

Question	Response
<p data-bbox="203 236 931 304">From Councillor James Hunt (2.4, Seaview Holiday Camp, Warden Bay Road, Leysdown):</p> <p data-bbox="203 344 595 376">20/500490/FULL - Para 8.3</p> <p data-bbox="203 419 947 746">Whilst I understand the reasoning behind not restricting the occupancy for the chalets replacing the caravans at which point would we be able to warrant saying no? I accept that there isn't an argument to change the restriction on the chalets due to the planning inspector decision, but a precedent could be set that may enable all caravans across the whole site to be replaced with 12-month occupancy chalets.</p>	<p data-bbox="976 236 1980 268">There are no restrictions on the existing chalets – just on the caravans.</p> <p data-bbox="976 308 2029 563">The wholesale replacement of caravans with chalets is an issue Officers are keenly aware of, and there is a possibility that all the holiday caravans could in time be replaced with chalets capable (in planning terms) of being occupied throughout the year. I had previously advised this committee, when the last appeal decision, allowing precisely what is currently proposed was reported, that I considered that it was a poor decision and did not set a precedent.</p> <p data-bbox="976 603 2036 898">Having given further thought to the matter, I remain of the view that the appeal decision was poor. However – in terms of setting a precedent, I have to say that it would be difficult in view of the decision for the Council to resist further applications. Equally, in terms of enforcement, it would not be impossible to distinguish between chalets approved for holiday use only and those that could be occupied throughout the year. However – it would be increasingly difficult to justify why action might be considered against the occupier of one chalet and not another a few yards away.</p> <p data-bbox="976 938 2022 1305">In broad terms, the Local Plan encourages the upgrading of holidays parks, which is what is proposed here. It is the occupancy period which is, it seems to me, at issue. If Members feel strongly that the chalets which would replace caravans should be the subject of occupancy restrictions, the Committee can delegate authority to officers to impose appropriate conditions. However – this would need to be clearly distinguishable from the allowed appeal. I do not think it would be possible to do so, hence I would advise Members against doing so, as the Council would be likely in such a scenario to lose both the appeal and a claim for costs made by the appellants.</p>