countryside location may require the applicant to set out what alternative locations have been considered. But although other locations were mentioned during the course of the Hearing - notably the Barette Commercial Centre, nearby - no such detailed evidence has been produced.

21. On the other hand, concerning the remaining criteria: (b) strictly does not apply, as the proposed development would not in my view be an extension. In any case, the building would be of similar design and subordinate in scale compared to the existing building, and physically well-related to it. As for (c), I have no reason to believe that the proposed building would give rise to any undue noise or disturbance. Storage is not a particularly disturbing activity in itself; the scale of the development would be small; and it would be located well away from residential development so that their occupiers would be unlikely to be affected by activity in the building or on the site. Similarly, while I would expect that there would be an increase in travel and trip generation that would affect the level of traffic on the road to some extent, I do not believe it would be would be "*significant*", which is the test here. I am reasonably satisfied that, irrespective of the outcome of the recently-served Enforcement Notice and the intention to submit a planning application in relation to the use of the wider site, the proposed degree of intensification would not lead to a breach of criterion (c). Finally, under criterion (d), although the proposed units would be visible from the rear, from La Route du Mont Mado, they would be seen against the bulk of the present building at some distance, and partly screened by an earth bank and vegetation. They would not be prominent nor would they cause serious harm to the landscape.

Exception 6

22. The submitted application plan refers to the proposal being for "ancillary storage"; and the Department considers that it would be acceptable under the provisions of Exception 6. The relevant supporting text to Policy NE 7 (paragraph 2.141 of the Island Plan) refers to "*proposals to develop buildings and structures ancillary to an*

employment use of land (which are not in the form of extensions to the principal building)”, but the term “ancillary” is not itself defined. It was generally agreed at the Hearing that, in the absence of a specific definition, it would be appropriate to accord the term its ordinary meaning. The following terms were suggested: subsidiary; supplementary; the same but smaller; and in support of. A search of definitions for the term on the internet reveals similar expressions. From these, it may be concluded that something which is ancillary would normally have a connection with something else but be of lesser importance. Mostly, the thing that is ancillary will be supportive of the principal thing.

23. Applying this to the situation at hand, it is clear that the proposed units would have a connection with the existing building, but only inasmuch as they would be on the same site. Although that site is in a single ownership and is accessed from a single point, with shared hardstanding and boundary treatment, the units would be leased out for storage to individuals who would not necessarily have a clear connection with the similar use taking place in the existing building. They would be less important than the existing building only by reason of being smaller, rather than anything to do with their use. They would be occupied separately from the principal building and have no functional or supportive relationship with it. In short, they would be self-contained rather than ancillary.
24. By way of comparison, they would not be similar in function or relationship to an ancillary building such as a canteen or a toilet block that would provide facilities for a principal use, or even provide storage for another use on the same site (for example a store serving a factory). Further, they would not be comparable to the example given to me by the Department’s representatives, of a separate, smaller office on its own site. In that case, the building would be ancillary because it would be occupied by planning staff who would be contributing to the work of the Department. There would be no such functional connection between the buildings on the appeal site. The proposed units would, in my view, be simply additional storage rather than truly ancillary.
25. It is notable that the criteria of Exception 6 in relation ancillary development are different to those under Exception 5, concerning extensions and intensification. In particular, there are no requirements to justify the location or to address the potential for noise, disturbance or traffic. The supporting text does not explain the difference in approach, but one may surmise that the location of truly ancillary development would be determined by the principal use of the site and so would not require separate justification. Moreover, by their ancillary nature, such development might be less likely to give rise to significant harm. I conclude that the proposed development would not be ancillary to the existing building and so it does not fall to be considered by reference to Exception 6.

Overall conclusion on Policy NE 7

26. I have concluded that, contrary to the views of the Department, the proposed development falls to be considered under Exception 5 rather than Exception 6 of Policy NE 7. In my opinion, it fails to meet the provisions of Exception 5 fully by reference to criterion (a) and is therefore not wholly consistent with the Island Plan.
27. That notwithstanding, if the Minister agrees with the Department and the rationale for the Planning Committee's decision, and takes the view that the development should be regarded as ancillary, then I consider that the relevant criteria of Exception 6 would be met and so permission may be granted. The building would be modest and proportionate to that existing. It would be sited so as to be wholly or mainly concealed in views from the road and the access; and though utilitarian in design, it would be similar to what is already there. I have already concluded with respect to Exception 5 that it would not cause serious harm to the landscape.

