

COMMITTEE DATE: | 7<sup>th</sup> September 2023

APPLICATION NO: RR/2023/217/P

Site Address: THE NORMANHURST ESTATE, CATSFIELD

**Proposal:** Outline planning application with all matters reserved apart from principal points of access and layout with Parameter Plans and Detailed Design Guide for the development of up to 211 holiday lodges, associated amenity buildings (including reception, leisure uses, resort retail and restaurant, maintenance and refuse storage buildings), affordable workspace, associated buildings and structures, new and secondary access roads, up to 350 car parking spaces, pedestrian and cycle routes, public open space, along with landscaping and biodiversity enhancements and sustainable urban drainage including the creation of new lakes and ecological ponds and other associated engineering works.

Comments from applicant:

The applicant has pointed out that 'layout' is to be determined at this outline stage and should be included in the description of development. The above wording now references layout. It should be noted that although the description had not been updated, layout is a matter which has been the subject of extensive consideration during the application process and has always been set out on the parameter plans, which form part of the outline submissions.

The applicant has submitted a 'Note on the economic benefits of the proposed holiday village at Normanhurst', (dated July 2023).

This Note clarifies a discussion between the Applicant and the LPA regarding employment creation, the nature of jobs created, and access to staff. The Note does not substantively change the socio-economic assessment as the actual end operator and their business case remains to be concluded at Reserved Matters.

The applicant belatedly served notice, (16<sup>th</sup> August 2023), on owners of land included in the application, namely small strips of the existing access road to the south, which belong to the owners of the Post Office and Old Bake House in Catsfield.

Consultees:

The applicant has submitted a further bat survey. The County Ecologist comments: *Of the 115 trees assessed from ground level and subject to one follow-up climbed inspection, six have significant bat roosting potential (T76 - high potential; T30, T51, T61, T68, T88 and T114 - moderate potential). Best Practice Survey Guidelines require two surveys for moderate and three surveys for high potential trees. As only one survey (climbed inspection) has been undertaken to date, presence/likely absence of bat roosts in these trees has not been confirmed. **The presence or absence of protected species and the extent to which they could be affected by the proposed development, should be established before planning permission is granted; otherwise, all material considerations might not have been considered in making the decision.***

*Our response (08/08 email and 11/08 letter) clearly stated that; 'Where trees with potential to support bat roosts are identified, it is recommended that either further survey is undertaken and/or potential impacts are fully designed-out by moving lodges/lodge clusters etc'. As the potential impacts on bats using these six trees (and particularly T30, T51, T114 in the core lodge area) has not been fully assessed or 'designed out' we are still recommending refusal on the basis of insufficient information.*

Planning Notice:

Some additional 8 objections have been received, mostly reiterating those matters already set out at paragraph 6.37 of the report.

In addition, the owners of part of the southern access have also responded to the Certificate B notification and advised that they do not give their consent for use of their part of the access.

Officer comment:

It should be noted that the NPPF reason quoted at the end of the report is incorrect. It should refer to 'refusal'. The following reason should be substituted:

*In accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 38) and with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, the Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, it has not been possible to resolve them. It has clearly set out the reasons for refusal, thereby allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied as part of a revised scheme.*