

**13. BROSTERFIELD CARAVAN AND CAMPING SITE, FOLOW – PROPOSED SUBMISSION OF REVISED PLANNING APPLICATION ( P4484/TRS )**

**Purpose of the report**

**To seek Members' approval for the submission of a revised planning application for Brosterfield Caravan and Camping Site following further community consultation during 2015.**

At the ARP meeting 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2013 Members recommended that Authority:

1. Agree the submission of a full planning application for the Brosterfield site as predominantly a touring caravan and campsite, with a manager's unit, 5 eco lodges, an amenity block and infrastructure as set out in Option 5 in the presented options report together with any required modifications which may be compatible with other options as presented in the options analysis paper.
2. Agree that finessing of the application is undertaken as part of the planning process.

**Key issues**

- The site was purchased by the PDNPA to remove the threat of Park Homes being developed on the site by Tingdene Homes (Arunworth Ltd) who in 2011 successfully appealed the interpretation of the 1998 Planning permission. To achieve this it is proposed that the existing planning permission as interpreted by the planning inspectorate in 2011 is changed by Discontinuance Order.
- A planning application was submitted in December 2014. The application comprises a finessed Option 5 as approved by Members in May 2013.
- The planning application met with a significant amount of objection, in particular from the Foolow community.
- The planning application was paused whilst further community consultation was carried out throughout 2015 with representatives of the Foolow community.
- As a result of the further consultation, the District Valuer was asked to provide additional Valuation advice based on the agricultural land value and three caravan and camping site scenarios. These were the 2014 planning proposal and two alternatives, A and B.
- In addition a further value has since been obtained of the recommended revised application which is a combination of Alternatives A and B known as Alternative C.

**1. Recommendations**

- 1. To agree that Option 2 is taken forward, to submit a full planning application for a revised proposal (Alternative C) with any required modifications/finessing undertaken as part of the planning process.**
- 2. That following and subject to the outcome of the planning application, an analysis for future options for the site is then presented to members.**

**How does this contribute to our policies and legal obligations?**

2. The site was purchased in 2012 in order to protect the intrinsic landscape value of the National Park. It was bought because the impact of the development of a 20 unit static caravan park without restrictions was considered detrimental to the quality of the unique landscape of the area, and the purchase would protect the local community

from such inappropriate development.

Having listened to the community representatives but also being aware of the duty of the Authority to the public purse to achieve best value, a revised planning application which balances the remit to conserve and enhance the National Park's qualities with public interest in terms of the community and the public purse is recommended. The revised proposal Alternative C will exclude the camping pods whilst seeking the most commercially attractive proposal without them.

### 3. **Background**

The site was purchased by the PDNPA to remove the threat of Park Homes being developed on the site by Tingdene Homes (Arunworth Ltd) who in 2011 appealed the interpretation of the 1998 Planning Permission. The Planning Inspectorate granted a Lawful Development Certificate for "The unrestricted all year round occupation of 20 caravans falling within the statutory definition (i.e. to include mobile "park" homes)."

The stated intention of the PDNPA was to remove the Park Home threat and return the site to a touring caravan and camping site as was the intention of the 1998 planning approval.

In May 2012, in accordance with Resolution 1 of item 12 of the Authority Meeting on 30 March 2012, land which included the Brosterfield caravan site was purchased by the Authority in order to protect the landscape and community cohesion of Foolow. Prior to purchase the District Valuer was engaged to value the site based on its agricultural value, and also its value with the benefit of planning consent for a touring caravan site.

At ARP on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2013 Members were presented with an options analysis paper for the development and disposal of the site. The paper presented 6 options for the development of the site and 2 for the disposal of the site. The committee resolved that officers should report back on the development of the options before a planning application was made.

At the May 2013 ARP it was resolved that Option 5, the most commercially aggressive of the options put to the meeting was pursued with any finessing required as part of the planning process.

4. Community consultation took place in November 2014 and a planning application was submitted in December 2014 comprising; 20 all year pitches to include 5 camping pods, 14 touring pitches and 1 warden's pitch plus 30 seasonal grass pitches for use Easter to 31<sup>st</sup> October, amenity block, new site access and services.

As a significant amount of objections were received to the proposal it was decided that the application should be paused whilst further community consultation was undertaken.

