

Parish:	Heacham	
Proposal:	Change of use of land to caravan park (extension of existing holiday caravan park)	
Location:	Long Acres Holiday Home Park South Beach Road Heacham Norfolk	
Applicant:	Heacham Holidays Ltd	
Case No:	21/01064/F (Full Application)	
Case Officer:	Mrs N Osler	Date for Determination: 13 August 2021 Extension of Time Expiry Date: 11 February 2022

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee – Called in by Cllr Parish

Neighbourhood Plan: No; the plan has not yet been to referendum. However, it has been to examination and can therefore be given some weight in the decision-making process

Case Summary

Full planning permission is sought to extend the area of Long Acres Holiday Park by 1.7ha in a parcel of land to the east of the existing site.

The proposal does not seek to increase the number of caravans across the wider site which would remain at a consented maximum of 155 (although it should be noted that only 108 currently occupy the wider site.) The extension to the park, without increasing the number of caravans permitted, would enable the provision of larger, higher quality caravans to meet the demand for such units.

The extension to the site lies outside of the development boundary in land designated as countryside. The south-western part of the extension lies in an area at risk of flooding, but outside of the Coastal Flood Risk Hazard Zone. The majority of the site lies in flood zone 1 (a lower risk of flooding than the existing site.)

The application was accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment / Drainage Strategy and Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. Following comments from Natural England, RSPB and Norfolk Wildlife Trust information to enable the LPA to undertake an Appropriate Assessment in accordance with the Habitat Regulations was submitted.

Key Issues

- Principle of Development
- Flood Risk
- Visual Impact
- Protected Sites and Species
- Highway Safety

Neighbour Amenity
Crime and Disorder
Other Material Considerations

Recommendation

APPROVE

THE APPLICATION

Full planning permission is sought to extend the area of Long Acres Holiday Park by 1.7ha in a parcel of land to the east of the existing site.

The proposal does not seek to increase the number of caravans across the wider site which would remain at a maximum of 155 (although it should be noted that only 108 currently occupy the wider site.) The extension to the park, without increasing the number of caravans permitted, would enable the provision of larger, higher quality caravans to meet the demand for such units.

The extension to the site lies outside of the development boundary in land designated as countryside. The south-western part of the extension lies in an area at risk of flooding, but outside of the Coastal Food Risk Hazard Zone. The majority of the site lies in flood zone 1 (a lower risk of flooding than the existing site.)

The application was accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment / Drainage Strategy and Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. Following comments from Natural England, RSPB and Norfolk Wildlife Trust information to enable the LPA to undertake an Appropriate Assessment in accordance with the Habitat Regulations was submitted.

SUPPORTING CASE

The planning application before you seeks approval for the change of use of land to site a total of 25 static 'holiday lodge' caravans which would form an extension to the existing Long Acres Holiday Park.

The north eastern extension will allow the park to 'breathe out' as it will accommodate caravan numbers which are already permitted within the existing park boundary in order to provide larger, higher quality accommodation across the site to reflect the growing customer demand for this form of holiday lodge caravan.

The proposed extension to the site would not increase the permitted number of caravans allowed on the site which, based on the current site licence, is a maximum of 155 caravans. The planning conditions related to permission DG8048 (Extension to the Site; Erection of Toilet Blocks – Approved February 1974) sets out that 'the total number of caravans on the whole site shall not at any time exceed 155', something which this application does not seek to exceed.

The principle of developing the site is considered acceptable as set out within our submitted Planning Statement and accords with policies CS08 and CS10 of the Core Strategy as well as policies DM11 and DM15 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies

Plan where it states that development will be of an appropriate scale to its location and will help to contribute to the economy of the area.

In terms of the economic benefits that the scheme can offer, the proposed extension to the site would provide increased employment, tourism and leisure opportunities, boosting the local economy and help to ensure the long-term sustainability of the Holiday Park.

Regarding the environmental benefits of the scheme, the sensitively designed extension to the Holiday Park has ensured that there would not be any detrimental effect on the biodiversity, landscape or rural character and openness of the countryside. It is proposed that a number of benefits will come forward including improved screening of the site through additional landscaping and planting.

The proposed extension area lies outside of any area at high or medium risk of flooding. By allowing the existing Holiday Park to breathe out into this area it will enable a reduction in the number of caravans currently located within a higher flood risk zones, therefore, putting less people at risk.

It is clear that the proposed development accords with the keys aims, objectives and visions as set out within both national and local policies to encourage the growth in domestic tourism to support the viability of existing holiday businesses without compromising environmental considerations. Based on all of these reasons, we trust that the Committee will be able to support this proposal and grant our client planning permission.

PLANNING HISTORY

21/02365/CM: OBJECTION TO NCC APP: 17/01/22 - County Matters: Waste Storage ancillary to the Holiday Park

19/00139/F: Application Permitted: 02/04/19 - Change of use of land to allow the residential use of the warden's caravan for 12 months each year

18/01605/F: Application Permitted: 04/12/18 - Change use of land from agricultural use to sales and storage area for touring and static caravans

18/00033/PREAPP: INFORMAL - Likely to refuse: 16/04/18 - PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE (FULL WITH CONSULTATIONS): Change of use of land to the north-east of existing park to accommodate 46 additional holiday lodge caravans and to alter existing layout

12/01907/F: Application Permitted: 14/01/13 - Lean-to extension of existing unit and erection of new mono pitch building for machinery shelter and secure storage of tools and materials associated with caravan park maintenance

11/01014/F: Application Withdrawn: 08/08/11 - Variation of condition number 1 of planning permission DG2694: to enable warden to reside on site throughout the year for security reasons, replacing previously approved planning permission 2/94/1411/F

04/00655/CU: Application Refused: 01/06/04 - Extension to caravan site including construction of amenity buildings and wardens flat

2/03/1196/F: Application Withdrawn: 09/09/03 - Change of use of land to form extension to caravan park – Long Acres Caravan Park

2/95/1076/F: Application Permitted: 28/09/95 - Use of land as caravan site without complying with condition 1 of planning permission DG 2694 dated 29.11.62 to enable caravan site to be occupied except the period between 15th January and 15th February in each year

2/94/1411/F: Application Permitted: 27/10/94 - Occupation of caravan without complying with condition 1 of planning permission DG 2694 dated 29.11.1962 to enable warden to reside on site throughout year for security reasons (renewal)

2/92/2406/O: Application Refused: 23/03/93 – Site for residential development (amended)

2/88/4530/CU/F: Application Permitted: 17/04/89 – Occupation of caravan without complying with condition 1 of planning permission DG 2694 to enable warden to reside on site throughout the year for security reasons

DG8048: Application Permitted: 18/02/74 - Extension to site and erection of toilet block

DG3123: Application Refused: 27/02/64 – Application to develop standing and amenities for caravans – Outline

DG2709: Application Permitted: 14/12/62 – Erection of two blocks of lavatories on caravan site

DG2694: Application Permitted: 29/11/62 – Caravan site 113 Holiday Caravans

RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

Parish Council: Heacham Parish Council **OBJECT** to this Application.

