

WYMONDHAM TOWN COUNCIL
MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING LIGHTING & HIGHWAYS Committee
held on 20th December 2016 commencing at 6.00 pm
in the Council Offices.

Present:

Cllrs. C Longhurst
P Broome - Chairman
J Halls
S Sayer

Also Present: 3 member (s) of the public

PL155/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Cllr. J Hornby.

PL156/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- Cllr. Halls planning application 2016/0627 – lobbied by residents.

PL157/16 MINUTES OF MEETING Upon the proposition of Cllr. Halls and seconded by Cllr. Sayer the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Lighting & Highways Committee held on 6th December 2016 were signed by the Chairman as a true record.

PL158/16 PROGRESS UPDATES None.

PL159/16 ITEMS RAISED BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

- V Grint & S Grint – planning application 2016/0627 objected
 - Flooding concerns. Information provided by applicant not verified.
 - Proposed ‘Troed’ path not appropriate
 - Additional access points through existing hedge are where Sparrows nest.
- K Dunn Hughes planning application 2016/0627 – objected
 - Flooding concerns. Information provided by applicant not verified.
 - If car park on adjacent recreation ground is enlarged this would need to be doubled in size.
 - Ecological assessment not done properly.
 - Concerns over footpath proposals – will force children onto the road.

PL160/16 PLANNING APPLICATIONS These were presented by Cllr. Broome and are shown separately.

[The meeting closed at 18.35 pm]

DATED this day of2017.

SIGNED (Chairman).

WYMONDHAM TOWN COUNCIL

PLANNING APPLICATIONS to be DISCUSSED at a
PLANNING, LIGHTING & HIGHWAYS MEETING
to be held on 20th DECEMBER 2016 in the **COUNCIL CHAMBER**
COMMENCING AT 6.00pm

1	2016/0627	Land west of school lane Spooner Row	Proposed erection of 7 residential dwellings (amended plans).	Refused Concerns over 1) Flooding. 2) No acceptable footpath plans. 3) Ecology assessment – openings in hedgerow and effect on bird nesting.
2	2016/2828	Sub division og garden at 83 Silfield Road	Outline application for a proposed 4 bedroomed dwelling	Approved
3	2016/2758	51 Norwich Common	Erection of three dwellings within the rear garden space.	Approved
		Extension		
4	2016/2626	B ay view Dykebeck	Single storey extension.	Approved
5	2016/2716	11 Northfield Gardens	Three storey hipped end extension to dwelling.	Approved
6	2016/2720	Ashcroft Eleven Mile Lane Sutton	Replace existing roof and construct 1.5 storey chalet extension to rear and side including replacement double garage.	Approved
7	2016/2863	19 Gaynor Close	Replacement single storey rear extension, new rear dormer window, replacement front porch.	Approved
		Others		
8	2016/2809	Holbrook Business Park London Road Sutton	Removal of condition 1 following planning permission 2013/2125. Condition to be changed from a temporary to a permanent approved use.	Approved
9	2016/2601	1A – 1B Farrier Close	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Alteration to site access and reconfigured car park to provide additional customer car park, cycle parking and new covered trolley store.2) Alteration to the building including new delivery pod and service access to north elevation, removal of existing entrance porch to facilitate new glazed shop front and alterations to the roof.	Approved

10	2016/2773	134 Pople Street	Retention of fence and replacement hedge.	Approved
11	2016/2746	Abbey Hotel 10 Church Street.	Insertion of 2 no roof lights first floor flat roof North. Demolition of wall to North side. New window at Ground level to North elevation. Resizing 2 no windows at first floor North Elevation. Resizing window second floor North Elevation. Remaking opening ground floor east elevation by reducing head and cill in matching brick. Renewing doors on ground floor East elevation.	Approved subject to views of Conservation Officer.
12	Norfol County Council c/3/2016/3023	Walnut Tree Farm Silver Road Besthorpe Attleborough	Extension of existing waste transfer station, provision of processing plant, infrastructure improvements and associated works (part retrospective). Demolition of existing waste recycling building and erection of new waste recycling building: increased waste throughputs: extended hours of operation; off-site highway improvements.	No comment
13	Breckland District Council 3PL/2016/1399/F	Land between Oak House and Cameo Norwich Road	Erection of 5 new dwellings and garages, creation of new access to Norwich Road.	No comment

DRAFT



Council Offices
14 Middleton Street
Wymondham
Norfolk
NR18 0AD

Town Mayor:
Joe Mooney

Town Clerk:
Trevor Gurney
Phone
01953 603302

C Curtis
Senior Planning Officer
Growth & Localism
South Norfolk Council
Cynet Court
Long Stratton
Norwich
NR15 2XE

23rd December 2016

Dear Claire

Planning Application 2016/0627
Location: Land west of School Lane Spooner Row
Proposal: Proposed erection of 7 residential dwellings

Thank you for your letter dated 7th December 2016 in respect of the proposed amendments that has now been discussed by the Town Council's Planning Lighting & Highways Committee.

The Committees view is that these amendments should be refused and has noted that a local resident Mrs K Dunn Hughes has emailed South Norfolk on the 21st December objecting on 3 grounds:

1. Highway safety.
2. Flood risk
3. Ecological report – Biodiversity.

I have appended below a copy of her email and the Committees concerns reflect are a reflection of the points she raises.

In respect of the report prepared for the Development Management Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday 4th January 2017 I would take issue with Section 4.12. Yes we did indeed hold a meeting with yourself, Chris Trett, NCC Highways and representatives of the developers to discuss the pedestrian refuge. Two scenarios were discussed being a 'Trode' footpath on Town Council land and/or enlargement of the existing car park (again on Town Council land) adjacent to the school. It was agreed that the developers would carry out further investigation to establish if either of these options were viable and that a fully costed proposal would be presented to the Town Council for consideration. This has never been received and therefore to state ' At the time of writing the report no response had been received from the Town Council in respect of the alternatives' is misleading as no proposal has been received.

