

**Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**  
**– 29 JUNE 2022**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Updates</b>	<b>Page No</b>
1-2021/1659	<p>1. Cllr Holden's Committee representation is attached as Appendix A to this Update Sheet.</p> <p>2. Four objections received following publication of the Committee report raising the following issues:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing has changed since Committee deferred the application previously.</li> <li>• Have not seen any information or calculations relating to the pre-development capacity of the site.</li> <li>• Measurements provided on the pre-development situation cannot be accurate.</li> <li>• The drainage lagoon appears small and not fit for purpose. It puts properties downstream at risk from flooding. Suggest a larger lagoon is created.</li> <li>• Volume of ditches is insufficient to contain heavy rainfall from adjacent fields.</li> <li>• LLFA is not independent.</li> <li>• Lagoon is now a ludicrous shape that nature will smooth out over time.</li> <li>• Drainage strategy does not cover the footprint of the new houses, let alone what has been lost.</li> <li>• Work has started at plot 6. The Council should be taking enforcement action on this.</li> </ul>	13
2-2021/1660	See above	13
3-2021/1661	See above	13
4-2021/1662	<p>1. As above on Cllr Holden's representation and neighbour objections received.</p> <p>Officer comment on working taking place at Plot 6:</p>	14

	<p>Consideration has been given as to whether it would be expedient for the Council to take enforcement action on the works that has been taking place at Plot 6. This plot has an extant planning permission (ref. 2019/2534) for a house and garage with the trigger for the drainage strategy being that it must be implemented and completed before that development is first occupied. With that trigger in mind and the ability for the developer to carry out works at the site, it is considered that it would not be expedient for the Council to take enforcement action.</p> <p>2. Comments received from Conservation &amp; Tree Officer following the submission of details relating to the construction of the drainage lagoon:</p> <p><i>I am happy with the additional method statement details.</i></p> <p>Officer comment: Condition 7 can be amended from requiring details of the drainage lagoon to be submitted to the lagoon being constructed in accordance with the details set out in the addendum to Arboricultural Impact Assessment.</p> <p>3. Clarification on condition 3. As listed in the Committee report, it states “<i>Implementation of SWD strategy</i>”. This condition also contains provision for the drainage system to be maintained in accordance with the Surface Water Drainage Maintenance and Management Plan as per paragraph 2.11 of the report.</p>	
5-2021/2495	<p>One additional public representation setting out the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant has already set out that they will use vehicles heavier than the weight limit</li> <li>• Church road varies in width between 4.4m and 5.5m the proposed vehicles are 2.5m wide. The road is inadequate, as is the filter lane from the A140.</li> </ul>	30

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental impacts upon the Church Road needs to be considered</li> <li>• Questions why Brick Kiln Lane cannot be used for both entry and exit.</li> <li>• Recent highways comments are at odds with those previously submitted which set out that Church road was not suitable for HGVs</li> </ul> <p><u>Swainsthorpe Parish Council</u> Further detailed comments received on the application objecting to the proposal on the basis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No information regarding how the power will be taken to Norwich South-Substation.</li> <li>• Insufficient information regarding the access, including road widths, size of vehicles transporting materials, lack of details regarding protection for pedestrians, use of HGVs and vehicles exceeding the weight limit of Church Road. Allowing further details to be submitted via a construction management plan as a condition, does not allow for the Parish Council to comment.</li> </ul> <p><u>Network Rail – Paragraph 4.3</u> Comments should have read: No objection subject to consideration of the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A glint and glare assessment</li> <li>• Effects on biodiversity</li> <li>• No encroachment on the boundary of the railway line</li> <li>• Protection of overhead lines, and no works within 3.5m of an overhead line.</li> </ul> <p>Officer Comments The additional comments raise particular concerns relating to the construction period and the impact upon Church Road. Consideration has been given to the impact of the development on the local highway network at paragraphs 5.19-5.23 of the report. A number of the conditions are proposed to be pre-commencement conditions which includes the Construction Management Plans</p>	
--	---	--

