



**Planning Committee**  
**Monday, 7th December, 2020 at 9.30 am**  
**in the Remote Meeting on Zoom and available for the**  
**public to view on WestNorfolkBC on You Tube - Zoom**  
**and You Tube**

**Reports marked to follow on the Agenda and/or Supplementary Documents**

1. **Receipt of Late Correspondence on Applications (Pages 2 - 8)**

To receive the Schedule of Late Correspondence received since the publication of the agenda.

**Contact**

Democratic Services  
Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk  
King's Court  
Chapel Street  
King's Lynn  
Norfolk  
PE30 1EX  
Tel: 01553 616394  
Email: [democratic.services@west-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@west-norfolk.gov.uk)

**PLANNING COMMITTEE  
7 December 2020**

**SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED SINCE THE  
PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA AND ERRATA**

**Item No. 8/1(a) Page No. 8**

**Third Party:** ONE additional letter has been received from a local resident neither objecting to nor supporting the application. Their comments can be summarised as follows:

- I am thankful the concerns I raised regarding being overlooked and the impact upon neighbouring single storey height bungalows is being considered. I am therefore grateful of the endeavours made to address this with regard to plot 19.
- However, plot 20: type 3 first floor bedrooms 2 and 3 windows overlook the bungalows Sunnyside and Appledore. These windows if moved to the either side of the house would lessen this. No need to alter internal layout. Please can this be considered?

**CORRECTION**

The first sentence of the last paragraph on p18 of the Officer's report should read "The development proposes 7 No. x 4 bed units, 9 No. x 3 bed units and 3 No. x 2 bed units".

Drawing No.720C.15-321B Type 2A Floor Layouts and Drawing No. 720C.15-322A Type 2A Elevations to be removed from the list of approved plans at Condition 1 on page 25.

**Amended condition:** The removal of the aforementioned plans requires Condition 1 to be amended as follows:

1 Condition The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Drawing No. 720C.15-311A Type 1A Floor Layouts
- Drawing No. 720C.15-312A Type 1A Elevations
- Drawing No. 720C.15-313A Type 1B Floor Layouts
- Drawing No. 720C.15-314B Type 1B Elevations
- Drawing No. 720C.15-323A Type 2B Floor Layouts
- Drawing No. 720C.15-324A Type 2B Elevations
- Drawing No. 720C.15-325A Type 2C Floor Layouts
- Drawing No. 720C.15-326A Type 2C Elevations
- Drawing No. 720C.15-327 Type 2D Floor Layouts - Plot 19
- Drawing No. 720C.15-328 Type 2D Elevations - Plot 19
- Drawing No. 720C.15-329 Type 2E Floor Layouts - Plot 29
- Drawing No. 720C.15-330 Type 2E Elevations - Plot 29
- Drawing No. 720C.15-331A Type 3 Floor Layouts
- Drawing No. 720C.15-332A Type 3 Elevations
- Drawing No. 720C.15-353A Type 5B Floor Layouts

- Drawing No. 720C.15-354A Type 5B Elevations
- Drawing No. 720C.1-5361A Type 6 Floor Layouts
- Drawing No. 720C.15-371B Type 7 Floor Layouts
- Drawing No. 720C.15-372B Type 7 Elevations
- Drawing No. 720C.15-380A Single Garage Details
- Drawing No. 720C.15-3000F Proposed Site Layout
- Drawing No. 720C.15-3002B Landscaping Scheme
- Drawing No. 720C.15-3003C Affordable Housing Scheme
- Drawing No. 720C.15-3004 Proposed Fence Details

1 Reason For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

**Assistant Director's comments:** Impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties along Jubilee Hall Lane has been fully considered within the Officer report. Moving the first floor windows of bedrooms 2 and 3 of Plot 20 to the flank elevations of the dwelling would not be appropriate as it would give rise to unacceptable overlooking to Plots 19 and 21. It is not considered that the current window arrangement proposed would result in unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to either Sunnyside or Appledore bungalows.

**Item No. 8/1(b) Page No. 26**

**Agent:** Submitted revised block plans (Dwg P01A and P02B) to address the comments of the Waste and Refuse Manager changing the surface material of the access/turning areas in places from permeable blockwork to permeable asphalt plus car charging point indicated.

**Cllr Paul Beal:** I am writing on behalf of the majority of Hunstanton constituents that I have spoken to objecting against the building on Southend Road Car Park with the loss of 120 parking spaces. Parking spaces are the life blood to Hunstanton tourism (which the town was built for over 160 years ago) and we have been told of capacity is only reached a few days during the summer, this is perhaps correct but not for the Southend car park this is the one that fills up first and the borough figures are amalgamated with Valentine Road and Central which are last to fill so the figures are not true relating to Southend Road capacity. I would understand the need for building on these prime spots if we had a sensible parking strategy but we haven't so once the spaces have gone, they are gone forever and not forgetting the Borough has an income over £2 million per annum from Hunstanton alone.

Another big earning car park is the cliff top but this unlike the Southend car park is not owned by the borough and is not 100% that if it went out to tender the borough would not necessarily win so income there would drop as well as town capacity.

