

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING, TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENT
COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY 25 OCTOBER 2018 AT 7.00 PM
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, NORTH LODGE, CROMER**

Present:-

Chairman – Cllr. T. Adams,
Cllr. T. Bartlett, Cllr. P. Harris, Cllr. R. Leeds, B. Stibbons

Julie Chance PSLCC - Town Clerk
Janet Warner PSLCC AICCM– Deputy Clerk

In attendance: Cllr. M. Hayhurst, Cllr. D. Russell, District Cllr. N. Pearce
14 Members of the public

Cllr. Adams welcomed everyone to the meeting and advised that as County Councillor he has already responded to County Council matters relating to this application.

1. DECLARATIONS AND REQUESTS FOR DISPENSATIONS.

Cllr. Adams declared an interest as County Councillor in relation to their pre-submission contact with the developers. NPS have also undertaken the Archaeological Assessment on behalf of the applicant. NPS are owned by Norfolk County Council.

Cllr Adams has already given a response to the proposal in line with Norfolk County Council's Planning Obligations (<https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/rubbish-recycling-and-planning/planning-applications/planning-obligations>)

This response has covered the following matters:

Education, including access to schools;

Libraries;

Adult Social Care;

Fire & Rescue Service;

Access to Green Infrastructure (Public Rights of Way etc);

Highways;

Transport;

Household Waste:

Historic Environment (Archaeology).

Cllr Adams will therefore be abstaining on any votes related to the above matters.

Cllr Adams is also a trustee of a charity which owns land bordering property owned by one of the landowners relevant to the application.

Cllr. Harris declared an interest as a member of Cromer Town Football Club.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were accepted from Cllr. Bossingham (family commitment) and Cllr. Plewman (ill health).

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Members of the public raised concerns in respect of various issues including those listed below:

- Road safety and access concerns.
- There is only a vague statement about the highways.
- Confusion as the application refers to Cromer's housing allocation but the development is in Roughton.
- There are better sites for the sports ground.
- The sports ground would be better based at Suffield Park or to the west of the town where more young people live.
- There is a need for a new sports ground and more care facilities but Roughton Road is unsuitable for traffic and pedestrians especially for youngsters walking to the sports field.
 - Mr. B. Cabbell Manners explained the need for a new sports ground and care facilities and stressed that if residents would like them positioned on a different area of the site please let the developer know.
 - Cllr. Harris advised that half of the attendees at football matches will come from other towns. There is a need for football facilities for CTFC & CYFC. The football clubs will be responding to the application.
- If there is a need for more care facilities why was Benjamin Court closed?
- There is a need for social care but this should be provided by Norfolk County Council not the private sector.
 - Cllr. Adams advised that over the next 38 years there will be increased need in Cromer for social care for both older and younger people. This is not completely understood at present. This forms part of the County Councillor response. NCC will respond in respect of care home and supported living.

Cllr. Adams advised that more responses from consultees will be submitted. The responses from NCC will be circulated to members and will be published on the planning portal.

4. PLANNING APPLICATION PO/18/1551 – ROUGHTON ROAD

- Noted that the total numbers of dwellings, affordable housing and beds within the residential institutions has not been determined as it was within the original superseded application form.

The Viability Assessment relevant to these provisions, and other elements such as the deliverability and maintenance of the open space has been withheld, therefore it is hard to determine the viability of these proposals. We therefore wish to request sight of this Viability Assessment to enable further understanding of these proposals.

- Noted that the proposed Open Space of various descriptions detailed exceeds the requirements.

Additional Open Space, including allotments, play areas and sports facilities could obviously be of great benefit to Cromer, but as the Viability Assessment has been withheld. it is therefore hard to determine if these are deliverable and sustainable.

It was **AGREED** that Cromer Town Council need to have sight of the Viability Assessment.

Open Space

-Noted that detailed designs of play spaces would come with any full application.

- It is unclear what defined provisions are being provided for running on the East site. Whilst paths are present and obvious in the Masterplan, these might not necessarily meet the needs of existing running groups.

- It would be helpful to know what standard of accessible toilet provisions are expected, given this Town Council's wishes to see accessible changing facilities in Cromer.

It was **AGREED** that the provision for other sports needs to be defined.

It was **AGREED** that the standard of the provision of accessible toilets needs to be defined.

It was **AGREED** that Cromer Town Council should support the principle of the provision of sporting facilities and the replacement of open space in Cromer.

Flood Risk and drainage Strategy

- Noted that the Infiltration Basins proposed will require ongoing maintenance to remain functional, but it is not clear who is going to be carrying out this maintenance, and how these will be sustainable.

- On page 27 of the report, it is shown that a "Strong petroleum smell" was identified within Borehole 1.

As per Page 96 of the Core Strategy under 3.3.71, "The land should not be capable of being determined as being contaminated land under the relevant regulations", and so this should be further explained.

-It is noted that measures are also required to ensure there is no migration of ground gas from a historic landfill nearby.

It was **AGREED** that we need to know how the infiltration basins will be maintained and sustained.

It was **AGREED** that the strong smell of petroleum identified in borehole 1 needs to be explained.

It was **AGREED** that measures are needed to mitigate the migration of ground gas.

