

AREA East

PARISH Great and Little Plumstead (Thorpe End)

1

APPLICATION NO: 20090886 **TG REF:** 628115/310478

LOCATION OF SITE Land at Brook Farm and Laurel Farm, Green Lane, Thorpe St Andrew

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT Development of a sustainable urban expansion comprising 600 dwellings, link road, 14.6ha of employment land for B1, B2 or B8 purposes, local centre (including 1,035m² of A1 retail/community hall), site for railway halt and associated open space (outline)

APPLICANT Lothbury Property Trust Company Ltd, 111 Old Broad Street, London, EC2N 1BR

AGENT LSI Architects LLP, The old Drill Hall, 23A Cattle Market Street, Norwich, NR1 3DY

Date Received: 7 July 2009
13 Week Expiry Date: 6 October 2009

1 THE PROPOSAL

- 1.1 This application has been submitted as outline with all matters reserved. The development is described as being a sustainable urban extension and is easily read as being three key parts.
- 1.2 (In no particular order) the first part is the provision of 600 dwellings with a local centre incorporating 1,035m² of A1 retail and a community hall on the Brook Farm side of the development. Secondly approximately 57,480sqm of B1, B2 or B8 (office, industrial, storage) employment land is proposed on the Laurel Farm part of the site. Thirdly this development is proposing a link road through the whole development connecting Peachman Way at the northernmost part of the existing Broadland Business Park with Plumstead Road East. It is proposed that this would join onto Middle Road and cross the railway line at this existing point. This proposal would also lead to Green Lane being cut off to vehicles and becoming a pedestrian/cycle route. The proposal also identifies land to the immediate north of the existing Green Lane vehicular crossing of the railway line for a rail halt.
- 1.3 In the design and access statement that was submitted as part of the planning application the development has been described as one that will create a sustainable urban extension that integrates employment with additional dwellings and local facilities in a new community. Furthermore the location of the employment uses (industry/warehousing to the south and smaller scale

offices to the north of Green Lane) is proposed to consolidate the B2/B8 type uses in the central zone of the expanded Broadland Business Park with the B1 uses marking the southern and northern edges of the whole Business Park.

1.4 The documents submitted in support of this planning application include:

- Plans
- Design and access statement
- Environmental statement and non-technical summary
- Transport assessment
- Travel plan
- Flood risk assessment
- Draft heads of terms for S106

2 CONSULTATIONS

2.1 Great and Little Plumstead Parish Council:

The development should not be considered in isolation to other proposals including 200 houses at Blue Boar Lane, 1200 houses at Blue Boar Lane, Pinebanks redevelopment, 250 houses at Little Plumstead, the Broadland Gate proposal, park and ride expansions, the eco-community development and the NDR.

Should additional housing/employment be required it makes much more strategic sense to allocate it on the A11 corridor, with high end employment.

Should planning permission be granted then a number of matters should be addressed including restricting the number of dwellings to 400 and that they should be to the south and west of the link road. Furthermore matters relating to school/medical facilities, the business park expansion, the positioning of the rail halt, environmental matters, drainage, S106 money and the NDR are relevant.

2.2 Postwick with Witton Parish Council:

States that until funding has been given for the Postwick Interchange and NDR then planning permission should not be granted for this development. Furthermore they think there should be provision for affordable housing and the design of the planned link road needs further consideration. In particular the reduction in the width of the road at the northern end and clarification is required of the capacity of the need to accommodate the traffic volumes. Whatever happens the link road should be delivered before any development takes place.

2.3 Thorpe St Andrew Town Council:

The proposals do not comply with the current Local Plan and are not part of the Joint Core Strategy.

The proposed road network would adversely impact on existing roads and the highways considerations have not been properly assessed in light of the NDR and proposed revisions to Postwick junction.

The link road would not serve the proposed business park development; heavy goods traffic arising from the business park would unacceptable in a housing area and thus would exacerbate the existing traffic problems at the Postwick interchange and on Yarmouth Road.

There is an existing permission for a link road to be constructed to link the northern part of the business park with Plumstead Road east and this should be constructed to relieve the traffic problems that have arisen from the current level of development at the business park.

The proposals are not in accordance with current policies GS1 and ENV8.

There are insufficient schools to cater for the new development.

The density of the proposed housing is much higher than adjacent housing areas.

No development should be permitted until the NDR route is settled and construction completed.

No HGV's should be allowed access to the B1140, Plumstead Road East.

The timescale of 10 years for commencement of development is unacceptable and could lead to the development taking well in excess of ten years before it was completed.

2.4 Anglian Water:

Suggest that any granting of planning permission would need to include a robust condition in order for a foul drainage strategy to be agreed with Anglian Water.

In respect of surface water they also suggest that a condition is put on any planning approval to cover surface water discharge.

