

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT**REF NO:** AL/44/08/**LOCATION:** Lidsey Caravan Park
Lidsey Road
Aldingbourne**PROPOSAL:** Demolition of existing maintenance buildings, cessation of use of civil engineering contractors yard, new caravan park maintenance building & wardens office/living accommodation**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The proposal is for the demolition of 2 no. existing maintenance buildings, and the erection of 1 No. caravan park maintenance building and 1 No. wardens office/living accommodation building.
SITE AREA	7 hectares approximately.
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY (NET)	N/A.
TOPOGRAPHY	Undulating.
TREES	None of any significance affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	None borders the existing buildings.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Caravan Park. The old maintenance building is a single storey detached building, which consists of brown brick walls and a corrugated roof with gable ends. The existing workshop to be demolished is a single storey building, which is industrial in appearance. The building appears run down in appearance and is used for storage purposes. Existing static caravan to adjacent to this building, which is cream and red in colour; shallow pitched roof.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Rural area. A cluster of residential properties is positioned to the east side of the application site. Open fields to the south and west side of the existing caravan park.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

AL/13/92	Application to vary Condition 2 imposed on AL/28/88 for use of land as static caravan	Approved Cond 09-06-1992
----------	---	-----------------------------

park from the present 8 months to 10 months per annum

AL/28/88	Static caravan park standings on area of site used for tents and tourers	Approved Cond 19-05-1989
AL/60/00/	Change of use of land as extension to existing caravan park to provide 100 static holiday caravan pitches (Departure from Development Plan and Dual Parish with BE/73/00)	Refused 05-12-2000 Appeal: Dismissed 03-AUG-2001
AL/63/02/	Change of use of land as extension to existing caravan park to provide 100 static holiday caravan pitches. (Dual Parish with BE/52/02) DEPARTURE FROM THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN	Refused 22-11-2002
BE/52/02/	Change of use of land as extension to existing caravan park to provide 100 static holiday caravan pitches. (Dual parish with AL/63/02) DEPARTURE FROM THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN.	Refused 22-11-2002
BE/73/00/	Change of use of land as extension to existing caravan park to provide 100 static holiday caravan pitches (Departure from Development Plan and Dual Parish with AL/60/00)	Refused 05-12-2000 Appeal: Dismissed 03-AUG-2001
AL/14/67	One residential caravan	Withdrawn
AL/15/67	One residential caravan	Withdrawn
AL/16/74	Erection of shop and control office	Approve Cond 17-07-1974
AL/19/81	Connection of all caravans to the existing treatment plant	Approve Cond 19-08-1981
AL/20/67	Additional facilities to existing toilet block	Approve 10-05-1967
AL/4/51	Use of land as site for 135 caravans and sanitary accommodation	Approve 02-05-1951
AL/4/51/A	Renewal of consent for use of land as site for 135 caravans and sanitary accommodation	Approve 13-10-1956
AL/4/51/B	Sewage disposal plant	Approve 17-12-1956
AL/4/51/C	Toilet block	Approve 19-02-1958
AL/4/51/D	Use of land as extension of caravan site	Approve

AL/4/51/F	Conversion of barn to club house	09-12-1960 Approve
AL/4/51/G	Laundry and shower additions to existing toilets	01-04-1964 Approve
AL/4/51/H	Site for 135 caravans (1 March to 31 October in each year) and tented camping (1 June to 30 September in each year)	27-05-1964 Approve
AL/4/51/I	Three staff caravans	17-06-1964 Refused
AL/4/51/J	Two farm workers caravans	11-08-1966 Refused
AL/44/73	Details planning application for control office and shop	11-08-1966 Refused
AL/48/84	Incorporation of parcel of land into caravan site land to be used primarily for tourers	24-10-1973 Approve Cond
AL/75/72	Erection of replacement shop	22-08-1984 Refused
		22-11-1972

REPRESENTATIONS

Representations received:

Aldingbourne Parish Council

None.

Comments on Representations received:

None.