Although G.47.1 of the SADMP Plan 2016-2026 states that Heacham is a coastal resort, Heacham is a coastal village we do not have the amenities to be a resort.

The proposed field is outside the boundary and in the countryside.

The access to the field is through the flood risk area, an alternative access from the Fenway to the site's maintenance area is also in the flood risk.

We feel that the applicant would be using Fenway more to access this site, which they do now to access their Concrete Crushing business, which is not only damaging the bridleway but also putting residents and walkers at risk.

Heacham's emerging Neighbourhood Plan, which is in the final stage, states in Policy 11 that development beyond the existing defined holiday areas will not be supported for the following reasons:

- To minimise the physical and visual impact that any further holiday development may have upon Heacham
- The desire to retain the existing peaceful and quiet nature of Heacham's holiday area
- Infrastructure constraints limit further large-scale holiday development
- To maintain the distinction between the contrasting holiday centres of Heacham and Hunstanton.

Highways Authority: NO OBJECTION The application appears to seek to regularise the use of the site to provide all the caravans permitted in the 1970's.

**PLANNING COMMITTEE
07 FEBRUARY 2022**

It is evident that the site exists, however it appears to now encompass additional areas of land to the east, which do not appear to be part of the existing site. Therefore, If the LPA consider the statements to be correct and confirm that the number of units is to remain static overall, then I would have no reason to raise any highway objection, however, I would not wish to agree an increased number of units, in the interests of highway safety.

Should your Authority be minded to the grant of consent, I would seek to append conditions relating to means of access (from South Beach Road only) and parking provision.

Internal Drainage Board: NO OBJECTION The site is within the Internal Drainage District (IDD) of the King's Lynn Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and therefore the Board's Byelaws apply. A copy of the Board's Byelaws can be accessed on our website (https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/KLIDB_Byelaws.pdf), along with maps of the IDD (https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/128-KLIDB_index.pdf). These maps also show which watercourses have been designated as 'Adopted Watercourses' by the Board. The adoption of a watercourse is an acknowledgement by the Board that the watercourse is of arterial importance to the IDD and as such will normally receive maintenance from the IDB.

In order to avoid conflict between the planning process and the Board's regulatory regime and consenting process please be aware of the following:

- I am pleased to see that initial testing shows that a drainage strategy reliant on infiltration is likely to be achievable on the proposed development. If for any reason a strategy wholly reliant on infiltration does not prove viable and a surface water discharge is proposed to a watercourse, then the proposed development will require land drainage consent in line with the Board's byelaws (specifically byelaw 3). Any consent granted will likely be conditional, pending the payment of a Surface Water Development Contribution fee, calculated in line with the Board's charging policy (https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/WMA_Table_of_Charges_and_Fees.pdf).
- I note the presence of a Board Adopted watercourse adjacent to the site boundary. Whilst not currently proposed, should the applicant's proposals change to include works within 9 metres of the watercourse, consent would be required to relax Byelaw 10 (no works within 9 metres of the edge of drainage or flood risk management infrastructure).
- Whilst not currently proposed, should the applicant's proposals change to include works to alter the Board Adopted watercourse, consent will be required under the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and byelaw 4).
- I am not aware of any riparian owned/maintained watercourses within or adjacent to the site boundary. However, this should be confirmed by the applicant. If the proposals do involve the alteration of a watercourse, consent would be required under the Land Drainage Act 1991 (and Byelaw 4).

Whilst the consenting process as set out under the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the aforementioned Byelaws are separate from planning, the ability to implement a planning permission may be dependent on the granting of these consents. As such I strongly recommend that the required consent is sought prior to determination of the planning application.

Environmental Health & Housing – Environmental Quality: NO OBJECTION No comments with regard to contaminated land.

Environment Agency: We have **NO OBJECTION** to the proposed development as all the proposed units and the access route will be located within Flood Zone 1.

Advice to the Applicant: The applicant/occupants should phone Floodline on 0345 988 1188 to register for a flood warning or visit <https://www.gov.uk/sign-up-for-flood-warnings>. It's a

**PLANNING COMMITTEE
07 FEBRUARY 2022**

free service that provides warnings of flooding from rivers, the sea and groundwater, direct by telephone, email or text message. Anyone can sign up. Flood warnings can give people valuable time to prepare for flooding – time that allows them to move themselves, their families and precious items to safety. Flood warnings can also save lives and enable the emergency services to prepare and help communities.

Natural England: NO OBJECTION subject to appropriate mitigation being secured.

We consider that without appropriate mitigation the application would have an adverse effect on the integrity of:

- The Wash Ramsar
- The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC
- The Wash SPA

and damage or destroy the interest features for which The Wash Site of Special Scientific Interest has been notified.

In order to mitigate these adverse effects and make the development acceptable, the following mitigation measures are required / or the following mitigation options should be secured:

- The provision of information boards and information packs including alternative dog walking areas
- The appropriate management of foul and surface water drainage
- Restrictions in lighting associated with the proposed development area
- A financial payment to King's Lynn Borough Council's Monitoring and Mitigation Fund as in accordance with Policy DM19.

We advise that an appropriate planning condition or obligation is attached to any planning permission to secure these measures.

RSPB: We **OBJECT** to the proposal. We do not consider this planning application and adjoining Preliminary Ecological Appraisal to provide sufficient information to determine whether the likelihood of significant effects on protected areas and species can be ruled out.

The area around Heacham is of national and international biodiversity importance, and this area of coast is known and valued for its natural beauty. The Wash SSSI is the UK's largest and it is the most important wetland site for birds in the UK, as well as being of international significance. The natural environment is an asset to the area and a draw for many of the people who live in and visit the area. Beach nesting birds, in particular, ringed plover, use the beach areas from RSPB Snettisham to Heacham south beach, and turtle doves (the UK's fastest declining bird species), use the Snettisham Coastal Park (the northern end of the Park falls within the 2km survey boundary for the application site) to breed in spring and summer.

Protected Areas and Habitats Regulations Assessment: The nature designations pertinent to this application are the internationally important Wash Special Protection Area (SPA), the Wash and North Norfolk Coast Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Wash Ramsar, as well as the nationally important Wash Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The Wash SPA, The Wash Ramsar and The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, as well as the Wash SSSI, protect important species and habitats and any proposed developments or activities must not undermine the sites' conservation objectives.

Despite the proximity of the application site to internationally protected sites, no Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has been undertaken to identify and consider all potential direct and indirect impact to the interest features of the designated sites listed above, either

**PLANNING COMMITTEE
07 FEBRUARY 2022**

alone or in combination (including lighting, surface water drainage and recreation, for example) and should be completed as a priority.

