

LEGAL COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

Certificate of Lawfulness - Twin-Unit Caravan Annexe

Updated to incorporate recent Planning Inspectorate appeal decisions

Purpose of this statement

This statement is prepared in support of an application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for Proposed Use or Development under section 192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Its purpose is to demonstrate, on the balance of probabilities, that the proposed siting of a twin-unit caravan/mobile home within the domestic curtilage of the dwellinghouse for ancillary residential annexe accommodation would be lawful at the date of the application.

1. Executive Summary

- The proposal is for the siting of a twin-unit caravan/mobile home within the residential curtilage of the host dwelling.
- The structure is designed for human habitation and is intended to provide ancillary annexe accommodation, remaining functionally linked to the main dwellinghouse.
- The proposal is submitted on the basis that it satisfies the statutory definition of a caravan under section 29 of the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and, for a twin-unit structure, section 13 of the Caravan Sites Act 1968.
- The relevant certificate test is not whether the proposal is desirable in planning terms, but whether, on the balance of probabilities, the proposed use/development would be lawful having regard to the statutory definition, the physical characteristics of the structure and its proposed ancillary use.
- The proposal does not rely upon Class E permitted development rights for an outbuilding. Where the structure satisfies the statutory definition of a caravan, it should not be assessed as a Class E outbuilding.

Core conclusion

The proposed annexe complies with the statutory caravan tests of size, construction and mobility; it is not permanently affixed to the land; it can be separated and removed without demolition; and its proposed use remains ancillary to the main dwellinghouse. On that basis, the siting and use of the structure would be lawful.

2. Legal Framework and Decision-Making Approach

This application is made under section 192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Local Planning Authority must determine whether the proposed use or development would be lawful if carried out. The assessment is one of fact and degree and the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities. Planning merits, design preference, perceived neighbour impact, or policy objections are not determinative in an LDC application of this nature.

- Section 29(1) of the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 defines a caravan as a structure designed or adapted for human habitation which is capable of being moved from one place to another, whether by being towed or transported on a motor vehicle or trailer.
- Section 13 of the Caravan Sites Act 1968 extends and regulates the definition of twin-unit caravans. A twin-unit caravan must be composed of not more than two sections separately constructed and designed so that the final act is joining the two independent sections together by means of bolts, clamps or other devices, and when assembled must be physically capable of being moved by road from one place to another.
- The statutory dimensional limits for a twin-unit caravan are: length not exceeding 20 metres, width not exceeding 6.8 metres, and internal height not exceeding 3.05 metres.

- If the statutory caravan definition is satisfied, the structure is assessed as a caravan/mobile home rather than as a building or Class E outbuilding.

3. Recent Planning Inspectorate Decisions Relied Upon

The following recent appeal decisions are relied upon because they address the exact issues commonly raised in relation to caravan annexes: the construction test, on-site assembly, number of constituent parts, mobility, service connections, permanence, Class E, residential facilities and ancillary use.

Appeal Ref / Site	Decision	Issue considered	Key relevance
APP/T0355/X/23/3333956 5 Combermere Close, Windsor 22 Oct 2025	Allowed; LDC granted	Twin-unit mobile home; construction test; on-site assembly; number of parts; mobility; operational development	Inspector held there is no limitation in statute or case law on the number of parts brought onto site to create a twin-unit mobile home, and warned against placing too much reliance on requirements not stated in the legislation.
APP/T2350/X/24/3348793 Rock House, Longridge 5 Jun 2025	Allowed; LDC granted	Ancillary annexe accommodation; full residential facilities; functional relationship with main dwelling	Inspector held that accommodation can contain all facilities required for day-to-day living and still be ancillary where it remains part of the same household and no separate planning unit is created.
APP/R3650/X/25/3359353 8 Forge Close, Farnham 29 Sep 2025	Allowed; LDC granted	Mobile home; on-site assembly; mobility; services; access constraints; Class E	Inspector held that assembly on site does not automatically make the structure a building; service connections do not defeat caravan status; access difficulties are not the point; if it is a caravan, Class E does not need to be assessed.

4. Statutory Tests for a Twin-Unit Caravan

4.1 Size Test

The proposed annexe is designed to remain within the statutory dimensional limits applicable to twin-unit caravans. The dimensions are to be confirmed by the submitted plans and elevations for the specific application site. Provided the proposed dimensions fall within the statutory limits, the size test is satisfied.

