



An  
Bord  
Pleanála

## Inspector's Report ABP-312139-21

---

<b>Type of Appeal</b>	Appeal against a Section 18 Demand for Payment.
<b>Location</b>	Lands west of Main Street, Kilcoole, County Wicklow.
<b>Planning Authority</b>	Wicklow County Council.
<b>Planning Authority VSL Reg. Ref.</b>	VS/K/03A.
<b>Site Owner</b>	Brookhampton Limited.
<b>Planning Authority Decision</b>	Demand for payment of vacant site.
<b>Date of Site Visit</b>	19 September 2022.
<b>Inspector</b>	Stephen Rhys Thomas.

# Contents

1.0 Introduction.....	3
2.0 Site Location and Description .....	3
3.0 Statutory Context .....	3
4.0 Development Plan Policy.....	4
5.0 Planning History.....	5
6.0 Planning Authority Decision .....	6
6.1. Planning Authority Reports .....	6
6.2. Planning Authority Notices .....	7
7.0 The Appeal .....	7
7.1. Grounds of Appeal .....	7
7.2. Planning Authority Response .....	8
8.0 Assessment.....	9
9.0 Recommendation.....	17
10.0 Reasons and Considerations .....	17

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1. This appeal refers to a Section 15 Notice of Demand for Payment of Vacant Site Levy issued by Wicklow County Council, stating their demand for a vacant site levy for the year 2020 amounting to €11,900 for a site west of Main Street, Kilcoole, County Wicklow, and identified as VS/K/03A.
- 1.2. A Notice of Proposed Entry on the Vacant Sites Register was issued to Laurence Keegan on the 13 February 2018. On the 4 July 2018, the Notice of Entry on the Vacant Sites Register was issued to Laurence Keegan, this was unsuccessfully appealed.
- 1.3. A valuation pertaining to the site was issued by Wicklow County Council on the 15 December 2019. The value of the subject site was stated to be €200,000. This notice was subsequently appealed to the Valuation Tribunal, new value is €170,000 dated 11 March 2021.

## 2.0 Site Location and Description

- 2.1. This site comprises a rectangular shaped area of ground 0.17 hectares (as stated by the planning authority) and which addresses Main Street in Kilcoole with a fenced area along the boundary with the footpath. An entrance from Main Street facilitates access into the site which is used as a car park and recycling centre. The site has a gravelled surface. A number of cars were parked on site and the rear of the site is occupied by steel shipping containers.

## 3.0 Statutory Context

- 3.1. **Urban Regeneration and Housing Act 2015 (as amended).**
  - 3.1.1. The site was entered onto the register subsequent to a Notice issued under Section 7(1) of the Act that stated the PA was of the opinion that the site referenced was a vacant site within the meaning of Section 5(1)(b) and 6(6) of the Act. The 7(1) Notice was issued 13<sup>th</sup> February 2018. The site was subsequently entered onto the register 4<sup>th</sup> July 2018.

3.1.2. Section 18 of the Act states that the owner of a site who receives a demand for payment of a vacant site levy under section 15, may appeal against the demand to the Board within 28 days. The burden of showing that:

*(a) the site was no longer a vacant site on 1st January in the year concerned,  
or*

*(b) the amount of the levy has been incorrectly calculated in respect of the site  
by the Planning Authority,*

*is on the owner of the site.*

## 4.0 Development Plan Policy

4.1.1. The current **Wicklow County Development Plan 2016-2022** refers to Urban Regeneration and Housing in Chapter 4 of the Plan and specifically at Policy HD19 where it states:

In many settlements in the County, there are sites and areas in need of development and renewal, in order to prevent:

- a. adverse effects on existing amenities in such areas, in particular as a result of the ruinous or neglected condition of any land,
- b. urban blight and decay,
- c. anti-social behaviour, or
- d. a shortage of habitable houses or of land suitable for residential use or a mixture of residential and other uses.

