

SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE – 28 January 2015

UPDATE TO AGENDA

APPLICATION NO.

14/2714N

LOCATION

Former Hack Green RAF Camp, Coole Lane, Austerson

UPDATE PREPARED

26 January 2015

CONSULTEES

Education – Insufficient capacity in local schools, therefore financial contributions required.

REPRESENTATIONS

2 further letters of representation have been received making further comments in response to the published committee report, relating to the following matters:

- The Application is for a permanent permission, not a temporary one. Therefore, the absence of a five year supply of deliverable sites is irrelevant and no weight ought to be attached to it.
- Previous inspector identified land as excluded from definition of previously developed land. Given the absence of any further development on site (which is acknowledged in the committee report) and a further 10 years of uninterrupted encroachment of nature on the site, it is difficult to comprehend how such a decision has been reversed

KEY ISSUES

Education

Given that up to 20 units of accommodation are to be provided on the site, the views from Education are based on a total of 20 units. The proposed development will generate a total of 4 primary aged pupils and 3 secondary aged pupils.

Capacity has been considered in the local primary schools (i.e. those within 2 miles) and the local secondary schools (i.e. those within 3 miles), and forecasts indicate that there will be insufficient capacity in the local primary and secondary schools to accommodate the pupils generated by the development. Therefore, in the event that the application is approved, a sum

of £43,385 would be required for primary education and a sum of £49,028 would be required for secondary education towards accommodation for the pupils generated.

Response to representations

Paragraph 25 of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) states that, “...if a local planning authority cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites, this should be a significant material consideration in any subsequent planning decision when considering applications for the grant of temporary planning permission”. With regard to the comments received in representation it is acknowledged that the current application is for a permanent permission, and not a temporary one.

However, paragraph 8 of the PPTS requires local planning authorities to set “plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in their area”. Paragraph 9 also requires local planning authorities, in producing their local plan, to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of sites against their locally set targets. The Council do not currently have an adopted policy that is based on an accurate assessment of need and which identifies a 5 year supply of deliverable sites. Paragraph 14 of the Framework identifies a presumption in favour of granting planning permission where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. For this reason, the absence of an adopted policy based on an accurate assessment of need does weigh in favour of the application. But this does not outweigh the identified harm in this case.

In addition, paragraph 203 of Framework, requires local planning authorities to consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions. One such condition considered in the original report was for a temporary permission (which would therefore trigger paragraph 25 of the PPTS). However, the imposition of conditions was not considered to make the development acceptable even for a temporary period.

Turning to the matter of previously developed land, the previous Inspector’s comments are noted and acknowledged in the original report. However, in order to be excluded from the definition of previously developed land as set out in the Framework, the remains of any permanent structure or fixed surface structure need to have blended into the landscape in the process of time. Following a site inspection, this is not considered to be the case with this site.

CONCLUSION

As in the original report a recommendation of refusal is made.