

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 7 October 2024

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

Item No. 9/1(a)	23/01763/FM	Page No. 8
<p>Clarification: The same appeal decision, dated 25 August 2021, covers both applications 19/00694/RMM and 19/01831/F. There was therefore no reason to append the same appeal decision twice.</p> <p>Correction: It is noted that the recommendation on page 29 is incorrect. The recommendation reads: APPROVE and REFUSE</p> <p>APPROVE subject to the imposition of the following condition(s): ...</p> <p>The recommendation should read, as outlined on page 11 of the report:</p> <p>A) APPROVE subject to the completion of a S106 securing Affordable Housing, Open Space, GIRAMS fee and £500 per clause monitoring fee within 4 months of the resolution to approve.</p> <p>Assistant Director's Comments: The above clarification and correction are noted.</p>		
Item No.9/2(b)	24/00504/F	Page No. 75
<p>Cllr Collingham: Requested that the boundary fence of No.61a, along the west side of Petals car park be clearly marked on the location plan. Furthermore, the reference in the report to "61 and 61a comprising Petals tea room" should be corrected. 61a is the Wells' home and not part of the tea room at all. It would appear that the White House is being airbrushed out of this application.</p> <p>Clarification: It is noted that the location plans submitted with the application do not show the north/south boundary line between No.60 (Petals Tea Rooms) and No.61a. However, any discrepancies with boundary demarcation would be due to the age of the OS mapping which has been used in preparation of the submitted plans. The applicant / agent is not obligated to check off-site measurements and precisely depict any boundaries / buildings outside of the red line. Providing the property and the proposed development are plotted correctly within the red line on the submitted plans, the application is valid and can be properly assessed.</p> <p>It is noted that the description of the neighbouring properties at Nos. 61 and 61a under the 'Form and Character and Impact on Heritage Assets' section of the report on page 82 of the agenda is incorrect. No.60 is Petals Tea Rooms and No.61a is an adjoining residential property, also known as 'The White Cottage'. However, the correct properties have been addressed under the section 'Impact on Neighbour Amenity' on pages 83 and 84 of the agenda and the impact on the residential amenity of No.61a has been fully considered.</p>		

Planning Committee
7 October 2024

Agent: The Parish Council comments quoted on page 80 of the agenda were those received prior to the submission of amended plans. Those previous concerns raised about inappropriate design within a Conservation Area and being out of character with neighbouring properties, visibility to neighbouring properties and from Manor Rd and the sports ground, plus loss of trees generally, related to the original contemporary design, not the current proposal.

Additionally, the Drainage section of the report on page 86 states that NCC Lead Local Flood Authority would likely be responsible for the watercourse running through the site, although it had not been possible to confirm this.

The agent has confirmed that Abbie Chamberlain, Assistant Flood Risk Officer from the LLFA has confirmed the following:

“I can confirm that if the works were going to impact or obstruct the watercourse in any way, you would need to apply for ordinary watercourse consent from us. More information on ordinary watercourse consents can be found here. However, we are not able to comment on the planning permission process as this is outside of our remit.”

The agent continues to state that this therefore does not preclude development, or planning permission being granted because there is a separate consenting process that will be followed, if planning permission is granted and it turns out there is a watercourse – bearing in mind the LLFA advised they were not able to find any information regarding the watercourse on their systems.

The agent agrees to the pre-commencement conditions as set out on pages 88 and 89 of the agenda.

Correction: The Parish Council’s most recent consultation response in relation to the amended plans reads as follows: -

‘At last night’s Full Council meeting on Monday 22nd July, the decision was made:

Comments: Objection - Cramped, over development of the site, concerned about the loss of the walnut tree.

Following on from our previous comments we would suggest that Norfolk County Council is consulted about the water course as they may be able to confirm the information’.

Assistant Director’s Comments: The above clarifications and corrections are noted. Impact upon neighbour amenity, in particular No.61a has been discussed within the officer’s report. The unknown watercourse issue would be pursued under separate legislation outside the scope of Planning Control.

Item No. 9/2(C) 23/02276/F Page No. 91

Correction: It is noted that on Page 93, the Neighbourhood Plan box states No, however this should state **Yes** as the application is located within Hunstanton and has been assessed and determined in accordance with the Hunstanton Neighbourhood Plan.

Assistant Director's Comments: The above clarification and correction are noted.

Item No. 9/2(d) 24/00892/F Page No. 110

Agent: Confirms agreement to the pre-commencement conditions set out on pages 123 and 124 of the agenda.

Assistant Director's Comments: Noted.

Item No. 9/2(e) 24/01188/F and 24/01189/LB Page No. 127

Kings Lynn Civic Society: Letter of SUPPORT, summarised as follows:

- Scheme has the potential to be of regional significance as a cultural venue, but should support and enhance or local grass-roots arts scene.
- Historic link to Shakespeare and others throughout history should not be the main focus. Must create a space that people visit regularly for art content and as a high-quality food and drink venue for various events/meetings/workshops
- Noise, especially from outdoor performances, must be addressed
- Public transport and walking/cycling links will only be excellent with sustained investment in transport
- Concern about length of time the venue will be closed and impact on existing user groups
- Request for existing courtyard planting to be retained

Additional Information Further to discussion with the officer, the Agent has provided a drawing schedule listing previously submitted and considered landscaping plans.

Assistant Director's Comments: Comments from Kings Lynn Civic Society are noted and broadly cover issues which are discussed already within the Officer's report. In so far as closures during construction and the impact on existing users, this is not specifically a planning matter however the conditions have been worded wherever possible to allow a phased approach to development which could allow some disruption to be minimised.

Full landscaping plans have been provided, and amended, during the course of this application and are considered acceptable on amenity and design grounds. It is not considered necessary to specifically request existing plants are retained as part of the proposed scheme. Those plans are covered by Condition 10 of the planning consent.

Amended Condition In order to provide more clarity on which landscaping plans are controlled by condition 10, it is recommended that the wording of recommended Condition 10 of the planning application 24/01188/F is altered as follows.

10 Condition: All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details shown on the JCLA Drawing Issue Sheet, KG214_St George's Guildhall Kings Lynn, received via email 26/09/2024. 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

Planning Committee
7 October 2024

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.

10 Reason: To ensure that the agreed landscaping details are completed to a reasonable standard within a reasonable period, to ensure a suitable external appearance in accordance with the NPPF (2023) and Policies CS08 and DM15 of the Local Plan.

Item No 9/2(f)

24/01316/F

Page No. 187

Third Party: ONE letter of OBJECTION (additional comments) as follows:

- Does the measurement of 210m² include the fenced and gated access walkway?
- Does the measurement of 400m² (curtilage of the plot) include the fenced and gated access walkway?
- The roadway [and any tarmac damage to it] is jointly owned by 10 properties which are all responsible for the upkeep of the road, and
- No plan has been submitted for the foul and rainwater drainage. These services must be routed within the boundaries of No 21 and cannot be taken through the tarmac access area to the rear of the east end of Broadland garages.

Assistant Director's Comments:

The access was not included with these measurements.

The upkeep of the main road named 'The Street' would be retained by the Local Highway Authority and the access to the rear would be a civil matter outside the remit of planning legislation.

With regard to provisions for foul and rainwater drainage, the agent has clarified that there is a drain that runs through the existing extension in the back garden of the application site that the foul sewer requirements would be served by. Surface water would be dealt with by a soakaway.