Recreational Disturbance:

- The species most susceptible to adverse impacts from any development which increases footfall and recreational activity at Heacham (including the application in question) includes beach nesting birds (in particular, ringed plover and oystercatcher (SPA Qualifying Feature) which have lost breeding grounds along the Norfolk coast) as well as breeding turtle doves (at the Snettisham Coastal Park) and internationally important wintering waterbird assemblages (including curlew, redshank, knot, pink-footed goose and black-tailed godwit).
- Although the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal concludes the impacts would not have any direct negative impact on the surrounding protected areas, the increase in people will exert increased pressures on protected areas, including the beaches at Heacham. The south beach at Heacham is used by breeding ringed plover during the spring and summer; birds highly susceptible to disturbance and their nests to trampling. There are opportunities to educate and direct the public away from sensitive areas via the use of a combination of signage, fencing, face-to-face engagement and wider communications. The RSPB is leading a project 'Plovers in Peril' along the protected site area from RSPB Snettisham, along the beach to Heacham south beach and we would be very happy to advise the Borough Council on suitable options for mitigating existing impacts on protected species and habitats. Adding to the existing pressures, however, is not in line with the Heacham Neighbourhood Plan or Borough Local Plan.
- The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal mentions turtle dove once (page 22, section 5.37 - Existing records), but no reference is made to the species' extensive use of the area (including the Coastal Park and adjoining fields to the application site). North West Norfolk and the North Norfolk Coast are extremely important for turtle dove, being one of the last places in the UK where turtle dove breed. Additional visitors into the Coastal Park would result in disturbance to this species.
- Recreational disturbance is year-round. Hundreds of thousands of waterbirds overwinter and move through the area each spring, autumn and winter, therefore, full operating periods of camping and caravan parks should be considered when assessing impacts.
- The field is intended to house more caravans, and therefore, visitors, but there are no planned facilities or recreational areas within the extended boundary so it is likely that visitors will use the surrounding coastal areas and protected sites for recreational activities.

We would urge the following to be taken into consideration also:

- The Heacham Neighbourhood Plan states that 'applications for further holiday accommodation beyond existing defined holiday areas should not be supported' (page 43), and we would strongly recommend this is upheld in this instance.
- When asked about the Community Vision as part of developing the Heacham Neighbourhood Plan, Heacham residents ranked the 'importance of preserving and enhancing our natural environment, including protection of ancient woodland and local wildlife habitats' as a priority (p.16 of the Neighbourhood Plan). Comments for this application received to date mirror this desire amongst the community.
- We would encourage the Borough Council to consider the application in the context of the increasing traffic and visitor numbers to the coast seen over recent years, and the resulting additional pressures exerted on villages, infrastructure and roadways and disturbance to the surrounding protected areas.
- As well as appropriate ecological information, where visitor information exists for the area, this should form part of the HRA which must demonstrate that appropriate

measures can and will be put in place to ensure conservation objectives of the nearby protected areas will not be undermined.

- Where developments are approved to proceed, consideration should be given to the management of disturbance on the protected sites (we do not consider the current Preliminary Ecological Assessment to do this sufficiently). This supports the Local Plan Site Allocation Development Management Policies (SADMP) Plan which states that recreational provision must be made 'to limit the likelihood of additional recreational pressure (particularly in relation to exercising dogs) on Habitats Regulations protected nature conservation sites in the wider area.' Simply stating that mitigation will be dealt with through the Borough Council's habitat regulations monitoring and mitigation payments is not demonstrating that sufficient mitigation will be put in place.
- The RSPB is working with the Norfolk Coast Partnership and partners to look at the issue of disturbance and visitor management along the Norfolk coast and would encourage the Borough Council to draw upon this work and the impacts on the wider coastline, when considering this application.

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal:

- Page 3, section 1.10 – Birds. One survey was carried out in winter (2nd December 2020) so it is not possible to say with any certainty there are a) no breeding birds which would be impacted by the development or b) that findings from one survey provide a robust assessment of the ecological interest at the site. The fact that 15 curlew (SPA Qualifying Feature) were seen in just one visit is significant. Later in section 5.38 (page 22) and section 6.5 (page 26) the Appraisal concludes that no bird fauna of interest is found at the site and no further surveys are necessary. We would recommend at least two years' worth of survey data for a site to enable robust data to be gathered.
- Page 4, section 1.16 states that 'The development is unlikely to have any direct negative impact on the features that the surrounding ecological sites are designated for. However, there could be indirect impacts from increased visitors to their sites, particularly due to recreational pressures. This is dealt with via the local authority management and mitigation payment.'. This is repeated on page 33, section 7.17 - Habitat monitoring and mitigation payments. It is not possible to draw this conclusion based on the limited data used.
- Page 4, section 1.17 – Mitigation, and page 31, sections 7.10 and 7.11. We are disappointed with the suggested mitigation measures. Firstly, mitigation is based on the assumption that the development will not result in negative ecological impacts, which as stated earlier, is not based on robust data. Secondly, the mitigation measures are very generic rather than species-specific. Putting up bird boxes will not cater for the needs of turtle dove or curlew, for example. Reference is made to additional habitat for nesting and roosting birds, but no detail is provided. And simply erecting more signage to 'limit recreational pressure' in isolation, based on our own experience, is not effective.
- Page 26, section 6.4 – Impacts on Protected Sites. It states that 'Despite the relatively close proximity, the nature of the development means it is unlikely to have any negative impact on the features that the surrounding ecological sites are designated for as long as measures are taken to prevent contamination of any water bodies that might be connected to them.'. The increase in visitor numbers and consequent disturbance/increased use of the areas is not considered.

NOTE: These comments were made prior to the submission of further ecological information contained within the Appropriate Assessment documentation to which Natural England were satisfied.

Norfolk Wildlife Trust (NWT): We note and share the concerns raised in consultation responses recently made by the RSPB and Natural England and support the recommendations that further information should be sought from the applicant prior to determination.

Recreational disturbance impacts on nearby wildlife sites: We share the concerns raised by the RSPB regarding potential visitor pressure impacts on nearby designated sites and recommend that further information is provided to allow the Council to carry out a robust evaluation of any adverse effects, as required by the Habitats Regulations. Whilst the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) recognises that there will be an increase in visitor pressure, and proposes payment to the Monitoring and Mitigation fund (as per Site Allocations Plan policy DM19) any evaluation should also consider the potential for additional on-site mitigation of additional visitor pressure, for example through provision of additional informal recreation provision, particularly for dog exercise), which we note is required in addition to compliance with policy DM19 for several sites in the Site Allocations Plan which are in close proximity to European Sites.

Planning Policy: We note the presumption against expansion of holiday accommodation beyond existing defined holiday areas in policy 11 of the recent submission version of the Heacham Neighbourhood Plan. It is not clear if the application is within such an area.