Further consultation took place throughout 2015 between the Authority and a group of representatives from the Foolow community. A group comprising neighbours and a representative of Foolow Parish Meeting have had meetings with our Brosterfield team to listen to and discuss the proposal, the different elements of it and also their concerns with regard to value of the site. During this consultation, the community stated that, ideally, they would like the site to be used permanently for agricultural use only.

The community group suggested that there would be little difference in value between agricultural land use and the land with planning consent for a caravan site. This was not the view of the Authority based on clear valuation advice received from the District Valuer. However, as a result of the consideration of new options identified and discussed with the community representatives during 2015 the Authority sought further valuation advice from the District Valuer.

5. The District Valuer was instructed by the Authority to value the site as agricultural land and also to value it under three possible touring caravan and camping planning scenarios. The first scenario was the 2014 planning proposal. The second and third scenarios were alternatives A and B; both alternatives exclude the camping pods but still have a maximum of 50 pitches for touring caravans and camping.

The camping pods appear to be the single most contentious element of the proposal, but all elements came in for some concern within the many objections lodged. The main objections highlighted by the community representatives were the impact on the landscape, impact on community, access, and planning creep.

Having now completed that consultation and having received additional valuation advice from the District Valuer, a decision is sought from ARP on the way this project is taken forward and the nature of a revised planning proposal, as any significant change will have an impact on capital value.

### **The 3 scenarios considered by the District Valuer;**

#### **1. The 2014 Planning Application- Finessed Option 5 as resolved by May 2013 ARP.**

20 all year pitches (5 camping pods, 14 surfaced pitches, 1 warden's pitch.)  
30 unsurfaced pitches for use Easter to 31<sup>st</sup> October  
Amenity block  
New site access  
Services - waste, water and electricity.

Valuation £400,000-£450,000

#### **2. Alternative A**

50 touring pitches for use Easter to 31<sup>st</sup> October  
Amenity block to simple design based on traditional limestone barn  
Warden's accommodation to be incorporated in to amenity block  
Minimise hard standing/permanent development footprint to the area around amenity block.  
New access  
Services – waste, water and electricity.

Valuation £320,000 plus - depending on nature of warden's accommodation.

#### **3. Alternative B**

20 all year pitches including 1 warden pitch  
10 additional pitches Easter to 31<sup>st</sup> October  
20 additional pitches at Bank Holiday weekends only  
Amenity block to simple traditional limestone barn style design  
New access

Services – waste, water and electricity

Valuation £325,000

#### **Agricultural Land Use only**

4. Agricultural Land comprising approximately 4.3 hectares in total - Brosterfield Caravan and Campsite together with roadside field.

Valuation £130,000-£150,000

### **6. Recommended Alternative Proposal**

#### **5. A combination of Alternatives A and B (Alternative C)**

20 all year pitches

30 pitches Easter to 31<sup>st</sup> October

Amenity block to simple design based on traditional limestone barn to incorporate warden's accommodation

Minimise hard standing/permanent development footprint to the area around amenity block

New access

Services - waste, water and electricity

Valuation £375,000-£400,000

### **7. Options**

#### **Option 1 – Continue with the current proposal as submitted**

Pursue the existing planning proposal as submitted in December 2014. The District Valuer valuation is £400,000-£450,000.

#### **Option 2- Submit a revised proposal (recommended Alternative C), a combination of alternatives A and B**

Submit a revised proposal, which is a combination of alternatives A and B to exclude the camping pods but include accommodation for the owner/warden within the amenity block design and make additional amendments to the access, and layout of the site. District Valuer Valuation £375,000-£400,000

#### **Option3 – Return to agricultural use**

Consider relinquishing the planning approval on site completely and returning the site to agricultural use only. District Valuer Valuation £130,000-£150,000

### **8. Financial:**

On balance the recommended proposal is the most favoured strategy to follow to minimise the cost of the intervention to the public purse whilst securing landscape protection and balancing community engagement objectives.

### **9. Risk Management:**

There is a risk that through the planning process some elements within the application may need to be modified.

There is a risk that members of the public, in particular some of the Foolow community will not be content with the revised proposal despite the recent consultations.

### **10. Sustainability:** There are no issues.

11. **Background papers** (not previously published) - None.

**Appendices** – None

**Report Author, Job Title and Publication Date**

Tammy Shirley, Rural Surveyor, 25 February 2016.