

Land South of Shripney Garden Caravan Park, Shripney Lane Bognor Regis PO22 9NS

Proposed variation to condition 4 of planning permission BE/151/11 "Extension to existing caravan park to provide 12no. additional mobile homes, associated parking area, formation of access and construction of electrical intake housing - Amendment to application BE/42/10"

This planning supporting statement accompanies an application under section 73 of the Act for the continuation of a development without compliance with a condition attached to the previous approval.

The condition which is the subject of this application reads as follows;

The caravans hereby permitted shall be occupied solely for holiday purposes only and shall not be occupied as a persons' sole or main place of residence. The owners/operators shall maintain an up-to-date register of the names of owners/occupiers of individual caravans on the site and of their main home addresses, and shall make this information available at all reasonable times to the local planning authority.

Reason: The use of the site for all year round residential occupation would conflict with policies GEN2, GEN3, DEV39 of the Arun District Local Plan on the use of caravans and on residential development.

The condition controls the occupancy of the caravans on the site, the principle of caravans being on the site and their visual appearance is already established and is unchanged as a result of the development.

The main issue in the determination of the application is the purpose of the condition and whether it continues to serve a useful purpose.

The Development Plan

Arun District Council is a local authority which by its own calculations does not have a five year supply of housing. Although the NPPF focuses upon the demonstration of a five year supply or otherwise, it is material that the shortfall in the housing supply at present is significantly short of the five year supply. The latest housing projections from the LPA are set out below;

Table 2 - 5 Year Housing Land Supply as at 31/03/17 (Based on August 2017 HSLAA & Projections HSLAA Data from H900)

Residual Need		
1	Requirement 2011 - 2017 (HSLAA)	2,514
2	Requirement 2011 - 2017	2,500
3	Net need	1,000
4	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	4,000
5	Net need	2,000
6	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
7	Net need	2,000
8	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
9	Net need	2,000
10	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
11	Net need	2,000
12	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
13	Net need	2,000
14	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
15	Net need	2,000
16	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
17	Net need	2,000
18	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
19	Net need	2,000
20	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
21	Net need	2,000
22	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
23	Net need	2,000
24	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
25	Net need	2,000
26	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
27	Net need	2,000
28	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
29	Net need	2,000
30	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
31	Net need	2,000
32	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
33	Net need	2,000
34	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
35	Net need	2,000
36	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
37	Net need	2,000
38	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
39	Net need	2,000
40	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
41	Net need	2,000
42	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
43	Net need	2,000
44	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
45	Net need	2,000
46	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
47	Net need	2,000
48	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
49	Net need	2,000
50	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
51	Net need	2,000
52	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
53	Net need	2,000
54	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
55	Net need	2,000
56	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
57	Net need	2,000
58	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
59	Net need	2,000
60	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
61	Net need	2,000
62	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
63	Net need	2,000
64	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
65	Net need	2,000
66	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
67	Net need	2,000
68	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
69	Net need	2,000
70	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
71	Net need	2,000
72	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
73	Net need	2,000
74	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
75	Net need	2,000
76	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
77	Net need	2,000
78	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
79	Net need	2,000
80	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
81	Net need	2,000
82	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
83	Net need	2,000
84	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
85	Net need	2,000
86	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
87	Net need	2,000
88	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
89	Net need	2,000
90	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
91	Net need	2,000
92	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
93	Net need	2,000
94	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
95	Net need	2,000
96	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
97	Net need	2,000
98	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
99	Net need	2,000
100	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000

5 Year Housing Land Supply v Requirement

1	Requirement for 2011/2012 (HSLAA & 5)	2,000
---	---------------------------------------	-------

In the context of an authority with a supply of only just over two years of the necessary five year supply there is no doubt that the housing policies in the Local Plan would be considered to be out of date and the circumstances in paragraph 14 of the NPPF are engaged such that;

where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

– any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or

Paragraph 55 of the NPPF provides the following guidance;

To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as.....:

A local planning policy may seek to distinguish between a site within a settlement boundary and a site in the open countryside. This reflects the approach of the Planning Policy Statements which used to contain a presumption against new development in the open countryside. The NPPF did not follow this presumption but instead only seeks to avoid 'isolated' locations.

Shripney Garden Caravan Park may not be within a defined settlement boundary within an adopted local plan but the site is not in any way an 'isolated' location. Paragraph 55 of the NPPF does not apply to the development.

The removal of the condition would enable the current holiday accommodation to be used as a person's sole or main place of residence. The land represents previously developed land and by making better use of land which is already developed the pressure to release greenfield sites (which given the local authority's housing position is a likely outcome) would be reduced.

The appearance of the site would not change whether the caravans are used as a person's weekend or holiday home or as a person's sole or main place of residence. There is no change to the landscape character of the area.

The residential occupation of park homes contributes to housing supply and section 124 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 requires Local Authorities to recognise demand for caravans within the housing needs assessments. Whether if this were done the LPA's housing position would become even worse is a separate matter but it is equally the case that the removal of the condition would make a positive contribution to housing supply in the district.

The management of the caravan park at present is that the caravans are occupied as a person's holiday home. The park does not include caravans let out for weekly holiday rentals and as a result of the size of the site the current provision is not of strategic importance to the district's tourism industry. The site does not create employment in any communal facilities which would be lost as a result of the change of the occupancy conditions.

The small scale of the site and the type of holiday accommodation provided is such that there would not be any adverse impact on the district's tourism economy. There is no net loss which would need to be balanced against the positive benefit to housing supply as a result of the development.

The site may not be in a location where housing development would normally have been encouraged. However, the lawful use of the site means that there will be journeys made to and from by residents of the site. As self-catering accommodation residents of the holiday accommodation would make journeys to the shops and supermarkets in the same manner as if the accommodation was used as a person's sole or main place of residence.

Mobile home parks are typically subject to management restrictions on the age of residents. Condition 4 could be varied to read;

No caravan shall be occupied as the sole or main place of residence of any person under the age of 45 years.

As a result of this age restriction there would not be the daily trips to and from school which may occur in a location where young children reside in the homes. The trips to and from the site whether the resident was leaving to go to work or undertake leisure activities would not be materially different from the daily trips to and from the site by residents of the site who use the accommodation as a holiday home, the facilities at the site are such that residents would leave the site for the majority of their entertainment.

Removing the planning condition would enable the supply of housing within the district to be improved and provide increased housing choice for future residents through the delivery of specialist accommodation which provides for persons over the age of 45 who wish to live within the community of a park home site.

The provision of new housing sites often brings a test of delivery, unlike a development site where following permission the site would need to be constructed, the variation of the condition would mean that the residential units would be immediately available. The positive benefit to the housing supply would be achieved as soon as the condition was varied, this is a further benefit from the development which weighs heavily in favour of the application.

The Government's commitment in the NPPF is to increase both the supply and choice of housing. The removal of the condition accords with both of these objectives on a site which is not isolated and the benefits in favour of the development outweigh the adverse considerations of the application.

Appended to this statement is a comparable case of the removal of holiday conditions from a mobile home park outside of any defined settlement. The main difference between the appeal case and the current application is that the housing shortage in the appeal case was not as severe as in the case of Arun District.

The application represents a sustainable form of development and should be approved.