

PLANNING COMMITTEE

12 April 2021

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

Item No. 8/1(a) Page No. 9

Agent: Submitted an amended plan to ensure that the landscaping plan tallies with the latest site plan and have provided an updated FRA & Drainage Strategy document to clarify LLFA queries for completeness.

Queries the need for Condition 5 given that the remediation report has been submitted and the Environmental Quality Officer is content.

Queries Condition 16 (construction hours) which should be revised to allow greater flexibility without causing harm to neighbours.

We are not in a position at the moment to further update the FRA & DS as we had hoped, so condition 21 will have to remain the same, which is agreed (as a pre-commencement condition).

Town Council: Hunstanton Town Council as a Statutory Consultee Object to the Planning Application 21/00243/FM - Construction of 32 apartments with associated access, cycle stores, infrastructure and landscaping land at Southend Road Seagate Hunstanton Norfolk.

This application has been discussed again at the recent full council meeting of Hunstanton Town Council, we stand by our original decision made previously, as there is no material changes to the development and our standing orders prevents us from voting again on this application, the reallocation of spaces from visitor to dwellings is not deemed a significant alteration to the proposed design.

Reasons for Objection

Car Parking

Car parking spaces (following national guidance/ local guidance and policy)

12 one bed apartments - need 12 parking spaces

18 two bedroom apartments – need 36 parking spaces

2 three bedroom apartments - need 6 parking spaces

Total requirement of parking spaces **54 spaces**

Actual provision is 1 parking space per unit **32 spaces a short fall of 22 spaces**

There is a presumption being used that Hunstanton has a good public transport infrastructure and the town does not require as many car parking spaces as local NCC and national NPPF guidelines recommend, however this is not the case, the current levels of public transport is poor compared to other areas of Norfolk. Cycling is not an option around Hunstanton as the roadways are not safe enough and an ageing population are less likely to use this option.

We note that other Major developments are proposed in West Norfolk which do meet the parking needs of a local community, for example 20/00724/FM 185 garage spaces and 645 parking spaces for 379 dwellings proposed close to Kings Lynn, a large town which has an adequate public transport infrastructure to support the needs of the local population.

Although we do welcome the acknowledgement of the need to meet future environmental needs by the recognition of increasing EV charging points and hope this is reflected in all future proposed developments.

We feel that this development does not fit in with the Hunstanton Neighbourhood Development Plan, although not yet agreed it is something planners need to take into consideration.

Conservation Officer: From a conservation perspective, the comments provided on the 20 November for application 20/00811/FM still stand. Conditions will need to be added for materials and detail such as joinery, eaves dormers etc.

CSNN: Recommends amended construction hours condition as follows:

Construction hours and site deliveries /collections shall not take place outside of the hours of 08.00 -18.00 Monday to Friday, 08.00 -13.00 on Saturdays and at no times on Sundays and Bank / Public holidays.

Between 08:00 and 08:30 on the permitted days no activities including deliveries requiring the use of noisy plant, machinery or equipment should take place. This includes the use of vehicles with reversing alarms or other machinery and equipment that utilise alarms.

Third Party Representation: One further **OBJECTION** received on the following grounds:

“This is a prime area in Hunstanton and this plan is at best mediocre. If something has to be built in this area it needs to be outstanding and of benefit to the current residents of the town. It is unattractive and does nothing to enhance the town. The amount of employment that will issue from this development is short term during the building process but the impact will be long term. Once this area is developed there is no going back. It should be an enhancement that offers accommodation and employment possibilities to current residents.”

Cllr Ryves: Asks the following questions:

- Can I please have detailed information on the monthly parking in Hunstanton in each car park for each month over the last three years so that I can understand fully the significance of the phrase " The majority of usage is between June and September"
- I would also like to know the monthly figures for parking infringements in the town
- I have been looking at the viability report and I am puzzled that no value has been attributed to the value of the car parking assets being surrendered. It does seem to me that these will have a significant market value. If each space generated a profit of £1,000 pa and a discount of 3% is applied, a single car parking space has a value of around £30,000. So how has the surrender of 100 car park spaces with an implied value of £3,000,000 been recognised?
- Is it possible to review the Hunstanton town centre developments over say the last three years and compare the numbers of new dwellings with the number of car parking place's lost, and of course those gained as part of the developments?

Amended conditions:

Condition 5 to be deleted as Environmental Quality are content with remediation report now submitted as part of this proposal.

Conditions 6 to 22 therefore are to be re-numbered Conditions 5 to 21 as a consequence.

New Condition 15.

15 Condition: Construction hours and site deliveries /collections shall not take place outside of the hours of 08.00-18.00 Monday to Friday, 08.00-13.00 on Saturdays and at no times on Sundays and Bank / Public holidays.

Between 08:00 and 08:30 on the permitted days no activities including deliveries requiring the use of noisy plant, machinery or equipment shall take place. This includes the use of vehicles with reversing alarms or other machinery and equipment that utilise alarms.

Assistant Director's comments: The Town Council's views remain the same as initially submitted and the parking issues have been covered within the context of the report. The issues raised by the Third Party have also been addressed within the committee report. Construction hours have been amended in accordance with the agreement of CSNN as above.

With regards to Cllr Ryves comments, comments are as follows:

- The phrase 'the majority of usage is between June-September' is taken from the detailed response of the Business manager – Leisure and Public Space response, set out in the report. It is considered that it clearly reflects the value of the summer months to car park income within Hunstanton, and is not surprising. Whilst the information asked for is not necessary for a decision to be taken on this application, it has been passed to the relevant section.
- Monthly parking infringement data is not relevant to the consideration of the application & it has been passed to the relevant section.
- The value attached to parking spaces is not a material planning consideration in the determination of the application.
- The information requested on developments in Hunstanton is available online for anyone to view. In any case, this will not affect the determination of this application, which needs to be considered on its own merits.