Planning Inspectorate support

In APP/T0355/X/23/3333956, the Inspector treated the size, construction and mobility tests as the relevant tests for determining whether the proposed twin-unit mobile home satisfied the statutory definition. Once those tests were met, the Inspector concluded that the proposal was a caravan and would not constitute a building.

4.2 Construction Test - Two Separately Constructed Sections

The proposed annexe is constructed as a twin-unit structure comprising no more than two separately constructed sections. The two sections are referred to in the accompanying Construction Method Statement as Section A and Section B.

- Each section is formed around its own independent structural steel frame.
- Each section includes its own floor, wall and roof structure.
- Each section is constructed as a distinct and self-supporting structural unit before final assembly.
- Neither section relies upon the other for structural stability prior to final assembly.
- At no point is a single continuous structural frame or load-bearing structure constructed across both sections before the final assembly stage.
- The final stage of installation consists of positioning and mechanically connecting the two pre-existing sections using bolts, brackets, clamps or other suitable mechanical fixings.
- Each section can arrive on site complete and independent of the other until bolted together

The relevant statutory question is not how many individual constituent parts are utilised during the manufacture of the annexe. Every caravan, mobile home and twin-unit structure is necessarily formed from numerous individual components. The relevant question is whether those components ultimately form no more than two separately constructed sections prior to the final act of assembly.

In the case of the proposed annexe, all constituent components are incorporated into either Section A or Section B. Each section is formed around its own independent structural frame and is constructed as a distinct and self-supporting structural unit. Each section includes its own floor, wall and roof structure and is capable of existing independently of the other section prior to final assembly.

The final stage of installation consists solely of the alignment and mechanical joining of Section A and Section B using bolts, brackets, clamps or other suitable mechanical fixings. Any subsequent works are limited to weatherproofing, finishing details and the connection of services associated with the completed junction between the two sections.

Accordingly, prior to the final act of assembly, the proposed annexe comprises no more than two separately constructed sections designed to be assembled on site. The final act of assembly is the bringing together and mechanical joining of Section A and Section B. The completed structure is therefore composed of no more than two separately constructed sections in accordance with Section 13 of the Caravan Sites Act 1968.

Key point for officers

The use of multiple constituent parts does not, of itself, prevent a structure from being a twin-unit caravan. The statutory test is whether the completed structure is composed of not more than two separately constructed sections designed to be assembled on site.

4.3 Windsor Appeal - On-Site Assembly and Multiple Parts

Appeal Ref APP/T0355/X/23/3333956 is directly relevant to the construction test. The Council in that case argued that the proposed mobile home would involve a volume of component parts, skilled tradespersons and construction steps representative of building operations. The Inspector rejected that approach.

- The Inspector recorded that, due to restricted access, the mobile home would be assembled from pre-manufactured interlocking parts by in-house manufacturing operatives.
- The Inspector accepted the appellant's position that there is no statutory requirement for the two halves of a twin-unit to be constructed off-site and that the essential final act is the bringing together of the two halves.
- The Inspector stated that there is no limitation in statute or case law limiting the number of parts that can be brought onto site to create a twin-unit mobile home.
- The Inspector considered that the Council was placing too much reliance on what had not been said in the legislation.
- The appeal was allowed and an LDC was granted certifying that the proposed twin-unit mobile home was a caravan satisfying the statutory definition.

This decision is important because it confirms that an authority should not impose an additional requirement that the two sections must arrive on site as two completed modules unless that requirement is found in the statutory definition. The statutory wording is concerned with the structure being composed of not more than two separately constructed sections designed to be assembled on site.

4.4 Byrne v Secretary of State and the Proper Distinction

The leading authority commonly cited in relation to the construction test is Byrne v Secretary of State for the Environment and Arun District Council [1997]. The principle derived from Byrne is that a structure assembled progressively as a single building from multiple components does not satisfy the statutory twin-unit definition merely because it could later be conceptually divided into two parts.

However, Byrne should not be misread as imposing a blanket prohibition on the use of multiple components. The material distinction is between:

Does not satisfy the construction test	Capable of satisfying the construction test
Multiple components are progressively assembled into one continuous structure, without two separately constructed sections first existing as independent structural units.	Multiple components are separately formed into Section A and Section B, each structurally independent and self-supporting, with the final act being the joining of those two sections.