It is an objective of this plan to encourage and facilitate the appropriate development of such sites /lands and all available tools and mechanisms, including the Vacant Site levy, may be utilised to stimulate such development.

In this regard, it is considered that all lands zoned 'Town Centre' in this plan (this refers to Level 5 settlements) as well as the following zones in larger towns (with stand alone plans) may include sites that are in need of renewal and regeneration, and these areas will be examined in detail to determine if there are sites where the Vacant Site Levy should be applied.

Kilcoole is a Settlement Zone 3 where TC and VC are included for the purposes of the Act. The site is zoned TC in the current Plan.

- 4.1.2. **Wicklow County Development Plan 2022 – 2028** – According to the planning authority, the County Council meeting of 12<sup>th</sup> September 2022 the Elected Members of Wicklow County Council resolved to make the Wicklow County Development Plan 2022 - 2028. This Plan will come into effect on the 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2022.

## 5.0 Planning History

### 5.1. Subject site

ABP-302552-18 – Permission refused for 267 no. residential units (225 no. houses, 42 no. apartments), 5 no. retail units, 4 no. office units, childcare facility, innovation hub and associated site works, the three reasons include:

1. There is a lack of certainty in relation to the wastewater network capacity, pump station capacity and the water storage requirements for the development. Having regard to the existing deficiency in the provision of adequate sewerage and water supply infrastructure serving the subject site, it is considered that the proposed development would be premature by reference to the existing deficiencies in the provision of sewerage and water supply facilities and the period within which this constraint may reasonably be expected to cease, and would be prejudicial to public health. The proposed development would, therefore, be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

2. Having regard to the information provided in the Report for the purposes of Appropriate Assessment Screening, dated the 26th day of June 2018, and the absence of any assessment of the potential for effects from the deficiencies in the existing municipal sewer network and treatment system, the Board could not be satisfied that the potential for effects on Special Conservation Interest bird species of The Murrrough Special Protection Area (site code 004186) or the potential effects on qualifying interests (annual vegetation of drift lines, perennial vegetation of stony banks, Atlantic salt meadows, Mediterranean salt meadows, Calcareous fens with *Cladium mariscus* and species of the Caricion

davallianae and Alkaline fens) within The Murrough Wetlands Special Area of Conservation (site code 002249) could be logically ruled out.

The Board therefore cannot be satisfied, beyond reasonable scientific doubt, that the proposed development, either individually or in combination with other plans and projects, would not adversely affect the integrity of these European sites, The Murrough Special Protection Area and The Murrough Wetlands Special Area of Conservation in view of the sites' conservation objectives.

3. The proposal for the construction of 14 number residential units, namely 113-122, on lands zoned open space would materially contravene an objective indicated in the Greystones-Delgany and Kilcoole Local Area Plan 2013-2019, which objective is considered reasonable. It is considered that the inclusion of these houses, within an area of land in which residential development is not permitted, would not be in accordance with Section 9(6)(b) of the Planning and Development (Housing) and Residential Tenancies Act 2016. Accordingly, the Board is not in a position to grant permission for these residential units.

## 5.2. VSL History

ABP-302146-18 - Entry on vacant site register confirmed.

## 6.0 Planning Authority Decision

### 6.1. Planning Authority Reports

- 6.1.1. Register of Vacant Sites Report (first report – 25<sup>th</sup> January 2018). The site is vacant, unauthorised structures on site, neglected appearance and signs of antisocial behaviour taking place. Car park use is unauthorised and should be disregarded.
- 6.1.2. Register of Vacant Sites Report (second report – 28<sup>th</sup> June 2018) – Site visits, 13/06/18, 21/06/18 and 24/06/18. The submission from the owner is noted. For the purposes of the register, the larger site is broken into three, that is A, B and C. The site remains vacant, unauthorised structures on site, neglected appearance and signs of antisocial behaviour taking place. Car park use is unauthorised and should be disregarded.

