

Updates for South Norfolk Council's DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 22 November 2023

Item	Updates	Page No
1. 2021/2784	No update	14
2. 2018/2787	<p>Additional Consultation Responses:</p> <p><i>Norfolk Wildlife Trust:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Impact on Wildlife Sites (noted commitments in S106)</i> • <i>Bats present on site (support use of lighting condition)</i> • <i>Mitigation – support mitigation measures outlines – needs condition</i> • <i>Biodiversity Net Gain; note that the New Greater Norwich Local Plan also has 10% BNG requirement and it is at an advanced stage. Highlights its importance</i> • <i>GIRAMS and Nutrient Neutrality – development has potential for impact on protected sites and no shadow HRA has yet been provided.</i> • <i>Energy Efficiency and Building Regulations - all new developments should be seeking to achieve net zero</i> <p><i>Lead Local Flood Authority:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Maintain no objection</i> <p><i>Ecologist Comment:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>GIRAMS and Nutrient impacts must be addressed prior to determination and HRA produced</i> • <i>Updated ecological information is fit for purpose</i> • <i>Request that recommendations of the report are secured by condition</i> <p><i>Contracts Officer (waste collection):</i> <i>Amendments have taken previous comments into account.</i></p> <p><i>Case Officer Comment:</i> <i>Ecology/Biodiversity:</i> These two parcels (items 2 and 3 on committee) are parts of a much larger outline application which was supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment, S106 agreement and over 50 planning conditions covering a significant amount of detail. This addresses the wider maps from the site, however;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Nutrient Neutrality and GIRAMS mitigation is pending and the decision will not be issued prior to</i> 	33

	<p>this being gained. HRAs will be produced and consulted on with Natural England.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conditions proposed on this permission pick up the parcel specific items raised for each parcel where they are not already covered. • Current advice is that Biodiversity Net gain does not apply to reserved matters applications with older outline permissions, however this may be updated once more guidance is received. If update before the decision is issued, conditions will be adjusted accordingly. • For energy efficiency, the site is bound by the JCS requirement of 10% renewable energy; which is a condition on the outline. While it is not possible to go further than this, it is noted that as a result of consumer demand and building regulations changes, recent discharge of condition applications for earlier parcels have been significant exceeding this which, while not required by the planning permission, is greatly welcomed. • An additional condition will be added regarding the bird/bat boxes and hedgehog holes as ecology mitigation 	
<p>3. 2018/2788</p>	<p>Additional Consultation Responses:</p> <p><i>Norfolk Wildlife Trust:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Impact on Wildlife Sites (noted commitments in S106)</i> • <i>Bats present on site (support use of lighting condition)</i> • <i>Mitigation – support mitigation measures outlines – needs condition</i> • <i>Biodiversity Net Gain; note that the New Greater Norwich Local Plan also has 10% BNG requirement and it is at an advanced stage. Highlights its importance</i> • <i>GIRAMS and Nutrient Neutrality – development has potential for impact on protected sites and no shadow HRA has yet been provided.</i> • <i>Energy Efficiency and Building Regulations - all new developments should be seeking to achieve net zero</i> <p><i>Lead Local Flood Authority:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Maintain no objection</i> <p><i>Ecologist Comment:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>GIRAMS and Nutrient impacts must be addressed prior to determination and HRA produced</i> • <i>Updated ecological information is fit for purpose</i> 	<p>57</p>

- *Request that recommendations of the report are secured by condition*

Contracts Officer (waste collection):

Some improvements have been made but not dwellings are served by adequate locations. .

Case Officer Comment:

Ecology/Biodiversity:

These two parcels (items 2 and 3 on committee) are parts of a much larger outline application which was supported by an Environmental Impact Assessment, S106 agreement and over 50 planning conditions covering a significant amount of detail. This addresses the wider maps from the site, however;

- Nutrient Neutrality and GIRAMS mitigation is pending and the decision will not be issued prior to this being gained. HRAs will be produced and consulted on with Natural England.
- Conditions proposed on this permission pick up the parcel specific items raised for each parcel where they are not already covered.
- Current advice is that Biodiversity Net gain does not apply to reserved matters applications with older outline permissions, however this may be updated once more guidance is received. If update before the decision is issued, conditions will be adjusted accordingly.
- For energy efficiency, the site is bound by the JCS requirement of 10% renewable energy; which is a condition on the outline. While it is not possible to go further than this, it is noted that as a result of consumer demand and building regulations changes, recent discharge of condition applications for earlier parcels have been significant exceeding this which, while not required by the planning permission, is greatly welcomed.
- An additional condition will be added regarding the bird/bat boxes and hedgehog holes as ecology mitigation