The proposed annexe falls into the second category. It is not a single structure progressively constructed across the site. It is formed as two separately constructed sections which are brought together as the final act of assembly.

5. Mobility Test - Physical Capability of Movement

The mobility test is whether the structure, when assembled, is physically capable of being moved from one place to another by road, whether by towing or by transport on a motor vehicle or trailer. The test is one of physical capability, not convenience, ease, cost, frequency or likelihood of removal.

- Each section incorporates an engineered steel frame designed to permit lifting and transportation.
- The two sections can be separated at the designed junction.
- Each section can be lifted independently using appropriate specialist equipment.
- Each section can be transported and re-sited without demolition.
- The foundations and service connections are demountable and do not prevent removal.

Physical capability, not convenience

The need for a crane, specialist lifting equipment, temporary access arrangements or a site-specific lifting plan does not mean the structure is not physically capable of being moved. Those matters concern the practical methodology of movement, not the inherent mobility characteristics of the structure itself.

5.1 Windsor Appeal - Mobility Evidence

In APP/T0355/X/23/3333956 the Inspector considered the mobility test and found it satisfied where the appellant had submitted lifting calculations showing that the structure could be moved without structural damage as one unit or as two halves. The Inspector noted that the Council had not submitted evidence to contradict that claim.

For the present proposal, the accompanying Construction Method Statement should be read in the same way: it explains the means by which the structure can be separated, lifted, transported and re-sited without demolition. If a Local Planning Authority considers that the stated mobility methodology is insufficient, it should identify the specific evidential deficiency rather than treating access difficulty or specialist equipment as determinative.

5.2 Forge Close Appeal - Access Constraints Are Not the Point

Appeal Ref APP/R3650/X/25/3359353 is highly relevant where an authority suggests that access constraints or crane arrangements prevent a structure being a caravan. In that case, the Inspector stated that perceived

difficulties in gaining access to the garden, transportation of the unit in its assembled state or craning it onto a flatbed lorry were not the point. The Inspector found that it is the residential unit that must possess the necessary mobility qualities, not the means of access to or from the site.

The same reasoning applies here. Site constraints, landscaping, parked vehicles, boundary treatments or the need for a specialist lifting strategy may affect how a removal operation is planned, but they do not alter the physical characteristics of the annexe or its capability of being separated, lifted and transported.

Size and the Statutory Caravan Definition

The fact that a structure is of a substantial size does not, of itself, prevent it from constituting a caravan for the purposes of the Caravan Sites Act 1968.

Parliament has expressly legislated for the maximum dimensions of a twin-unit caravan through Section 13 of the Caravan Sites Act 1968. A structure falling within those statutory dimensional limits is capable of being a caravan in law provided that it also satisfies the relevant construction and mobility tests.

Accordingly, the assessment of whether a structure constitutes a caravan does not involve a separate discretionary judgment as to whether it is "too large" to be a caravan. The issue of size has already been addressed by Parliament through the statutory dimensional limits contained within the Act.

Reference is sometimes made to the decision in *Cardiff Rating Authority v Guest Keen & Nettlefolds Ltd* [1949] 1 KB 385, in which size was identified as one of several factors that may assist in determining whether a structure constitutes a building as a matter of fact and degree. However, that case was not concerned with the statutory definition of a caravan and pre-dates the twin-unit caravan provisions now contained within the Caravan Sites Act 1968.

Whilst size may be relevant when considering whether an unidentified structure constitutes a building, the position is materially different where Parliament has enacted a specific statutory code governing the dimensions of structures capable of being treated as caravans.

It would therefore be inappropriate to treat compliance with the statutory dimensional limits as evidence against caravan status. To do so would undermine the legislative purpose of Section 13 by effectively introducing a further size-based restriction beyond those expressly imposed by Parliament.

The relevant question is not whether the structure appears substantial when viewed on the site, but whether it satisfies the statutory dimensional, construction and mobility requirements prescribed by the Caravan Sites Act 1968. Where those requirements are met, the mere size of the structure does not prevent it from constituting a caravan in law.

Physical Attachment and Fixation to the Ground

The existence of a foundation system or service connections does not, in itself, prevent a structure from constituting a caravan.