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal: Best practice guidance notes that, due to their scope, PEAs are not normally appropriate to fully meet planning authority requirements. A PEA is normally written to advise a client of ecological constraints and opportunities and the need for further surveys. We recommend that PEA is revised to include the further ecological appraisal recommended by ourselves and other consultees, including sufficient information to allow the Council as competent authority under the Habitats Regulations to carry out an Appropriate Assessment, then resubmitted as a full ecological appraisal.

NOTE: These comments were made prior to the submission of further ecological information contained within the Appropriate Assessment documentation to which Natural England were satisfied.

REPRESENTATIONS

TWENTY FIVE letters of **OBJECTION/CONCERN** have been received. The issues raised can be summarised as:

- Increased traffic on South Beach Road and in Heacham generally
- Increased noise and disturbance
- Loss of green space / agricultural land
- Loss of view
- Village infrastructure can't cope
- Impact on protected species
- The application is not clear and transparent and fails to mention some important planning applications
- Other businesses are not mentioned (e.g. Plumbs Caravan Sales and Transport business or Plumbs Plant and Machinery)
- Is the application for caravans or lodges?
- Can someone please confirm that, if approved, construction traffic can only enter/exit via south beach road only?
- The additional land is required because the applicants have developed areas of the original site meaning it can no longer accommodate 155 caravans.

- This is just the start of a larger development which will ultimately end up along Fenway which is a restricted byway
- Will destroy valuable flood plain
- Objection to the use of Fen Lane / Fenway as access to the site
- The Ken Hill Rewilding project is now established and is less than 300 yards from the boundary of this site
- The LPA's advice on a 2018 PREAPP was 'Likely to Refuse'
- Contrary to Heacham Neighbourhood Plan
- Static caravans are not environmentally friendly
- The field immediately to the north of the site is owned by Ken Hill Farms & Estate. I understand that it is subject to a 10-year countryside stewardship agreement entered into by the Estate in 2018 to enhance and improve wildlife in Heacham and Snettisham. Muntjac, hares, pheasants, marsh harriers and a barn owl (to name but some) have all been regular visitors to the field, and development immediately adjacent to the field will disturb that environment
- The site is subject to a restrictive covenant
- The site lies within an AONB
- Approval of this application would set a precedent for future applications from both this applicant and other sites along the coast
- Where do we draw the line? We can't allow this 'drip-feed' of small extensions
- Carbon sequestration through soil would be reduced
- I anticipate the already minimal water pressure experienced would be reduced further

SEVENTEEN letters of **SUPPORT** have been received. These can be summarised as:

- Long Acres is a lovely site that is kept clean and tidy
- Most visitors to the site respect their surroundings
- The issue with dogs off leads is most definitely not limited to holiday homeowners
- I have never seen 80% occupancy in the time that I have been here
- The application would provide jobs for local people and support local businesses
- Long Acres is a private park (no renting)
- Parking on the side of the roads is not from caravan owners
- Will allow a well-established business to expand onto land that it already owns
- 25 caravans wouldn't disrupt much at all
- This application makes clear that it does not exceed the original permission. Static caravans and their plots have grown larger and this has led to displacement on the original site
- What a great positive outcome this would have on the community providing more jobs and more income from tourism, this is just what we need after Covid as more of us are taking holidays in England and this perfect to accommodate more of us wanting to take a break in our beautiful Norfolk countryside
- An extra 25 plots would not impact upon the environment or existing quality for current residents
- The extra caravans will make no difference to 'distinguishing the difference between Heacham and Hunstanton' as the site is on the Snettisham side of the village
- Wild birds and animals do not stay in one field, muntjac, hares and pheasants are regularly seen in the field on the other side of the site nearer to the beach
- There should not be a big impact on traffic on South Beach Road as the site entrance is at the beginning of the road and owners usually walk to the beach
- Heacham is an attractive tourist area, it must be preferable that more holiday homes are made available rather than depleting the local resident's housing stock.

LDF CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

CS01 - Spatial Strategy

CS02 - The Settlement Hierarchy

CS06 - Development in Rural Areas

CS07 - Development in Coastal Areas

CS08 - Sustainable Development

CS10 - The Economy

CS11 – Transport

CS12 - Environmental Assets

SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES PLAN 2016

DM1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

DM2 – Development Boundaries

DM11 – Touring and Permanent Holiday Sites

DM15 – Environment, Design and Amenity

DM19 - Green Infrastructure/Habitats Monitoring & Mitigation

NATIONAL GUIDANCE

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

National Design Guide 2019

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main considerations in the determination of this application are:

Principle of Development

Flood Risk

Visual Impact

Protected Sites and Species

Highway Safety

Neighbour Amenity

Crime and Disorder

Other Material Considerations

Principle of Development

Planning History Summary: A caravan site on the wider site was established in 1962 under application DG2694 for the siting of 113 holiday caravans (condition 5) the use of which was restricted to the period between 20 March to 31 October inclusive in any calendar year (condition 1.)

Subsequent permission, granted under application DG8048, allowed an extension to the park for no more than 155 caravans (condition 5) with the same occupancy restriction (20 March to 31 October inclusive (condition 2))

Permission granted under application 2/95/1076/F allowed the caravans to be occupied, for holiday purposes only (condition 2), except during the period between 15th January and 15th February in each year (condition 1.)

The current site licence is in accordance with permission 2/95/1076/F and allows for a maximum number of 155 holiday caravans for occupation outside of the period between 15th January and 15th February.

The current application seeks to extend the site area of the park to include an area of 1.7ha to the east of the existing park which would enable the siting of larger, higher quality 'holiday lodge' caravans. The proposal does not seek an increase in the maximum number of currently permitted caravans (155), their period of occupation (except during the period between 15 January and 15 February in any calendar year) or their use (holiday.)

The application is therefore for an extension (in terms of area only) to an established tourism business.

Many third-party representations believe the application is for an additional 25 caravans. Those that understand that this is not the case suggest that the larger units would result in more people and thus an intensity in the operation of the site.

It is important to note however, that all units will be required to fall within the definition of a caravan and therefore, in *planning terms*, there is a status quo. That is to say the existing site has permission for 155 caravans regardless of whether they are single or twin unit or 'lodges' as long as they fall within the definition of a caravan. It is true however that site licence requirements may not allow for that number (e.g. distance between caravans may prevent that number of larger units.)

Notwithstanding this, more spacious units do not necessarily mean more people (although it is acknowledged that they could), they do however provide a variety of choices which improves the tourism offer.

It is not considered the increase in size of some units that this permission may allow would result in a material increase in the operational capabilities of the site.

Notwithstanding this, the Appropriate Assessment, due to an error by the ecologist, provides for an additional 25 units. As such this aspect, impact on protected sites, is actually more robust than required.

The development is outside of the development boundary in land designated as countryside, and a small part of the site lies in an area at risk of flooding (south west corner). None of the site lies within the Coastal Flood Risk Hazard Zone where such development is precluded, and the area of the site at risk of flooding is shown to be retained as recreational open space.

