

## Minutes of the Planning Committee of Costessey Town Council, held in the Costessey Centre at 6.30pm on 10 May 2022

**Present:** Cllrs P O'Connor (Chair), J Amis, L Glover, S Jones, S Sizeland; H Elias (Town Clerk). One member of the public and N Bailey Deputy Clerk observed via zoom

### **To accept apologies for absence**

**P085/22:** Apologies were accepted from Cllr G Blundell (unavailable) and J McCloskey (clashing commitment)

### **To receive declarations of interest** (pecuniary, non-pecuniary & sensitive)

**P086/22:** Cllr Glover declared an 'other' interest and abstained from voting/took no part in discussions ref: Min P088/22 2021/0740 & 201/0741. She is a Church Warden at St Edmund's Church.

### **To approve minutes of the Planning meeting held on 26 April 2022**

**P087/22:** RESOLVED to approve the minutes as a true record with no amendments

### **To make recommendations on planning applications, and receive information on appeals & other planning matters**

#### **P088/22: a) Planning applications for consideration:**

i) i) 2021/0740 & 2021/0741: Mr & Mrs Trivedi New boundary treatment between The Church of St Edmund & Church Farm Barn including retention of existing timber sleeper fence/retaining wall - Church of St Edmund The Street, NR8 5DG - Full & Listed Building

The contents of an objection were read out and supported by the committee.

**Comment:** Cllrs expressed concerns that the integrity of the graveyard and the dignity of those buried there had been compromised, as it appeared that the Developer had removed the existing Grade 1 churchyard curtilage (brick wall), replacing it with old sleepers on the boundary and also with a close board fence, which was unacceptable to the Heritage Officer, and with a hedge - both actually within the curtilage of the churchyard. Old sleepers would contain toxic chemicals, which could leech out and possibly poison the hedge.

The objection from a member of the public was noted, and Cllrs broadly supported its contents. In summary: that the purpose of the Norfolk red brick boundary wall was to retain the consecrated ground of the church yard; that over 57m of Grade 1 listed wall had been removed and replaced with steel RSJ's and sub-standard, potentially toxic, railway sleepers; that over a period of time the timber sleepers would collapse, allowing the grave yard to wash out and spill out soil and including possibly the remains of the deceased onto the significantly lower level of the neighbouring property; that the proposed treatment of the remaining sections would structurally weaken the existing wall as the wind loading on a timber fence could result in the remaining listed wall being pulled over; that planting a live hedge beside the wall would eventually undermine the integrity of the wall, leading it to collapse; that the correct decision would be to repair the existing grade 1 listed wall to its original height 900mm above church graveyard's ground level, with old red brick.

However, this should be the decision of the Heritage Officer, who is better placed to make and enforce any decision

**RECOMMEND REFUSAL on the above grounds**

ii) 2021/1730: **AMENDED** - Mr Jordan Last - Former School and Shop Reserve Site, Britannia Way, Costessey - Erection of 44 new homes (including affordable homes), estate roads/private drives, open space, landscaping and supporting infrastructure on 1.5 hectares of land on the former school and shop reserve site at Hampden View, Costessey.

**Comment:** A query was raised as to whether the percentage of affordable homes was in line with SNC policy. Cllrs would like to see the inclusion of Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points and solar panels where possible, though they thought air source and ground source heat pumps would be too costly to run.

**Cllrs re-iterated their previous comments as they did not think these had necessarily been taken into account:**

- Councillors expressed disappointment that a school and local shops would not be provided (Norfolk CC decided it did not wish to build a school on the site, and no commercial business was interested in the shop site)

- Affordable Housing: It was not considered good practice to locate affordable housing in a group together: such dwellings should be "sprinkled" throughout the site ("pepper potted"), so that it was not obvious which were the social housing dwellings. It was noted that the affordable houses were also distinguishable because they had single parking places away from their houses and they were in a brick weave cul-de-sac, whereas the other dwellings had a different road surface treatment, and parking for two vehicles adjacent to their houses. CTC had thought "pepper potting" affordable housing was preferred by SNC as the Planning Authority. Councillors considered that differentiating between the affordable housing area and the rest of the development could be a potential breach of Equality rights. Councillors also commented that often the percentage of affordable housing was reduced on appeal by the developers on viability grounds, and this should not be acceptable.