2.5 Council for the Protection of Rural England:

The link road is already in the Broadland Local plan. We support the road in principle but wish the road to be extended northwards to the Salhouse Road.

The extended link road will take traffic pressure of Plumstead Road East and Woodside Road. The gap between the Brook Farm / Green Lane North link road and Sprowston White House Farm development link road will be closed.

We do not see the need for two roundabouts on the link road.

CPRE objects to the Northern Distributor Road (NDR). This road is not needed, is environmentally damaging and poor value for money given the cost is well over £100 million. This link road extended to the Salhouse Road and thence past White House Farm to the Wroxham Road is a cheaper more cost effective solution to local traffic needs. The NDR is too far out and has too many junctions. The NDR junctions are not grade separated and as such likely to compromise highway safety.

CPRE objects to alterations to the Postwick "Hub" A47 interchange. Without the NDR the junction can remain as it is. The changes at the A47 junction are not needed for this plan (or Broadland Gate either).

CPRE objects to this development considering it premature. It is not in the revised Local Plan running from 2006 to 2011 and parallel to the LDF process. CPRE welcomes the fact the Broadland Local Plan is more up to date than other district's Local Plans. The fact the Local Plan is from 2006 confirms that settlement and development limits are up to date, notwithstanding the LDF process and RSS.

The Site Allocation DPD has yet to be completed and consultation is taking place at the time of writing this letter. CPRE understands the Site Allocation DPD will have a further consultation in 2010. This development is premature, therefore.

Until and unless Brook Farm is made a site allocation development cannot take place here. Object: General Strategy, Housing and Employment policies of the Local Plan.

Site is outside the settlement limits for Thorpe St Andrew and neighbouring parishes. Object PPS1 PPS3 and PPS7.

We do not believe the developer has proven the site is needed to meet housing supply needs in the Norwich Policy Area.

Questions of infrastructure, such as water supplies and drains have not been addressed and resolved. Other issues such as schools, noting the situation at Dussindale School, have not been addressed either.

The site is not an allocation and CPRE does not believe the developer has proved under PPS3 the land is suitable for development. The process for determining the Broadland Site Allocation DPD may resolve this.

Proposals must be in accordance with the Local Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. There are no such considerations in our view.

2.6 East of England Development Agency:

At a strategic level the site is located within the broad influence of the Greater Norwich sub region identified in the Regional Economic Strategy and lies immediately to the east of Norwich, one of the regions economic drivers. Part of the site is currently an allocated employment site and the application proposes the implementation of that allocation.

The sub region has ambition to promote and develop itself as a leading UK city and to continue to develop Norwich as a nationally important centre in the financial and business services sector. Norwich is the regions largest labour market and will continue to see growth into the immediate future. In order to manage this challenging growth agenda there must be emphasis on delivering the increased jobs and associated housing in a sustainable and coherent manner.

Part of the site is allocated for employment in the Broadland District Local Plan 2006, and the site is also covered by the Greater Norwich Core Strategy, Consultation August 2008 which identifies the area broadly as a strategic employment location. EEDA made representation to the Greater Norwich Core Strategy and generally supported the approach to levels and locations of employment growth and that this will further be informed by the Employment Growth and Employment Sites and Premises Study which has since been published in final form.

The Employment Growth and Strategic Sites Study identified a shortfall of employment land to meet current demand and long term targets. However the study also advised that the release of new sites needs to be carefully phased in order to avoid undermining existing and city centre sites.

There is however no allocation on this site for residential, retail and associated community uses proposed in the application. EEDA supported the approach in the Joint Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation 2007 in that there should be emphasis on the brown field sites in Norwich and then further major development in other locations.

The application proposes the development of a new urban extension for Norwich.

EEDA acknowledge the development would not wholly accord the policies of the Broadland Local Plan 2006; there is a current allocation for employment use on part of the application site but without allocation for the residential or community parts of the application. There are studies such as the Greater

Norwich Growth Sites and Premises Study which has supported the development of this site for employment development.

It examined the potential of the Norwich economy and included an analysis of supply and demand and the consequent assessment of quantity, quality and location of employment land and premises. The report highlighted a shortage of high quality office accommodation within the city and that the current offer of office premises are unsuitable for modern town centre use, and will detract from investment in the Norwich Sub region.

EEDA have also supported the level of proposed housing growth which needs to accompany the employment growth for the sub region. However this will require major development on sites not yet identified or allocated and that this has not yet been sequentially assessed through the local planning systems.

Therefore whilst EEDA can support the development of the employment land, the consideration of the residential element of the application needs considerable investigation in order for the Local Planning Authority to be assured that the application site would be the most appropriately located in terms of sustainability. There should be a clear evidence base that marries the appropriate needs of housing and employment with services and transport infrastructure.

We however emphasize the need to maintain high quality design in the development of this site and ensure the site is sensitive to the edge of city setting the location.