Development Management Policy DM2 allows development within the countryside where it complies with Core Strategy Policy CS10, and Development Management Policy DM11 relates specifically to Holiday Sites.

The Heacham Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) is also relevant, and given its position in the adoption process (it has been to examination and the modified wording considered by the Examiner to “fulfil the basic conditions”), can be given some weight in the planning balance.

However, in relation to Policy 11 ‘Holiday Accommodation’ of the HNP, the policy, as originally submitted, was deleted by the Examiner. It should be noted that it is this policy (the deleted version) that the Parish Council mention in their representation.

Given the above, the original version of policy 11 of the HNP can be given no weight in the decision.

A modified, and accepted, policy reads as follows:

In order to maintain and improve Heacham’s attraction as a quiet uncommercialised holiday centre, applications for further holiday accommodation beyond existing defined holiday areas, will only be supported where the proposals:

- 1. Maintain the distinction between the contrasting holiday centres of Heacham and Hunstanton and do not diminish the physical separation between these centres; and*
- 2. Do not have any unacceptable impact on local infrastructure, including green infrastructure; and*
- 3. Minimise any visual and physical impact on the village by including, where appropriate, a landscaping plan incorporating the use of landform, native trees and locally appropriate planting ; and*
- 4. Are not directly adjacent to any residential areas; and*
- 5. Do not need to be accessed through the village centre of Heacham; and*
- 6. Incorporates high quality accommodation for which adequate parking and servicing arrangements are provided; and*
- 7. Can demonstrate a link to wider tourism or land use initiatives that provide demonstrable benefits to the local area.*

It is considered that this policy can be given some weight in the decision-making process, although members will need to consider how much weight given its stage in the process.

In relation to the policy criteria above the LPA comments as follows:

1. The site does not diminish the physical separation between these centres.
2. Given that the number of caravans is not increasing it is not considered that the development would have an unacceptable impact on local infrastructure. In relation to green infrastructure, an Appropriate Assessment has satisfied Natural England that, with mitigation, protected sites will not be unacceptably affected. Conditions, that include the mitigation measures, resulting from the ecology survey will help to protect specific species on the site itself.
3. The proposed landscaping, that is a substantial improvement on the existing, is considered to minimise any visual and physical impacts on the village.
4. The development is not directly adjacent to any residential areas.
5. The site does not have to be accessed through the village centre.
6. The existing site is well-maintained, and the LPA therefore has no reason to consider those units to be accommodated on the extension would not likewise be high quality accommodation. Adequate parking and servicing are proposed, and the proposal aims to improve the quality of the overall site.

7. This is an extension to an existing, historical tourism site.

It is therefore considered that the proposed extension is in general compliance with Policy 11, as modified, of the HNP.

The other main policy relating to the proposed development is Development Management Policy DM11 that requires:

1. The proposal is supported by a business plan demonstrating how the site will be managed and how it will support tourism or tourist related uses in the area
2. The proposal demonstrates a high standard of design in terms of layout, screening and landscaping ensuring minimal adverse impact on visual amenity and the historical and natural environmental qualities of the surrounding landscape and surroundings; and
3. The site can be safely accessed;
4. It is in accordance with national policies on flood risk;
5. The site is not within the Coastal Hazard Zone indicated on the Policies Map, or within areas identified as tidal defence breach Hazard Zone in the Borough Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the Environment Agency's mapping.

Small scale proposals for holiday accommodation will not normally be permitted within the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) unless it can be demonstrated that the proposal will not negatively impact on the landscape setting and scenic beauty of the AONB or on the landscape setting of the AONB if outside the designated area. Proposals for uses adversely affecting Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) or European Sites will be refused permission.

Policy DM11 also requires certain restrictive conditions relating to holiday use. However, in this instance it is considered that conditions that control the use and occupancy of the existing caravans are sufficient. Such conditions would be appended to any permission granted.

In relation to the points raised above the LPA responds as follows:

1. The extension will be run in the same manner as the existing park in accordance with details contained in the Planning Statement
2. The layout and screening are considered to demonstrate a high standard of design (a LVIA has been submitted, following preapp advice, and is discussed in more detail below)
3. The local highway authority raises no objection subject to the extension being accessed via the main site including all construction traffic
4. The development is considered to be in accordance with National Flood Risk requirements, but this is discussed in more detail below
5. The site is not within the Coastal Hazard Zone.

It is therefore considered that the proposed extension is in general compliance with Policy DM11 of the SADMP.

It is therefore considered that the Principle of Development, subject to compliance with other relevant planning policy and guidance, can be supported and it accords with enabling policies in the Core Strategy and HNP.

Flood Risk

Only the southwest corner of the site lies in an area at risk of flooding (flood zone 2 and 3a.) No caravans are proposed in this area, with the layout plan showing this area to be used as 'Recreational Open Space'.

This results in the extension being at lower risk of flooding than the existing park meaning that any caravan that is relocated into the extension will be at lower risk of flooding than they currently are.

Overall, it is therefore considered that the risks associated with flooding are very small, and the development would result in betterment by relocating some caravans to an area at less risk of flooding than they currently are.

The sequential and exception tests do not need to be carried out on the majority of the extension (because it falls within Flood Zone 1), and not in the area the caravans are to be located. In relation to the part of the extension that does fall within risk of flooding the impacts have been addressed by the use of this area as Recreational Open Space. This will be secured by condition if permission is granted.

The development is therefore considered to pass the sequential and exceptions tests in the areas required, and the EA raise no objection.

It has been confirmed that the site is signed up to the EA's Flood Warning System.

Visual Impact

Policy DM11 makes it clear that one of the main issues with developments such as these are their impact on visual amenity and the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Following the submission of a PREAPP on a wider site for more caravans, which was determined with a recommendation of 'likely to refuse', in part because the visual impact of the development could not be accessed, this application was accompanied by an LVIA (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.)

An LVIA is used to identify and assess the likely significance of the effects of change resulting from a development. The two components of LVIA are:

- Assessment of landscape effects: assessing effects on the landscape as a resource in its own right;
- Assessment of visual effects: assessing effects on specific views and on the general visual amenity experienced by people.

The LVIA that accompanied the application specifies the following:

The study was carried out in April 2021 through a combination of desk studies and field surveys within and around the study area.

The extent of the study area is within 2km of the development site and is defined by the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) of the proposals.

The field study was undertaken in April 2021 when deciduous vegetation was partly in leaf; therefore, site visibility was similar to what would be expected in winter months.

The study area is within Natural England, National Character Area 46, The Fens published in 2015 and National Character Area 76, North West Norfolk published in 2014.

In relation to Character Area 46, the field survey concludes that the areas east and south of the site are heavily wooded and not open.

In relation to Character Area 76, the field survey concludes that the area near the site includes a mixture of woodland and rolling arable farmland.