Therefore to put in amended plans is extremely premature and it is my feeling that the Town Council will not agree to a 'Trode path' being constructed on its land and would certainly view the offer of a contribution of £10,000 towards an extended carpark as derisory and unacceptable.

I would be grateful if you would bring this letter and it's attachments in its entirety to the attention of the Development Management Committee on the 4th January 2017 noting the Town Council's strong request that this application is refused.

Yours sincerely

Trevor Gurney
Town Clerk

Highway safety/pedestrian refuge/trod path/car park:

- The road is too narrow to provide a pedestrian refuge. The trod path alternative (which is just a quotation submitted on Wymondham Town council's land) is not a suitable alternative to a pedestrian refuge and has not included access onto it and has created a bizarre situation. For the new residents to reach the trod path, they would need to enter the highway go over a muddy, uneven tractor access, over a ditch, where trees are, in which to enter onto it. (See photo of tractor access below) – this is not suitable for walking or pushchairs/wheelchairs. The previous site plan accommodated a path on the development site to reach the recreation ground, but this has been removed from the revised site layout due to the proposed driveways for plots 1 & 2.
- In the other direction, the access to the trod path at the school end goes nowhere as it reaches a Victorian brick wall at the school with a large timber building beyond – this is also ridiculous. Is it the developer's intention to:
 - A. remove both of these structures and provide access to the school here – there's no mention of funding or permission for this?
 - B. to turn left at the school wall, walk on the grass, make a new entrance in the hedgerow to re-enter the highway and use the school entrance there? This will defeat the purpose of the trod path.
 - C. or, to turn right at the school wall, walk on the grass to the car park and expect children to walk through the busy car park to reach the school entrance from here?
- Any extension to the car park may reduce the cars on the road but it is **NOT a pedestrian refuge** which is a Local Plan and Highways requirement. The car park takes 30 cars (32 if you include the 2 that park in front of the gates with the "no parking sign". There is currently an average of 31 cars that park on the School Lane and station Road during the school run (we have counted them), so the car park would need to double in size in order to accommodate these. No plans have been submitted.
- Who will pay for the maintenance of the trod path and car park? Will the long-term costs be put on the precept payers? At WTC's meeting the council said they will object to both.
- NCC Highways to date have not provided any comments on the latest alternatives. Highways have expressed their concerns on the safety issues of school children using the highway. The proposed houses are all family sized houses and more children on the highway will make the existing situation worse – as a resident I have witnessed how bad the existing situation is.

Flood risk:

- The proposed dwellings are at the low point in School Lane already have a flood risk with surface water flooding. I am concerned that the Water Management Officer has removed the holding objection with the conclusion stating, "Please be aware that this Service has not assessed the accuracy of the calculations or the design standard". The Environment Agency has lots of concerns here (see their report) and during their regular on-site monitoring and flood assessments in School Lane, have said that the ditches were struggling to cope now. The very fact that there is no assessment made on the accuracy of the details provided by the developer is reason enough to reject this planning application on this high flood risk area. Any flood water escaping from the development site will affect properties opposite and properties further down the cul-de-sac from the flood point and block their access. The flood water management on clearing out ditches is not enforceable and therefore this development will make the existing flood risk worse.

Hedgerow/Biodiversity/Birds:

- The first (and rejected) site layout involved just one access resulting in one gap in the hedgerow. The revised site plan now includes 3 entrances/gaps in the hedgerow to allow for two additional driveways for dwellings at Plots 1 & 2. Here at Plots 1 and 2, the hedgerow is the exact location where a large colony of sparrows' roost. Removal of this hedgerow here will devastate this colony bearing in mind that sparrows are a IUCN endangered red listed species. Residents who have lived in School Lane for decades remember them as always being here. Removal of this species-rich hedgerow will impoverish the existing biodiversity.
- The NCC Ecologist report on the site assessment was carried out on the original site plan with only one entrance; the recent email messages report that the hedgerow is not significant and contains no trees. If the proposed trod path

was to be installed on WTC's land, then this will require a fourth gap in the hedgerow adjacent to the dwellings and where there are significant trees. The same could also be said if the car park was to be extended. It would require an extended access in the existing gap or there will need to be a new access and gap in the hedgerow, again there are trees and ditches that would need to be considered. No assessment on impact and mitigation measures have been provided for this.

Local Plan, JCS Policy 15 Document Requirements for Spooner Row:

- There are two Allocated Sites in Spooner Row and the Document wording states that small-scale housing to be “within the range of 10-20 dwellings”. The SPO1 Site at the Chapel Road, has planning permission for 13 dwellings, which meets the requirement for the 10-20 houses allowance specified within the Local Plan's Allocated Sites. It could be argued that the School Lane site (SP02) is surplus to requirements under Policy 15.
- Policy 15 states that the developer of the site is required to ensure that a “Pedestrian refuge” is provided to improve pedestrian access to the school. As School Lane is too narrow to provide this, the trod-path is currently a non-workable option and a car park extension in Station Road is not a “refuge”, this planning application cannot be legally delivered.
- The Document also requires that the developer is to ensure that no surface water drains off the site. The on-site measures provided to the Waste Water Team would need to be enforceable to provide this requirement, which they are not, and the accuracy of the calculations and design standard has not been assessed. In my opinion the developer this has not provided a robust enough assurance to meet the requirements of the Local Plan.