

Ryarsh **TM/15/02814/FL**

Downs And Mereworth

Two storey side and rear extension at Fishpond Cottage Chapel Street Ryarsh West Malling for Mrs Katy Nunn

DPHEH: As per the main report the amended plans have now been received correcting the error to the south elevation. This has been achieved by enlarging the flat roof section to be in-line with the south elevation wall of the extension above the proposed bathroom.

RECOMMENDATION UNCHANGED

Shipbourne **TM/15/03865/FL**

Borough Green And Long Mill

Proposed conversion of existing stable and hay barn into 3 bedroom dwelling house (including new roof and walling to hay barn) with associated creation of domestic curtilage, access and parking facilities at Great Oaks House Puttenden Road Shipbourne for Mrs L Cohen

DPHEH: : The application has be withdrawn from the agenda to allow full consideration to be given to further information submitted by the applicant with regard to policy interpretation and land use matters.

RECOMMENDATION CHANGED

Item withdrawn from this agenda

Stansted **TM/15/04050/FL**

Wrotham, Ightham And Stansted

Section 73 application for the variation of condition 1 of planning permission TM/13/00081/FL (to allow land marked C41-C46 to be associated with static caravans and to allow storage area to accommodate touring caravans) to provide for year round use in line with other parks in the area and 1 (c) to be deleted at Thriftwood Caravan And Camping Park Plaxdale Green Road Stansted for Mr S Sellers

Agent: The agent has submitted 2 emails since the agenda was printed including one that has been sent to Members of this committee direct. They both largely repeat the same arguments, summarised as follows:

The only issue is whether some of the static vans can be beneficially used (including by workers) in February or if preventing such use serves any overriding beneficial planning purpose.

At present up to 18 of the static caravans can be used by workers at any other time of the year although in reality the worker units are split between statics and touring vans. They can stay in up to 18 tourers at any time of the year. Workers stopping on the site in winter really benefit from being able to use some of the hire fleet vans but at the moment, if working over February, they

have to move out of the statics and bring on a tourer for 4 weeks after which they can move back into the vacant static and have the tourer towed off site. Tourers are not well suited to winter occupation and certainly not as sustainable to run whilst the additional unnecessary caravan towing movements bringing worker touring vans onto the site is not sustainable by comparison to using the otherwise empty hire fleet static caravans. The better insulation of the static vans also cuts down any noise arising from the use of the site whilst reducing slow caravan towing movements benefits all road users. Making people move out and into a tourer for February seems perverse and effectively makes some of them stay in tourers in winter because of the hassle of moving between tourers and statics during their stay is too much bother/added expense. The maximum number of worker units remains the same at 18 and otherwise empty vans are put to good use at a quiet time of the year for holiday makers. Such use does not detract from the holiday offer here as there is limited demand in February. Enhancing winter income is important to the business and especially in providing year round employment.

The key issue here is one which has been largely overlooked (so creating a misleading impression of the current situation) being the way in which the site can and does operate under the terms of the existing permission. The site will continue in this way as allowed by the extant consent unless more appropriate conditions can be put into place as is being sought by the current application. This request to amend the conditions will not just benefit the park operator and other businesses who use the park to provide affordable worker accommodation when needed but also that what is being sought represents a more appropriate starting point in terms of material planning considerations such as enhanced sustainability, reduced impact on local residents, improved safety/free flow of traffic on the road network, etc - significant planning gains and no demonstrable harm!

The remaining extant conditions still prevent any form of residential use and overall levels of use of the site will not change (with the 18 unit maximum remaining in force) whilst significant planning gains will result and general sustainability will be enhanced.

If the matter is refused it will give rise to an appeal and most likely a claim for costs. I am struggling to see any appropriate justification for the approach being adopted but hope that doesn't end up having to be tested at appeal.

DPHEH: The points made above have been addressed in the main report.

RECOMMENDATION UNCHANGED

East Peckham 15/00394/WORKM
Hadlow And East Peckham

28 Westwood Road East Peckham Tonbridge Kent TN12 5DE

No supplementary matters to report