2.7 Environment Agency:

At the time of writing this report discussions with the Environment Agency were still ongoing in relation to water issues. This conclusion of these discussions will be reported to planning committee either through the supplementary schedule or verbally.

2.8 Environmental Health (Noise):

I would recommend that the applicant implements the noise mitigation measure detailed in sections, 11.5.2 and 11.6.1 of the Environmental statement submitted. I also recommend that the developer applies for consent under section 61 of Control of Pollution Act 1974 with a view to implementing the criteria within BS5228, 'Noise control on construction and open sites' and referred to in section 11.2.2 of the Environmental statement.

2.9 Environmental Health (Pollution):

The desk studies for the site appear to have been written 3 years ago. As such they are not completely up to date and it would be worth seeing if they have any new information to include that may have an impact on the proposed

development. It is also noted that the reports have been written based completely on paper based information without a site visit. It is usual practise for a site walk over to be carried out as part of a desk study to allow the producer of the report to get a better understanding of the site conditions with particular regard to the proposed end use.

The desk studies have concluded that in general there is not considered to be a potentially major issue with contamination on the site. However, they do highlight that a site investigation maybe required. It is suggested that a site investigation is required in view of the proposed sensitive end use proposed for the area of residential and recreational open space. In addition an investigation should be carried out in the area of the industrial units and the area of the fill in order to ascertain both the ground conditions and whether there is anything that may impact on the proposed site layout.

It would be appropriate to condition this. Assuming this course of action it is suggested that the DCLG condition is added, together with an informative to state that it is the developer's responsibility to ensure the safe development of the site.

2.10 Environmental Health (Protection):

In relation to the noise impact upon new development, there are a number of proposed houses that will fall within PPG24 noise exposure category C for road noise, where planning permission would not normally be given. Residential facades should not lie within the category C area (within 15.5m of the link road according to the submitted report)

Properties that are proposed within a category B area should have appropriate mitigation, for those affected by rail noise, the gardens should be protected by a close boarded fence with a density of above 10kg/m³. The houses themselves should be protected by sealed double glazing with trickle vents. The orientation of the proposed houses and living rooms should be considered in order to minimise noise impact.

The details of the noise mitigation methods to be used should be submitted in the full planning application.

The air quality impact once the site is developed will be minimal.

2.11 Environmental Health (Recycling):

Request that they are continued to be involved during the reserved matters stage of the planning process.

2.12 Highways Agency:

No objections and have removed the Article 14 holding directive.

2.13 National Grid:

No objections.

2.14 Natural England:

At the time of writing this report discussions with Natural England were still ongoing in relation to water issues. This conclusion of these discussions will be reported to planning committee either through the supplementary schedule or verbally.

2.15 Network Rail:

No objections.

2.16 Norfolk Constabulary:

The scale of this development will place additional pressure on Norfolk Constabulary infrastructure. The current police station building (Sprowston) was built in 1950 and is not now fit for purpose.

The cost to the Police equates by formula to circa £240 per dwelling. Norfolk Constabulary objects to this planning application without financial support towards police (community) infrastructure to support replacing or extending Sprowston Police Station.

2.17 Norfolk County Council (Highways):

No objections subject to relevantly worded conditions.

2.18 Norfolk County Council (Planning Obligations):

Suggested a number of community infrastructure requirements that should be contributed towards including schools, libraries, public transport and fire hydrants.

2.19 Norfolk County Council (Public Rights of Way):

The planning document refers to the creation of new routes (footpaths, footways, cycleways). Whilst the creation of new public access in appropriate locations is welcomed it is recommended that the exact classification of these new routes is determined as this will affect their standard of construction and also who is subsequently responsible for their maintenance.

Subsequently, if there is an intention to create public footpaths, then further consultation would be required. Any proposed footways/cycleways would need to be approved by Highways and informal routes should be considered by those likely to take on their maintenance.

2.20 Norfolk Landscape Archaeology

No objections subject to relevantly worded conditions.

2.21 Norfolk Wildlife Trust:

We have no objection in principle to this proposal in relation to biodiversity and we are pleased to see inclusion of elements of green infrastructure, which are designed to tie in with the Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure Strategy. In particular we support the provision of a green space linking Belmore and Racecourse Plantations with Triangle Wood and the wider countryside beyond.

Section 5 of the ES on Ecology and Nature Conservation states that there will be some adverse impacts on biodiversity including loss of foraging habitat for bats, which currently use the area zoned for housing. As a result, mitigation measures as set out in 5.1.3 should be secured via suitable conditions or planning agreements. Although biodiversity enhancement is not included to any significant degree in this section we are pleased to see that biodiversity enhancement on a landscape scale is addressed in the ES under section 6.3.4 and 6.3.9 on Green Infrastructure.

