

REPORT UPDATE

Application No: BE/151/11/

Page No:

Location: Land South of Shripney Garden Caravan Park, Shripney Lane Bognor Regis

Description: 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

UPDATE DETAILS

Reason for Update/Changes:

Consultation Response

District Engineers
No comment

Letters of Representation regarding the amended plans

Bersted Parish Council
No objection

4 further letters of objection

No further issues raised except the seeking of permission for contraventions and the original permission is not acceptable.

* Letter of Representation criticising Officer Report

The extension is 30m not 17m. An internal access road is not shown. Planning History BE/38/08 has been omitted which shows the Inspectors criticism. Report omits Parish Council statement that the applicant stated all work had been approved by Arun District Council. The Inspector identified the site as Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. There is an agricultural use on the site opposite. Environmental Health commented that Fire and Rescue Services should comment on the new access. Economic Development Section were not consulted re: BE/42/10, where is their response? The Inspector stated that the area was environmentally sensitive and that the proposal would have an urbanising effect on the character of the countryside. The Market Needs Assessment did not state other sites in the built up area that could accommodate the need. The GPDO is applicable to sites not requiring a licence and the site requires a licence and beyond the scope of the Caravan Site and Control of Development Act 1960. The access has moved closer to the Myddleton Terrace. The caravans do not need to move to accommodate trees. The boundary with the lane should be a double row of native hedgerow. If conditions were in accordance with Circular 11/95 why were they not enforced?

update

26/2



Officers Comment:

* Noted. The size was measured on site by an Enforcement Officer and is shown on the submitted plan. The conclusion describes the history and Inspectors decision of BE/38/08. Cannot comment on third party discussion when no details submitted. Under application BE/41/95 the Inspector dismissed the appeal on the grounds that the land was Grade I - 2 Agricultural land, however since that time and before BE/38/08 Government policy changed the classification and the Inspector for BE/38/08 raised no objection regarding this. Fire and Rescue is part of the licence and the applicant was advised of Environmental Health response in the officers report. The Economic Development Section were consulted regarding BE/42/10 but made no comments. The Inspectors comment referred specifically to - in the absence of a justification - that he would have to conclude the proposal had an urbanising effect. The justification was submitted with BE/42/10 Market Needs Assessment. An explanation of planning controls concerning caravan sites was included within the conclusion of the Committee Report. Site layout is controlled by the site licence. This application resulted from Enforcement Investigations, under planning legislation changes can be made to approvals provided they seek retrospective approval such as in this case.

Note: The changes to recommendation, conditions and/or reasons show under Officers Recommendation at the end of the attached report.

Or

Note: The changes to recommendation, conditions and/or reasons are attached on the amended replacement recommendation sheet.

Representations

1 Letter of Objection

No new issues raised except that the writer was not allowed to speak at the Committee as someone else had taken the allocated slot. The access lane in front of Mydleton Terrace was previously owned by the residents of the terrace. This gave access to Marigold Caravan Site as a back entrance.

Officer comments

Noted. Letter from applicant's agent stating that the proposed hedgerow on the southern boundary will be difficult to maintain and it would be slow growing. It is understood that the neighbour also did not want the hedging. Therefore request the Condition 3 be amended to standard conditions.

update