

Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
– 16 November 2022

Item	Updates	Page No
1 - 2021/2764	Additional condition proposed for inclusion: Details of method of foul water disposal to be submitted for approval.	14
2 – 2022/1083	No Updates	25
3 – 2022/1084	Consultee Comment – Cllr Dearnley and Cllr Hardy Object to the development on the following terms: • Policy DM4.7 of the South Norfolk Development Management policies protects the openness of the strategic gap between Hethersett and Wymondham to ensure these two settlements do not converge in the face of substantial housing growth in these areas and it carries substantial planning weight against an approval. Landscape character area, itself protected under policy DM4.5. • We must ensure that the substantial planning weight of policy DM4.7 is applied in full by all decision makers - whether planning officers under delegated authority or planning committees when called in - when determining planning applications. It is one of the most important planning policies we have carrying the most planning weight, preventing as it does Hethersett merging with Wymondham which would undermine our separate identities which we must guard against at all costs. • Whilst the provision of a dental surgery would be welcome, there is a distinct lack of dentists nationally to occupy such surgeries, and the provision of just 5 homes with a dental surgery in no way offsets the substantial harm housing development would have in the strategic gap and this protected landscape area. Additional information submitted by the applicant. Officer comments included below in <i>italics</i> • Strategic gap analysis – This has considered appeal decision APP/L2630/W/15/3007004. This was	33

	allowed within the strategic Gap. Evidence has also been provided to show lack of visibility of the site within the gap. - Assessment of alternative sites for a dentist surgery -Two alternative sites were shown within the development boundary which had been dismissed as unsuitable. <i>Limited evidence has been provided as to the reason why the sites were discounted. The land is available within the defined development boundary for E class use and would represent a suitable alternative.</i> - Bunwell appeal decision relating to Nutrient Neutrality <i>The appeal decision allows for nutrient neutrality mitigation to be provided through a discharge of condition application as opposed to being required in advance of the determination. It should be noted that a number of other appeal decisions have been received which have concluded that the nutrient neutrality mitigation is needed in advance of a decision being taken. At this stage the reason for refusal is considered to remain appropriate.</i> Officer Comments – Consideration has been given to the updated information. Whilst additional information has been submitted this is not considered to overcome the reasons for refusal as set out within the report.	
4 – 2022/1118	No updates	45
5 – 2022/1417	Lobbying letter has been received and circulated to all members of the committee	50
6 – 2022/1548	<u>Further comments from the applicant</u> Note that they can amend the layout to address issues raised by the Highway Authority. <u>Officer's comments</u> – noted. If these details are provided then the third reason for refusal in the report recommendation can be deleted. <u>Comments from SNC Ecology Officer:</u>	56

	Further information required on Nutrient Neutrality mitigation: The application will need to provide a shadow HRA which demonstrates how the proposal will be nutrient neutral, with what has been submitted is not detailed enough to satisfy this. The proposed Package Treatment Plan is unlikely to be accepted by Natural England due to the need for ongoing dosing and management of the dosing system. It is also not clear whether the reed beds will form part of the mitigation strategy and how this would be secured. Further Issues with the ecological survey: 10 ponds and one drain are present within a 250m radius of the site. No pond surveys were undertaken as access was not obtained. The closest pond is 47m from the site. The desk top study revealed that one pond, P6, had great crested newts in 2014. Suitable terrestrial habitat (rough grassland and hibernacula) exists within the site margins. The report notes <i>'the site may be used by individuals commuting between ponds, if present in these features'</i> and <i>'The rough marginal grassland provides some connectivity but the small area of suitable habitat and regular site disturbance through mowing and grazing would suggest that great crested newts are unlikely to be using the site for foraging'</i>. Please note the activities of 'foraging' and 'commuting' are not distinct from each other i.e. GCN will feed on worms, snails and spiders when foraging or commuting between or too ponds. The loss of 0.39 ha of land (terrestrial habitat) within 100m from any breeding ponds (worst case scenario in the absence of surveys) would be likely to result in an offence under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and/or Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. The application site is also located within an amber zone for great crested newts (<i>amber zones contain suitable habitat and GCN are likely to be present</i>). Additional land would be required to satisfy Highway's recommendation for a footpath between the site and Rode Lane (NCC, 22/09/22).	
--	--	--

	For the reasons above and in the absence of pond surveys I am not satisfied that there are sufficient grounds for discounting impacts on GCN and further information is required. <u>Officer comments</u> – additional reason for refusal proposed in regard to the potential impact on protected species: <i>Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed scheme would not have an adverse impact on protected species and in particular in regard to great crested newts.</i> Further Neighbour Comment: • Notes that the qualification statement suggests the development would not set a precedent. However, Rosecroft adjacent to the site is wide enough for a roadway to be constructed alongside the proposal, providing access to a plot to the rear. • Questioned the validity of 'self-build' as there is a development company involved. • Dwellings are out of character • Concerned regarding access	
--	--	--