6.1.3. Section 15 Report – (13<sup>th</sup> January 2020), site visit 10<sup>th</sup> January 2020, the site remains vacant, unauthorised structures on site, neglected appearance and signs of antisocial behaviour taking place. Car park use is unauthorised. Charge levy.

## 6.2. Planning Authority Notices

6.2.1. Wicklow County Council advised the site owner that the subject site (Planning Authority site ref. VS/K/03A) is now liable for a payment of 7% of its valuation. The site is valued at €170,000 and hence the levy for 2020 is €11,900. Payment terms and methods are outlined. Notice dated 8<sup>th</sup> November 2021. Previous Notices withdrawn upon request.

Valuation Tribunal determination of market value - €170,000, dated 14<sup>th</sup> October 2021.

6.2.2. A Section 12(4) Notice issued on the 8<sup>th</sup> March 2020, advising the owner of the site valuation (€200,000) and instructions to make an appeal to the Valuations Tribunal, accompanied by a map with the site outlined.

6.2.3. A section 7(3) Notice issued on the 4<sup>th</sup> July 2018, advising the owner that their site had been placed on the register.

6.2.4. A section 7(1) Notice issued on the 26<sup>th</sup> January 2018, advising the owner that their site had been identified as a vacant site and invited submissions, accompanied by a site map.

## 7.0 The Appeal

### 7.1. Grounds of Appeal

7.1.1. The landowner has submitted an appeal to the Board, against the decision of Wicklow County Council to retain the subject site on the Register and demand the levy. The grounds of the appeal can be summarised as follows:

- There is a deficiency of adequate water services infrastructure to serve the site and this is demonstrated by a refusal of permission to development on wider lands in the area, ABP-302552-18 refers. In addition, the appellant engaged with Irish Water, and a PWSA dated 14<sup>th</sup> May 2020 states that significant infrastructural works are required to allow development in Kilcoole.

The Draft Wicklow County Development Plan, states that lack of investment in infrastructure has meant that Kilcoole is not in position to provide large numbers of new housing.

A recent pre-planning consultation on the same lands with the Board states that any future application must address water services constraints, ABP 304438-19 refers.

The site therefore fails to meet the criteria set out in section 6(5)(a) and/or (b) of the 2015 Act.

- There is a lack of road infrastructure, section 10.10 of the LAP sets out the need for and route of a western distributor road. The site is constrained and according to an engineer's report would require the need for an inefficient four arm junction. The site is therefore not suitable for housing, the site therefore fails to meet the criteria set out in section 6(5)(a) and/or (b) of the 2015 Act.
- Not all of the site as outlined by the planning authority is within the ownership of the appellant. A portion to the north of the site has been included with the vacant site outline and this does not belong to the appellant.
- The site is in full use as a free of charge car park and recycling centre, since 2013.

The appeal is supported by a very detailed appendix that contains the following documents: Council planning report regarding ABP-304348-19, Irish Water report on Kilcoole and Newtownmountkennedy PWSA's dated May 2020, ABP-304348-19 Board Opinion, Draft Action Plan for Bullford 2017, Statutory Declaration regarding ownership and use of lands and an insurance renewal.

## **7.2. Planning Authority Response**

The site was included on the register because it is a regeneration site not a residential site, for the purposes of the 2015 Act. Therefore, no regard is had to the issues raised by the appellant in relation to section 5(1)(a) of the 2015 Act with regard to residentially zoned lands.

Delays in the valuation process should not alter the status of the demand for the calendar year 2019. Site was inspected January 2020 and in any case the uses on site remain unauthorised.

The matter of services and infrastructure is not a concern when regarding regeneration sites.

This is the first time that ownership of lands has appeared as an issue, reference is made to the submission of Mr Laurence Keegan in relation to the section 7(1) notice. Site ownership was confirmed.