Other relevant policies

28. Policy EIW 2 *New industrial buildings* says that proposals for new industrial buildings within designated sites and the boundary of the Built-Up Area will be permitted provided that the development accords with Policy GD 1 *General development considerations*. Proposals that do not satisfy these criteria will not be permitted. Policy EIW 2 was used to justify the refusal of the application for 8 containers at the site. However, at the Hearing, the officers of the Department conceded that this was an error: the containers should not have been regarded as industrial buildings by reference to the provisions of the GDO. I agree: The GDO defines "industrial process" as "*any process that is necessary or incidental to (a) make an article or part of an article; or (b) to alter, repair, ornament, finish, clean, wash, pack or can, or to adapt for sale or to demolish an article.*" As no such activities would have taken place in the containers, they could not be regarded as industrial buildings. For the same reason, the description does not apply to the units that are the subject of this appeal. Consequently, the appellant's argument about inconsistency of approach falls away. It is not necessary to consider this policy further: it is irrelevant to the appeal.
29. The applicant has brought a number of other Island Plan policies and references to my attention. Under the heading of the *Strategic Policy Framework and Sustainable Development* (p16), the management of the Island's limited resources – particularly land and buildings – in an efficient and effective way is promoted. Under *Location of development: spatial strategy* (p17), the need to maintain the viability and vitality of the rural economy is highlighted, including by making provision for development essential to the needs of the rural economy. However, I note that the latter is subject to tests of necessity and appropriateness. Under *Brownfield land* (p20), the re-

use, redevelopment and regeneration of already-developed land and buildings is encouraged in the interests of sustainable development. Again, the need to consider each site on its merits relative to specific criteria is emphasised. These general aspirations are carried forward in the succeeding policies SP 1 *Spatial Strategy* and SP 5 *Economic Growth and diversification*. There is no doubt that the Plan supports economic development in both urban and rural areas, but only where appropriate. In my view, these policies must be applied having regard to the detailed policies of the Plan, especially in designated areas such as the Green Zone, where the starting point is a presumption against development other than in exceptional circumstances.

Whether sufficient justification exists to make a decision contrary to Island Plan Policy.

30. Article 19(2) of the Law states that, in general, planning permission shall be granted if the development proposed in the application is in accordance with the Island Plan. However, Article 19(3) adds that, despite that paragraph, planning permission may be granted where the proposed development is inconsistent with the Island Plan if the Planning Committee (or in this case, the Minister) is satisfied that there is sufficient justification for so doing.
31. The proposed development is, in my view, partly inconsistent with the Island Plan, with respect to criterion (a) of Exception 5, insofar as the location has not been adequately justified. That said, the supporting text to the policy (paragraph 2.120) says that there is a need to provide for the reasonable expectation of businesses to undertake economic activity and provide employment, having regard to the capacity of the landscape to accommodate development without serious harm. The Green Zone is described (in paragraph 2.119) as a "living landscape, containing a ... number and variety of buildings and land uses". Paragraph 2.121 adds that policy NE 7 sets a presumption but not an absolute moratorium on development within the Green Zone: the key test is the capacity of the site and its context to accommodate development without serious harm to landscape character; and this is the starting point for consideration of development proposals.
32. With respect to that key test, I am satisfied that the site as it stands contributes little or nothing to the quality of the local environment. The development of a small, inconspicuous part of it with an equally small, inconspicuous building as proposed would have negligible impact on the character of the landscape or even of the immediate surroundings. It could be accommodated without any loss of productive agricultural land and without any prejudice to the prime purpose of the Green Zone. Although the evidence supplied to justify the rural location falls somewhat short of what the Island Plan expects, the evidence that has been submitted generally supports the contention that there is a need for local provision of this kind. It is in my opinion arguable that the amount of justification required to meet

the "sufficiency" test of Article 19 should be commensurate with the size of the development proposed and the degree of harm that might be occasioned. In this case, the development would be small and the harm negligible. On that basis, I conclude that the justification provided in this case is sufficient, and that consequently it would be appropriate to apply the flexibility provided by Article 19, and to grant permission.

Other matters

33. I note the reference in the appellant's grounds of appeal to policy headings in Policy NE 7 relating to "change of use" and "conversions". But these are not relevant to the present case, which I have considered by reference to intensification of the use of land. Nor is the development comparable to residential development, to which a number of different criteria apply.
34. I appreciate the appellant's concern at the potential for this case to set an adverse precedent, but I am satisfied that my recommendation has been made having regard to the individual merits and circumstances of the proposal, according due weight to Policy NE 7. I would expect any future proposal, should it arise, to be determined according to its own merits.
35. I have considered the appellant's arguments with respect to perceived inconsistency with the decision not to grant permission for the 8 containers on the same site (ref MS/2016/1818) in March 2017. As indicated above, the Department has acknowledged that it was wrong to have characterised the containers as industrial and therefore should not have applied Policy EIW 2. The Committee Minutes reveal that Members were also concerned that the containers did not deliver the required standard of design appropriate to the site and its rural Green Zone context. Moreover, and notwithstanding that shortly afterwards permission was given for the permanent use of the existing shed for storage, at that time the last temporary permission for that use had expired. Consequently it would not have been appropriate to apply either Exceptions 5 or 6 of Policy NE 7. As the larger shed now has permanent permission, the planning situation is different today.
36. None of these matters are sufficient to cause me to alter my recommendation.

Conditions

37. In the event that the appeal is dismissed, any permission granted should be subject to conditions designed to ensure that the development is carried out appropriately. The Department imposed a number of conditions on the permission which is the subject of this appeal. Conditions A and B are common to all permissions and relate to the timescale for commencement and compliance with the approved plans. Conditions 1, 2 and 3 repeat conditions attached to

the permanent permission for the existing storage building. Condition 1 requires that storage etc. should not take place outside the building. Condition 2 limits the use to storage of goods and excludes manufacturing or other processes from taking place. Condition 3 says that there shall be no employees working permanently at the site. The fourth condition relates to the implementation of ecological mitigation measures concerning protected species.