- Parking: While tandem parking was better than parking courts to the rear of dwellings, it was noted that tandem parking simply led to one vehicle being parked on the drive and a second (and further vehicles) being parked on the raised footway or shared surfacing on the road, thus causing obstructions to pedestrians, pushchairs, the less abled etc. As most households these days have a minimum of two vehicles this should be taken into consideration. There is also too little parking provision for visitors, which would again lead to parking on pavements, which already happens around the existing developments at Lodge Farm. The provision of parking spaces around the children's play area is not acceptable on health and Health & Safety grounds. PLEASE WOULD PLANNERS LOOK AT THE PARKING PROVISION IN DETAIL AND ADDRESS THESE CONCERNS.

- Play area (LAP): The play area is surrounded by parking spaces on two sides without any visible barrier being shown on the plans. A barrier is essential for the safety of children, especially as the parking area abuts the play area on two sides, to prevent damage to cars, and it is not acceptable due to the fumes. This would create an unhealthy area for children to play in. A fence should be installed which is high enough to prevent balls from leaving the area and children running out into the road to retrieve them. A discussion ensued as to whether the "natural" type of play equipment was suitable, but it was noted that other play areas were not too far away.

- Footway / Pathway: Councillors were not able to determine if the pathway alongside the road was a raised or a shared surface. Shared surfaces are not recommended, cause chaotic parking and are difficult for the less abled and pushchairs etc to negotiate.

- Double yellow lines around the bends are requested as part of a S106 to prevent parking in sight lines on the grounds of road safety.

- Garages: Concerns were expressed that standard width garages and parking spaces were actually too narrow to accommodate modern vehicles - eg at Plots 33 & 34. Again if these are too narrow they will force cars to be parked on the roads

- Traffic: Councillors disagreed with the traffic report which suggested that the development would have little or no effect on traffic and the wider road network. The Longwater area is already very busy with the Longwater Interchange at capacity and the Longwater Lane traffic lights having long queues. 44 dwellings could result in 60 extra vehicles as a minimum and as schools and other facilities are at least 1.4km away, so parents will drive children to school regardless. It was noted that Queen's Hills Primary School and St Augustine's were not mentioned as possible schools for the area. All journeys to school would have to cross the A1074 Dereham Road.

- Bus Shelters & bus stops: Whilst bus services are an operational matter, it has been made known to Council that the operator did not intend to offer a service through Lodge Farm Phase 2, so the developers and the Town Council, (& County Cllr) were trying to arrange for the bus shelters allocated under a S106 for Lodge Farm Phase 2 to be relocated on the Dereham Road to avoid them being installed where they will not be used.

- Sewers: Concerns were expressed that the sewers would link into the existing sewers on Lodge Farm Phase 2, with there being reports of problems with drains backing up and toilets "bubbling".

- High Pressure Gas Main: the line of the pipe was noted, as was the correspondence with Cadent.  
- S106: Councillors requested that a S106 be written to ensure that all green space MUST be offered to the Town Council for ownership first and then, if not wanted by the council, offered to the developer, rather than the areas being automatically passed to a management company.  
- S37: A request for a S37 (road adoption) to be signed before completion of the development was made, so that roads could be adopted speedily by Norfolk CC Highways.

iii) 2022/0634: Mr Santokh Singh - 7 Breckland Road, NR5 0RN - Single storey rear extension  
**Comment: this proposal matches work on the other houses in the neighbourhood. All have very long plots. APPROVE**

iv) 2022/0728: The Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Limited - Unit A1 Alex Moorhouse Way, NR5 0JT - External alterations to Unit A1 - Full - by 17 May 2022  
**Comment: Queries were raised about the fire exits being blocked up and if there were sufficient escape means from the extended mezzanine floor – Otherwise APPROVE**

**P089/22: b) Information & Planning decisions received from South Norfolk & Norfolk County Councils:** (\*Information only). (No decisions needed). See also separate sheet. Noted

**P090/22: c) Appeals:** None

**To consider Highway proposals**

**P091/22:** Cllrs O'Connor and Laidlaw had attended a briefing by representatives from the RNAA regarding a single level Market Garden at the Norfolk Showground. They had made suggestions in regard to road traffic concerns and the type of business proposed. Approx 15 acres of land had been sold for other uses.

**To receive a general update on Planning matters** (No resolutions may be passed)

**P092/22:** None

**P093/22:** The date of the next Planning Meeting was confirmed as Tuesday 24 May 2022 at 6.30pm (in person)

**P094/22:** The meeting closed at 7:01pm

**Chair:**

**Date:**