In our view, both strategic and local measures for biodiversity enhancement and habitat creation (as suggested in the ES and Design and Access Statement) should be secured via suitable conditions or planning agreements. This should include arrangements for long term management of the green space within the development.

We do have some concerns however, which fall outside of the scope of on-site biodiversity impacts in relation to impacts on the Broads and North Norfolk Coast European protected sites. These include impacts of water quality and increased visitor numbers. It is likely that these impacts will need to be addressed through an Appropriate Assessment and the advice of Natural England should be sought in relation to this issue.

3 PUBLICITY

3.1 Site Notice: 22 July 2009

Expired: 5 August 2009

3.2 Notice in Local Newspaper: 28 July 2009

Expired: 18 August 2009

3.3 Neighbour Notification: 13 July 2009

Expired: 5 August 2009

4 REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 30 letters of representation have been received regarding this application, predominantly from residents of Thorpe End, Thorpe St Andrew and Great & Little Plumstead, with the following objections:

- The proposal does not take into account sites like Rackheath and other major schemes that are proposed for the area.
- We do not believe it is necessary to extend the timescale for commencement from the standard 3 years to the 10 years requested. At worst case this could mean overall development takes 10+ years, which is totally unacceptable. It would seem that Lothbury are trying to milk the current economic environment at the expense of the local community.
- If these plans go ahead then essentially Dussindale and Thorpe End will be right on top of each other. A small divide between the two would give the sense of at least a slight bit of privacy.
- Norfolk is a farming county, how can we proudly say that, when we want to build on every available piece of land? As more and more land is lost how it will get harder and harder to grow our own food. If we are not careful then we will lose all of the countryside in this area.
- I would prefer to look out of my window at fields rather than more houses. I don't want to go on a walk and see endless houses. The gap between Thorpe End and Dussindale holds an ENV1 and ENV8 designation and there is no indication of any projected housing development contained in these policies. If this land were built on I would be very interested to see the compensation package offered to residents.
- The proposed housing area is not allocated in the Local Plan. It is outside of settlement limit and therefore is contrary to Local Plan Policy GS1.
- The proposal is premature, as the LDF process is not at an advanced enough stage for the Council to be fully able to assess whether this site and proposed scheme is the most appropriate and sustainable option for growth. If this application were to be approved then I believe that it could prejudice the longer term vision and comprehensive approach to growth, and deliver of vital infrastructure.

- The density of the housing is much higher than the adjacent areas, in particular Thorpe End.
- It would appear 600 houses and the effects of such would not be a sustainable energy factor for the region.
- Green Lane North is incredibly narrow and gets a fair amount of traffic now. If the properties were built the road would become a lot busier creating noise pollution, which is never a good thing for residents.
- Plumstead Road East is not big enough to cope with the proposed volume of traffic. Another 600 houses means that there will be at least another 500-600 cars on the road all trying to get to Norwich at similar times during the morning rush hour creating greater congestion than at present.
- If the population of Dussindale is increased and is not balanced out with additional infrastructure, such as schools and doctors, surely the oversubscription of these existing facilities would be worsened.
- The proposed access through Prince Rupert Way by way of a cycle route from *Brook Glade* is a security risk. It would allow an easy escape route for those of 'criminal intent'. There is also a reasonable amount of traffic along Prince Rupert Way that would not be safe for cyclists. A much better access point to Dussindale Drive would be from *Brook Glade*.
- The Dussindale drive/Plumstead Road junction is dangerous enough without siting another roundabout within just a few yards that will be the main exit from the proposed development. In the mornings and evenings this junction can be precarious when turning right towards Thorpe End and such plans would exacerbate the problem. There are tailbacks in the area already at peak times.
- The plan does not show any proposed access from Rainsborough Rise to the new development, hopefully this suggests that any vehicular access will be denied, but will there be cycle paths or pedestrian access?...hopefully not.
- I am hoping that the new development will have a complete stand alone bus route and will not mean extra bus traffic on Dussindale Drive.
- We have a 3 year old that we are hoping will get a place in the Dussindale School in time, but we understand that the school is already at capacity...so how do 600 new families fit into such plans? Similarly so with doctors and dentists.
- This development should not come forward prior to the NDR being approved/built, due to the extra traffic it will bring.