38. Conditions A, B, 2 and 4 are in my view uncontentious and I recommend them for the reasons put forward by the Department. However, I have concerns about the wording of Nos 1 and 3 having regard to the conditions already imposed on the existing building.
39. The wording of existing Condition (1) is open to interpretation. Although it refers to the "*placement, stacking, deposit and storage*" of 9 categories of item, together with "*any other item*", boats or vehicles are not listed, nor is parking as a use of the land. As has been demonstrated during this appeal, and by the Department's decision to serve the Enforcement Notice, it is uncertain whether the condition should apply to storage of vehicles and boats. Further, even if storage of boats and vehicles is intended to be prohibited, as the Department argues, it would be unreasonable to extend that to temporary parking associated with visits to the storage facilities and for loading / unloading. That was generally acknowledged at the Hearing as unavoidable and acceptable. I appreciate the distinction between storage and parking, but the lack of precision in the wording has already led to significant uncertainty over the lawful use of the site. This has now led to the service of the Enforcement Notice and an indication from the applicant that an application is to be made to regularise the situation. If permission were to be granted in relation to that application, an opportunity would be provided to impose a more effective condition. However, it is important that this appeal decision does not pre-empt its proper consideration.
40. Condition 3, which states: '*There shall be no employees working permanently on the site*' is also uncertain. First, if the intention is to prevent working at unsocial hours in order to protect local amenities, then specific hours should have been stipulated. As the wording stands, enforcement could be problematic. Second, whatever limitation was intended, it applies only to "*employees*". But the storage units are rented out to a variety of business and individuals. Many, for example sole traders and family members, will not be employees and so would not be caught by the condition. Even if the condition were reasonable, it may be ineffective and practically unenforceable.
41. On the one hand, repeating these conditions in relation to the appeal proposal would ensure consistency between the two developments, which is arguably essential in the interests of avoiding even more uncertainty. On the other hand, unsatisfactory conditions should never be imposed. Bad practice cannot be justified on the basis that it is consistent with previous practice.

42. I have consulted with the parties regarding this dilemma but there has been little agreement. I have therefore approached the matter pragmatically.
43. With respect to Condition 1, I consider that it should be made explicit that temporary parking of vehicles is limited to that associated with the use of the permitted storage facilities. As for the outside storage of vehicles and boats, it is important that the limitations applied to both the proposed and existing buildings should be consistent, not least because the boundary of the present appeal proposal covers the whole of the wider site and so they would apply to the same land. It is equally important that any condition does not pre-judge or prejudice the outcome of the enforcement proceedings and the anticipated planning application.
44. I therefore propose a condition that explicitly prohibits the outside storage of vehicles and boats, unless authorised by a separate planning permission. That separate permission could be the permission for the existing building, if the applicant were to be successful in challenging the Enforcement Notice; it could be a permission granted following consideration of the forthcoming planning application or another permission granted in the future. In such circumstances, and should it be deemed necessary, the power exists (under Article 27 of the Law) for a permission relating to the appeal proposal to be modified by substituting a revised condition relating to outside storage.
45. As for condition 3, The Department's explanation of its intended purpose is that it aims to reinforce the fact that permission has been given for storage use only and not for manufacturing or any other processing or use which would require anyone to be on site, employees or otherwise. But manufacturing is already specifically excluded from the permission by condition 2 and there are in any event no staff facilities on site. In the circumstances, and in the absence of any suggestions for alternative form of words, I find no reason to impose this condition or to substitute it with another.
46. A Schedule listing the recommended conditions is attached in the Annex to this report.

Overall Conclusions

47. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed and that permission should be granted subject to the conditions set out in the Annex to this report.

Jonathan G King

Inspector

ANNEX

**CONDITIONS THAT MAY BE IMPOSED ON THE PLANNING
PERMISSION IN THE EVENT THAT THE APPEAL IS DISMISSED**

- A. The development shall commence within 3 years of the decision date.
- B. The development hereby approved shall be carried out entirely in accordance with the plans, drawings, written details and documents which form part of this permission.
 - 1. No materials, goods, plant, machinery, equipment, skips, crates, containers, waste or any other item shall be placed, stacked, deposited or stored outside the building on the site. For the avoidance of doubt, no outside storage of vehicles or boats shall take place unless authorised by a separate planning permission. The temporary parking of vehicles shall be limited to those visiting the storage facility hereby permitted.
 - 2. The use hereby permitted shall be for the storage of goods only and no manufacturing or other processes shall take place on these premises.
 - 3. The findings and required mitigation measures outlined in the Initial Ecological Assessment (Addendum dated 25th September 2017) shall be implemented prior to the commencement of the development (where applicable) and thereafter retained as such. Any variations that may be required as a result of findings on the site are to be agreed in writing by the Department of the Environment prior to works being undertaken.

--ooOoo--