

Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
– 14 December 2022

Item	Updates	Page No
Item 1 : 2020/8033	ITEM DEFERRED	20
Items - 2, 3, 4 and 5: 2021/1034, 2021/1035, 2021/1036 and 2021/1037	Lobbying letter which has been circulated to all members. An additional letter of objection: • Note that these applications will again be returned to committee next week and feel it necessary to again raise the concerns shared by the residents of Keswick around the nature of this development and its likely impact on the safety of Low Road for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. • Consider it necessary to highlight that the world has changed significantly since 2017. • Can understand that any approved planning application made at that time would need to be honoured, it is appropriate that all new applications (or in this case radical changes to the old applications), must be reviewed in the context of how the public live, work and express their leisure time in 2022. • Today South Norfolk residents, whose interests you represent, work from home, they want to be able to walk their children to school in safety and enjoy the South Norfolk countryside on foot or by bicycle. • Despite the conclusions of the recent committee meeting, I would suggest that these “new” applications, as now being considered, no longer accord with the original planning application. • As a resident of Keswick the safety of Low Road is paramount. Whilst I understand that there is a requirement for a “traffic management system” as part of the conditions, it is hard for us to trust in a system which has allowed for such a radical change in the nature of this development to occur iteratively	34, 55, 75, 94

	and “by stealth”, and which has continued to fail to advise what such a traffic management system for Low Road might look like. • However the bigger picture here still must remain; do we need a development of this nature at all? • What does it contribute to the local environment, to society or to the economy? (I would suggest not) • Does it bring employment on the scale previously implied by the developer? • (certainly not) • Does it help conserve natural habitat or support economic prosperity for local firms? (sadly not) • The ongoing changes requested by this developer continue to make this development irrelevant in 2022. • It fails to offer present a raison d’etre and as such I would argue that those councillors reviewing the case need to look up and consider the bigger picture. • This is not an argument about the finer details of whether or not reserved matters have been discharged or whether the changes requested are legal, but rather a more important argument about whether the plans being considered at this time are what South Norfolk wants or needs.	
Item - 6 2022/0276	Natural England have provided comments and have raised no objection subject to the appropriate mitigation measures. Following the comments received from NHS in relation to health care provision as referenced in paragraph 4.8 and 5.42 of the committee report, further discussions have taken place with the applicant and it is agreed that a development management based argument can be made that a health related impact would occur and thereby they will pay the health care contribution as stated in the NHS consultation response and that this will be secured as part of the Section 106 Agreement. Note that the applicant is ESCO Developments and M, A and D Hutton, C/O Brown and Co	114

	It has been noted that the NPPF quotes provided at paragraphs 5.4, 5.14, 5.16 and 5.57 of the committee report are not from the most recent, 2021 iteration of the NPPF. Notwithstanding this, the quotations remain consistent with the general spirit of the current NPPF, and as such their reference does not alter or effect the assessment or change the officers recommendation.	
Item - 7 2022/0067	It has been noted that the NPPF quotes provided at paragraphs 5.3, 5.13, 5.15, and 5.98 of the committee report are not from the most recent, 2021 iteration of the NPPF. Notwithstanding this, the quotations remain consistent with the general spirit of the current NPPF, and as such their reference does not alter or effect the assessment or change the officers recommendation.	138
Item - 8 2022/1435	No Updates	172
Item - 9 2022/1108	Update to report: Paragraphs 5.8 and 5.98 should include reference to the proposed carbon capture and storage facility which will enable capture of carbon dioxide from the process and its liquefaction which will enable it be to be used in industries such as the food and drink industry which is another benefit of the scheme. However, the conclusion in paragraph 5.101 that the adverse impacts identified outweigh the benefits remains the same. Additional comments from Natural England: Advise that the Technical Addendum submitted addresses the issues previously raised as it indicates that use of an annual mass of waste types of 23,950 tonnes per annum results in process contribution values of less than 1% at statutory designated wildlife sites. Officer comments: Noted and therefore we are not proposing any further reasons for refusal relating to impacts on air quality in the recommendation 2 additional representations objecting to the application:	186

	Further comments relating to the unsuitability of the local highway network to accommodate the development.	
Item - 10 2022/0803	Additional Conditions (carried over from previous permission as still unresolved) : 1) external lighting - due to rural area / Amenity 2) Surface Water 3) Foul Water 4) Contamination during construction – site visit this week highlighted this is still relevant as building is unfinished.	226
Item - 11 2022/1532	Response from LLFA requires additional information. Recommendation still stands to allow for resolution of this matter. Additional plan showing tree protection has been submitted– the relevant condition will now be implementation only and will no longer need to require details to be submitted.	234