

WYMONDHAM TOWN COUNCIL
 MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
 PLANNING LIGHTING & HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE
 held on 19th March 2019 commencing at 6.00 pm
 in the COUNCIL OFFICES.

Present

Cllrs.	S Nuri
	J Halls
	C Longhurst
	P Broome (Chairman)
	S Sayer

Also Present	19 Member (s) of the Public Cllrs. J Hornby & L Hornby.
--------------	--

PL033/19	<u>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</u> – None.
PL034/19	<u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr. Halls – planning applications 2019/0330 & 2019/0483 lobbied by residents. • Cllr. Nuri – planning application 2019/0330 lobbied by residents.
PL035/19	<u>MINUTES OF MEETING</u> Upon the proposition of Cllr. Sayer and seconded by Cllr. Nuri the minutes of the Planning Lighting & Highways Committee meeting held on 5 th March 2019 were signed by the Chairman as a true record.
PL036/19	<u>PROGRESS UPDATES</u> – None.
PL037/19	<u>ITEMS RAISED BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr. J Hornby - Planning Application 2019/0330 – advised that he had been contacted by local residents and had spoken to the planning Officer at South Norfolk Council and was concerned re the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outside Development Boundary. ○ Effect of traffic movements onto the B1172 – safe and free flow of traffic. ○ Flooding – flow path across access to site over a ditch. Recommended application should be refused. • Various residents – Planning Application 2019/0330 – same objections as above plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Size of development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Neighbouring properties overlooked. ▪ Overpowering local settled community. ▪ Loss of privacy. ▪ Out of character. ▪ Close proximity to existing Travellers site.

PL038/19	<u>PLANNING APPLICATIONS</u> These were presented by Cllr. Broome and are shown separately.
PL039/19	<u>LICENSE APPLICATION</u> No objections were raised to the request by the Co-op shop Limetree Avenue to increase the licencing hours to 11.00pm.

(The meeting closed at 19.12 pm)

DATED.....day of2019

SIGNED.....(Chairman)

DRAFT

WYMONDHAM TOWN COUNCIL
PLANNING APPLICATIONS DISCUSSED AT A
PLANNING LIGHTING & HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE MEETING
held on 19th March 2019 in the Council Offices commencing at 6.00pm

1	2019/0330	Morley Hall Farmhouse London Road Suton	Change of use to allow formation of 8No travellers pitchers each with mobile home, hard standing for touring caravan and stable building.	Refused see attached.
2	2019/0483	Land east School Lane Spooner Row	Erection of 5 Dwellings.	Refused <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside development boundary. • Flood zone. • Narrow access to site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Free and safe flow of traffic.
	2019/0405	Land to the rear of 16 Norwich Common.	Proposed development of 3 new dwellings and detached garages, with suggested highways improvements, re-positioning of existing access drive and amenity space. New detached garage to No 16 Norwich Common.	Refused <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside development boundary. • Encroaches on the strategic gap between Wymondham & Hethersett. • Overdevelopment of site. • Surface water drainage concerns. • Un -neighbourly form of development. • Concerns over safe and free flow of

				traffic.
4	2019/0466	Land south of Back Lane.	Erection of two semi-detached dwellings.	Refused <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overdevelopment of site. • No parking provision. • Inappropriate form of development.
5	2018/2738	Woodland Area South of Silfield Street Silfield. Amended plans.	Change of use of land to educational purposes. Erection of gates and fencing, Yurt, summer house, field shelter, sheds (4), poly tunnels (6), composting toilets (3) and construction of parking areas with hard standing.	No further comment.
	Extensions			
6	2019/0544	39 Silfield Road	Erection of first floor front extension & single storey rear ground floor extension.	Approved
7	2019/0500	87 Silfield Road	Removal of existing garage and replace with a two storey side extension and replace porch canopy and replace west and north elevation from brick work to painted render.	Approved
8	2019/0428	Land at Industrial site West of Stanleys Lane.	Full planning permission for demolition of commercial building and replacement with 4 blocks of flats (total 21 dwelling units), demolition of Unit 13 and part Unit 12 and construction of an industrial unit (B2/B8). Outline planning permission for demolition of existing commercial units and erection of four industrial units (B2/B*) and 1 office unit (B1)	Refused <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over development of site. • Site contamination. • In sufficient parking. • Traffic – free and safe flow of traffic. • Potential noise pollution.
	Other			

