

DEREHAM TOWN COUNCIL

13th January 2026

At a meeting for **Plans** at the Memorial Hall on **Tuesday 13th January 2026 at 7.00pm.**

Present: R O'Callaghan (Chairman), A Greenwood, Z Flint, H King, L King, A Keats, P Duigan and P Morton.

Also Present: Town Clerk T Needham and Deputy Town Clerk J Barron.

1. To receive apologies for absence.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S Green, C Coleman, R Jamieson and A Brooks

2. Declaration of Interest

There were no declaration of interest.

3. [PL/2025/1893/OMAJ](#)

Land between Westfield Road and Shipdham Road, Toftwood

Outline planning application with all matters reserved other than principal means of access (junction onto Westfield Road) for the development of: up to 19 homes; and associated internal roads, footpaths, open space, landscaping and associated services and infrastructure.

No objection in principle provided the following are adequately addressed/ incorporated.

- 1) *The Application does not comply with Policy ENV04 as it is not providing outdoor playing space on the development site or providing an off-site commuted sum.*
- 2) *The walking link to Shipdham Road should be upgraded to a cycle link with suitable transition onto Shipdham Road.*
- 3) *The allocated pedestrian space along side the vehicular access only seems to be 1m wide, this is inadequate and unacceptable. Space set aside for pedestrians should be sufficient for pedestrians, buggies and wheelchairs, 1.8m minimum.*
- 4) *Measures should be put in place to prevent the access road becoming an 'overflow' car park for the proposed care home.*
- 5) *Visitor parking is inadequate, this will lead to vehicles using the access road and parking over the area set aside for pedestrians and limit access for emergency vehicles.*
- 6) *There is concern regarding the cumulative impact from the traffic generated from a*

number of developments in this area especially around school times.

PL/2025/1800/FMAJ

Former Jewson Builders Merchants Westfield Road

Erection of a two storey 66no. bed care home for the elderly with associated access, parking, landscaping and ancillary buildings.

The Council does not accept that the parking provision is sufficient, especially when shifts change or that workers will cycle to work. Westfield Road is already blighted by traffic and on-street parking. There seems to be space available for additional parking, the Council would feel happier with this application if there were additional onsite car parking.

While it is recognised that such facilities are needed, they do impose a disproportionate impact on GP services. There are existing challenges with regards to GP services in Dereham, the Council would like reassurances that primary healthcare provision in Dereham can accommodate these additional pressures.

Concerns were also raised with regards to:

- *Contaminated land and remediation*
- *Noise and smell from the kitchens impacting on local amenity.*
- *The impact of light spill on neighbouring properties.*

Councillor P Duigan arrived

PL/2025/1944/FMIN

Land At Grange Farm, Etling Green

Proposed 4 no. single storey dwellings, associated parking and means of access onto Norwich Road.

The Committee strongly objects to this development, for reasons including:

It is outside the settlement boundary, There would be an unacceptable negative impact on the character and form of the existing settlement and would lead to unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside.

Negatively impact on the viability of the adjacent County Wildlife site.

The site has potential for significant archaeology, which has not been addressed within the application.

The access is over Town Council owned land and no consent has been provided to increase the burden of traffic over this easement.

It is a poor quality design, misleading plans with bedroom 4 labelled but only 3 bedrooms shown.

The Committee delegated authority to the Clerk to develop the themes further and submit additional objections.

Councillor A Keats arrived

PL/2025/1822/FMAJ

Lidl Kingston Road, Dereham

Sub-division of existing Class E building into 4 units of Class E and Sui Generis use. Including alterations to car park to allow for 6 EV charging spaces.

While the Council would not wish to see the building empty, it did have concerns regarding the impact this would have on the vibrancy of the Town Centre where there are a number of empty units.

The Council felt that it could not reach a definite decision as it would be dependant on what would actually be located within the subdivided units and whether these could be located in the Town Centre.

Chairman

Comments Submitted under delegated authority.

PL/2025/1944/FMIN

Land At Grange Farm, Etling Green

Proposed 4 no. single storey dwellings, associated parking and means of access onto Norwich Road.

