

DEREHAM TOWN COUNCIL

At a meeting for **Plans** at the Memorial Hall on **Tuesday 11th October 2022** at **7.00pm**.

Present: Councillors H King (Chairman), C Bunting, H Clarke, P Duigan, S Green, H Jones-Seymour, L Monument, and P Morton.

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

1. To receive apologies for absence.

Apologies were received from Councillors A Brooks, K Cogman, A Greenwood and T Monument

2. Declaration of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. 3PL/2022/1050/D

Land off Swanton Road

Consultation – Reserved Matters: Application for Approval of Reserved Matters for residential development of 216 dwellings, landscaping, open space, parking and discharge of Conditions 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 26, 27, 28 & 29 following Outline approval on 3PL/2015/1487/O. For Abel Homes Ltd

Comments from the meeting and report presented at the meeting:

While Dereham Town Council are generally happy with this development they are extremely unhappy and concerned with the proposed treatment of the level crossing. The proposal only provides for a footway on the northside of the level crossing, the Council finds this wholly unacceptable and unsafe. Somebody living on the south side of this development and wanting to walk their children to King's Park will need to cross the road twice. This simply will not happen when people are in a hurry, they will take the quickest route and walk in the carriageway. As a minimum there needs to be a footway on both sides of the road, over the level crossing. What is presented in this application is very different from what was shown to the Planning Committee at the outline stage. When the decision was made to approve this application at outline stage, a plan was presented which showed a pedestrian path on the southern side of the level crossing and a shared use walking and cycling route on the north side, creating a safe cycle route to Cemetery Road. This arrangement would have been compliant with the Breckland Policy TR01 which states that sustainable transport will be achieved through (amongst other things):

*promoting and improving safety, security and healthy lifestyles by encouraging walking and cycling, **creating and improving links to existing routes** and, for new developments, ensuring the provision of facilities such as secure, accessible bicycle parking with changing facilities on site. [emphasis added]*

The Town Council are mindful that this application could be the first of further applications coming forward on the eastern side of the level crossing. If what is proposed is deemed acceptable then it may not be just for 216 properties, it could be

for a much larger number. It is important to get the treatment of the level crossing right for this first application.

Outdoor Playing Space.

The original proposal within the application showed a provision of outdoor playing space in excess of what would be required under ENV04. Quite a few pieces of open space which would not be suitable for play were included in the calculation. The developer was asked to remove these non-play areas from the calculation, which the developer did.

Original proposal



Once these pieces of open space had been removed from the calculation, it showed a deficit of 0.126ha. By way of compensating for this under-provision it was suggested that a 5 aside MUGA be included. This will extend the use of the space and enable the space to be used more intensively throughout the winter. It will also ensure that football is retained behind high fencing, reducing the possibility of balls getting into the road. The Town Council found this proposal acceptable and would need for it to be written into the decision notice.

Proposed modification (indicative layout of MUGA only)



Speed Limit

The Town Council felt that a 20mph speed limit would be more appropriate along the frontage of this development.

3PL/2022/1043/HOU

Drift Farm Mill Lane

Consultation – Householder: Demolition of existing rear extensions and erection of new two storey rear extension.

For Mr Simon Wood

No comments, no objections.

3PL/2022/1065/VAR

Land off Shipdham Road, Westfield Road and Westfield Lane

Consultation – Variation of Conditions: Variation of Conditions 3, 15, 16 & 17 on 3PL/2015/1490/O - Amendments to the wording of Condition 3 (Approved Drawings and Documents); Condition 15 (flood and ecological works to the River Tud); and Condition 16 (Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)); Condition 17 (Ecological Management Plan (EMP)).

For Glavenhill Strategic Land

Councillors object to this application on the basis that it is only relevant if application 3PL/2022/1071/O is approved and Councillors currently strongly object to application 3PL/2022/1071/O.

3PL/2022/1071/O

Land to the east of Westfield Road and to the south of Westfield Lane

Consultation – Outline: Outline planning application for development of a maximum of 89 dwellings and associated infrastructure.

For Glavenhill Strategic Land

Comments from the meeting and report presented at the meeting:

This site was originally subject to an application for a minimum of 291 dwellings. When the Planning Inspector reviewed the Local Plan, he felt that “minimum” should be changed to “approximately”. There was no objection from the developer and the subsequent outline application for this site was for a “maximum” of 291 dwellings. It is generally accepted, in planning terms, that edge of settlement development should be of a lower density than more central developments. This was confirmed in the Local Plan, for this specific site it stated:

“Development proposals should respond to the density of the surrounding area. Lower density development would be more appropriate to the south of the site to reflect the rural edge”

Councillors felt that this additional 89 dwellings, a 30% uplift, would be contrary to the Local Plan as well as the outline planning application. Such an increase in numbers should be part of a completely new outline application for the whole site. The Council felt that this is a cynical attempt by the developer cram more houses onto a site which has been deemed, through the Local Plan, to be suited to 291 properties rather than 380.

Proposed internal road layout.