Waste Collection:

This parcel of development is a reserved matters on a development that has been delivered infrastructure first. The spine road is therefore already approved and constructed to base course. Waste collection advice has changed since the outline and infrastructure approvals were granted so changes have been made to get as close to the

	<p>new advice as possible, but it is not quite possible to fully comply without more fundamentally changing the layout. To require this would be unreasonable given the stage construction has reached in this case and the few plots affected.</p>	
<p>4. 2021/2782</p>	<p>Update to report: In respect of paragraph 3.5 and other references in the report to draft policy GNLP0250/0342/0119/0291, it should be noted that this policy was proposed in the earlier versions of the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP), however, in recognition of the advanced stage of the emerging Diss Neighbourhood Plan when the GNLP was submitted for examination, the policy has since been removed from the GNLP to allow the majority of site allocations in Diss to be made through the Diss Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan has now been made and as explained in the report, this forms part of the development plan and as such the Neighbourhood Plan site allocation under Policy DDNP1 must be afforded full weight. In addition, Policy 7.2 of the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan makes it clear that further growth in Diss is a key part of the overall growth strategy for the area.</p> <p>As such policy GNLP0250/0342/0119/0291 of the emerging GNLP is no longer a material consideration in the determination of this planning application and full weight continues to be afforded to the Diss Neighbourhood Plan as reported.</p> <p>Additional responses: 1 additional neighbour objection received, and lobbying material summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over committee procedures and the 5 minutes speaking time to be shared between objectors. • Open day prejudiced and not made aware of alleged consultations. • Planning policy for this area has caused significant disruption to local roads and services. • Infrastructure insufficient, caused by stagnating traffic along A1066 Park Road / Victoria Road to the A140 roundabout, exacerbated by supermarkets and leisure centre. • Poor planning resulting in road users seeking alternative routes, frequently onto Shelfanger Road 	<p>81</p>

and to Burston Road, to bypass Victoria Road.
Others continue north towards Norwich.

- Already an unsupportable amount of traffic in the area of the planned development which gives rise to concerns over safety and pollution.
- Concerns over Burston Road with its narrow country style geometry, bends, uneven surfaces, overgrown verges and blind spots.
- Details provided regarding a road collision and emergency services attending the scene as well as references made to road accidents.
- Despite complaints made to Norfolk Highways, unable to persuade them to implement road safety measures.
- Development will result in an extra circa 300 vehicles which will use infrastructure incapable of supporting them.
- Link road will encourage motorists to use as a 'rat-run' and does not design out risk.
- Concerns over increase in weight and volume of traffic causing disruption to our house and access to our drive.
- Times of day and night when noise pollution becomes an issue.
- Development will likely devalue our house and our quality of life. Any future disruption should be compensated.
- Any loss of life, injuries, excessive noise pollution, air pollution and disturbance should be made accountable.
- If these dwellings receive consent, expect measures to preserve our quality of life and the procurement and installation of at least a 3m high environmental noise fence, capable of creating renewable solar energy at the cost of the council and/or applicant.
- Burston Road to have traffic calming measures to reduce quantity and speed of traffic.

Officer comments:

- Committee procedures are set on the committee front sheet (page 4) confirming that objectors have a maximum of 5 minutes in total to speak.
- A Transport Assessment has been submitted with the planning application which assesses and sets out the proposed access arrangements, including the new link road connecting Heywood Road and Shelfanger Road, which is required as part of the site allocation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed access arrangements, including the wider traffic impacts and volume of traffic associated with the development, have been fully assessed by the Highway Authority, who are satisfied with the arrangements and have raised no objections to the application in terms of highway safety or the free flow of traffic. • The Council's Environmental Quality Team have assessed the proposals and has raised no objections to the planning application in respect to noise or pollution. • Property value is not a material consideration in the determination of this planning application. • The Council is not accountable in relation to accidents etc on the public highway. • All other comments are fully noted and have been considered as part of the assessment of the planning application. 	
5 2022/1773	No update	109
6. 2022/2116	No update	121
7 2023/0752	Item Deferred from Committee to allow officers to reconsult on updated plans	127
8. 2023/1530	Clarification on applicant, this is South Norfolk Council only.	138