The relevant question is not whether the structure is connected to the land in some manner, but whether it has become so permanently incorporated into the land that it has lost its physical capability of separation, removal and transportation.

The proposed annexe is specifically designed to remain physically capable of removal. The structure is supported by a removable foundation system comprising mechanically installed ground screws or, where ground conditions require, pre-cast concrete support plinths. Neither foundation solution involves the creation of continuous in-situ

concrete foundations, reinforced concrete slabs, strip foundations or other permanent substructures intended to form an inseparable part of the land.

The supporting foundation system is capable of removal and does not require the demolition or destruction of the annexe in order for the structure to be lifted, transported or re-sited elsewhere. The removal process simply involves reversing the installation process.

Similarly, all utility connections serving the annexe are designed to be disconnected. Connections to electricity, water, drainage and other services are ancillary service connections rather than structural elements of the building. The existence of such connections does not prevent the structure from being separated, lifted, transported and re-installed elsewhere.

The weight of the structure is likewise not determinative. The statutory test contained within Section 13 of the Caravan Sites Act 1968 is whether the structure is physically capable of being moved by road. The legislation does not require that such movement be straightforward, inexpensive or achievable without specialist equipment. Many lawful twin-unit caravans and mobile homes require specialist lifting equipment, cranes or transport arrangements due to their size and weight. This does not alter their status as caravans.

The relevant consideration is therefore whether the structure remains physically capable of disconnection, separation, lifting, transportation and re-siting. The proposed annexe has been specifically designed to facilitate each of those processes.

Accordingly, neither the foundation system, service connections nor the weight of the structure result in a degree of fixation inconsistent with caravan status.

6. Foundations, Services and Permanence

The annexe is designed to avoid permanent attachment to the land. It is supported on a removable foundation/support system, such as ground screws or equivalent demountable supports. There are no continuous concrete strip foundations, no permanent raft foundation and no slab forming part of the land.

- Ground screws or equivalent supports can be removed.
- The steel subframe rests upon the removable support system.
- The structure can be separated from its supports without demolition.
- The land can be reinstated following removal.
- Service connections are demountable and can be disconnected, capped and made safe in the ordinary way.

The fact that a caravan or mobile home may remain in one location for a long period does not, of itself, make it a building. Static caravans and mobile homes commonly remain in place for extended periods. The correct question is whether the structure has the necessary physical characteristics of a caravan and whether it can be removed without demolition.

6.1 Forge Close Appeal - Services, Permanence and Intention to Move

In APP/R3650/X/25/3359353, the Inspector held that attachment to services would not in itself mean that the proposed residential unit was not a caravan. The Inspector distinguished service connections from physical attachment to the ground and noted that disconnection from services is generally a simple matter if a caravan needs to be moved.

The Inspector also emphasised that a lack of any suggested intention to move the unit around the site would not mean that what is proposed is not a caravan, noting that static caravans often remain in the same place for long periods of time.

6.2 Operational Development

Where the statutory caravan definition is satisfied, the siting of the caravan within the residential curtilage for lawful ancillary purposes is not to be assessed as the construction of a conventional building. The question of whether the proposal constitutes operational development should therefore be approached through the caravan legislation rather than by importing criteria applicable to permanent buildings or Class E outbuildings.

- In APP/T0355/X/23/3333956, the Inspector concluded that the appellant had shown on the balance of probabilities that the proposed twin-unit satisfied the statutory caravan definition. In so doing, the Inspector stated that it followed that it would not constitute a building under section 55 of the 1990 Act.
- In APP/R3650/X/25/3359353, the Inspector found that because the proposal met the definition of a caravan, it could not therefore be a building. The Inspector also stated that it was not necessary to assess the proposal against Class E because a caravan, and not a building, was proposed.

Operational development response

Arguments based on size, apparent permanence, utility connections, removable supports or difficulty of removal should not be used to convert a structure that satisfies the statutory caravan definition into a building. Those matters may be relevant to the factual assessment, but they do not override the statutory tests of size, construction and mobility.

7. Ancillary Use and No Separate Planning Unit

The proposed use is ancillary to the main dwellinghouse. The annexe remains within the same domestic curtilage and is intended to provide accommodation for a family member as part of the same overall residential use of the site. It is not proposed as a separate dwelling or independent planning unit.

