

Email thread from Emma Fuller dated 25th April

Dear Mr Gillah

Thank you for the e-mail below. I am aware from the attached letter that there are concerns that the application will be determined prior to the expiry of the consultation date. I would like to assure you this is not the case. I requested that you advise, in writing, by the 26th April should you wish to withdraw the scheme, I did not advise that it would be refused on this date. The officer report will take time to prepare and as such this date has been set to allow you sufficient time to consider how you wish to proceed and for me to start work on the report in accordance with the deadline. I am also aware of the request made for the application to be determined by the Planning Committee. This would require the application to be called in however there is a deadline for this which has now expired (21st April). As such, in accordance with the Council's constitution this option is no longer available. As such this application will be determined under delegated powers in accordance with the deadline of the 9th May.

With regards to the outline nature of the application, this does not negate the need for the application to address the fundamental issues relating to ecology, trees and highways as an example. Under an outline application the principle of development is established. It is however not possible to agree to the principle on such a scheme when the impact on such matters cannot be fully considered.

With regards to the other matters raised, application 07/01717/FUL was refused however an appeal was lodged and the inspectors decision is a material consideration. With regards to the attached responses I have forwarded these to the relevant consultees and the other points raised will be discussed within the officers report.

"Please note that I cannot accept any further information in relation to this scheme."

I note your comments outlining the reasons why an outline application has been made however you will appreciate that in the absence of key information the Council cannot permit such a building, particularly within such a sensitive location when the impacts of it are unknown.

I trust the above response addresses a number of the questions raised, other matters relating to the planning merits of the scheme will be discussed within the delegated report.

kind regards

Emma

From: Colin Gillah [mailto:cdg@mursell.co.uk]
Sent: 24 April 2013 15:35
To: Emma Fuller
Cc: Brian W Smith; Nick Bailey; Edward Lines; Alan Law
Subject: <v9_SmartSaved/> Thames Heritage Boat Museum 13/00575/OUT

Dear Emma

Thank you for your email of 17 April. You will have seen the subsequent correspondence between the project team and the local Ward member, regarding the progress of the application.

For completeness, I enclose responses to the points raised in your email of 17 April and also to the recently submitted consultation response from the Access Officer.

Whilst I understand the request for detailed information, I submit that most of this could, and would be covered in a subsequent consideration of reserved matters.

For the avoidance of doubt, this application, by The Child Beale Trust is for an additional facility as part of the overall visitor attraction that is Beale Park. It makes use of the existing facilities of the park, in particular the existing access from the highway and the existing parking. It will be enclosed within the security fencing of the main visitor areas and thus for day-to day access and access by visitors will only be accessible from within the Park.

The projected increase in visitor numbers puts the anticipated totals of visitors to the Park at a figure which is still significantly less than the 200-250,000 visitors received in the 1980s. Currently visitor numbers are in the order of 100-125,000.

You will have seen the considerable local and national support that this proposal has already received and which has been lodged with the Council. However, our clients cannot proceed with the construction of a building until a secured source of funding is obtained. There are strong indications of funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund, but such funding is diverted to schemes which have planning permission, and outline planning would secure this route. Whilst a fully developed scheme and full submission would be desirable, the costs involved in this are potentially quite high and beyond the current resources of a small charity. This Catch-22 would be released by the HLF funding, in turn released by the grant of Outline planning.

In essence, the site is next to and would be part of the Beale Park visitor attraction, it uses the spare capacity of the existing facilities, it is located in a position of artificially created lakes formed by gravel extraction about 30 years ago, it sits amongst trees and is shielded by those trees, all of which have been planted or grown naturally since the gravel extraction and it provides a facility for a use which the Planning Inspector agrees is of national importance.

I am certain the details raised by the consultees can eventually be addressed at the appropriate time to a reasonable satisfaction.

Our clients would like the opportunity to place this application before committee so that the members can make this assessment.

kind regards

Colin Gillah

Note section in large type quoted in appeal