CONSULTATIONS

Head of Highways and Transport

Environmental Health - John Green

Consultations responses received:

County Highways

No Objection:

The proposal through the cessing of the civil engineering use would result in a less intensive use of the access onto the public highway. On that basis, this proposal would have benefits from a highway perspective. Whilst new facilities are proposed in the form of maintenance building and wardens office/accommodation, this ought not to generate little if any additional traffic above which the existing caravan park generates anyway.

Licencing Officer

No adverse comments on this proposal.

I refer to the above application for Demolition of existing for Demolition of existing maintenance buildings, cessation of use of civil engineering contractors yard, new caravan park maintenance building & wardens office/ living accommodation.

The proposal to remove the contractor's yard is welcomed and replacement of dated buildings is considered reasonable. A site warden is needed to ensure that site licence conditions are complied with and to provide a presence particularly when the site is not open.

Comments on Consultation responses:

Comments noted.

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:

Outside Built up Area Boundary
Class 'A' Road

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

West Sussex Structure Plan:	LOC2	The Countryside
	CH1	Character
	DEV1	High Quality Development
	NE12	Leisure, cultural and tourism facilities
	NE17	Roads
	ERA4	Flooding and coastal defence
Arun District Local Plan:	GEN3	Protection of the Countryside
	GEN7	The Form of New Development
	GEN11	Inland Flooding

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

PPS1	Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS7	Sustainable development in rural areas
	Good Planning Practice Guide on Tourism

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies combine to describe the criteria against which the application will be assessed particularly with regard to visual and residential amenity.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

The proposal is considered to conflict with relevant Development Plan policies in that on the basis of the submitted information, the Local Planning Authority is not convinced that there is sufficient justification to warrant 1 No. detached building, comprising wardens living accommodation on site. Further, no satisfactory Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted as part of the application.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is for the demolition of 2 no. existing maintenance buildings, and the erection of 1 No. caravan park maintenance building and 1 No. wardens office/living accommodation building.

The agent states within the accompanying Design and Access Statement that 'the existing warden, who occupies the mobile home next to the club house is due to retire, but wishes to keep his mobile unit on site. The proposal would provide accommodation for the new warden and his family and at the same time provide a site office. This would free up more space in the clubhouse for recreational activities. At the same time from experience it makes sense to have the office located within or immediately adjoining the wardens accommodation. This is because they are on call 24 hours a day and more book keeping is undertaken in their living quarters'. In addition, the submitted 'existing block plan' highlights a building as 'existing wardens accommodation'. There is no indication that this building will cease use as wardens accommodation. As a result, it is not clear what accommodation will remain on site.

The 'Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism', Annexe A: Tourist Accommodation; para24 states that "as far as possible, suitably located existing dwellings should be used to meet these accommodation needs. But where there is not a feasible option, and particularly in locations where suitable housing is not available, or is unaffordable, it may be necessary to provide new, on-site accommodation for managerial and/or other staff. In such cases the conversion of any suitable available existing buildings should be considered first in preference to the construction of new and potentially intrusive housing development in the countryside". On the basis of the submitted information, the Local Planning Authority is not convinced that there is sufficient justification to warrant the erection of 1 No. detached building, comprising wardens living accommodation on site.

In addition, the application site is located within Flood Zone 2, as identified by the Environment Agency. In the absence of a satisfactory Flood Risk Assessment to the contrary, it is considered that the proposed residential use, which is classed as vulnerable in accordance with advice in PPS25 (Development and Flood Risk) would be deemed inappropriate for this location.

It is therefore recommended that this application is refused, for the reasons outlined below.

RECOMMENDATION**REFUSE**

- 1 The Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the need for 1 No. two bedroomed building, comprising wardens office/ living accommodation to serve Lidsey Caravan Park has been demonstrated and the proposal is therefore contrary to the Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism and policies LOC2 of the West Sussex Structure Plan and GEN3 of the Arun District local Plan.
- 2 The site lies within an area of high flood probability (Flood Zone 2). In the absence of a comprehensive Flood Risk Assessment to the contrary, it is considered that the proposed residential use, which is classed as vulnerable in accordance with advice in PPS25 (Development and Flood Risk) would be deemed inappropriate for this location.

The proposal is therefore contrary to PPS25 Development and Flood Risk, policy ERA4 of the West Sussex Structure Plan and policy GEN11 of the Arun District Local Plan.