Stephen Stone Esq
Public Health and Community Safety
Appletree Court
Beaulieu Road
LYNDHURST
SO43 7PA
DD: 01392667634

13 October 2015
ACWB 52073.1
CLIC/07/00154


Dear Sir

## Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 <br> Fleur-de-Lys Park Pilley Street Pilley Lymington SO41 5QG Application to change site licence conditions to allow additional home

We are instructed to act for Mr Charles and Mrs Kathleen Fitzgerald who are the holders of the caravan site licence in respect of the above premises. We seek an alteration to the licence conditions to permit the stationing of an additional caravan.

The matter is the subject of an existing application to the Council (under reference CLIC/07/00154) and the substantive correspondence concluded with your letter to Mr and Mrs Fitzgerald dated 25 June 2015. In that letter you raised a number of questions to which we endeavour to respond below.

We have enclosed two copies of plan 6294 prepared by a land surveyor and any references in this letter to the plan are to this plan.

## The amendment which is sought

We seek the amendment of conditions 1 (a) and (b) and condition 3 to read as follows:

1. a) The total number of residential caravans on the site shall not exceed $\mathbf{1 2}$ (twelve) at any time.
b) Caravan standings shall be located on the site in the positions indicated by a numbered rectangle on the approved plan attached reference 6294, provided by the site owner.
2. Whilst any caravan is stationed on the site:
a) Except in the case mentioned in sub paragraph c) below every caravan must be spaced at a distance of no less than 6 metres from any other caravan which is occupied as a separate residence.
b) no caravan shall be stationed within 2 metres of any road or communal car park within the site or more than 50 metres from such a road within the site.
c) Where a caravan has been fitted with cladding from Class 1 fire rated materials to its facing walls, then the separation distance between it and an adjacent caravan may be reduced to a minimum of 5.25 metres.

Based on the rather unsatisfactory plan which accompanied the earlier application you raised the question whether an amendment of condition 3(b) would be sought but the design work which is reflected in plan 6294 demonstrates that this is unnecessary.

You asked for a number of measurements to be given and most of these are marked on the plan. The two car parking spaces are respectively $4.8 \mathrm{~m} \times 2.4 \mathrm{~m}$ and $4.6 \mathrm{~m} \times 2 \mathrm{~m}$ (minimum), these figures being scaled off the plan.

You enquired about the position of the storage shed and it is proposed to site it on the North East side of the patio. It will be a standard proprietary shed of metal construction and will be shielded by fence panels and trellis on the Northern and Eastern boundaries.

You enquired about the new footpath adjoining the pitch of number 9 and that will indeed be constructed outside the existing pitch of number 9 .

There will not be a window in the Eastern end of the proposed new park home.
The plan now shows that parking provision is to be enhanced and each home will have its own parking space. At the moment number 14 does not have a parking space and the homeowner parks her moped outside her pitch in the road. She will have a dedicated parking space outside her pitch. Incidentally the siting of the proposed new park home will not involve any alterations to pitch 14 at all except for the provision of the parking space, which is outside pitch 14 as currently configured.

There is ample parking space for visitors adjacent to the access road on the right hand side as one comes onto the park.

Access to the proposed new home will be through the front door on the South side of the home (a path will connect to the parking place) and onto the patio through a door on the Northern side.

Fences will be erected to define the boundaries with pitches 12 and 14 and these will be shiplap close-boarded fence panels approximately 4 feet in height with a trellis of two feet.

You enquired whether the new parking space for number 14 would have access across it. There will be no need for the proposed new home to have access across the parking space of number 14 as the main access will be on the South side.

You raised the question whether there would be a "blind spot". We trust that the plan now supplied will reassure you that there will in fact be a good line of sight from the access road past the park homes $3,4,14$ and the proposed new home. Our clients quite recently removed the fountain in the open space as it impeded motor vehicles manoeuvring in the area.

May we add a couple of general comments:

- Pilley is a village with very high house prices and the additional home will be relatively affordable when offered for sale at probably about one third to one half of the average house price in the village.
- The area on which the new park home is proposed to stand does not perform any particular function for the residents of the park, as might be said of a garden amenity area or a mini village green. The opportunity is there to put the area to a productive use without adversely affecting the amenity of existing residents. The plan reveals that the pitches at Fleur de Lys Park are fairly generous in size particularly numbers 12 and 14 which are most directly affected by the proposal.
- Planning permission exists for an additional home and there must be clear-cut licensing reasons for the Council to decline this application. The applicants believe they have addressed all the licensing considerations.

We are informed our clients paid the fee of $£ 315$ with their application in 2014 for the siting of the additional home and the application does not appear to have been formally determined. In the circumstances we assume the Council will be prepared to deal with the matters raised in this letter as part of the same process without payment of a further fee.

We look forward to hearing from you.
Yours, faithfy fly

## TOZERS

t.beard@イozers.co,uk


