

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 16 November 2023

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

9/2(a) 23/00739/F Page 31

The applicant has provided the following representation, that accompanies slides that shall be shown.

- “I have been at Burnham Deepdale for the past sixteen years. The bird-rearing/ re-introduction programmes are a natural extension of the work that I have been doing around landscape recovery. Hopefully, I have shown a degree of commitment and consistency over an extended period.
- Our local staffing needs have grown through this period and now amounts to one full-time member of staff, an apprentice plus a number of local ad-hoc contactors.
- The project has developed, and we have now reached a point where there is a need for staff to be on site 24 hours a day. We have rented properties locally since 2008 (Docking, Burnham Norton etc) for our staff so we feel those temporary accommodation arrangements have been well tested and our need well established.
- I do not feel that it is reasonable to expect such staff to be accommodated in my family home. Neither are we big enough as an operation to consider alternative options for night-time shift work etc.
- The Burnham Deepdale conservation project is not self-sustaining in as much as it has required some personal funding over and above the conservation farming income we generate annually and re-invest in the project. However, I am confident that I have the financial resources to keep the project on track for the next 25 years plus.
- I understand concerns that, down the track, I might want to turn the new dwelling to an alternative use - a holiday let, for example. Therefore, I am happy that you attach restrictions on the planning consent to limit the property's usage;
- a restricted occupancy condition as I understand it

I hope you feel able to support this unique project and help ensure long-term nature conservation objectives are achieved through the approval of this application.”

The agent has provided the following points of clarification:

Sustainability: This is not an entirely new project, commencing with landscape recovery since 2007 (a pre-cursor to other projects in the area such as Ken Hill), together with the small-scale reintroduction of wader birds ongoing alongside, this reintroduction of Ruff is now to be intensified, such that the project now demands a staff presence around the clock for the Ruff reintroduction. Hence the application including accommodation requirement.

With the history thus far, there is no reason to believe the project will not be sustained.

Planning Committee
16 November 2023

Trials are already ongoing for introduction of other species such as Black-tailed Godwit, so the on need is not going to decrease - it is long-term.

Proposed accommodation: Accommodation is for one permanent full-time member of staff (warden), together with occasional visiting staff including specialist researchers. Hence the second bedroom.

Highland Cattle: The cattle are linked to the conservation project, providing habitat management. Highland chosen to deliver our conservation objectives in terms of sward for breeding waders etc They are also a commercial element of the farm, beef being sold via local butchers to local restaurants. All income from the cattle operation is recycled into the conservation project.

The cattle will benefit from an on site presence, though the current scale of the herd alone may not fully financially support the dwelling.

Existing Dwelling: As above, utilising welfare only accommodation on site would require additional staff to operate a shift system, which is not sustainable.

The existing dwelling is not suitable to provide additional self contained permanent accommodation for a warden, in the same way that a farmhouse would not be considered suitable to provide accommodation for the farmer and their essential farm workers.

Sustainable Funding: The conservation project, like all conservation projects is not self-funding, the applicant is committed to continual funding of the project as they have for the last 15+ years.

For additional reassurance it is expected that any approval will have an appropriate condition restricting the dwelling to ongoing management and use of the land.

An accompanying representation prepared by the applicant's accountant expresses the view that:

"In the thirteen years from 2011 to 2023, the average annual gross income of the farm has been £55,000 and the average annual expenses £77,000 before interest payments that are no longer relevant now that the business is debt free. This implies an annual loss of just £22,000 per annum. Over the last 13 years, out of his private funds, Andrew has introduced capital of around £52,000 per annum to the farming business. This has been more than sufficient by a substantial margin, to cover the annual losses.

Furthermore, moving staff from rented accommodation to the new house would reduce the annual outlay by nearly half this cost."

The representation goes on to give the opinion that the applicant's overall financial affairs suggest that he should be capable of absorbing this level of funding into the future.

Assistant Director's comments:

Policy DM6 - Housing needs of rural workers sets out the criteria on which to assess the current and future financial soundness, amongst other criteria. This policy is set out on page 38 of the agenda.

The statements received are based upon opinion, unsupported by prepared accounts and projections, and are not adequate to prove the current and future financial soundness of this proposal. The officer recommendation remains unchanged.

Item No. 9/2(c) 23/01667/F Page 57

Agent: Submitted the following clarifications:

On the consultees list *Highways Authority* it states OBJECTION – but the content is ‘no objection’. The bold title of ‘**OBJECTION**’ requires amendment to ‘**NO OBJECTION**’

On the *Highway Safety* section of *Planning Considerations*, it should be noted that the access is simple being widened to the south. To say it is being ‘repositioned’ is misleading – it is being altered. Aside from the gates being set back further into the site this **access is already approved as per the current planning permission 22/02009/F.**

Assistant Director’s comments:

These clarifications are agreed, and do not alter the recommendation.

Item No. 9/2(d) 23/00580/F Page 72

Holme-next-the-Sea Parish Council have submitted a paper that is included as Appendix A to this report.

Assistant Director’s comment and recommendation:

The paper submitted by the Parish Council as a late representation raises significant planning issues that require in depth review and consideration by officers. For this reason, it is recommended that this application is **DEFERRED** from this planning committee agenda.

Item No. 9/2(f) 23/01194/F and 23/01195/LB Page 101

Corrections:

Typographical errors

1. There is a typographical error on page 106, under Conservation Officer. The second sentence in the second paragraph on page 106 reads ‘The proposed extension would not deliver any discernible public benefits to outweigh the harm, the existing building is already a sizeable swelling.’

This should read:

The proposed extension would not deliver any discernible public benefits to outweigh the harm, the existing building is already a sizeable dwelling.

2. There is an omission on page 103 under recommendation which currently reads: ‘**REFUSE**’

This should read:

REFUSE for the following reason(s):

1 RECOMMENDATION A:

REFUSE application 23/01194/F for the following reason(s): The proposed extension to a listed building, by virtue of its design, mass and appearance, would result in harm to the historic fabric, appearance, and historic plan of the building. As such, this would cause harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. Given the lack of public benefits of the proposal, which would outweigh this harm, it is considered to be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF, and Policies CS06, CS08 and CS12 of the Core Strategy 2011, and DM15 of the SADMPP(2016).

RECOMMENDATION B:

REFUSE application 23/01195/LB for the following reason(s): The proposed extension to a listed building, by virtue of its design, mass and appearance, would result in harm to the historic fabric, appearance, and historic plan of the building. As such, this would cause harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. Given the lack of public benefits of the proposal, which would outweigh this harm, it is considered to be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF, and Policies CS06, CS08 and CS12 of the Core Strategy 2011, and DM5 & DM15 of the SADMPP(2016).

This is already included as the recommendation on page 109.

Assistant Director's comments:

These typographical errors are agreed, and do not alter the recommendations (these are already referred to on page 109 of the report).

Item No. 9/2(g) 23/00605/O Page 110

Assistant Director's comments: Having visited the site and considered the report, significant weight has been attached to the planning permission on the adjacent site which removes the 2Agriculture storage building (in connection with Stoke Ferry Mill) in favour of residential development. The applicant is not in control of the 2Agriculture site and therefore a thorough assessment of the impact of the adjacent storage building and use needs to occur in the event that this building/use remains. It is also apparent that a noise impact assessment has not been submitted with the current application and further advice is required from CSNN. As a result, it is recommended that this application be **DEFERRED** to allow full consideration of the aforementioned issues.