Calculation of the levy is confirmed by the Valuation Tribunal €170,000 at 7% amounts to €11,900.

### **7.3. Further Submission**

The appellant has responded to the comments raised by the planning authority, as follows:

The Board must take into account the issues raised by the appellant, regardless of whether the site is regeneration or residential, a de novo approach must be adopted.

Confusion over the year of the levy charge (2020 or 2019) means the notice is inherently unlawful.

Reference to infrastructural capacity in 2022 has no relevance to the matter in hand, constraints as of 2020 or 2019 are the relevant dates.

There can be no fault with Laurance Keegan's lack of an appeal against land he did not own. The Board should note that it is not right to encumber another's land when they have not had the chance to engage with the process.

## **8.0 Assessment**

### **8.1. Introduction**

8.1.1. The Board should note that a concurrent appeal on a nearby site under the same ownership has been lodged, ABP-312140-21 refers.

8.1.2. This appeal relates to a Section 15 Demand for Payment. In accordance with the provisions of the legislation there are 2 key criteria to consider:

(a) the site was no longer a vacant site on 1<sup>st</sup> January in the year concerned, or

(b) the amount of the levy has been incorrectly calculated in respect of the site by the Planning Authority.

I will consider each of these in turn.

## **8.2. The site is no longer vacant**

8.2.1. The Board should be aware that the provisions of Section 18(2) of the Act does not specify whether the applicant must demonstrate whether the site constitutes a vacant site as per the provisions of Section 5(1)(b) i.e. that the site constituted a vacant site in the first instance when the Section 7(3) Notice was issued or whether they must just demonstrate that notwithstanding the Notice issued, that development has taken place on the site and it is no longer vacant as of the 1<sup>st</sup> of January in the year concerned, in this case 2020.

8.2.2. For the purposes of this assessment, I will consider both scenarios.

## **8.3. Is it a Vacant Site?**

8.3.1. The appellant has stated that the Board should assess this appeal anew and consider whether the site should have been placed on the register in the first place. To inform this stance, the appellant has brought into play the criteria set out in the 2015 Act for residential lands and how the site is severely constrained due to the lack of infrastructure. In that context the appellant states that the site is not suitable for housing. In addition, the appellant highlights the fact that the site has had a long standing use as a no-charge car park and recycling centre. The planning authority correct the appellant and point out that the site is actually a regeneration site for the purposes of the 2015 Act and quite different criteria are brought to bear. Finally, the uses stated by the appellant are unauthorised and should not be taken into account.

8.3.2. Firstly, the appellant has requested that the Board should assess this appeal de novo, meaning that a fresh look from the beginning should take place. Furthermore, the appellant requires that any new assessment should take into account the criteria set out for residential lands in the 2015 Act. I am certain that this approach cannot be used by the Board because, section 5(1)(b) of the Act sets out the criteria for a vacant site consisting of 'Regeneration' land. Only consideration of the criteria that is applicable to regeneration sites, that is section 5(1)(b) and section 6(6) can apply. By reference to the Planning Authority notice, it is stated that the subject site comprises

'Regeneration' land for the purposes of the Vacant Site Levy. A Section 7(3) Notice of Entry on the Vacant Sites Register was issued to the original owner Laurence Keegan in July 2018. A Section 9 appeal was made to the Board, and a comprehensive assessment was undertaken precisely because the site was considered to be a regeneration site, ABP-302146-18 refers. The criteria for a regeneration site are very different to that of residential lands and the matters raised by the appellant to do with the site not being suitable for housing have no place in the assessment of a regeneration site such as this. Section 5(1)(b) and section 6(6) of the 2015 Act, state:

*5. (1) In this Part, a site is a vacant site if—*

*(b) in the case of a site consisting of regeneration land—*

*(i) the site, or the majority of the site, is vacant or idle, and*

*(ii) the site being vacant or idle has adverse effects on existing amenities or reduces the amenity provided by existing public infrastructure and facilities (within the meaning of section 48 of the Act of 2000) in the area in which the site is situated or has adverse effects on the character of the area.*