In relation to Local Landscape Character Assessment, the study area is within the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council Landscape Character Assessment, published in 2007. This local level character assessment provides more detail on the type of landscape that occurs within the study area. The study area is within; A4 Heacham, B2 North Wootton (includes the site itself), C1 Heacham and F1 Snettisham and Dersingham, Landscape Character Areas. The key characteristics described and also apparent in the study area are as follows:

In relation to A4, Heacham, the LVIA concludes that, given the low height of the proposed development, together with existing caravans and vegetation at Long Acres Holiday Park, the development will be screened from this character area.

In relation to B2, North Wootton (which includes the site itself), the LVIA concludes that the site is screened by existing caravans immediately to the north and a hedgerow immediately to the east, and urban fringe lands to the south and east. Likewise, due to the low height of the proposed development, screening from existing caravans, the retention of existing hedgerows around the site and additional screen planting the development will have a negligible impact on this character area.

In relation to C1, Heacham, the LVIA concludes that the proposed development would not be visible / barely noticeable from this character area.

In relation to and F1, Snettisham and Dersingham, the LVIA concludes that the proposed development would not be visible from this character area as it is screened by dense intervening woodland.

Visual Receptors

Public Rights of Way

- *There are no public rights of way within the site itself. There are some public rights of way within the wider study area, the following paragraphs describe those located within 1.5km of the site*
- *A public bridleway travels along Fenway south and east of the site. Further to the south east a short section of public bridleway travels south from Lamsey Lane at Summerhill connecting to a permissible footpath further south and west. Intervening vegetation suggests that the proposed development would be barely perceptible from the bridleway and permissible footpaths at Summerhill. The development may be partially visible in the distance from a limited section of Fenway where there is no boundary vegetation*
- *A public footpath commences near Beach Farm and travels south near the coastline and Creek at South Beach. The proposed development would generally not be visible from this public footpath as intervening vegetation and existing caravans at Long Acres Holiday Park screens the site*
- *This same public footpath above continues north near the coastline at North Beach after crossing Beach Road and traveling in between two sections of the caravan park. This footpath then joins up with a public byway which runs along the edge of the coastline at North Beach. Due to existing caravans, the proposed development would not be visible from this public footpath or byway*

- *A public footpath commences at Home Farm in Snettisham and travels west through Lodge Hill Plantation towards Lodge Hill Farm and then travels further west to connect to the coastal public footpath. Intervening vegetation and the effect of distance suggests that the proposed development would not be visible from this footpath*
- *A short section of public footpath commences near Heacham Bottom Farm. The footpath runs adjacent to both Lynn Road (A149) and Lamsey Lane. Intervening vegetation and the effect of distance suggests that the proposed development would not be visible from this footpath*
- *A short section of public bridleway to the east of the site runs from Marea Farm along School Road. Due to intervening built development the proposed development would not be visible from this public bridleway*
- *A short section of public bridleway to the north east of the site runs in between the backs of housing off of Poplar Avenue, Staithe Road and Lodge Road. Due to intervening built development the proposed development would not be visible from this public bridleway.*

Public Highways

- *South Beach Road and Lamsey Lane travels north and east of the site. Further north are residential roads at Heacham. Lynn Road travels in lands east of the site. Further to the east is Sedgford Road which connects Sedgford to Snettisham. South east of the site the A149 connects Lynn Road to Beach Road. Intervening vegetation/ built development and the effect of distance suggests the site would not be visible from these roads. The development may be partially visible in the distance from a limited section of Fenway where there is no boundary vegetation*

Settlements

- *The closest settlements to the site include Heacham and Snettisham. Intervening vegetation, topography and built development suggests that the development would not be visible from these locations. At most there may be some distant views to the site from first floor windows at the back of a few dwellings at Foldgate Road.*

Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments

- *There are numerous listed buildings (at Heacham, Ken Hill Wood and Snettisham in particular) and scheduled monuments located within the wider study area. Scheduled monuments include: a Watch Tower (remains) located circa. 2.7km south of the site near Snettisham Common, a Roman Villa, a Cross and Shernborne Hall and Moat at Snettisham Village. Dense intervening vegetation and built development indicates that the development would not be visible from these locations.*

A total of 14 Viewpoints were assessed in relation to visual impact with the overall conclusion being neutral (with a slight adverse impact from 2no viewpoints on Fenway Lane in opening year. This means the proposed development would cause a limited deterioration to the view. Once the proposed screen planting within the site matures the significance of the visual effect of the development would improve on these two visual viewpoints.

The LPA considers that the submitted LVIA is robust and agrees with the conclusion that the development would have a negligible visual impact.

Protected Sites and Species

Protected Sites

Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA): Changes have been made to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (2017 Regulations). The changes are

made by the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 (2019 Regulations).

The 2017 Regulations are one of the pieces of domestic law that transposed the land and marine aspects of the Habitats Directive (Council Directive 92/43/EEC) and certain elements of the Wild Birds Directive (Directive 2009/147/EC) (known as the Nature Directives).

The Regulations require the competent authority (in this instance the LPA) to ascertain the impacts of a plan or project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of a protected site that may impact on the site.

The competent authority must be satisfied that the project would not adversely affect the integrity of a protected site or, where there is no alternative solution that the project must be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interests.

The protected sites are known as Natura 2000 and consist of SACs, and SPAs. Ramsar sites, candidate SACs (cSACs) and potential SPAs (pSPAs) are treated the same as SAC and SPAs for the purposes of the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA).

Whilst it is the responsibility of the competent authority to undertake the HRA, it is the responsibility of the applicant to supply the information required to undertake the assessment. In this instance the applicant has undertaken the AA, and whilst it is more robust than required, the LPA has given full consideration and is in agreement with (as is Natural England.) It is not considered necessary for the LPA to duplicate the AA submitted which is appended to this report.

The HRA is a staged process. Stage 1 (Screening) considers the scope for likely significant effects to occur based on a broad scale assessment taking into account factors such as the spatial relationship between impact sources and designated site. Screening for likely significant effects considers the project both alone and in-combination with other projects.

Stage 2 (Appropriate Assessment) if stage 1 identifies likely significant effect an assessment of the implications of the project for the site(s)'s conservation objectives is carried out.

Stage 3 if Stage 2 concludes that the project will adversely affect the integrity of the sites or when adverse effects cannot be ruled out, an assessment of alternatives for the project must be considered. Should no alternative be available 'Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest' (IROPI) must be justified and compensatory measures identified.

The following Natura 2000 sites were considered:

- The Wash Ramsar
- The Wash SPA
- The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC

Full details of the site's qualifying features and conservation objectives accompanied the application.

As previously stated, the AA was actually more robust than required because the ecologist incorrectly assumed that the development was increasing the number of caravans over those permitted by 25 which is not the case.

Stage 1 – screening of potential likely significant effects on the protected sites for construction, operation and decommissioning.