- There is no separate postal address.
- There is no separate council tax assessment proposed or required as part of the certificate application.
- There is no separate curtilage or garden area severed from the main dwelling.
- There is no separate access, parking arrangement or boundary treatment creating an independent planning unit.
- Services are taken from and remain functionally linked to the host dwelling.
- The annexe will not be let, sold, occupied or used as a separate dwelling independent from the main house.

7.1 Full Residential Facilities Do Not Prevent Ancillary Use

The presence of a kitchen, bathroom, sleeping accommodation or living facilities does not automatically create a separate planning unit. The correct question is how the unit is to be used in practice and whether it remains functionally connected with and subordinate to the main dwellinghouse.

7.2 Rock House Appeal - Facilities for Day-to-Day Living

In APP/T2350/X/24/3348793, the proposed mobile home contained a kitchenette, sitting and dining areas, two bedrooms, ensuites and a home office. The Inspector accepted that the proposal would provide additional primary living accommodation and would not be incidental in the Class E outbuilding sense. However, the Inspector held that providing additional primary living accommodation does not automatically entail a material change of use. The assessment depends on the physical and functional relationship between the existing and proposed accommodation.

The Inspector found the use ancillary because the unit remained closely associated with the main dwelling, with no separate address, post box, meters, services, parking, garden area/curtilage or access, and because it would form an extension to the existing household rather than a new residential unit.

7.3 Forge Close Appeal - Dependant Relative and Functional Relationship

In APP/R3650/X/25/3359353, the caravan contained facilities required for independent living but was to be occupied by a dependant relative. The Inspector found no material change of use because there would be no separate curtilage, no separate parking areas, no separate postal address, and the occupant would be connected with the family living in the main dwelling. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would not amount to development requiring planning permission.

8. Class E and the Incidental/Ancillary Distinction

A common error is to assess a caravan annexe as though it were an outbuilding proposed under Class E of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the GPDO. That is not the basis of this application. The application seeks confirmation that the proposed structure is a caravan/mobile home and that its siting and ancillary use within the domestic curtilage would be lawful.

- Class E is concerned with buildings or enclosures required for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse.
- A granny annexe used as living accommodation will often be ancillary rather than incidental in the narrow Class E outbuilding sense.
- That does not defeat the application if the proposal is a caravan/mobile home and remains ancillary to the main dwellinghouse.
- If the statutory caravan definition is satisfied, it is not necessary to determine whether the proposal would also satisfy Class E outbuilding criteria.

This approach is supported by APP/R3650/X/25/3359353, where the Inspector held that because a caravan, and not a building, was proposed, it was not necessary to assess the proposal against Class E. It is also supported by APP/T2350/X/24/3348793, where the Inspector distinguished between additional primary living accommodation and the creation of a separate residential planning unit.

9. Common Objections and Responses

Potential objection	Response
The unit may arrive on site in more than two parts.	There is no limitation in statute or case law on the number of parts that may be brought onto site to create a twin-unit mobile home: APP/T0355/X/23/3333956. The test is whether the final structure is composed of not more than two separately constructed sections before final assembly.
The unit is assembled on site and therefore is a building.	Assembly on site is expressly contemplated by section 13 of the 1968 Act. What matters is whether two separately constructed sections are assembled on site by bolts, clamps or other devices. On-site assembly is not automatically building operations: APP/R3650/X/25/3359353 and APP/T0355/X/23/3333956.
The unit has a kitchen, bathroom and bedroom.	Full facilities for day-to-day living do not automatically create a separate planning unit. The correct test is the functional relationship with the main dwelling: APP/T2350/X/24/3348793 and APP/R3650/X/25/3359353.
The unit will be occupied long term.	A lack of intention to move the unit does not prevent caravan status. Static caravans often remain in place for long periods: APP/R3650/X/25/3359353.
The unit requires a crane or specialist equipment.	Specialist equipment relates to methodology, not physical capability. The test is whether the structure can physically be moved, not whether movement is easy or convenient.
Access to the rear garden may be difficult.	Access constraints are not the point; the mobility qualities must belong to the unit itself, not to the means of access: APP/R3650/X/25/3359353.