9	2019/0431	70 Damgate Street	Erection of new security gates and fencing and drop a section of kerb.	Approved subject to views of Conservation Officer.
10	2019/0432 (LBC)	70 Damgate Street	Remedial works and damp proofing works, erection of new security gates and fencing	Approved subject to views of Conservation Officer.
11	2019/0456	Arch over entrance to Car Park Market Street.	Replace all windows like for like, and a pigeon netting structure.	Approved



Council Offices
14 Middleton Street
Wymondham
Norfolk
NR18 0AD

Town Mayor:
Tony Holden

Town Clerk:
Trevor Gurney
Phone/Fax
01953 603302

Claire Curtis
 Planning Officer
 South Norfolk Council

20th March 2019

Your Reference: 2019/0330

The Town Council's Planning Lighting & Highways Committee has now discussed the above application and wishes to strongly object to the proposed development.

The below has already been submitted by a local resident and it is the Committees opinion that this sets out the views of local residents which the Town Council fully supports and provides reason as to why this application should be refused.

'Objections can be summarised as follows:

1. The proposed development is not in keeping with the character of the locale
2. The size of the proposed development relative to the existing residences would be overbearing to an unacceptable degree
3. The proximity of the proposed development to existing residences would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of privacy and access to amenities
4. The location and design of the development is not consistent with either the Local Plan or guidance on the establishment of travellers' sites in South Norfolk.

The objections presented here make reference to the *South Norfolk Local Plan*, the *South Norfolk Development Management Policies Document (DMPD)*, the *Joint Core Strategy*

(JCS), the *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) and the *South Norfolk Place-Making Guide* (PMG).

Objection 1: the proposed development is not in keeping with the character of the locale

The DMPD refers to the National Planning Policy Framework and its emphasis on ‘the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness’ (1.31). It indicates that the Design and Access Statement (DAS) ‘should demonstrate an understanding of... distinctive local characteristics and should justify the proposed layout and design against an expectation that all new development should make a positive improvement (1.34)’ The DMPD further states that an application for a new development must include a DAS which should address ‘the natural, influenced and built environment and locally distinctive characteristics of places’ (1.34). **Policy DM1.4** states that ‘All development proposals must demonstrate an understanding and evaluation of the important environmental assets including locally distinctive characteristics and justify the design approach’. The policy indicates that reasonable opportunities should be taken ‘to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness’. The thrust of the design principles set out in the DMPD and the PMG is that new developments should ‘respect the vernacular character’ of individual buildings, villages and settlements.

The application for planning makes no reference of any kind to the impact of the proposed major development on the long-established settlement of six houses which are located just 10 metres from the site on the opposite side of the London Road or the properties to the side. The settlement opposite the development consists of six visually distinctive properties which date from 1900-1909 including three former estate houses of Morley Hall (itself a listed building) and former farm buildings converted in a sympathetic character as required by planning regulations. The three houses which directly face the proposed development include features which are clearly described as characteristic of vernacular architecture in the *South Norfolk Space-Making Guide* (brickwork, pantile roofing, chimneys). The SPG specifically advises that new development should respect and reflect in their design such local characteristics.

The proposed major development would unacceptably alter the visual appearance of the area. The buildings are completely out of character with existing residences to which the development would be closely proximate. The proposed development is fundamentally out of keeping with the distinctiveness of the vernacular architecture of existing buildings. As such the proposal is inconsistent with both South Norfolk and national guidelines.

Objection 2: The size of the proposed development relative to the existing residences would be overbearing to an unacceptable degree

The South Norfolk Local Plan concentrates growth on existing towns and Service Villages with only limited development to be permitted elsewhere. The DMPD states that developments elsewhere should be ‘of compatible scale, form, function and character with the surroundings’ (1.26) **Policy DM 3.3** states that a key consideration for planning is that ‘the scale of the site should not dominate the nearest settled community’.

The application proposes a major development which would clearly be unacceptable in scale in the terms of this policy.