- The rail halt proposed is in the wrong place. It should be serving the business park as allocated in the Broadland Local Plan.
- The (Planning) Inspector's report stated that the green wedge between Thorpe End and Dussindale should remain and the link road should follow and agreed route. Broadland has supported this decision previously and even though the government is calling for more houses there can be no justification for discarding a decision taken a few years back by the Inspector in the interests of the environment and the local residents.
- The community area will be too close and noisy with teenagers loitering, using abusive language and anti-social behaviour.
- Many residential properties in this area are situated at the bottom of a valley, along the edge of an arable field. The area of hedging between ourselves and the development site is often prone to standing water. The development will substantially increase the hard surfaces, which will up the potential for flooding. There are safety problems with the balancing ponds being included in recreation areas.
- The water table could be lowered resulting in no water for the locality.
- The closure of Green Lane would cause us to lose access to properties along this road. A suitable point of access should be provided. Green Lane is a protected route with the Local Plan and the applicants have not provided adequate reasoning for this protected route to be closed.
- The proposed changes to road alignment and the new roundabout at Plumstead Road East do not incorporate the access that is required to land to the north. A fourth access point onto this roundabout should be added.
- The road proposals under the current application will require Road Orders under the Highways Act for roads to be altered and closed those losing their existing access will be statutory objectors to any such proposals, as they currently have the legitimate right for access onto these roads that will be removed under the planning application.
- If alternative arrangements cannot be made before the determination of the planning application then it is assumed that conditions will be imposed requiring the provision of such access arrangements so as to protect existing residents' position.

4.2 Thorpe End Garden Village Residents Association make the following representations:

- The link road roundabout at the start of the link from Plumstead Road should be situated at the top of Dussindale, slightly into the wooded area.

This would facilitate improved traffic flow from Brook Glade, which would not be the case with the proposed design.

- The link road should be constructed prior to any building work or any other developments and should be started within 3 months of planning approval. The surface of the road should be of the highest quality to minimise surface road contact noise and have adequate screening from existing housing. On completion Green Lane North should be blocked off for through transport, with Green Lane South becoming a greenway.
- The number of dwellings should be restricted to 400 maximum. Dwellings should be restricted to two and a half storey. Any building should be to the south and west of the new link road. The dwellings should have adequate parking and garage facilities for two vehicles. Each dwelling should have individual access to the rear of their properties, and have individual refuse bins. We would support the use of solar and heat pump technology but would not support the use of wind power (large turbines) on this sensitive site.
- If a rail link is required then it should be sited within the business park.
- The flood risk assessment leaves many questions unanswered, with evidence of strata data lacking. Why is anyone thinking of discharging surface water into an Anglian Water sewer?
- The business park should not be allowed to expand beyond that already agreed in the local plan.
- The proposal for S106 money should be upfront with specific use for Thorpe St Andrew and Gt and Lt Plumstead Parish.
- The poplar trees should be retained and kept within the green area/habitat and this should be one area. In addition not split by the link road, it should be protected from any future development of any kind. The green lung could then be managed by a local trust with adequate funds made available for its future upkeep.
- Adequate provision should be made for schools and medical facilities. Catchment areas should be identified for these new houses.

4.3 County Councillor Mackie also objects to this application for the following reasons:

I have been made aware that no travel plans have been submitted with this application, especially the residential proposal, and therefore without such plan it is impossible to adequately determine the travel demand that this development would add to the area and what mitigation strategies could be established. However, with 600 properties being proposed, there will naturally

be demand on the already fragile infrastructure. The impact on residents living along Plumstead Road in Thorpe End and Thorpe St Andrew would be intolerable, as would the additional usage of HGVs. It is at best unclear as to the demand from business travel on the area.

I am aware that the employment allocation for Brook Farm is included in the Broadland Local Plan. The housing is not included in the Local Plan. The area indicated will be for housing, to the north and west of the site is allocated as an environmental area, the purpose of which is to maintain a green belt between Dussindale and Plumstead.

This development is being undertaken in isolation to the housing growth plans in the area. A possible example of this is that whilst there is a proposed rail halt in Dussindale, Network Rail wish for a quick route into Norwich from the proposed Eco Town, therefore making the Dussindale rail halt redundant. This is an important area for clarification. I have been made aware that the traffic impact modelling has not been assessed as the base information is incorrect and no validated base models are provided.

Therefore;

HDCR 31 The application is not supported by sufficient highways and transport information to demonstrate that the proposed development will not be prejudicial to the satisfactory functioning of the highway and highway safety.

Contrary to Development Plan policies - Broadland District Council Local Plan (Replacement) 2006 Policy TRA2.

HDCR 32 The application is not supported by a Travel Plan to demonstrate that the proposed development represents a sustainable form of development.

Contrary to Development Plan policies - Broadland District Council Local Plan (Replacement) 2006 Policy TRA 3.

The proposals are overambitious in scale and scope, I strongly object to 600 properties. Whilst there contributions available for community use I am yet to be convinced that there will be adequate resources available for school provision. I am very concerned that Norfolk County Council will have to find resources available in respond to this development. The County Council's capital priorities are already under great strain and could not respond to this additional demand in my opinion. Dussindale Primary, Little Plumstead Primary, St Williams Way Primary, Hillside Primary and Thorpe St Andrew High School are already at full capacity. Some of the schools have one pupil above the 30 per class limit. Any contributions should be provided ahead of any housing being developed and be to the satisfaction of Norfolk County Council education officials.