*(6) A planning authority, or the Board on appeal, shall determine whether or not the site being vacant or idle has adverse effects on existing amenities or reduces the amenity provided by existing public infrastructure and facilities (within the meaning of section 48 of the Act of 2000) in the area in which the site is situated or has adverse effects on the character of the area for the purposes of this Part by reference to whether—*

*(a) land or structures in the area were, or are, in a ruinous or neglected condition,*

*(b) anti-social behaviour was or is taking place in the area, or*

*(c) there has been a reduction in the number of habitable houses, or the number of people living, in the area,*

*and whether or not these matters were affected by the existence of such vacant or idle land.*

Matters raised by the appellant with regard to lack of infrastructure and thus the site is not suitable for housing is irrelevant in this instance.

8.3.3. The planning authority have plainly set out that the land is a regeneration site for the purposes of section 5(1)(b) and section 6(6) of the 2015 Act and, and this fits within Policy HD19 of the Development that states TC zoned lands should be included as regeneration lands. This formed the basis for the previous appeal and upon which the Board determined that the section 9 Notice issued by the planning authority should be confirmed. There is no mechanism to undo or change this decision. The site stands on the register as it is, until matters change regarding vacant or idle status or that such status no longer adversely affects the amenities or character of the area.

8.3.4. The site has been on the register since July 2018. Given the reports of the planning authority and the decision of the Board regarding the section 9 appeal, I am satisfied that the site constituted a vacant site when the Section 7(3) Notice was issued and the appeal concluded. A significant amount of time has passed since the site was first assessed by the planning authority and the Board, and I can see that numerous planning reports leading up to the serving of demand notices took place and conclude that the site still fulfils the requirements for a vacant site under the terms of regeneration lands. I do not, therefore, propose to consider this matter any further in this assessment.

#### **8.4. Is the site no longer vacant as of the 1st of January 2020?**

8.4.1. In section 8.3 above, I have established that the site was and is a vacant site in terms of section 5(1)(b) of the 2015 Act. The appellant has submitted evidence to suggest that the subject site was not and is no longer vacant/idle and should be removed from the register and the charge cancelled. The appellant states that the site has been and continues to be in use as free-of-charge surface car park and recycling centre. Legal documentation has been produced together with photographs to back up this claim. The planning authority state that the car parking use is an unauthorised use and cannot be taken into account.

8.4.2. In assessing this matter, I will consider the characteristics of the site in the context of Section 5(1)(b) 'regeneration' land. There are two specific criteria to be considered in

this regard and they are whether the site being vacant/idle had an adverse effect on the amenities and character of the area.

**The site, or the majority of the site, is vacant or idle:**

- 8.4.3. Photographs submitted by the appellant show the lands in use for car parking purposes and recycling infrastructure occupies a portion of the site. The planning authority's photographs more or less agree with this view, but highlight the unauthorised nature of the car parking use.
- 8.4.4. In terms of subsection 5(1)(b)(i), that the site, or the majority of the site, is vacant or idle, I note the grounds of appeal on behalf of the site owner which refer to the principle use of the site as a car park. The history of the use of the car park has been outlined by the Planning Authority and the appellant. The PA state that the use is unauthorised. While the use may be ongoing for an extensive period and beyond the statute of limitation this does not authorise the use. Section 6(7) of the Urban Regeneration and Housing Act 2015 states that in determining for the purposes of this Part whether a site was vacant or idle for the duration of the 12 months concerned a planning authority, or the Board on appeal, shall not have regard to any unauthorised development or unauthorised use. Therefore, notwithstanding that the use has been ongoing for some time, it does not authorise the use and therefore as per Section 6(7) of the Act, the unauthorised use cannot be considered to negate vacancy. Consequently, I consider that the site can be considered vacant or idle for the purposes of Section 5(1)(b)(i).
- 8.4.5. At the time of my site visit, I observed that the car park was occupied by a number of vehicles and cars entered and exited the site during that time. I agree with the appellant's contention that the car park was and is in use as a car park during the relevant period, before and after. However, that use is an unauthorised use as a development for which planning permission is required. In my mind the matter of any unauthorised use (section 6(7) of the 2015 Act) comes into play and the Board should not have regard to such unauthorised use. I am satisfied that the site was vacant or idle during the relevant period. The use of the site for recycling purposes may or may not require permission Class 42 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) may refer, however, as this use occupies a minor