The proposed development would completely dominate the settled community in which it would be located (the hamlet of Sutton). The site is vastly greater in size than existing residences opposite and to the side. The proposed site is overbearing in terms of both size and number of proposed residences being overall 'disproportionate to the size and density of the surrounding population' (**DMPD 3.30**)

Objection 3: The proximity of the proposed development to existing residences would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of privacy and access to amenities

Policy DM 3.13 states that 'Development should ensure a reasonable standard of amenity reflecting the character of the local area. In all cases particular regard will be given to avoiding: a) overlooking and loss of private residential amenity space'. Further the policy states that: 'Planning permission will be refused where proposed development would lead to an excessive or unreasonable impact on existing neighbouring occupants and the amenity of the area...'

Approval of the proposal would mean that residents facing the development would no longer be able to enjoy the amenities and quality of life associated with use of property and grounds. As an existing resident whose property directly faces the proposed major development at a distance of only 10 metres – we would, if approval were granted, face an unacceptable degree of overlooking and loss of privacy. Use and enjoyment of amenities for residents – as defined in the DMPD and NPPF and in line with the Human Rights Act Article 1 – would additionally be impacted by noise associated with the large number of residences and vehicles associated with the site, and smell associated with stabling for horses and storage of muck on the site.

A significant part of the proposed development is the construction of eight stables on the site. **DM2.8** states that for changes of land for equestrian use there is a responsibility such that the 'scale, design, material and siting of proposed buildings and equipment is designed to avoid serious adverse impact on the natural and local environment and the appearance of the locality, integrate the proposal with existing features, and respect and enhance the character of the surround landscape/area' and that: 'It is sensitively sited to protect the amenity of the locality; any muck pad/storage is sited not to adversely impact on the natural and local environment or the residential amenities of local residents and other occupiers.'

As the planning application makes no reference to existing residents and includes no plans for managing the impact of overlooking, noise and smell relating to equestrian use it is unacceptable within the terms of South Norfolk planning guidelines.

Objection 4: The location and design of the development is not consistent with either the Local Plan or guidance on the establishment of travellers' sites in South Norfolk.

The proposed site is not included in any designated Development area of the Local Plan. It is proposed to develop a greenfield site although the DMPD sets out a preference that travellers sites be located 'on previously developed land' or 'in countryside away from settlements' (3.25). The site fills neither criteria and is, I believe, completely inconsistent with South Norfolk Council's published guidance.

In addition to the points notes above, the application for planning permission contains a significant number of factual errors, discrepancies and omissions. These include:

- the application is for a change of use, but the proposal as presented seems to be for a major new development of a significant number of residences on a greenfield site;
- the application indicates space for 8 touring caravans, but the site plan shows and refers to 16 such spaces;
- the applications states that the land proposed for development has recently been used for grazing, but it has not been used for grazing for at least ten years;
- an assertion that there is no flood risk when nearby properties have been flooded, most recently in 2018;
- the statement that eight households are to dwell on the site when nine are identified on the application;
- a statement is made that change of use has not begun; this omits the fact that significant work has been undertaken from July 2018 on this greenfield site;
- although this is a required element of a planning application, no acknowledgment is made of the close proximity of the houses directly opposite and beside the proposed development;
- there is no mention of any works vehicles or business usage of this site, although one of the named proposed residents advertises a landscaping business linked to his current house;
- the site is located on and requires access to a busy road; as a resident I see near misses every day. An additional driveway and significant numbers of vehicles increases the risk of accidents, an aspect of the development which the application does not comment on.

In summary, I believe that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of existing nearby residents and on the character and appearance of the area. Its location, design and scale clearly do not comply with the South Norfolk Local Plan’.

In 2008 when the Chepore lane site was being considered the Head of planning at South Norfolk Council, at the time, stated that

'there will be no expansion of that site, and in addition , no future permanent or transit site would be allowed in the vicinity of the permitted site'

In addition attention is drawn to the **DCLG Planning Policy for Traveller sites** dated August 2105 where it states

At Policy E that Traveller sites should not be approved in Green belt , **except in exceptional circumstances** .

At Policy H para 24 a that Local Planning authorities should consider ‘The existing level of local provision and need for sites ‘ and goes onto say at para 25

‘Local planning authorities should **very strictly** limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from settlements and outside the development plan’...and such sites in rural areas should respect the scale of, and should not dominate, the nearest settled community ...

Trevor Gurney
Town Clerk