	which will mean that the Council will need to review and approve these before work can commence on site. In addition to highways conditions, a pre0commencement condition is also included relating to the construction period from the Environmental Quality Team. This will require the applicant to set out details ensuring the amenity of residents are protected during the construction phase.	
6-2022/0016	<b>No Updates</b>	48
7-2022/0509	<p>1. Amendment made to condition 1. The condition will provide consent for 42 years in total to allow for one year either side of the 40 year operational period of the solar farm for its construction and decommissioning.</p> <p>2. Comments received from the Highway Authority. Re-submitted on details of the suitability of the access from Barnham Broom Road for HGVs are acceptable. No further conditions recommended.</p> <p>3. Comments received from the Council's Ecology and Biodiversity Officer. The information provided since the original comments satisfy all queries raised. Planning conditions recommended in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the submission of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan,</li> <li>• the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan for Biodiversity</li> <li>• No external lighting.</li> </ul> <p>These conditions are considered to be reasonable, necessary and proportionate and in the event of the application being approved, will be added to the decision notice.</p>	59
8-2021/0740	<b>Deferred</b>	72
9-2021/0741	<b>Deferred</b>	72
10-2021/1149	<b>No updates.</b>	81
11-2021/2637	Lobbying letter sent to all members from the neighbours.	87

	<p>In this letter, it raises concerns regarding what is happening to the wall of the existing extension on the boundary. The case officer has sought clarification from the agent and will update Members accordingly.</p> <p>Cllr Michael Edney comments in full:  Firstly I wish to offer my apologies to the chairman, when I called this decision in, I had no idea it would be at the next meeting. I am disappointed I cannot be with you at the meeting, but I'm on holiday for the first time in two years.</p> <p>As I cannot react to anything put forward at the meeting I will keep my points to material planning considerations, with so many I find it hard to understand how the council could have even considered approving this application in the first place.</p> <p>NPPF Paragraph 130 says: <i>"Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;</i></li> <li><i>b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;</i></li> <li><i>c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);</i></li> <li><i>d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit</i></li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>The proposed extension would not add to the overall quality of the area over the lifetime of the development because its visual impact would be to create an unattractive large dominant box like “add on” to the existing house which: A) does not sympathetically match the architecture of either number 2 or number 1 Freemasons Cottages; B) does not sympathetically match the architecture of River Cottage – the neighbouring dwelling immediately to the west and C) would be visually overpowering in the setting of the street scene when viewed from the pavement alongside the B1527 and the southern section of the Swan Meadows public footpath thereby negatively impacting the quality of the scene as viewed by pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and motorists entering the village of Hempnall from the west - see Visualisation (1.)</p> <p>Overall it represents a negative change to the quality of the area.</p> <p>The exterior of the proposed extension is not visually attractive because it is out of scale by comparison with the existing structure and the use of contemporary windows and a variety of materials and surfaces clashes with the traditional brick and slate construction of the original building with its tall visually appealing sash windows.</p> <p>Visualisation (1) clearly reveals the potential out of scale impact which is especially apparent when viewed from the northwest. Elevation 02 (NORTH WEST ELEVATION) on the drawing identified with the Drawing Code WF999-WF-FC-ZZ-DR-A-0250 (Proposed Elevations) as published on the SNC website on 23/05/22 shows that the current flat roof extension, on the north western side of number 2 Freemasons Cottage occupies just 30% of the total length of the existing building</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>(when viewed from the north west) with the pitch roofed original dwelling occupying the remaining 70%. The proposed extension would double the length of the north western side and hence account for 50% of the total length. Moreover the total length of flat roof on display (existing plus proposed) in that elevation would rise to almost 2/3 of the total length (65%) if this application was permitted with the pitched roof section diminishing to around 35%. These statistics clearly reveal the magnitude of just how much the proposed development is out of scale by comparison with the existing building.</p> <p>With reference to NPPF paragraph 130c) the proposed extension is not sympathetic to local character and history. At the moment the intrinsic character of both number 1 and number 2 Freemasons cottages is retained despite extensions. As a whole this pair of cottages stands out as an attractive recognisably Victorian building in Georgian style, quite a rarity, thereby making a substantial and distinctive contribution to local character. A huge contemporary structure attached to one of the cottages would severely compromise this contribution as this incongruous addition would detract from the integrity of the overall character of the whole building and it is crucially important to take into account, when a planning application is considered for a semidetached property, the potential impact on both of the dwellings that make up the total building.</p> <p>The NORTH EAST ELEVATION (Elevation 01) on the Proposed Elevations drawing WF999-WF-FC-ZZ-DR-A-0250 (as published on the SNC website on 23/05/22) reveals a particularly unattractive aspect of the planned extension which is the manner in which it protrudes outwards to become visible beyond the</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>frontage of the original building. Currently the entire frontage of both number 1 and number 2 Freemasons Cottages is harmonious, consistent and visually attractive with the Suffolk white bricks, tall sash windows and slate roofs contributing much to the street scene and local character. This integrated, consistent wholeness would be destroyed if this protrusion was allowed. There is no way that large vertical (floor to ceiling) aluminium windows can be considered visually compatible with Victorian sash windows when seen in the same view and for this reason alone the extension contradicts the requirements of NPPF paragraph 130 subsections a) b) c) and d.</p> <p>The existing brickwork on the north western walls of the property is red brick but it looks as if these bricks are to be painted. If this is indeed the case this will further compromise local character and the character of Freemasons cottages which essentially derives from the fact that they are constructed with brick walls and slate roofs.</p> <p>Freemasons Cottages together with neighbouring properties and the surrounding rural landscape create a strong and distinctive sense of place and NPPF paragraph 130 (d) requires that <i>“Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit”</i>. Permitting this development would not maintain the existing strong sense of place which results from the current arrangement of spaces, building types, materials and rural landscape and granting permission would therefore contravene NPPF paragraph 130 (d).</p>	
--	--	--



