

# Agenda Item 9

## PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

26<sup>th</sup> MAY 2020

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION TO SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

**1. Y16/1017/FH                      COAST DRIVE CAR PARK, COAST DRIVE, GREATSTONE, KENT**  
(Page 15)

A hybrid application encompassing; 1) Outline application for the erection of 20 residential units within Zone A with matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping reserved for later consideration 2) Full application of Zone B for the re-provision of a public car park, residential parking for the 20 units and landscaping areas.

**Mr Martin Chamberlain, local resident, written representation against application**  
**Cllr Rolfe, ward member, to speak on application**  
**Cllr Paul Thomas, on behalf of New Romney Town Council, video representation**

**2. Y19/0553/FH                      RECREATION GROUND, STATION ROAD, NEW ROMNEY**  
(Page 45)

Erection of a two storey community hall and sports pavilion following the demolition of the Maude Pavilion. Refurbishment of the existing nursery building including a new recreational play area and the erection of 34 dwellings with associated landscaping, parking and access in the south west of the recreation ground

**Tony Hunter, Chairman of New Romney Football Club, written representation**  
**Guy Holloway, applicants agent, representation in support of application**  
**Cllr Paul Thomas, on behalf of New Romney Town Council, video representation**  
**Cllr Rolfe, ward member, to speak on application**

---

**THE SCHEDULE WILL RESUME IN THE FOLLOWING ORDER:**

**3. Y19/1370/FH                      BEACH CHALET 1 – 79 MARINE WALK, FOLKESTONE,**  
(Page 73) **KENT**

Renovation of 35 existing beach chalets, demolition of 44 huts, the improvement of the corresponding infrastructure.

**1. Y16/1017/FH COAST DRIVE CAR PARK, COAST DRIVE,  
GREATSTONE, KENT**

In paragraph 7.37 delete the wording “ exceed 5.3m AODN for living accommodation and 5.6m for sleeping accommodation” and replace with “5.6m for all living accommodation” as per condition 7 recommended by the Environment Agency.

**Additional comments from a resident**

A. The report on the use of the car park was only carried out from the period from 2015/16 to 2017/18. The car park was used a lot more in 2018/19 and I think the figures should be published. As shown in the existing application it does show that an average of 91 cars used the car park daily over the period during late August/Early September 2017, I think that this will also be the case during a lot longer of the 2018/2019 period, but without the figures this cannot be confirmed, so this needs to be confirmed prior to any decisions being taken. Also, in advance of this years summer with cancellation of flights and cruises due to the Corona Virus, more people should be expected to use UK holiday areas and coasts so the car parking requirements should be assessed for additional visitors holidaying in the UK this year. Further to the 39 car parking spaces allocated to the development, I anticipate the development will require a lot more spaces than this even though the figures have probably been done on the advisory planning numbers for car parking spaces, as nobody can afford to purchase a property on one wage anymore, so if there are people buying the properties in joint names then they will almost definately have more than one car. If the 10 visitor spaces are actually just visitor permits then the visitors will have to park in the proposed 49 public spaces, this then allows visitors only 39 spaces, and as stated in the figures in the summer months an average of 91 cars were parking. Where are these additional cars now going to park? Where has new car parking spaces been allowed so visitors can access the beach and seafront area. In fact, I believe double yellow lines are going to be added to more of Coast Drive, so there will be even more need of additional car parking spaces to the Coast Drive area.

B. It is the duty of Folkestone and Hythe District Council to protect and enhance the local environment, including wildlife habitats, parks and gardens, urban open spaces, water resources and the coastline. The proposed development contravenes this as it takes away both open space, local environment and parking requirements and access to the coastline for residents and visitors to use and enjoy.

C. I purchased my property nearly 9 years ago, and at the time the area in question was on my searches as a flood plain. I have concerns about the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding properties and open/public land (e.g. The Greens) in terms of drainage. There have also already been 4 major flood warnings for this area this year, so could you please confirm that this area is not on a flood plain and that if there had been properties built in the area already, that they would not have had the flood warning notices, and that they would also be able to purchase house insurance at an affordable rate.

D. Could you please clarify how much affordable/social housing is being allocated, and that the Folkestone and Hythe Council social housing benefit will cover the cost on an average family to be able to afford the rent the social housing, as beach side

accommodation normally incurs a high premium of rent or purchase costs, so I cannot see how this is going to help any local people to either afford to purchase a property or to rent with regards to the social housing.

E. For the last comment, I believe that The Localism Act introduces a Community Right to Bid for Assets of Value to the Community, with the aim to ensure that buildings and amenities can be kept in public use and remain an integral part of community life. The Community Right to Bid allows local groups to nominate buildings and land that they consider is of value to the community to be included on a local authority maintained list. I believe that the community should be given the opportunity to express an interest in purchasing the asset (the car park land), and another window of opportunity to bid to buy the asset, as there are other areas with less impact for housing and development.

**2. Y19/0553/FH RECREATION GROUND, STATION ROAD, NEW ROMNEY**

**1. Consultation response from Lead Local Flood Authority**

We have reviewed the information received and whilst we would always discourage the use of a pumped solution we accept that for this site there is no real alternative. We will expect for a stringent maintenance and monitoring strategy to be submitted as part of the application. However we are unable to recommend approval of the scheme for the following reasons:

We would expect to see the drainage system modelled using FeH data in any appropriate modelling or simulation software. Where FeH data is not available, 26.25mm should be manually input for the M5-60 value, as per the requirements of the latest drainage and planning policy statement (June 2017), the FSR dataset should not be used.

Furthermore we note that the half drain time for the 1:100 year +40% event is above 24 hrs. We would expect for it to be demonstrated what would happen should another 1:100+40% even occur in this period of time, if flooding is shown then we would expect for an exceedance plan to be provided.

It should be noted that the rainfall FSR value used for storage is 19.3mm. Whilst the 26.25mm requirement is only really required for simulation we would advise that should this value be used for the storage estimate it could result in a storage requirement which alleviates the issue above.

Due to the restricted amount of space provided available on site we cannot be certain that the system required in order to facilitate the above requirements would actually fit on site and as such object to the design proposed.

Officers Recommendation: To approve the application subject to a suitable pre-commencement condition to be confirmed agreed by the Chief Planning Officer

**2. Paragraph 7.36 –** The response from ECC Ecology stating that trees are not being felled relates to those identified as being potential bat roosts. There are trees elsewhere which are to be felled which have been identified by the Arboricultural Manager as being low category specimens at the end of their life expectancy, and has no objection to their felling.

This page is intentionally left blank