portion of the site, I am satisfied that this aspect of the appeal can also be disregarded.

**The site being vacant or idle has adverse effects on existing amenities or reduced the amenity provide by existing infrastructure and facilities (within the meaning of section 48 of the Act of 2000) in the area in which the site is situated or has adverse effects on the character of the area.**

8.4.6. It is stated under section 6(6) of the Act that the matters relating to adverse effects are to be determined by reference to the following criteria:

*(a) Land and structures in the area were, or are, in a ruinous or neglected condition*

*(b) Anti-social behaviour was or is taking place in the area, or*

*(c) There has been a reduction in the number of habitable houses, or the number of people living, in the area*

*and whether or not these matters were affected by the existence of such vacant or idle land*

8.4.7. I am satisfied that the site was and is a vacant site in accordance with the meaning set out in the 2015 Act and taking into account section 6(7) to not have regard to any unauthorised development or unauthorised use. I will consider each of the criteria set out in section 6(6) of the 2015 Act in turn.

8.4.8. Firstly, the planning authority note the condition of the site, its neglected appearance and the existence of litter and graffiti and the impact it is having on the amenities and character of the area. I note that the site is clearly visible from the street, large recycling containers back on to the street and shipping containers occupy the back of the site. The poor condition of the shipping containers and visible graffiti cannot easily be ignored, it has and is affecting the overall character of the area. The condition of the site cannot and could not be compared favourably with other sites in the vicinity. The wider area is characterised by a number of elements: the well maintained public realm and the quality and character of neighbouring buildings. It is because of the vacant nature of the subject site and its relatively neglected appearance, when compared with other property in the area, that I am satisfied that

the site is and has been neglected in line with the criteria set out in Section 6(6)(a) of the 2015 Act.

- 8.4.9. The second matter 6(6)(b) refers to anti-social behaviour which was or is taking place in the area. The planning authority's photographic surveys show a combination of litter and graffiti and this provides the basis for concluding that antisocial behaviour probably was and is taking place. I consider that the site would meet this test.
- 8.4.10. In terms of a reduction in the number of habitable houses, or the number of people living, in the area. I find that there is no hard evidence either way to suggest that there has been a reduction in the number of habitable houses, or the number of people living, in the area.
- 8.4.11. Because the Act includes commas and an 'or' between (a), (b) or (c), only one criteria is required to be met. In conclusion, I consider that two of the tests in Section 6(6) are met and that the site has adverse effects on the character of the area and that antisocial behaviour was or is taking place, so thus can be categorised as a vacant site as defined by Section 5(1)(b)(ii). In addition, I am satisfied that the neglected condition of these vacant lands has an adverse effect on existing amenities and reduces the amenity provided by existing public infrastructure and facilities (within the meaning of Section 48 of the Act 2000) in the area in which the site is situated, particularly due to the strategic location of the lands along Kilcoole Main Street and its proximity to physical and social infrastructure.