Item No. 8/1(b) Page No. 42

Parish Council: South Wootton Parish Council wished to have the following comments passed to Members as they have no one available to attend the Committee Meeting:

"The Parish Council supports this application however, would like to emphasise that the link to the north-eastern corner of the site should have NO direct vehicular link through to the larger site, as per the amendment to condition 32. This area should be used for a cyclist/pedestrian link ONLY as agreed."

They also queried the removal of hedging / trees and an ecological corridor other than that shown to be retained on the amended plan (on the eastern side of the site).

Cllr Parish: Queried whether the list of Parish Council objections have been addressed, and raised the issue of the link road recalling that committee concluded that no link road was required.

Third Party Representation: Three third party representations have been received. Two raise the same issues as the Parish Council and Cllr Parish in relation to the internal link road between sites; two raise issues relating to the repositioning of the affordable housing and its lack of pepper-potting, and one raises the issues of landscaping and hedge planting raised by the Parish Council as well as concerns relating to overlooking from the properties backing onto existing dwellings fronting Grimston Road.

Assistant Director's comments:

With regard to the Parish Council's comments, as stated in the Officer Report, "*An adopted highway is shown to run towards the boundary at the north eastern corner of the site. It stops short of the boundary, with no direct vehicular link through to the larger site. Parish Council and third party concerns have been made to this layout providing a link road through to the larger Knights Hill site.*"

However, it is confirmed that the highway does not provide a link between the two sites, as this was shown not to be necessary during consideration of applications on both sites."

In relation to the hedging / trees and an ecological corridor, the plans still show existing trees and hedgerows being retained and improved on the southern and western boundaries of the site. The dog walking area is now however proposed along the eastern side of the site and within it, to prevent potential issues associated with crime and disorder.

With regard to Cllr Parish's comments the officer report states that the Parish Council now support the application and that their initial objections have been addressed.

With regard to the Third Party comments, the affordable housing was repositioned following consultation responses. This issue is covered in the officer report.

Overlooking impacts have been covered in the officer report.

Item No. 8/2(a) Page No. 65

Third Party Representation: One third party representation has been made reiterating the comments they submitted to the development. They wish to have their comments reiterated as they're not confident with Zoom.

I have already stated in detail my serious concerns of being overlooked, loss of natural light as a result of being surrounded by two-storey houses, loss of privacy with regard to both Sunnyside and Appledore being bungalows. Still the incorrect height is stated on the plans! Neither bungalows are anywhere near the height of a two storey cottage nor have 1st floor windows. All accommodation is ground floor. Outside space is limited to the back of Sunnyside as it is set back within the plot and it will be overlooked by first floor windows from the proposed development. I fail to understand why bungalow properties could not be considered to be in keeping with these existing properties. The new Chalet opposite down Jubilee Hall Drive is an example of building in sympathy to existing property. My fear is of loss of privacy, being overlooked, being overshadowed, overbearing, loss of light, noise, and therefore loss to my enjoyment, peace and wellbeing.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak and again state my concerns. I understand the desire to develop the land - though it saddens me greatly, and ask for consideration and sincerely hope that these two-storey houses can be replaced with single storey bungalows, please, so they will not impact negatively on the existing property? The plots referred to are 19, 20 and 23. In particular plot 20 with windows overlooking Sunnyside. From the plans plot 19 and 23 seem to be turned in order for the windows not to overlook? I am not an expert on this, but this is my interpretation. However, it is the height of two storey houses surrounding that is a huge worry.

Assistant Director's comments:

These comments are a reiteration of comments made on the application. The officer report covers all the issues raised.

Applicant: Submitted a supporting statement as follows:

It is disappointing to hear that the parish have objected, although I am sure they have their reasons. With that in mind, I thought it might be helpful to write a few words myself....

Jim and I have a great love of Norfolk, me especially as I spent all my childhood holidays there. Once parents we re-discovered Heacham and have been regular visitors ever since; just a 2 hour drive and we are there!

It is so very important for us to have something a little, 'home from home' to stay when we visit. Why? I hear you ask... one very simple reason ...Ceira! Ceira is our 13 year old daughter. She has autism. She absolutely LOVES coming to Heacham. She is unable to cope with airports so Heacham truly is our little escape, our 'happy place'.

Ceira and myself often come to Heacham in the summer, most weekends if we are able! Everything about the place is perfect for her. We can spend hours walking along the beach, playing in the sand, swimming in the sea ... perfect for children with sensory issues. The sea air, away from the hustle and bustle really calms her, me too!

When we saw that 58 South Beach was for sale, 'ecstatic' is an understatement. The location is perfect for Ceira, a wonderful retreat.

The property which is there at the moment is very antiquated. We originally submitted plans to extend the existing dwelling but at the planners request we happily re submitted our plans for a new build to bring the property well above sea level.

We would just like a perfect holiday home, primarily for Ceira and myself (our 2 four legged friends too who incidentally also love Heacham!)

Item No. 9 Page No.139

Correction

The officer report should have referred to the following:

Planning History – 6/8/2019. Certificate of Lawful Use of Development: Use of waste land, as domestic garden land for storage of household items, building materials, installation of septic tank and siting of shed/hut used by Owner of 19-20 North Beach. Land N E of 20 North Beach, Heacham **REFUSED - NOT LAWFUL**