Any dwellings should the application be approved, should be in keeping with existing properties within Dussindale and be restricted to two storey high. The dwellings should have adequate parking and garage facilities for two vehicles. Each dwelling should have individual access to the rear of their properties, and have individual refuse bins.

I am unconvinced that the impact on the current green belt have been adequately assessed. The impact of 600 properties will built on some prime green belt land, when there are brown field sites available, such as the former Hospital in Thorpe St Andrew.

In conclusion, I believe that this development should be rejected on the following grounds;

- (1) inadequate travel strategy
- (2) not part of the local development plan
- (3) inadequate consideration given to education requirements
- (4) considerable environmental impact on those living in Dussindale and along Plumstead Road
- (5) not joined up with other housing growth areas.

5 RELEVANT POLICY GUIDANCE

5.1 National Policy: Planning Policy Statements (PPS) and Planning Policy Guidance notes set out the Government's national policies on different aspects of land use planning in England.

5.2 PPS1 – Delivering Sustainable Development:

Sets out the overarching planning policies on the delivery of sustainable development through the planning system.

5.3 PPS3 – Housing:

Sets out the national policy framework for delivering the Government's housing objectives. Aims to widen the choice of high quality homes, to widen the opportunities for housing ownership, to improve affordability and to create sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities in all areas.

5.4 PPS4 – Planning for Sustainable Economic growth:

Sets out the Government's comprehensive policy framework for planning for sustainable economic development in urban and rural areas.

5.5 PPS9 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation:

Sets out planning policies on protection of biodiversity and geological conservation through the planning system.

5.6 PPG13 – Transport:

Sets out the objectives to integrate planning and transport at the national, regional, strategic and local level and to promote more sustainable transport choices both for carrying people and for moving freight.

5.7 PPS17 – Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation:

Sets out the policies needed to be taken into account by regional planning bodies in the preparation of Regional Planning Guidance and by local planning authorities in the preparation of development plans.

5.8 Broadland District Local Plan (Replacement) Saved Policies:

5.9 Policy GS1:

New development will only be accommodated within the settlement limits for the Norwich fringe parishes, market towns and villages. Outside these limits, development proposals will not be permitted unless they comply with a specific allocation and/or policy of the Plan.

5.10 Policy GS3:

Sets out general considerations to be taken into account in all new development proposals including access, residential amenity, the character and appearance of the surrounding area, nature conservation, agricultural land, building conservation and utilities and services

5.11 Policy GS4:

New development will only be permitted where utilities, services and social infrastructure are or can be made adequate.

5.12 Policy ENV1:

Seeks to protect and enhance the environmental assets of the district including the character and appearance of the countryside, towns, villages and urban areas.

5.13 Policy ENV2 :

For all development proposals a high standard of layout and design will be required with regard given to scale, form, height, mass, density, layout, energy efficiency, landscape, access and use of appropriate materials. This will include the consideration of the appearance and treatment of spaces between and around buildings and the wider setting of the development taking into account the existing character of the surroundings.

5.14 Policy ENV3:

Requires developers to make adequate arrangements for future maintenance of landscaped areas.

5.15 Policy ENV8:

Protects the inherent visual qualities of Areas of Landscape Value and may permit development appropriate to the general location where it is not detrimental to the character, scenic quality or visual benefit of the area.

5.16 Policy ENV20:

Seeks to ensure that relevant conditions are added to planning approvals to ensure that archaeological issues are fully addressed.

5.17 ENV23:

The availability of water resources and the effect of increased abstraction on environmental water needs will be taken into consideration when determining development proposals as advised by the Environment Agency.

5.18 Policy RL5:

Endeavours will be made to ensure that adequate open space for outdoor playing purposes is sufficient to meet the relevant standards.

5.19 Policy RL7:

Where developments of 5 or more dwellings are proposed it will be expected that developers will provide the future maintenance of land for both formal and informal outdoor recreation purposes.

5.20 Policy CS2:

Requires that surface water drainage from new developments should be by way of sustainable drainage systems where appropriate.

5.21 Policy HOU4:

Seeks to negotiate an appropriate proportion of affordable housing on sites over a certain size.

5.22 Policy HOU6:

Outlines appropriate densities for estate scale developments to ensure the efficient use of development land.

5.23 Policy EMP1:

Identifies sites of strategic employment.

5.24 Policy TRA2:

In the case of major developments or where the transport network is under particular stress, applicants will be required to submit a transport assessment with planning applications, demonstrating the measures proposed to deal with the travel consequences of the development. Developers will be expected to pay for all improvements that are primarily required directly as a consequence of their proposals.

5.25 Policy TRA3:

For major development, (or for smaller developments that would generate significant amounts of traffic in, or near to, air quality management areas), the submission of a travel plan will be required as part of the planning application.