It has been established through the 'Visitor surveys at European Protected Sites across Norfolk during 2015 and 2016' (Footprint Ecology, 2016) that tourist development within proximity of the Norfolk European Sites will contribute 'in combination' to recreational pressure within those sites and that mitigation will be required.

Stage 2 – because the project is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the European Sites and is likely to have an 'in-combination' significant effect on the identified sites an Appropriate Assessment is required. This will assert whether or not there would be no adverse effects on European Sites and whether mitigation is required to reach that conclusion.

The AA concludes that, subject to the following mitigation, the development would not have an adverse effect on the Protected Sites either alone or in combination:

- Provision of information boards and packs as part of a previous HRA for the caravan site including alternative dog walking areas,
- A sensitive foul and surface water drainage design to the satisfaction of Natural England, and
- Restriction in lighting associated with the development.

Natural England has confirmed its support for these findings and the proposed mitigation that will be suitably conditioned if permission is granted.

The objection from Norfolk Wildlife Trust and RSPB were received prior to the submission of the applicant's Appropriate Assessment. No further comments were received from them following the submission of the additional information submitted.

Protected Species

The majority of species mentioned by the RSPB and NWT are on protected sites rather than the application site and are therefore fully covered by the AA.

In relation to the site itself the Preliminary Ecological Survey concludes:

Habitat: The proposed development site comprises of an area of species poor semi-improved grassland bordered by hedgerows, scrub and wire fences. To the east of the site are paddocks, to the south is an area of regularly managed amenity grassland and a storage compound all owned by the client. To the west are the static caravans making up the Long Acres Holiday Park, also owned by the client. To the north is an area of rough grassland separated from the development site by a thick row of scrub, this area is not owned by the client.

Bats: There are no buildings in the area to be developed. The small number of planted trees along the edges of the site were mostly immature. A small tree along the western boundary had low bat roosting potential and limited features. The margins to the proposed development area could however support foraging bats.

Water Voles/Otter: The Ordnance Survey map indicates that there are a number of ditches to the south 190m (across a single-track road) and 270m to the north of the proposed development site. Due to their distance from the site they were not inspected as part of this survey. There is no suitable habitat for water vole/otter in the proposed development area.

Badgers: No direct evidence of badgers was noted in the proposed development area, although the surrounding habitat did have the potential to support badgers and the grassland on the site itself could support foraging badgers.

Hedgehogs / small mammals: The close proximity and connectivity to the surrounding habitat and suitable habitat on site (variably managed grassland and hedgerows) means that there is a potential for hedgehog / small mammals to occur on site. A single hare was noted during the survey.

Birds: Three wood pigeon nests were noted in the boundary hedgerows to the south of the site. The hedgerows (in particular the scrub to the north) could support breeding birds. The potential for breeding birds to occur on the site is rather limited due to the regular mowing and dog walking by caravan residents. The fields to the east did support a wintering flock of curlew at the time of the survey.

Amphibians /Reptiles: There are no ponds within 500m of the site. The Ordnance Survey map indicates that there are a number of ditches to the south, 190m (across a single-track road) and 270m to the north of the proposed development site. Due to their distance from the site they were not assessed further as part of this survey.

The potential of the development site to support protected amphibians / reptiles was considered limited due to the regular (mostly) mowing. The site could however support foraging common amphibians. In addition, the occasional transient grass snake (particularly in damp conditions) can however not be completely discounted.

Invertebrates: By the nature of the common habitats present, the proposed development site is unlikely to support significant invertebrate populations.

Impact assessment: The likely impacts on protected species recorded are as follows:

- Impacts on bat foraging due to additional lighting relating to the new caravans. The development will not affect any potential roost sites;
- The loss of small mammal terrestrial habitat;
- Loss of bird nesting habitat through the addition of the access road;
- Loss of bat foraging habitat through the addition of the access road;
- The loss of habitat for foraging amphibians.

The development is unlikely to have any direct negative impact on the features that the surrounding ecological sites are designated for (as covered by the AA.)

Mitigation and Enhancements

Precautionary mitigation and enhancement proposals include:

- Careful site clearance to prevent impacts on foraging mammals and amphibians;
- Limitation in external lighting to prevent impacts on foraging bats (covered by AA);
- Incorporation of bat boxes and bird boxes on poles within the site (or in the woodland immediately to the south of the site);
- Planting as part of the green spaces between the caravans or around the edge of the site to attract insects that bats can feed on;
- Provision of additional bird nesting and roosting habitat;
- Management of parts of the site not used for caravans as longer less regularly managed grassland to provide cover for a range of species;
- Information to be provided in caravans and on display boards to limit any further recreational pressure (covered by AA.)

All these aspects can be suitably conditioned if permission is granted.

Protected Species (PS) have full protection 2017 Regulations. It's an offence to deliberately capture, injure or kill, or deliberately disturb PS. These requirements are enforced in the

2017 Regulations and any derogation is regulated and overseen by a system of licensing administered by Natural England (NE).

It is not the role or responsibility of the LPA to monitor or enforce NE's obligations under the 2017 Regulations. However, if a development proposal could potentially result in a breach (i.e. a licence is known to be required), the LPA must form a view on the likelihood of a licence being granted under the regulations by NE in order to fulfil its own obligation.

As a licence is not known to be required in this case, the LPA does not need to undertake the tests of derogation.

The development is therefore considered to be in accordance with the Regulations, the NPPF and Development Plan Policy CS12, subject to suitable mitigation secured by condition(s).

Highway Safety

The Local Highway Authority has confirmed that because the application does not result in an increase in the number of permitted caravans they have no objection on the basis of highway safety subject to conditions requiring access from South Beach Road and parking provision.

It should be noted that the application does not provide for access from Fenway. Notwithstanding this, any permission will be conditioned to ensure access is from South Beach Road only, including construction traffic or the delivery of new / replacement caravans.

Neighbour Amenity

Notwithstanding objections from third parties, the extension to the site would not result in a material increase in the operational capacity of the site and it is therefore considered that the development would not result in any material neighbour amenity issues.

The extension area is suitably separated from any existing non-associated residential development to conclude that there would be negligible impact over and above existing caravans, many of which are located closer to these dwellings.

Crime and Disorder

There are no specific crime and disorder issues arising from the proposed development.

Other Material Considerations

In relation to the Parish Council's comments not covered above the LPA responds as follows:

Although G.47.1 of the SADMP Plan 2016-2026 states that Heacham is a coastal resort, Heacham is a coastal village we do not have the amenities to be a resort – Whilst this description has no material impact on the application, Heacham is Key Rural Service Centre with all the associated facilities.

The access to the field is through the flood risk area, an alternative access from the Fenway to the site's maintenance area is also in the flood risk – Access will be from South Beach Road.

We feel that the applicant would be using Fenway more to access this site, which they do now to access their Concrete Crushing business, which is not only damaging the bridleway but also putting residents and walkers at risk – Access is proposed and will be conditioned via South Beach Road.