This all started several years ago to build a few houses along Southend road to cover the aesthetic view of Azzam's building for people entering the town from the south but the Hemmingway regen report has been tagged on to create an income to progress the regeneration but it is mine and the towns people belief that building on car park spaces is not the way to do it.

I implore the panel to reject this application and hopefully the borough will talk to our town to find a way to take the Hemmingway regeneration forward.

**Cllr Charles Joyce:** Has the following queries:

How is

"Neighbourhood Plan: The Hunstanton Neighbourhood Plan is in draft form and not at an advanced stage, so presently it has no weight with regards to decision-making."

squared with NPPF 48 because in this application the Planning Ctte is the LPA. What does the emerging Hunstanton Neighbourhood Plan have to say on this application?

NPPF 48. Local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

(a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);

(b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and

(c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

This application has 22 missing car parking spaces. What is the total number of missing car parking spaces in applications already approved and in the pipeline in Hunstanton? Missing car parking spaces is the number of spaces that are short judged against Manual for Streets and NCC Parking Standards.

**Hunstanton and District Civic Society:** The Civic Society **OBJECTS** to this development believing it to have no merit. The opportunity site identified in the 2008 Masterplan was for development along Southend Road of houses possibly with retail units at street level. It did not sweep around into Seagate and Beach Terrace Road and would entail the loss of only perhaps 20 car parking spaces.

The maps in the GEO Environmental Report with this application suggest it is based on only the eastern half of the site.

It has been suggested that the Borough Council needs this development to go ahead in order to finance the replacement of the Oasis Leisure Centre but money will not be ring fenced and there is no guarantee that a new leisure centre will be constructed.

Para 1.2.1 of the Ecology Survey refers erroneously to the bus station site not this one.

Not only does this proposal lose 100 car parking spaces, it results in both the entrance and the exit to the main car park with 388 remaining spaces being from the narrow Beach Terrace Road.

The main reason for objection is that the development is being promoted as Regeneration. It is not. The 2008 Masterplan listed 5 objectives and the Coastal Community Team endorsed these in 2016. The vision for Hunstanton is that it should be:

- An Active Town – expand the existing water sports and activities offer;
- A Local Town – which meets the needs of its residents with an expanded retail core;
- A More Attractive Seaside Destination – where visitors stay longer and spend more;
- A Town that Respects its Heritage – whilst looking into the future; and
- An Environmental Town – making the most of the town's natural assets.

The proposed development does not accord in any way with those five aims, nor does it go towards addressing the very skewed age distribution imbalance.

**Third Party: OBJECTS** on the following grounds:

- Queries whether Hunstanton can still be seen as a safe and pleasant Victorian Seaside Town or an urban development area where parking is becoming harder every year and pleasant greenfields and farmland is disappearing at an alarming rate;
- Are these for 2<sup>nd</sup> Home Owners or for young people in the area? If either, we believe that Southend is not the place for them. Where will visitors park?
- If parking is not available, visitors drive away along the coast and that is not a good thing for all our traders who rely on a good summer season to pay their way through the winter months;
- Surely a Marsden pub and restaurant with a makeover is enough.

**LLFA:** Further information has been provided in the form of an updated FRA, Drainage Strategy and document from Anglian Water and therefore the LLFA has **NO OBJECTION subject to condition.**

### **CORRECTION**

Page 7. Item 8/1(b) – should read *Seagate*.

### **Amended Conditions:**

The aforementioned plans require amendments to the following plans:

2 Condition: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans drawing no's:

- LP-870-P01 Revision A
- LP-870-P02 Revision B
- LP-870-P03 Revision A
- LP-870-P04 Revision A
- LP-870-P05 Revision A
- LP-870-P06
- LP-870-P07
- LP-870-P08
- LP-870-P09 Revision A
- LP-870-P10
- LP-870-P11
- LP-870-P12
- LP-870-P16

2 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

8 Condition: Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted drawings no works above slab level shall commence on site unless otherwise agreed in writing until detailed drawings for the off-site highway improvement works (footpath widening), as indicated on Drawing No. LP-870-P02 Revision B, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

8 Reason: To ensure that the highway improvement works are designed to an appropriate standard in the interest of highway safety and to protect the environment of the local highway corridor in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan.

18 Condition: The charging point for electric vehicles as shown on the approved plan, Drawing No. LP-870-P02 Revision B shall be installed prior to occupation of the apartments hereby approved.

18 Reason: In order to accord with Paragraph 110 of the NPPF.

### **Additional Condition**

The LLFA has agreed the following condition:

21. Condition: Prior to the commencement of development, a revised FRA and Drainage Strategy shall be produced to include the following:

I. Detailed site investigation and infiltration testing in accordance with BRE Digest 365 (or equivalent) to determine if rates are viable for the use of soakage features and to determine the dissolution feature risk;

II. If infiltration is not viable, provision of surface water storage, sized and designed to accommodate the volume of water generated in all rainfall events up to and including the critical storm duration for the 1% AEP flood event, including allowances for climate change with an additional 10% allowance for urban creep. A minimum storage volume of 54.4m<sup>3</sup> (for the attenuation basin) will be provided in line with Drainage Strategy plan Ref: 191315 RLC-00-00-DR C-001 P2 of the FRA. The attenuation basin will be designed with a run-off rate of 3.5 l/sec;

III. Finished ground floor levels of the property should be a minimum of 300mm above expected flood levels of all sources of flooding and will be a minimum of 150mm above the surrounding landscape;

IV. Details of how all surface water management features to be designed in accordance with The SuDS Manual (CIRIA C697, 2007), or the updated The SuDS Manual (CIRIA C753, 2015), including appropriate treatment stages for water quality prior to discharge; and

V. A detailed maintenance and management plan detailing the activities required and details of who will adopt and maintain the all the surface water drainage features for the lifetime of the development;

which will be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

The approved scheme will be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development.

