D/319/SM/P f 6/3/321

D.C. Sun
6/9/83

Department of the Environment and Department of Transport
Common Services
Room 1422 Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9 DJ
Telex 449321
Direct line 0272-218927
Switchboard 0272-218811

EASTLEIGH BOROUGH
17 AUG 1983

Your reference

Messrs Charles F Jones and Son
70 Watergate Street
CHESTER
CH1 2NP

Our reference
T/APP/5230/A/83/2959/PH2
Date
16 August 1983

Gentlemen

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9
APPEAL BY RANK MARINE INTERNATIONAL LIMITED
APPLICATION NO:- 16487/2

1. I refer to this appeal, which I have been appointed to determine, against the decision of the Eastleigh Borough Council to refuse planning permission for change of use from residential and holiday caravan site to residential caravan site only at Riverside Caravan Park, Satchell Lane, Hamble. I have considered the written representations made by you, the council, the parish council and also those made by other interested persons. I inspected the site on 29 June 1983.

2. It is situated on the north side of Satchell Lane - which continues beyond the site and bends southwards past a newly developed private housing estate comprising St Agatha's Road, Fry Close and Kingfisher Close - and on the east side of a country lane which provides vehicular access to the caravan site and, beyond that, to an oil pumping depot and Mercury Yacht Marina and car-park. The appeal site fronts onto Satchell Lane and the country lane, extending south-eastwards to form the northern boundary of the house plots on Fry Close and Kingfisher Close.

3. The vehicular access points to the caravan site are located about 100 ft and 300 ft from Satchell Lane and are linked by a looped internal site road. The site is sub-divided into 3 main areas:-

part A is to the south-east of the loop and includes some 35 residential caravans;

part B is the north-western sector, which includes about 50 static holiday caravans;

part C is a relatively narrow strip between Satchell Lane and the southern leg of the loop road, for touring caravans.

Part C is relatively level ground, but parts A and B slope downhill appreciably from west to east.

4. From the written representations it is clear that the Hound, Hamble, Bursledon Local Plan, which provides the policy basis for the sole reason for refusal of planning permission, is as yet only in draft form, having been placed on deposit in February 1983. On behalf of the appellant, you have objected to the deposited plan - Policies 1 to 3 and 7 - insofar as it relates to Riverside Caravan Park which is shown on the plan as located outside the urban edge.

5. Although I have noted that objection, I cannot take it into account as a consideration material to the determination of this appeal because it takes issue with the definition of the urban edge which is of much wider import and cannot be determined solely on the merits or otherwise of arguments relating to the proposed exclusion therefrom of the appeal site. Nevertheless, in the light of the guidance contained in Circular 4/79 (Memorandum on Structure and Local Plans) - paragraph 4.4 - the emerging local plan which is now on deposit is a material consideration in the exercise of development control.

6. The council consider the existing 35 residential units on the appeal site (part A) to be a valuable source of low cost housing accommodation which should be retained. Accordingly, I have formed the opinion that the decision on this appeal turns on whether the need and/or demand for residential (as opposed to holiday or touring) caravans is such as to warrant changing the present use of the site (parts B and C) from holiday and touring to residential caravans, contrary to the emerging local plan policies for the restraint of development outside the urban edge and of the extension of caravan sites in coastal and riverside locations.

7. I accept that considerable benefits to the present occupants of residential caravans on the site (part A) would ensue if the whole site were to be redeveloped the manner indicated on the proposed layout for 43 units (drawing No 1376-8); and incidental benefits might accrue also to those residents of Kingfisher Close and Fry Close whose gardens back onto the appeal site, by reason of the reduced density and improved disposition of caravans in their immediate vicinity. I accept also that conditions on the site, including the site roads and environment, are unsatisfactory by today's standards; and the proposed change would bring about improvement.

8. However, the representations for the appellant do not provide any material evidence of need or demand for the extension of the permanent residential element of the site, but claim that the present situation does not provide any incentive or return for the appellant. Conversely, while recognising the value of the existing residential element, the council consider the site as a whole has an important recreational function; and that view is strongly supported by the representations of the majority of interested persons concerned about the possible loss of holiday accommodation. Moreover, the predominance of the areas of parts B and C over that of part A, and the preponderance of holiday and touring over residential caravans despite the appellant's recognition of the unsatisfactory conditions is the strongest evidence of the demand for holiday accommodation. I therefore conclude that the demand or need for residential caravans is not such as to outweigh the demand for recreational use, and does not warrant the change of use which was the purpose of the application.

9. I have taken account of all the other matters raised in written representations made by you, including those relating to previous temporary permissions for parts or the whole of the site, the irrelevance of submissions relating to permanent housing, and the Mobile Homes Act 1983; but whereas one or more of those matters may be pertinent to the existing and any future residential caravans, separately or collectively they do not outweigh the considerations which have led to my conclusion. I have also noted the other matters raised in written representations made by the council, the parish council and other interested persons; but they are not sufficient to alter the conclusion I have reached.

10. For the above reasons and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby dismiss this appeal.

I am Gentlemen
Your obedient Servant

R. G. Bromiley.

R G BROMILEY MCD BArch MRTPI ARIBA
Inspector