In relation to Natural England's request for payment of the Habitat Mitigation fee, such a payment can only be secured on additional tourism units. As no additional caravans are proposed over and above what is already authorised on the main site, a payment cannot be sought.

In relation to third party comments not covered in the main body of the report, the LPA comments as follows:

- The application is not clear and transparent and fails to mention some important planning applications; it is considered that all relevant planning applications have been taken into account in the determination of this application
- Other businesses are not mentioned (e.g. Plumbs Caravan Sales and Transport business or Plumbs Plant and Machinery) – these are not relevant to the current application
- Is the application for caravans or lodges? – the description of the units is somewhat immaterial; all units will have to fall within the definition of a caravan
- The additional land is required because the applicants have developed areas of the original site meaning it can no longer accommodate 155 caravans – The site area of the 'main site' remains as historically permitted
- This is just the start of a larger development which will ultimately end up along Fenway which is a restricted byway – Every application has to be considered on its own merits, and access via South Beach Road only can be conditioned
- Will destroy valuable flood plain – The majority of the site falls within flood zone 1
- The LPA's advice on a 2018 PREAPP was 'Likely to Refuse' – This application is substantially different to that proposal and has been considered on its own merits. The main reasons for the recommendation on the aforementioned PREAPP (that was for more caravans on a larger site) were that part of the site was in the Coastal Flood Risk Hazard Zone and part of the site intruded on land that formed part of the Hunstanton to King's Lynn Railway Line (neither are the case with the current application)
- Static caravans are not environmentally friendly – This is a caravan site
- The site is subject to a restrictive covenant – If this is the case it is a civil matter
- The site lies within an AONB – The site does not lie within the Norfolk Coast AONB.

CONCLUSION

The application seeks the extension to an existing, long-established, holiday caravan park without increasing the number of caravans permitted or their occupation in terms of holiday use and period of occupation. It will allow a more spacious layout of the site.

There will be an incursion into the countryside adjacent to the existing site to accommodate this development, but Members will be aware that there are positive policies in the Development Plan that allow the provision and extension of tourism uses in the Borough, subject to their individual impacts.

In this particular case, the application has shown, through the submission of detailed reports and evidence, that there would be very limited landscape / visual impacts, neighbour or highway safety impacts, that protected sites / species and drainage issues could be suitably mitigated, that the risks associated with flooding are negligible, and the relocation of a

**PLANNING COMMITTEE
07 FEBRUARY 2022**

maximum of 25 caravans from an area at greater risk of flooding into the extension area would result in betterment.

In addition, conditions will still control the number of caravans, the layout, holiday use only, and will conditioned access from South Beach Road.

It is therefore considered that the development complies with the NPPF, Development Plan Policies CS01, 08, 10, 11, 12, DM1, 2, 11, 15, and 19 and Heacham Neighbourhood Plan Policy 11.

It is therefore considered that the development should be approved subject to the following conditions.

RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE subject to the imposition of the following condition(s):

- 1 Condition: The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 1 Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004.
- 2 Condition: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans drawing nos: 20066-DD-LP-3-01-REV-4 and 20066-DD-LP-0-02-REV-3.
- 2 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
- 3 Condition: In relation to the extension area the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in full accordance with the following approved drawing no: 20066-DD-LP-3-01-REV-4. This area shall be retained in accordance with the permitted plans.
- 3 Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
- 4 Condition: Notwithstanding the information that accompanied the application no development shall commence until full details of the foul and surface water drainage arrangements for the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage details shall be constructed as approved before any part of the development hereby permitted is brought into use.
- 4 Reason: To ensure that there is a satisfactory means of drainage in accordance with the NPPF.
This needs to be a pre-commencement condition as drainage is a fundamental issue that needs to be planned for and agreed at the start of the development.
- 5 Condition: There shall be no more than 155 caravans, as defined in the Caravan Sites & Control of Development Act 1960 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968, stationed at any one time on the site (the existing and extension in combination).
- 5 Reason: To define the number of caravans permitted for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 6 Condition: This permission authorises the occupation of the caravans hereby permitted (excluding the warden's unit) except during the period 15 January to 15 February (inclusive) in any single calendar year.
- 6 Reason: The accommodation provided in the caravans and the space around them are suitable only as holiday accommodation for which the site was designated and because the site lies outside of the development boundary where full time residential units are not supported by the NPPF or Development Plan.
- 7 Condition: The caravans hereby permitted shall be used only for holiday accommodation and at no time shall be occupied as a person's sole or main place of residence.
- 7 Reason: The accommodation provided in the caravans and the space around them are suitable only as holiday accommodation for which the site was designated and because the site lies outside of the development boundary where full time residential units are not supported by the NPPF or Development Plan.
- 8 Condition: Notwithstanding the approved plans, prior to the siting of the first caravan in the extension area full details of both hard and soft landscape works shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include finished levels or contours, hard surface materials, refuse or other storage units, street furniture, structures and other minor artefacts. Soft landscape works shall include planting plans, written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment) schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers and densities where appropriate.
- 8 Reason: To ensure that the development is properly landscaped in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with the NPPF.
- 9 Condition: Prior to the first occupation of any caravan in the extension area, or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, all hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Any trees or plants that within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species as those originally planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written approval to any variation.
- 9 Reason: To ensure that the work is carried out within a reasonable period in accordance with the NPPF.
- 10 Condition: Means of access to and egress from the development hereby permitted, including for the delivery of any new caravans to the overall site, shall be from and to South Beach Road only and shall at no time access the site via Fenway.
- 10 Reason: In the interests of highway safety and traffic movement in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan.
- 11 Condition: Prior to the first use of any caravan located within the extension area of the development hereby permitted the proposed on-site car parking, turning and waiting areas shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.

- 11 Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of the parking/manoeuvring areas, in the interests of satisfactory development and highway safety in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan.
- 12 Condition: Construction traffic, associated with the development hereby permitted, shall only access the site via South Beach Road and shall at no time use Fenway.
- 12 Reason: In the interests of highway safety and traffic movement in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan.
- 13 Condition: Prior to the first occupation of any caravan located within the extension area or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority the Mitigation and Enhancements contained in Chapter 7 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal that accompanied the application (prepared by Philip Parker Associates Ltd; Ref: P2020-65 F1 FINAL; dated 13 May 2021.) shall be carried out to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
- 13 Reason: In the interests of protected species in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan.
- 14 Condition: Prior to the first occupation of any caravan located within the extension area or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority the mitigation identified in the Conclusion (page 11) of the Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Matrix and Appropriate Assessment Statement to Assist Competent Authority Decision Making that accompanied the application (prepared by Philip Parker Associates Ltd; dated 16/12/21) shall be carried out to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. The mitigation shall be retained and main tend as approved for the lifetime of the development.
- 14 Reason: In the interests of protected sites and species in accordance with the NPPF and Development Plan.