	I hope you are convinced enough by these arguments to refuse the application and as I said to the applicants architect this large ugly box does nothing to enhance the properties or the street scene. It is a carbuncle and has no place amongst these fine houses.	
12- 2022/0654	<b>No updates</b>	94

## **Appendix A – Tony Holden Local Member -Written submission**

I have met with the residents on a number of occasions and know how badly this has affected them, both in terms of the financial and the emotional impact it has had on them. Not only have they had the experience of their homes being flooded, along with all of the problems this inevitably caused, but in addition they feel that they have been poorly treated over the past 18 months.

It is disappointing that this matter still remains unresolved and once again has to come before this committee, I feel strongly that if the correct procedures had been followed by the developer in the first instance, a lot of time could have been saved and an enormous amount of stress and heartache would have been avoided.

I would ask the committee to bare in mind that, this issue is due to a Developer who, although he was well aware Land Drainage Consent was required, and was also aware that it might be refused (as intermated by Shirley Bishop in the early stages of this application) decided to go ahead with the development anyway. So, with apparent disregard for planning conditions, processes, this committee, and definitely with no regard to the impact this would cause to existing residents he simply went ahead with his plans in the hope that the council would effectively turn a blind eye.

Opportunities to stop works and rectify the situation were missed, and today I understand a revised drainage strategy with a minor change is in front of you. On reading the arborists report it is clear that question marks still remain on the likely final capacity of this proposed lagoon.

I am aware that residents have put forward a compromise proposal, which I hope you will consider seriously in order to bring this matter to a conclusion.

As a council we must give more consideration to the conditions set and be prepared to enforce where necessary.

I represent these residents and feel we have let them down, when they needed our help and they deserve better.

Residents should be able to have faith in a planning system, and faith in us to ensure that this is a robust and fair process. On this occasion I suggest that we appear to have fallen short of expectations.

Cllr Tony Holden  
North Wymondham Ward