5.26 Policy TRA4:

Within new developments suitable provision will be made for pedestrians, including people with disabilities, those confined to a wheelchair or others with mobility difficulties. Outside the new development site additional provision will be required, as a direct consequence of the development, linking with existing provision and improving links with local services including public transport.

5.27 Policy TRA5:

Within new developments safe and coherent provision will be made for cyclists, including secure cycle parking and where appropriate, showers and changing facilities. Outside the new development site additional provision will be required, as a direct consequence of the development, linking with existing provision and improving links with local services including public transport.

5.28 Policy TRA7:

Where clearly justified developers will be expected to enter into an agreement to contribute to the appropriate public transport provision before planning permission is granted.

5.29 Policy TRA8

The parking provided in relation to a particular development will reflect the use, location and accessibility by non car modes as determined in the transport assessment for the development. In new developments parking and manoeuvring space will be provided in accordance with the Council's parking guidelines, which augment the nationally applicable advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note 13.

5.30 Policy TRA11:

Planning permission requiring a new access onto or off the A47 will only be granted where it provides a junction with other main roads or access to service areas, maintenance compounds and other major transport infrastructure facilities. Development served by side roads connecting to the A47 will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the traffic generated by the proposed development would not be detrimental to the safety and free flow of traffic on the A47.

5.31 Policy TRA12:

Planning permission requiring new access onto or off other principal routes defined on the proposals map will only be granted where it supports integrated transport and sustainable development objectives. Development served by side roads connecting to the other defined principal routes will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the defined route will as a result suffer significant adverse effects.

5.32 Policy TRA14

Development will not be permitted where it would endanger highway safety or the satisfactory functioning of the local highway network.

5.33 Policy TRA17:

New or improved highways will incorporate appropriate landscaping, making use of native species where possible.

5.34 Policy TSA2:

Outlines the business park allocation in Thorpe St Andrew including land being taken up by the related main road infrastructure and landscaping.

5.35 Policy TSA3:

Expands upon Policy TSA2 by explaining what will be allowable within the allocation and what associated infrastructure, including the link road, will be required in association with it.

5.36 The emerging Joint Core Strategy is also relevant to this application. The final JCS will be a joint document between South Norfolk, Broadland District Council and Norwich City Council to provide a long-term vision, objectives and spatial strategy for the future development of all three Councils. The JCS was submitted to the Secretary of State in February 2010 and will be subject to Examination in Public in November 2010.

5.37 The two Supplementary Planning Documents on Affordable Housing and recreational Open Space are also relevant in the determination of this planning application.

5.38 Furthermore the Great Plumstead, Little Plumstead and Thorpe End Garden Village community Parish Plan should be taken account of, as should Thorpe End's recent designation as a conservation area.

6 LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE

6.1 This site is split into two parts known currently as Brook Farm and Laurel Farm. Bisecting the two farms is the north-south Bittern railway line from Norwich to Cromer with Brook Farm forming the northwest part of the site and Laurel Farm the southeast. The Laurel Farm part of the site is where the business park element of the development is proposed with the residential, open space and commercial parts being on the Brook Farm site.

6.2 The site is approximately 57 hectares in size and is located 5km to the east of Norwich city centre. It lies between the Dussindale Park and Thorpe End residential areas and to the north of the Broadland Business Park. As the names would suggest the site is currently in agricultural use.

6.3 The sites are split again through their policy designation in the Local Plan. The majority of Laurel Farm is allocated for employment use, which is seen as a natural expansion to the Broadland Business Park. The area north of Low Road up to Middle Road (on the east of the railway line) is not allocated for this purpose. Brook farm is allocated on the proposals map as being an Area of Landscape Value under Policy ENV8 of the Plan.

6.4 The site is typical of the large scale farmland landscape to the southeast of Norwich with large arable fields surrounded by hedgerows, many with mature hedgerow oaks. The inherent open character of the landscape is counterbalanced by pockets of small-scale relatively enclosed countryside, particularly along rural roads.

- 6.5 On the employment allocation of this proposal there is a tip owned by Broadland District Council. Should this application be approved then a land transfer agreement will be entered into with the developer to pass control of it over to them.

7 PLANNING HISTORY

- 7.1 20031510 – Business park comprising B1(c), B2 and B8 uses and construction of new road on Laurel farm site (phase 1) – Withdrawn (02/06/04).
- 7.2 20031511 – Business park comprising B1(c), B2 and B8 uses and construction of new road on Laurel farm site (phase 2) – Withdrawn (02/06/04).

