

From: [Ben Stockley](#)
To: [kathleen.fitzgerald](#) [REDACTED]
Subject: Additional mobile home at Fleur de Lys Park
Date: 28 April 2022 16:48:00
Attachments: [FLEUR.docx](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Dear Mrs Fitzgerald,

I write with reference to your enquiry about the feasibility of adding an additional home to Fleur de Lys Park. The site is currently licenced for 11 caravans, but I understand that through discussions with the National Park Planning Authority, you have been told the site has planning permission for the siting of 12 caravans. I am aware that the planning history of the site is relatively complicated, however the boundary and number of caravans situated on the land has been static for some time.

You will recall that you made a similar application to add an additional home to the site in 2015, and this was heard by the Council's General Purposes and Licensing Committee in December 2015. At that time, the proposal that you put forward, to place a new home in front of numbers 12 and 14 of the site was refused – I attach a copy of an extract of the meeting minutes for you information. I note that in 2016 you subsequently appealed to HM Courts 1st Tier Property Tribunal, but withdrew the appeal prior to the hearing.

When you approached me this year to revisit the matter, I reminded you of the Committee's decision, and that any new application would need to be significantly different to the original proposal to warrant fresh consideration. As a reminder, I sent you a copy of the plan that you originally had drawn up indicating the precise location of the new home. When we subsequently spoke about the matter, you told me that this plan as drafted, remained the best option for the site.

On this basis, I am unable to consider your application, as it is identical to the one previously refused. I would suggest that you have two options at this point – firstly, you may consider the feasibility of siting a new home elsewhere on the site, which may be considered to be a separate proposal. Secondly, you may wish to consider appealing the 2015 Committee decision via the 1st Tier Property Tribunal.

I would be happy to discuss this matter with you if you are unclear or require further advice.

Ben Stockley

Ben Stockley
Food and Safety Team Manager
New Forest District Council
Tel: **023 8028 5348**

ben.stockley@nfdc.gov.uk
www.newforest.gov.uk



FLEUR-DE-LYS MOBILE HOME PARK

3 December 2015

The Committee considered an application for the amendment of the site licence conditions to enable the placing of an additional home on the site at Fleur-de-Lys Mobile Home Park. The current site licence condition 1(a) provided that the total number of residential caravans on the site should not exceed 11 at any time. There were currently 11 occupied caravans on the site. The application requested an alteration to the site licence conditions to provide that the total number of caravans on the site does not exceed 12 at any time. The application also sought an amendment to condition 3 of the site licence, reducing the permitted separation distance between caravans from 6 metres to 5.25 metres.

A letter from the applicant's Solicitors, Tozers, had been circulated to the Committee in advance of the meeting. The letter set out the applicant's case and was read out in full by the Chairman and circulated to all parties present for their consideration.

The applicant, Mrs Fitzgerald briefly addressed the Committee following submission of the letter. Mrs Fitzgerald said that since purchasing the site, various steps had been taken to improve the general condition of the site, such as obtaining the necessary electrical certificate as well as improving the drainage. With reference to the loss of parking space for plot number 14, she referred to the fact that the resident of number 14 currently did not have a designated parking space, and often parked on the gravel open space by her mobile home. The proposed application would however give plot 14 a designated parking space. Mrs Fitzgerald referred to the fact that Hampshire Fire and Rescue had not objected to the proposal nor expressed concerns.

Miss Knight, speaking on behalf of the residents of Fleur-de-Lys Mobile Home Park, addressed the Committee. Miss Knight said that residents of the site strongly opposed the application for the siting of an additional caravan on the following grounds: -

- The proposal would restrict the entry (and egress) to the park to 3.7 metres. This would restrict the view of motorists increasing the chances of potential motoring accidents on the site.
- The proposed 3.7 metre distance from the proposed home to that of current plot number 4 could mean that vibrations from traffic concentrated nearer to plot 4 and the new home could put undue pressure on the integrity of the homes resulting in structural damage. Members were reminded that the mobile homes were made of wood, not steel construction.
- The 3.7 metre path between the proposed home and plot number 4 was illogical and impractical in terms of road usage as it created a narrow entry point to the site. Coupled with the fact that the 8.1 metre distance between the proposed new home and plot 8 would further restrict turning/manoeuvring of larger vehicles, this posed a risk to drivers turning cars on the site, as there would be limited space to manoeuvre and would create 'blind spots' for drivers. Residents were concerned at the effect of the restricted turning space on the access and egress of emergency vehicles.
- Currently all residents had a clear view of the open space and the new home would severely impact on the outlook and privacy of residents, particularly residents at plots number 4, 12 and 14. The character and amenity value of the park would be lost.
- The Applicant's proposal would be in breach of the licence condition as the distance between the proposed new home and the home on plot 14 was 5.25 metres, not 6 metres as required by the licence condition.

The Chairman read out a statement from Cllr Wise, local ward member, who was unable to attend the meeting. Cllr Wise requested that the Committee support the officer's recommendation to refuse the application on the grounds that the proposal detracted from the amenity space available to residents and the proposal would restrict access to the site, posing a health and safety risk, particularly to emergency vehicles.

Following the presentations, Members were given the opportunity to question the applicant and the residents' spokesperson in turn.

In coming to their decision, the Committee had regard to the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 and the Model Standards 2008 for Caravan Sites in England and all of the representations made to them.

The Committee felt that the central area of the site was critical to its physical character, and that the siting of an additional caravan on this space would lead to the loss of the amenity value of the space. This impact would particularly be considered by the residents of plots 14 and 12. The proposed new home would also have a detrimental impact on the privacy of the resident at plot 14.

Members were shown an aerial image of the site and noted that this showed more clearly than the plans that the existing homes on the site were very close together, and another home in the space proposed would leave the site feeling very cramped.

In addition, members considered that whilst the separation distance between plots 6 and 7 was 5.25 metres, this had been an exception and it would not be appropriate to alter the site licence conditions to include a general permission for the separation distance to be 5.25 metres. The separation distance of 6 metres accords with the Model Standard Conditions and was imposed in the interests of persons dwelling on the site, for reasons of health and safety and privacy.

The Environmental Health Manager advised members that following the submission of an altered plan by the Applicant's Solicitors which shows the parking spaces with larger dimensions, the following sentence should be deleted from the recommendation as it no longer applied: -

"The parking spaces provided for plots 14 and the new home would not comply with the minimum dimensions required, and would be impractical".

The Committee supported this amendment.

RESOLVED:

That the application from Mr and Mrs Fitzgerald be refused on the following grounds: The central, gravelled area gives the park an open, spacious feel and is key to the character of the park. Siting an additional home in this space would leave the park feeling cramped, and would be of real detriment to the visual amenity that the central space offers to all residents. The detrimental impact on amenity would be particularly significant for the residents of plots 12 and 14. The new home would have a significant impact on the privacy of the resident of plot 14. It is not appropriate to amend the conditions to enable the site owners to reduce the separation distance between mobile homes on the site to 5.25 metres, because the existing condition requiring a separation distance of 6 metres has been imposed for the health and safety, and privacy of persons dwelling in caravans on the site.