

## Stade Amusement Park

On reading the Officers report for the alterations to the Stade Amusement Park it was said the area of the enclosed amusement park [with permitted developments rights which allow rides and other structures up to 25 metres ] would have a "small"



increase. It was obvious from the plan that the actual size of the increase was over 1/3 as much again. This element of the scheme had not been described on the planning notice as was pointed out to Councillors. There was the opportunity to speak to our petition so Michael Hunter kindly agreed to do this as did Cllr. Dany Louise. Strangely the Foreshore Trust had no comment to make on the application despite having a duty to protect public rights over this land. The on-line petition organised by the Green Party was disallowed as part of the planning process thus disenfranchising over 1000 signatories.

The application was to be heard at the Planning Committee on 12<sup>th</sup> September. At this meeting chair Cllr. Alan Roberts suggested that the item be deferred and the application re-advertised with a plan and description covering this extension to the enclosed area. This was sensibly agreed and so there is still time to see exactly how large this area will become – a new plan is on the website now; please sign the petition at the History House and lodge an objection to this aspect of the scheme as well as to the great reduction and unsafe design of the footpath from East Parade to the beach. The current application reference is **HS/FA/17/01056. The plan is on the planning website and the revised site notice has gone up giving 14 days from 13th September for further comment/objections. If you would like a copy of our petition please let me know email ohscontact@gmail.com. All objections will need to be in by 26th September. Please write to the Foreshore Trust too and come to their AGM on Monday 24th September at Muriel Matters House at 6pm.**

The Town and Country Planning Act legislation on the Rights over an enclosed amusement park are as below:-

Permitted development B. Development on land used as an amusement park consisting of— (a) the erection of booths or stalls or the installation of plant or machinery to be used for or in connection with the entertainment of the public within the amusement park; or (b) the extension, alteration or replacement of any existing booths or stalls, plant or machinery so used.

Development not permitted B.1. Development is not permitted by Class B if— (a) the plant or machinery would— (i) if the land or pier is within 3 kilometres of the perimeter of an aerodrome, exceed a height of 25 metres or the height of the highest existing structure (whichever is the lesser), or (ii) in any other case, exceed a height of 25 metres; (b) in the case of an extension to an existing building or structure, that building or structure would as a result exceed 5 metres above ground level or the height of the roof of the existing building or structure, whichever is the greater; or (c) in any other case, the height of the building or structure erected, extended, altered or replaced would exceed 5 metres above ground level.

Interpretation of Class B B.2. For the purposes of Class B— “amusement park” means an enclosed area of open land, or any part of a seaside pier, which is principally used (other than by way of a temporary use) as a funfair or otherwise for the purposes of providing public entertainment by means of mechanical amusements and sideshows; but, where part only of an enclosed area is commonly so used as a funfair or for such public entertainment, only the part so used is to be regarded as an amusement park; and “booths or stalls” includes buildings or structures similar to booths or stalls

Trawling through the OHPS archive I came across articles from 1971/2 when Mr S Deboo was proposing various developments. Among the objections was one from Lord Holford as follows:

“The proposal is in a Conservation Area and does not in fact, conserve the character of The Stade.

On the contrary it proposes a form of development which is quite out of scale and character with the Old Town; and being in such a very conspicuous position will militate against genuine efforts to preserve that character. During the winter it would soon contribute to an appearance of dilapidation...Utterly wrong and unworthy of the important site which it proposes to occupy.”

OHPS opposed the plans then and on many occasions since, the battle for public rights over this piece of public land, supposedly protected by the Foreshore Trust is not over.