*It was **AGREED** to suspend Standing Orders to continue the meeting past 9pm. Messrs. Cabbell Manners and District Cllr. Pearce left the meeting.*

Environmental Statement

- Under “4.8 benefits of the scheme” under section e. It is stated that “*hedgerows and trees are retained and additional linkages are provided*”. It is unclear how much of the species rich hedge on the East Boundary of the West site is to be removed to accommodate the proposed access, vision splay and footways.

Preliminary Ecological Statement

- It is unclear how much of the “*species rich*” hedge is to be removed to accommodate the access, though it is assumed that a large part of this will be removed entirely which could contradict the Core Aim 3 of the Core Strategy. The Preliminary Ecological Assessment states that “*the hedgerows on site could potentially be of importance to bats as flyways/commuting routes and as foraging habitat*”.

Policy SS4 states that proposals must protect the natural environment and minimise the fragmentation of habitats.

EN 9 – Biodiversity and Geology states that proposals should protect and enhance features such as hedgerows.

The Norfolk Biodiversity Action Plan states that “*development proposals should be accompanied by sufficient information to assess the effects of development on protected sites, species, biodiversity or geology, together with any proposed prevention, mitigation and compensation measures*”.

It is further assumed that the access will also be illuminated, so it is not clear how the potential impacts on biodiversity can be mitigated here.

Lighting Impact Assessment

- Noted that on Page 7 of the document, it states that “*Roughton Road has no streetlighting*”. This is incorrect.

It is assumed that streetlighting will be part of any full planning application, including at the proposed accesses. Once again, it would be useful for further information to be made available to determine how this provision will be delivered and maintained.

It was **AGREED** that the loss of the species rich hedge on the eastern boundary of the western site is a material consideration and contradicts the Core Strategy.

It was **AGREED** that the hedge needs to be retained.

Important Approach Routes

– Roughton Road is defined as one of three an Important Approach Routes into Cromer according to the current Local Development Framework South of 248 Roughton Road. This is alongside areas of Overstrand Road and the A148 Holt Road.

It is noted that it states in Policy SS7- Cromer, “*Important Approach Routes are designated to protect and enhance the setting and approaches to the Town*”.

The Landscape Character Assessment states that “*The proximity to Cromer has a strong influence on the Northern Boundary part of the area. Views over the Town are apparent from the A149 which are very distinctive with sea views beyond. The entrance via Roughton Road is equally distinctive – no*

views of the town or sea until one is upon them. There is a small amount of gradual post c19th ribbon development along the roadway”.

We would refer back to our earlier comments on the removal of hedging in connection to Policy EN 4- Design.

It was **AGREED** that Roughton Road is defined as an important approach route to Cromer and is designated to protect and enhance the setting and the approaches to the town.

Infrastructure

It was **AGREED** that assurance is needed that the appropriate infrastructure is in place to support the development including education, retail, transport, libraries, health provision and amenities.

Transportation

It was **AGREED** that there should be sufficient non-car modes of transport to the site including cycle paths, foot paths and dropped kerbs to improve accessibility for disabled people.

Design & Access

-We can be broadly supportive of the proposal for on-site energy sourcing of up to 10% of the predicted energy requirements. However, Policy EN 6 – Sustainable Construction and Energy Efficiency policy states that on-site renewable energy for developments more than 100 homes are expected to provide for 20% of total energy usage.

- We would also like to see details of the total number of residents/visitors likely to benefit from the provision of Charging Points for electric vehicles.

- Noted the response of Norfolk Constabulary and the requirement for gates for public car parking areas to prevent misuse.

It was **AGREED** to seek reassurance that ALL developments on the site meet policy EN6 and reach 20% on-site production.

It was **AGREED** to request details of the total number of people likely to benefit from the provision of charging points for electric vehicles.

Cromer Town Council Policy Consideration:

“10.1 New development will be supported only when in accordance with the Local Development Framework”

It was **AGREED** that Cromer Town Council cannot support the proposals according to existing policy.

Application Form:

- The application form describes the site as being within Cromer.

Whilst the site borders Cromer to the North, Felbrigg to the West and Northepps to the East, the site is within the Parish of Roughton.

Roughton is the subject of distinct planning policies as a Service Village.

Therefore, the SS7-Cromer Core Strategy Policy which has been relied upon

several times by the applicant to justify the application should not be relevant. Policy SS1 - Spatial Strategy For North Norfolk of the Core Strategy states that *“a small amount of new development will be focused on a number of designated Service Villages”*, whereas this can be considered a major development proposal.

Policy SS3 - Housing states that *“allocations in the Service Villages and Coastal Service Villages, on one or more sites, will be for a maximum of 26 dwellings”*, whereas this proposal is for up to 185 dwellings.

Separately, Policy SS2 – Development in the Countryside, states that such a proposal could be acceptable where it provides for facilities such as the proposed sports facilities and other open space, but Roughton is not designated as *“Countryside”* according to Policy SS1 as it is a Service Village. Therefore, Policy SS2 cannot be used to justify the application.

The sites are not allocated for development in the current Local Plan and there is currently a 6.6 year land supply for housing delivery in North Norfolk. Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework States that *“Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted”*.

It was **AGREED** that the proposal is against the above-mentioned policies.

5. PLANNING APPLICATION PF/18/1811- Great Gable, Metton Road

It was **AGREED** under the planning protocol to raise no objections.

6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING Thursday 01 November 2018 at 7.00 pm.

There being no other business the Chairman closed the meeting at 10:00 pm.

.....

Chairman

.....

Date