The unit is connected to services.	Service connections do not in themselves prevent caravan status. Disconnection from services is distinct from physical attachment to the ground: APP/R3650/X/25/3359353.
The unit is on ground screws or support pads.	Removable supports are not permanent foundations. The relevant question is whether the structure is permanently affixed to the land and whether it can be removed without demolition.
The proposal does not fall within Class E.	The application is not made under Class E. If the proposal is a caravan, it is not necessary to assess it as a Class E building: APP/R3650/X/25/3359353.

10. Evidence Submitted with Application

The application should be read together with the following supporting documents and drawings:

- Construction Method Statement explaining the two-section construction methodology, final assembly stage, removable foundation system, lifting/removal methodology and demountable service connections.
- Legal Compliance Summary addressing the statutory caravan definition, construction test, mobility test, foundations, services, ancillary use and relevant appeal decisions.
- Personal Statement explaining the proposed occupier, family relationship, care/support arrangement and continuing functional connection with the main dwelling.
- Plans and elevations confirming dimensions and identifying the two-section arrangement and joining line.
- Where appropriate, manufacturer/engineer confirmation that Section A and Section B are independently constructed, self-supporting and capable of being handled/lifted independently prior to final assembly.
- Where appropriate, outline lifting/removal statement confirming that the annexe can be separated, lifted and transported without demolition.

11. Site-Specific Application Checks

The following site-specific matters should be completed or confirmed for each application before submission:

Matter	Evidence to confirm
Dimensions	Confirm length, width and internal height are within statutory limits.
Curtilage	Confirm the annexe is within the residential curtilage of the main dwelling.
Ancillary use	Confirm the occupier relationship and functional link to the main dwelling.
No separate planning unit	Confirm no separate address, curtilage, sale/letting, independent access or separate services as a self-contained planning unit.
Two sections	Confirm Section A and Section B arrangement and show the joining line on drawings.
Foundation/support	Confirm ground screws, pads or equivalent removable support system.
Services	Confirm services are taken from the host dwelling and are demountable.
Removal	Confirm future separation, lifting, transport and reinstatement methodology.

12. Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposed annexe/mobile home satisfies the statutory definition of a caravan, comprises no more than two separately constructed sections, is physically capable of being moved, is not permanently affixed to the land, and is proposed to be used solely for ancillary accommodation linked to the main dwellinghouse.

Recent Planning Inspectorate decisions support the approach taken in this statement. In particular, they confirm that the number of constituent parts brought to site is not determinative, that on-site assembly does not automatically result in a building, that service connections and access constraints do not defeat caravan status, that long-term stationing is not inconsistent with caravan status, and that full residential facilities do not automatically create a separate planning unit.

Accordingly, on the balance of probabilities, the siting and use of the proposed twin-unit caravan annexe would be lawful and a Certificate of Lawfulness should be granted.

Appendix A - Key Appeal Extracts and Principles

APP/T0355/X/23/3333956 - Windsor

Planning merits are not relevant to an LDC; the decision rests on facts, planning law and judicial authority. The three tests are size, construction and mobility. There is no limitation in statute or case law limiting the number of parts brought onto site to create a twin-unit mobile home. Where the statutory caravan test is met, it follows that the structure does not constitute a building under section 55.

APP/T2350/X/24/3348793 - Rock House

A mobile home containing a kitchenette, sitting/dining areas, bedrooms, ensembles and a home office can still be ancillary. Additional primary living accommodation does not automatically entail a material change of use; the issue is the physical and functional relationship with the main dwelling.

APP/R3650/X/25/3359353 - Forge Close

Assembly on site does not automatically mean the proposal is a building. Services do not in themselves defeat caravan status. Access difficulties are not the point; mobility qualities must belong to the unit, not the means of access. A lack of intention to move the unit does not prevent caravan status. If the proposal is a caravan, it is not necessary to assess it against Class E.

Appendix B - Template Certificate Wording Requested

Suggested certificate description:

Suggested wording

The proposed siting of a twin-unit caravan/mobile home within the residential curtilage of the dwellinghouse for use as ancillary annexe accommodation in connection with the main dwellinghouse.

Important Note

This document is a planning compliance statement prepared to support an LDC application. It should be read alongside the site-specific drawings, Construction Method Statement, Personal Statement and any site-specific lifting, access or engineering information. It does not replace formal legal advice where the applicant wishes to obtain it.