

PLANNING COMMITTEE
1st August 2016

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

Item Number 8/1(a) Page Number 9

Applicant: Additional 3D visuals supplied of proposed development

BCKWLN Environmental Health (Environmental Quality & Licensing): No additional comments re: additional information

Third Party: ONE letter regarding:

- Cumulative impact of this and other development proposals upon school's GP's surgeries, roads and pollution; and
- Crime and disorder.

Assistant Director's comments: The issues raised by the 3rd party are not affected by the design changes.

Amendment: To reflect the full list of revised plans conditions 15 and 25 need to be amended to read as follows:-

15 Condition All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: 2067-15-A Rev.6 and 2067-15-B Rev.6. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation or use of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. 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.

25 Condition The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans drawing nos: 001 Rev.A05, 002 Rev.A26, 004 Rev.A03, 005 Rev.A07, 006 Rev.A06, 007 Rev.A06, 008 Rev.A05, 009 Rev.A04, 020 Rev.A03, 051 Rev.A02, 052 Rev.A02, 054 Rev.A02, 055 Rev.A02, 056 Rev.A01, 057 Rev.A05, 058 Rev.A00, 059 Rev A00, 060 Rev.A01, 061 Rev.A00, 062 Rev.A01 and A063 A00.

Item Number 8/2(a) Page Number 2 (Late Pages)

Third Parties: **FOURTEEN** items of correspondence **OBJECTING** to the proposals and raising the following issues:

- Approval would be undemocratic given objections from Parish Councils and public;
- Traffic;
- Counter arguments of objectors are not included in the assessment;
- Impact on tourism;
- Report ignores Council's own policies;
- Impact on landscape;

- Noise
- Odour
- Bird flu

Docking Parish Council: OBJECT

Assistant Director's comments: The application has attracted a significant amount of correspondence from consultees and members of the public and other bodies. The comments from these bodies and people are recorded in the standard manner, i.e. they are summarised. Six pages of the report are given over to recording the points raised, including 3 pages of representations.

However, the number of representations is not a material planning consideration. Rather, it is the issues that those representations raise that the Committee needs to consider when coming to a decision on the application.

In response to the specific allegation that the report ignores the Council's development plan policies, these are specifically covered on pages 13 and 14 of the agenda and under subject headings elsewhere.

Item Number 8/3(a) Page Number 35

Third Party: THREE items of correspondence **OBJECTING** raising the following issues:

- Unsuitable site;
- Road inadequate for additional traffic;
- Noise and vibration in a quiet area;
- Retrospective application;
- Devalue properties and make them difficult to sell; and
- Road safety, particularly for elderly pedestrians.

Item Number 8/3(e) Page Number 67

Holme Parish Council: OBJECT raising the following points:-

- Proposal is twice the size of the existing building in terms of floor space and 405 higher;
- The site is not hidden and will be prominent. Screening referred to be the applicant is off-site;
- Will impact on views from public footpaths
- Impact adversely on AONB;
- Measures proposed to mitigate light pollution will be ineffective;
- Proposal will adversely impact on ecology;
- Adverse impact on economy by making the area less attractive; and
- The practice of purchasing small houses and replacing them with larger ones is driving local people out of the housing market.

Item Number 8/3 (f) Page Number 36 (late pages)

King's Lynn Area Consultative Committee Planning Sub-group: OBJECT on the following grounds:

- There would be an increase in HGV traffic in the town centre;
- The proposal would have an impact on residents in relation to noise, disturbance and odour from the lorries travelling to and from the site.
- Flood risk.
- There would be a detrimental visual impact on the landscape; on the AONB as a designated asset and on its immediate setting.
- The site was not an identified industrial site and it was understood that the County Council's policy was that waste facilities should be located on identified industrial sites.
- The proposal would be detrimental to the Borough Council's vision for the enhancement of the river.
- In relation to the flare stack it was considered that this could have a visual impact if burning constantly and at night and could be a noise nuisance. The Group were also concerned about the potential impact of the flare stacks and the emissions from the stack on wildlife/protected species.
- The impact on protected species and fisheries from accidental spillage.

Third Parties: FIVE items of correspondence raising the following issues:

- Congestion along Cross Bank Road adjacent Fisher Fleet reduces it to a single vehicle width;
- Why are the County Council and Borough Council's websites not linked to show the total number of objections? There are 20 objections on the County Council's website;
- Impact on landscape;
- Impact on users of the by-way in terms of general amenity;
- No direct route from adjacent farms to the digester as suggested by the applicant;
- No room for screening of the plant;
- Impact upon utilities; and
- Impact upon ecology.

King's Lynn Civic Society: OBJECTS raising the following points:-

- Increase in HGV traffic including in the town centre;
- Extend industrial nature of the area further along the river bank;
- Odour; and
- Vermin.