21. Reason: To prevent flooding in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 163, 165 and 170 by ensuring the satisfactory management of local flood risk, surface water flow paths, storage and disposal of surface water from the site in a range of rainfall events and ensuring the SuDS proposed operates as design for the lifetime of the development. This is a pre-commencement condition as surface water disposal is a matter which requires agreement before development commences.

**Assistant Director's comment:** Cllr Beal's comments have been covered in the committee report.

With regard to Cllr Joyce's comments, the Hunstanton Neighbourhood Plan is still in draft form - it recently undertook a health check and amendments are required as a result of that exercise. It has not gone to Reg.16 stage yet, but it is understood that they are soon wanting to move to that stage - probably early next year. In summary it does not hold any weight yet since it is still in its early stages and has not been subjected to examination.

With regards to 'missing' car parking spaces (your term), officers are only aware of 5 cases for substantial development of flats/apartments in the town - Whitley Press site (16 units with 18 spaces). Kit Kat Club site (16 units with 16 spaces), Le Strange Terrace (6 units with 2 spaces)

plus the current schemes for Southend car park (32 units with 33 spaces) and bus station (47 units with 47 spaces).

With regard to the comments of the Hunstanton and District Civic Society, most of the matters have been addressed in the report. Some typographic errors have been made in certain documents, but the matters of concern have been addressed to the specific site in question.

**Item No. 8/1(c) Page No. Late Report**

**Agent:** Submitted revised block plans (Dwg P01C and P02G) to address the comments of the Waste and Refuse Manager changing the surface material of the access/turning areas in places from permeable blockwork to permeable asphalt plus indication of electric vehicle charging points.

**Hunstanton Town Council: SUPPORTS** the application.

**LLFA:** Further information has been provided in the form of an updated FRA, Drainage Strategy and document from Anglian Water and therefore the LLFA has **NO OBJECTION subject to condition.**

**Amended Conditions:**

The aforementioned revised plans require amendments to the following conditions:

2 Condition: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans drawing no's:

LP-869-P01 Revision C  
LP-869-P02 Revision G  
LP-869-P03 Revision B  
LP-869-P04 Revision B  
LP-869-P05 Revision B  
LP-869-P06 Revision A  
LP-869-P07 Revision A  
LP-869-P08 Revision A  
LP-869-P09 Revision B  
LP-869-P10 Revision B  
LP-869-P11 Revision C  
LP-869-P12  
LP-869-P13 Revision B  
LP-869-P14 Revision B  
LP-869-P15  
LP-869-P16 Revision A  
LP-869-P17 Revision A  
2468-20 Revision 2

2 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

11 Condition: Prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted the vehicular access indicated for improvement on Drawing No. LP-869-P02 Revision G shall be upgraded in accordance with the approved details to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Arrangement shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway.

11 Reason: To ensure construction of a satisfactory access and to avoid carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway in the interests of highway safety in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan.

23 Condition: The charging points for electric vehicles and associated infrastructure as shown on the approved plan, Drawing No. LP-869-P02 Revision G, shall be installed prior to use of the associated library and retail/services unit(s) hereby approved.

23 Reason: In order to accord with Paragraph 110 of the NPPF.

**Additional Condition**

The LLFA has agreed the following condition:

31. Condition: Prior to the commencement of development, a revised FRA and Drainage Strategy shall be produced to include the following:

I. Further BRE testing shall be carried out at formation level to inform the design of the permeable asphalt with regards to the depth of sub-base required;

II. A surface water flooding exceedance flow route plan shall be provided to show how this has been considered within the design of the development layout and comments provided on confirmation of how resilience has been considered; and

III. An updated Maintenance and Management Plan shall be provided which includes revised details accounting for the proposed change from permeable paving to permeable asphalt;

which will be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

The approved scheme will be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development.

31. Reason: To prevent flooding in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 163, 165 and 170 by ensuring the satisfactory management of local flood risk, surface water flow paths, storage and disposal of surface water from the site in a range of rainfall events and ensuring the SuDS proposed operates as design for the lifetime of the development. This is a pre-commencement condition as surface water disposal is a matter which requires agreement before development commences.

**Item No. 8/2(c) Page No. 80**

**Parish Council: OBJECT** – Unfortunately our Chair of Planning is unable to attend the Planning Committee meeting due to another planned Zoom meeting. When the Planning Application came to us for our comments, we made a substantial representation and would like to reiterate our objects for the grounds previously noted.