

# Comments for Planning Application PF/16/0596

## Application Summary

Application Number: PF/16/0596

Address: 1 High Street, Sheringham

Proposal: Demolition of building

Case Officer: Mr G Linder

## Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Lone Pine, Sheringwood, Beeston Regis, Sheringham NR26 8TS

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Dear Sirs,

For disclosure, I am the son of the company director of the applicant.

There appears to be two categories of concern being raised by objectors.

1) That the structure should be retained, irrespective of the prospects for successful renovation.

The heritage statement does address this at length. The structure's age, traditional construction and exposed position have left it very vulnerable to soluble salt ingress and the building fabric has very significant faults. These have been exacerbated by the structure's load-bearing, solid wall construction.

Further, the existing structure suffers from considerable problems that would preclude full application of the site's many attractive features for our anticipated use of the site (a mix of retail, restaurant and residential). It is also unlikely that the structure could ever achieve an acceptable level of environmental performance and it lacks a clear link to the town and its historical and architectural context. Whilst providing a useful stop end for the high street (which it would continue to provide for the remainder of the holiday season due to the need to serve statutory notice), there is nothing distinctly 'Sheringham' about the structure.

Any developer, public or private, would need to have regard for the significant commercial hurdles to renovating the structure in a profitable way. Meanwhile, we invite the committee to consider our position that the prominence of the site should invite a more suitable heritage asset, and the designs presently being formulated and discussed with planners allows for a contemporary,

forward looking structure with a clear and poetic link to the town and its heritage - reinforcing the town's heritage 'brand' for tourism and improving the area for local people and tourists alike.

2) That the demolition application should not be approved without concrete proposals as to the replacement structure, particularly given the preceding period when the building has stood unused.

We do recognise these concerns, and we recognise their validity. We do invite the committee to consider that demolition is the first stage of any redevelopment of the site and this application should be taken as an expression of our eagerness to progress this redevelopment. Further, we will suggest reasons why these concerns should not override the clear interest in allowing the developer to begin work on this first stage of any redevelopment.

The applicant has invested significant sums in contracting with a national firm of surveyors and a significant local architectural firm to provide their services in regard to our redevelopment of the site. We are fully committed to this redevelopment, and hope that this investment speaks as to this commitment.

Allowing the application to demolish the existing structure will allow the site's owner to begin redevelopment work at the site as soon as practicable at the end of the holiday season, serving the statutory notices and fulfilling any additional requirements for works whilst the developer continues to formulate an application for the replacement structure to be submitted to the LPA. With regard to any additional requirements, it is also open to the committee to grant conditional approval of this application, setting such conditions as the LPA sees fit to ensure that the demolition pertaining to this application is not truly standalone, and cannot be begun without some further progress of the application for the replacement structure.

In any event, should the private owner of the site discontinue the process of redevelopment after demolition has been undertaken, the Council will still have their powers of compulsory purchase to be used as a last resort, where the powers are necessary and proportionate to facilitate development. I would respectfully submit that concerns that the site may be left vacant for years after demolition may be assuaged by this legal context.

Thank you for taking the time to read and consider the above.

Yours faithfully

Harry Roper