The Proposed lay out for this addition 89 properties shows a long internal estate road which is wholly shared use i.e. vehicles, cycles and pedestrians all compete for the same space. Such shared use might be acceptable in small cul-de-sacs, where it is used by a small number of properties, but this proposal is a loop with nearly 40% of properties accessing off the Road. Such a road requires clearly defined pedestrian space, otherwise this would be a very uncomfortable location for pedestrians, especially those with physical or visual impairments.

Dropping off point.

The proposed dropping off point appears not to have any pedestrian footway. Further thought needs to be given to this dropping off-point. It is a nice idea but it needs to be given more thought to ensure that it doesn't make the existing situation much worse.

Off-site cycling provision.

For the outline application a Transport Assessment was produced, but it omitted any analysis of opportunities for cycling even though the NPPF clearly states that:

Transport assessment

A comprehensive and systematic process that sets out transport issues relating to a proposed development. It identifies measures required to improve accessibility and safety for all modes of travel, **particularly for alternatives to the car such as walking, cycling** and public transport, and measures that will be needed deal with the anticipated transport impacts of the development. [emphasis added]

At the time the Town Council challenged this omission. In response to this challenge, the applicant agreed to include off-site improvements which would link the development to the nearest point on Cycle Route 13. This was confirmed in a supplementary report authored by Simon Wood (reference date 12/12/18) where he states:

“Issues have also been raised regarding cycle links and the contribution the development should make to the wider cycle network in the southern section of Dereham. The details of the cycle links would come forward as part of the reserved matters application and the agent has acknowledged that the offsite highway works required in connection with the scheme could also include improved connections to the existing National Cycle Network Route 13 which currently runs in proximity to Shipdham Road. There would be scope to incorporate such linkages into the detailed design of the highway works, which is considered to represent a positive benefit along with the 2.2km of cycle routes that would be provided within the site”

Given that at the time the outline application was considered and agreed by the Planning Committee, all parties acknowledged that off-site improvement works were required to link the site to cycle route 13 along Shipdham Road, it is surprising that

such details have still to be considered and agreed. It is also disappointing that the developer is now trying to absolve themselves from their previous commitments of providing off-site improvements to allow a safe cycle connection to the Cycle Route 13.

It is not understood why a cycle link along Yaxham Road to Tesco is being considered in this Transport Assessment. It was the applicant who proposed creating a safe link to CR 13 along Shipdham Road, this was agreed by NCC and the Local Planning Authority, it also concurs with Breckland Policy TR01, which states that:

The Council will work in partnership to promote a safe, efficient and convenient sustainable transport system. This will be achieved through:

e. promoting and improving safety, security and healthy lifestyles by encouraging walking and cycling, **creating and improving links to existing routes** and, for new developments, ensuring the provision of facilities such as secure, accessible bicycle parking with changing facilities on site. [emphasis added]

This Transport Assessment needs to be sent back until it shows off-site improvements to Cycle Route 13 as agreed when the Outline application was agreed by the Planning Committee.

The Transport Assessment for this current application does include some analysis of cycling links, but it is not sufficiently comprehensive to comply with the requirements of the Local Plan. Paragraph 4.11 of the Local Plan clearly states that:

When considering the opportunities to encourage walking and cycling within the district, **it is also necessary to consider the perceptions of safety**. Studies have shown that the perceptions of safety in relation to both walking and cycling can result in people choosing to make journeys by the private car. [emphasis added]

This Transport Assessment has not considered perceptions of safety. While fear of traffic generally is a concern for people who would like to cycle but choose not to, road safety problems – actual and perceived – generally congregate at junctions on the network, as this is where users are most likely to come into conflict with one another. The Department for Transport's Route Selection Tool, presented in its LCWIP guidance, recognises this, and provides an auditing mechanism to understand the cycle friendliness, or otherwise, of highway junctions. The Route Selection Tool assesses how well a potential alignment meets several critical criteria that combine to make an accessible and attractive cycle route. These all relate to actual or perceived safety. Perceived safety is not normally a factor in highway safety considerations, however, it should be noted that perception of safety is such a strong push away from cycling that failure to address is likely to result in disappointing uptake of new cycling infrastructure.

3PL/2022/0879/VAR

Grange Farm, Etling Green

Consultation Amendments – Variation of Conditions: Variation of Condition(s) 2 on 3PL/2017/1281/F - Re-design of timber barn to enhance the design and setting of the building.
AMENDMENT: Amended Plans
For NR20 Developments Ltd

Councillors have studied the redesign from the previous application and cannot see that there has been any significant change.

Councillors reiterate their comments from the previous application;

Councillors Object to this application. Councillors are concerned that the proposed application would make the property too large and too tall. The re-design no longer reflects the historic nature of the original barn to the extent that it no longer looks like a barn and looks more like a Holiday Inn.

Councillors feel that the memory of the original historic structure should be retained within the design.

3PL/2022/1011/HOU

35 Sandy Lane

Consultation – Householder: Single storey detached summer room in rear garden (retrospective).
For Mr Barry Taaffe

No comments, no objections.

Chairman