Dereham Town Council strongly objects to this development, for reasons set out below:

It is outside the settlement boundary, There would be an unacceptable negative impact on the character and form of the existing settlement and would lead to a significant intrusion into the open countryside. While Policy HOU 05 has been used to try and justify the development, the proposal fails in meeting the criteria set out in that Policy for the following reasons:

HOU 05 Policy considerations: Sensitive infilling or Rounding off with access to an existing highway.

Sensitive infilling or Rounding off

The existing form of development is a traditional Norfolk hamlet dating back to medieval times when houses clustered around a small common. The form of the settlement which exists extends around the edge of the Common then follows Shillings Lane. It is generally linear in nature with a single dwelling adjacent to the boundary, be that the boundary with the common or the boundary with Shillings Lane. The proposal is not rounding off an incomplete group of buildings, it is branching off the existing form of development and introducing a 'T' shaped form of development onto the North side. The properties are formed into a block rather than follow the boundary, which predominates in this location.

This is not sensitive infilling or rounding off it is 'T'eeing off the existing form rather than define or complete the boundaries of existing dwellings. It therefore clearly distorts the character and tradition of the existing group of dwelling in an undesirable way. With regards to point 4 of HOU 05, the proposal harms and undermines a visually important gap that contributes to the character and distinctiveness of the rural scene.

Access to existing highway.

The policy states that there should be access to an existing highway, there is further clarification under para 2.28 where a development should complete the local road pattern. The Local Plan is silent on the definition of 'road', however the Highways Act 1980 defines 'road' as being a way over which the public have right of access.

The access to these properties is over a private street rather than a 'road'. It therefore does not meet the requirement of completing the local 'road' pattern.

No application has been made to the owners of the common to permit further intensification of the access route and Norfolk County Council's policy is to resist developments of more than 9 properties of an unadopted private street.

Negatively impact on the viability of the adjacent County Wildlife site.

Etling Green Common is a County Wildlife Site with a population of great crested newts. Great Crested Newts (GCN) have a wide habitat range and need to be able to range over a wide area in order to intermix with other populations in order to prevent inbreeding and maintain genetic diversity within the populations.

Blocking-in populations by 'closing-off' access to the wider countryside prevents populations of GCN intermingling. While a district level licence could be a way around this, it will not benefit the colony of GCN at Etling Green which could become increasingly genetically isolated with the risk of inbreeding and eventual decline.

The site has potential for significant archaeology, which has not been addressed within the application.

It is well recognised that the site is likely to have significant below surface heritage assets and archaeology.

The majority of archaeological finds on this site have been recorded from the eastern part of the proposed development site in the area of the former common boundary. They include a medieval buckle, brooch, coins, keys, and strap fittings, as well as a post-medieval buckle, bell, spur, thimbles, coins and tokens. This is a typically domestic assemblage of artefacts that strongly supports medieval to post-medieval settlement activity within the boundary of the proposed development site. A medieval jetton has also been separately recorded in the western part of the site.

Has the full details of the potential archaeology been properly considered within this application?

Has a full map regression exercise been carried out and the relevant historic maps included in the Assessment report?

Access

The access to the site is over Town Council owned land, no consent has been provided by the Town Council to increase the burden of traffic over this route. The development would lead to more than 9 properties being served by an unadopted private street without maintenance arrangements in place. The route is already poorly maintained with no strategy in place for maintenance and is already used by more than 9 dwellings.

Norfolk County Council's guidance for new developments states that [emphasis added]:

To ensure suitable access to new development can be maintained, direct or suitable access is required onto a publicly maintainable highway. The dwelling threshold mirrors that given in the National Planning Policy Framework for major development housing of "ten or more homes".

Private drives are not considered an appropriate form of development to serve more than nine dwellings.

This policy may be relaxed for minor developments off existing lengths of 'private road' serving existing development, as service provision will already have been made and some agreement reached regarding the maintenance of the right of access for the foreseeable future. However, proof of these points may be required by Norfolk County Council, as Local Highway Authority, at the time the planning application is submitted.

Poor quality design,

Misleading plans with bedroom 4 labelled but only 3 bedrooms shown.

The layout with gardens on the outside of the square is likely to lead to solid fencing being installed at a later date in order to create private garden space, this would urbanise the location and be unacceptable.

The location and layout could lead to further 'infilling' to the west of the development leading to a form and size of development which would be wholly unacceptable.

The proposal should be set out to further protect the character of the area rather than leave a space for further development into the open countryside.