## 8.5. **Other Matters**

- 8.5.1. Ownership - The appellant states that land to the north has been included within the vacant site outlined by the planning authority that does not belong to the owner in question. It is noted that the appellant shows concern for its neighbours. However, it is also noted that no appeal from 'others' have been received by the Board in relation to the placement of the site as outlined, on the register or to any demand notices issued by the planning authority. It is also noted that the strip of land in question is a well used and maintained vehicular access point to the side of a public house, in constant use. I am satisfied that this mapping error in relation to the extent of the site can be corrected and has not unduly impacted on neighbouring property owners. Furthermore, the market value of the site (as outlined) has been agreed by

compromise between Brookhampton Limited and Wicklow County Council, by order dated 14<sup>th</sup> October 2021 of the Valuation Tribunal. The site as outlined by the planning authority has had no material impact on the value of the site and consequently the calculation of the levy imposed.

- 8.5.2. I also note that the site has changed ownership to Brookhampton Limited, correspondence on file is noted and the levy charge is for 2020 and not previous years.
- 8.5.3. Demand Notices – The Board will observe that a number of section 15 notices are present on file. This is for a variety of reasons, but principally to await the outcome of the Valuation Tribunal's deliberations. I have had regard to the most recent demand notice and it is this that has prompted the appeal on hand.

## **8.6. Levy Calculation**

- 8.6.1. A Notice of Valuation Entered on the Vacant Site Register was issued to Brookhampton Ltd on the 8<sup>th</sup> of March 2020 stating that the valuation placed on the site is €200,000. This was appealed to the Valuation Tribunal, that through compromise determined a market value of €170,000, dated 14<sup>th</sup> October 2021.
- 8.6.2. A Notice of Demand for Payment of Vacant Site Levy under Section 15 of the Urban Regeneration and Housing Act was issued to on the 8<sup>th</sup> November 2021 to the value of €11,900 for the year 2020.
- 8.6.3. The levy rate applicable in this instance is 7%. The rate of levy has been increased from 3% to 7% of the market valuation of relevant sites with effect from January 2020, to be applied in respect of sites that were included on vacant site registers in 2019. It is evident, therefore, that the levy calculation has been correctly calculated.
- 8.6.4. The appellant has raised questions about what year the planning authority seek the levy charge for and references different years in the submissions received by the Board. I can see from the Demand Notice dated 8<sup>th</sup> November 2021 that the planning authority seek the levy charge for 2020 and this is logical, given the survey dates and determination of market value. I am satisfied that it is the year 2020 that the levy has been demanded and I have based my assessment on this time frame.

## 9.0 Recommendation

- 9.1. I recommend that in accordance with Section 18 (3) of the Urban Regeneration and Housing Act 2015 (as amended), the Board should confirm that the site was a vacant site as of the 1<sup>st</sup> of January 2020 and was a vacant site on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2021, the date on which the appeal was made. In accordance with Section 18(4) of the Urban Regeneration and Housing Act 2015 (as amended), the Board confirm that the amount of the levy has been correctly calculated in respect of the vacant site. The demand for payment of the vacant site levy under Section 15 of the Urban Regeneration and Housing Act 2015 is, therefore, confirmed.

## 10.0 Reasons and Considerations

Having regard to:

- (a) The information placed before the Board by the Planning Authority in relation to the entry of the site on the Vacant Sites Register,
  - (b) The grounds of appeal submitted by the appellant,
  - (c) The report of the Planning Inspector,
  - (d) That the majority of the site is and was vacant, because the ongoing use of the site as a car park shall be disregarded as an unauthorised use and thus the site is vacant or idle,
  - (e) The neglected condition of the site which detracts from the amenities and character of the area,
  - (f) The evidence of antisocial behaviour having taken place on the site,
  - (g) The amount of the levy has been correctly calculated at 7% of the site value,
- the Board is satisfied that the site was a vacant site on the 1<sup>st</sup> of January 2020 and was a vacant site on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2021, the date on which the appeal was made and the amount of the levy has been correctly calculated. The demand for payment of the vacant site levy under Section 15 of the Urban Regeneration and Housing Act 2015 is, therefore, confirmed.

---

Stephen Rhys Thomas  
Senior Planning Inspector

30 September 2022