

PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 May 2021

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

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

LLFA: NO OBJECTION subject to amended condition.

Cllr Paul Beal: I am saddened to hear the Borough Council are still pushing to build onto Hunstanton's busiest car park even though the business community is fervently against it. On the 25th April this particular car park was full for most of the day. Car parks like central (behind the theatre) and Valentine Road were empty for most of that day. This is where the combination of putting all the car park figures into one pot fails, and is the reason why we can't have a combined car parking system saying Hunstanton only has full capacity for only 9 days a year because with figures you can make them show good or bad . As far as the town is concerned the car park must stay.

Cllr Joyce: The Borough Council should have the month by month statistics as I assume they [too] were released under an FOI request. Maybe they can be made available in late correspondence.

Assistant Director – Operations & Commercial: In response to Cllrs Beal and Joyce, 2019/2020 and 2020/2021 financial year figures are produced in Appendix A. The pandemic has pushed parking out of the central area to the bigger, quieter beach area. This can be seen when comparing the Cliff and Southend car parks year for year. Given correspondence around car park occupancy, specific research will be undertaken and reported at Committee regarding the occupancy of Southend Car Park on 25th April 2021.

Amended Condition 20

As a result of additional comments received by the LLFA, Condition 20 requires amendment as follows:

20 Condition Prior to commencement of development, in accordance with the submitted FRA (Rossi Long ref 191315 Rev 01, dated November 2020), detailed designs of a surface water drainage scheme incorporating the following measures shall be submitted to and agreed with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The approved scheme will be implemented prior to the first occupation of the development. The scheme shall address the following matters:

- 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 54.4m³ (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.
- 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.

20 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 Nos. 8/2(a), 8/2(b), 8/2 (c), & 8/2 (d) Page Nos. 43 - 98

Cllr Parish: With reference to the multiple applications for extending caravan site seasons:

1. An argument for doing so is to compare data for loss of income during 2020 in particular. Apart from anecdotal evidence, is there actual evidence of a loss of income? Reports in business sections of newspapers indicate a bumper year last year when lockdown ceased, there are large investments going on, etc etc. And do we know of any Covid grants received by these businesses to support them during lockdown?
2. Please explain what a 'shadow HRA' is. I note that this was carried out by Philip Parker Associates of Pott Row. Though their website lists expertise in several ecological niches, like amphibians, bats, and woodland, there is no expertise indicated in the ecology of The Wash (coast and sea) or, in fact, birds (in this case waders.)
3. I cannot see any consultation with the RSPB or NWT. Has this been done? Was there a reply?
4. I note that mitigation measures for disturbance of birds in the proposed season extensions are limited to noticeboards and pamphlets. Is there any evidence that such measures provide any meaningful mitigation elsewhere? Anecdotally, and stated in panel meetings, officers in this authority despair of visitors effectively reading signs on recycling facilities.

Assistant Director's comments:

In response to the queries raised by Cllr Parish:

1. There is no requirement for the applicant to provide evidence of loss of income. It is considered inevitable that caravan and holiday parks will have lost income due to having to close as a result of lockdowns between March and July 2020. The Ministerial Statement dated July 2020 states that caravan and holiday parks are a mainstay of their local economies, providing employment and supporting local services and businesses. It goes on to state that extending their operation beyond the usual summer season will be invaluable to parks as the sector begins to recover therefore the temporary relaxation of seasonal occupancy planning restrictions can play a vital role in helping these local businesses to get up and running again.
2. A 'shadow HRA' is a report to inform the Appropriate Assessment that has to be undertaken by the local planning authority.

3. There is no requirement for Norfolk Wildlife Trust or the RSPB to be consulted on the application as they are not statutory consultees. Natural England is the statutory consultee in relation to impact on protected sites.
4. Natural England welcome the provision of educational materials including information boards and leaflets as suitable mitigation measures. Furthermore, there is no evidence that such measures don't provide meaningful mitigation.

Item No. 8/3(c) Page No.142

Parish Council: The Parish Council has no further comments to make on the application other than it's previous response to the consultation; the original conditions should remain and the work on the footpath should be carried out at the same time for the full length of the development.

Item No. 8/3(d) Page No.150

Applicant: From the first set of formal comments made by Sedgeford Parish Councillors in relation to this application for conversion of existing garaging it appears that the Councillors have made 2 objections in addition to stipulating a request for conditions if the application is approved. The 2 objections relate to (1) over-development and (2) the dark skies policy (E6). In those formal comments the Councillors went on to make objections to a proposed cart shed which is the subject of a SEPARATE planning application by me. Those comments in relation to the cart shed state that the construction of it would contravene policies H3, H7 and E6 of the NP. I therefore wish to draw attention to the fact that the planning officer, in the section of his report sub-titled PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS has included those objections relating to the alleged contravention of policies H3 and H7 in this current application. He has however gone to state that H3 (referring to infill development within the development boundary) is not relevant to this application but he has addressed Policy H7 although he does conclude that this current proposal does accord with Policy H7. The Planning Officer has extensively covered the Parish's objection of over-development and so I appreciate that I do not need to repeat all the points he has addressed. I would however like to state that there has been significant MAJOR development in Sedgeford in recent years, and much of that I have witnessed with my own eyes during the 15 years that I have lived in the village. There have been whole new houses built in gardens of existing houses, making the resultant two new plots looking very cramped, not to mention more minor developments of conversion of existing garaging and conservatories etc. I submit it is completely beyond reasonable opinion/belief to state that what is effectively my 'filling in' of existing open cart shedding breaches the planning rules regarding over-development. The width and depth of my plot each amount to some 100m and the extension to the front and side of the building are each 1.5m. In relation to the second objection regarding the dark skies policy I wish to reiterate that there will be no change to the exterior lighting that has been on the outbuilding since it was first constructed in the year 2004 and there will be suitable curtains/blinds installed behind glass in the interior of the building.

In the second set of formal comments made by Sedgeford Parish Councillors they have made a further objection stating that the 1.5 m protrusion to the front and side of the building has increased the size of the building by over 40%. This is not correct and in any event the extension does not collate to an OVERALL increase of more than 40% in floor space.

Finally, I understand and very much appreciate that the planning laws in this country are most important and benefit the whole of society but I do wish to repeat my point that I feel the conduct of the Parish Councillors in taking my very small project to Committee stage amounts to an abuse of their valid powers and smacks of victimisation, intimidation and bullying.