

Western & Southern Area Planning Committee

10 June 2021

Public Participation

Mr N J Perrott

On January 7th this Committee met to discuss amongst other items, application WD/D/20/001703 - Land Adjacent to Buckland House, Buckland Rippers, DT3 4FT.

This was a full retrospective application that sought to change the condition of an earlier permission so that a toilet block could be permanently rather than temporarily sited on a campsite that was open for two months a year

During debate Councillor Dunseith said "It was supposed to be green, of modest size and removed in September...all of these conditions have been disregarded. They are not optional extras." Councillor Wheller said "I increasingly wonder why we bother to have a planning committee, if people can't be bothered to comply with conditions... it shows a lack of respect... maybe we could save a lot of money and not have a planning department?"

These comments indicate that the subject of conditions was an important part of the discussion

The committee's decision said "That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning to approve subject to the planning conditions as set out in the officer's report and additional conditions regarding the submission and implementation of a BMEP, and a condition in respect of disabled access to the toilets and shower facilities, to comply with the wording of the Disability Act, with these conditions to be agreed between the planning officer and Chairman of the planning committee."

The Case Officers report had a number of conditions which therefore should have been included in the subsequently published Decision Notice

One of these was condition two, which said "The toilet/shower block hereby approved shall only be operational and lit between 30th June and 1st September, inclusive, in any one year. The reason given for this was "For the avoidance of doubt given its associated use with the use of the adjoining land as a camp site between those dates only and in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality."

When the Decision Notice was issued no such condition was made. The committees instructions to the Head of Planning were not followed. I would like to ask the committees why their decision wasn't followed and why this condition was omitted from the Decision Notice.

The answer to this is increasingly important as a further application has now been submitted which seeks to double the months this site is open. The failure not to include a condition as instructed by yourselves is a failure in the democratic process.

Not only does the visual amenity of the locality lack this protection but it has disturbed the balance between those who seek to object to this latest application and the applicants desire to gain permission for yet further development.