[redacted]

**From:** [redacted]
**Sent:** 07 January 2024 19:04
**To:** [redacted]
**Cc:** [redacted]
**Subject:** Knoll House Hotel App Ref: P/FUL/2022/06840
**Attachments:** 18012_Knoll House_Committee Report Letter_Jan 24.pdf; KHS-PPC-XX-XX-DR-C-0201 P4 Drainage Strategy-0201.pdf

Hi Ursula,

Thank you for your email about the recent NET comments, and comments on the subsequent BP submitted. The applicant's ecologist is speaking with NET directly with the aim of trying to resolve it before committee, in spite being raised for the first time at the 11th (I would say nearly 12th) hour!

In addition, please find attached a copy of a letter prepared setting out a number of errors in the Officer Report to committee. Some are more substantive than others, but they do warrant an update to members and the Report itself to ensure that the Committee are not being misguided on what is before them. I have copied in Kim and Anna, because I spoke with Kim before Christmas to plead our case to defer the application and also left a message with Anna to the same effect. The letter re-affirms the request to defer the presentation of the application to members. There are a number of resolvable issues which have been raised at a very late stage and the OR recognises that you have not considered any of our submissions since the beginning of December, despite a number of consultee comments being received for the first time since then which go to the heart of reasons identified for refusing planning permission. This is a complicated site, the application has been with the LPA for over a year and a number of the factual errors set out are also relevant to predicating the AA on erroneous inputs – matters which I think reasonably direct that it should be deferred.

Notwithstanding the above, there are a few key issues in the letter, which I draw to your attention:

- The revised Drainage Strategy (attached) was requested by both Natural England and the National Trust. The applicant sought to accommodate these in the interests of good practice and a co-operative approach. The LLFA had previously (as part of the first application) raised no objection in respect of a drainage strategy which discharged surface water to a watercourse west of the site. This would discharge towards Littlesea, but the site does already in an unregulated manner. The proposal, irrespective of the direction of the outfall, would result in betterment in terms of water quality compared to the current situation. This a material issue for both the planning application and AA;
- The commentary regarding the applicant declining to engage on a C1 only scheme is inaccurate. I have previously requested that the LPA consider this;
- The commentary relating to control over dogs in the accommodation on site, refers to difficulty over enforcement (but does concede that centrally managed proposals could implement it), but does this refer to an absolute control (i.e no dogs at all)? This would be relatively straight forward to manage;
- A number of benefits of the scheme pertaining to economic forecasts and trip generation (air quality) reductions do not reflect the current proposal – I think they may have been extracted from the OR relating to the previous scheme. The trip generation and therefore air quality commentary is material to both the planning application and the AA; and
- The OR does not consider highly relevant elements of the emerging LP, including Policy E8. Irrespective of the weight you give, and I do think that the analysis of paragraph 48 of the NPPF directs that an emerging Plan which has been subject to examination, initial findings of the Inspector and two subsequent Main Modifications Consultations should be afforded substantial weight. It has reached a very advanced stage, as directed by the PPG.

In conjunction with the drainage commentary I also attached the update Strategy and FRA (FRA via this link: https://we.tl/t-3jnss3oaeY ) .

Please let me know if you would like to discuss any of the issues raised – I would welcome it in the interests of narrowing the issues and ensuring that the information presented to members reflects what is proposed. I would also be grateful if you can confirm receipt of this email.

Kind regards
Ben

Ben Read MRTPI
Director
Black Box Planning Ltd
[redacted]
[redacted]
W: www.blackboxplanning.co.uk

Follow us on LinkedIn

Bristol Office: 36 King Street, Bristol, BS1 4DZ
Exeter Office: 72 Paris Street, Exeter, EX1 2JY
London Office: United House, North Road, London N7 9DP
Company No: 11444297