8 APPRAISAL

- 8.1 The residential element of this proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Broadland District Local Plan (Replacement) 2006 as Policy GS1 of said plan states that new development will only be accommodated within the settlement limits for the Norwich fringe parishes, market towns and villages. The residential element of this proposal is outside of these settlement limits. However, the policy then goes on to say that outside of settlement limits, development proposals will not be permitted unless they comply with a specific allocation and/or policy of the Plan.
- 8.2 The majority of the employment element of the application, up to Green Lane North, is allocated for such development under Policy TSA2 of the Local Plan and as such this proposal is acceptable in planning terms. However, there is also a small (when compared to the rest of the site) rectangle of land to the immediate north of Green Lane North, which apexes at Middle Road, which is also identified on the application plans as land for employment. In the Local Plan this is identified as ENV1 land, which is land that should be protected from development (other than some minor exceptions of which this is not one), and as such is contrary to the Local Plan.
- 8.3 Elements of this application are therefore a departure from the development plan. This coupled with the size of the proposal would mean that the development would have to be considered by the government office (or successor) should it be recommended for approval. This is noted, however it is considered that this development offers benefits and achieves other policy objectives that would otherwise not be forthcoming. The Local Plan proposals map identifies an indicative route for a link road from the north of the existing business park, across the railway line and through the land to the north of Dussindale/south of Thorpe End, then joining onto Plumstead Road East. This is further identified through Policy TSA3 of the Local Plan. One of the benefits of this development is that it will provide this link road. The reason that this link road is identified as a key priority is that it provides the necessary infrastructure from the north to the business park, thus unlocking the

remaining employment allocation. Furthermore the recently published Statement of Focused Changes for the Joint Core Strategy (which will be consulted upon until 30th September) paragraph 47 states that *'any development beyond existing planning permissions and allocations (and the exemplar scheme for Rackheath) would be dependent upon the provision of the Link Road...'* This reinforces the importance of the link road as a key element of the wider growth. Its provision would also have the added benefit of resolving the problem of the totally unsatisfactory nature of Green Lane South in capacity and safety terms, by eliminating the through route, including the substandard bridge, under the railway. To ensure its early delivery a condition will be attached stating that this link road be constructed prior to the occupation of any new residential property and prior to the occupation of anymore employment land on the business park (which is in accordance with the provisions of Policy TSA3 of the Local Plan).

- 8.4 The employment allocation is worth highlighting again as it has been a long held allocation in the Local Plan (through Policy TSA2). The applicant (Lothbury) has overseen the development of the rest of the Broadland Business Park and as such there is confidence that they will be able to deliver this allocated employment land (in the order of around 57,500sqm including office, industrial and warehousing uses), bringing economic benefits to the area through inward investment and job creation.
- 8.5 On the matter of housing, 600 homes are proposed as part of this application. This Council has a shortfall in its 5 year housing supply and as such there is the potential that speculative developers could submit planning applications to fill this shortfall. Whilst they would be determined on their merits and ultimately could be refused, the 5 year argument is one that it is anticipated would be raised at appeal and is one that would be difficult to defend. For clarification the purpose of the 5 year land supply analysis is to ensure that there is sufficient deliverable land identified for development to meet the needs of the local area. The tests that land contributing towards this supply are that sites are available, suitable and achievable. Planning Policy Statement 3 (Housing) sets out this requirement for local authorities to identify and maintain a rolling 5 year supply. As discussed above this application not only helps towards the 5 year housing supply figures it also has other policy benefits.
- 8.6 Accompanying this application will be a S106 Agreement to secure planning obligations in connection to the development. These include heads of terms to cover contributions towards and/or agreements to provide:
- Affordable housing
 - Public transport (including travel planning)
 - Education
 - Libraries

- Open space
 - Land transfer (for the tip from Broadland District Council to the developer, which will be dealt with through an accompanying land transfer agreement).
- 8.7 There is a reduced S106 package with this planning application than would perhaps be usually expected with a development of this size. However, in this instance it is considered that this reduction is justified. Furthermore, in this period of economic uncertainty reduced S106 packages are likely to be the norm. There is every chance that the market will pick up during the lifetime of this development and as such it is considered appropriate and reasonable to put clawback/reassessment triggers of viability into the S106 agreement.
- 8.8 The affordable housing provision for this development is proposed at a total of 144 houses (24% of the total). This is clearly under the 40% figure that would usually be sought, but opportunities for a reassessment of these figures will be inserted into the S106 agreement as discussed above. Furthermore proposed education, libraries and public transport contributions are less than would usually be expected from an application of this size. However, officers have negotiated these figures up significantly from those originally proposed through work on the applicant's viability appraisal (with the assistance of an independent financial assessor). The independent financial assessors have confirmed with officers that the package now being proposed is the limit to which the applicant can go whilst still making the scheme viable in these difficult economic times. As such it is considered that this reduced package is acceptable, again subject to reassessment as highlighted above.
- 8.9 As highlighted earlier in section 6.5 of this report the former tip on the business park allocation of the proposal is to be transferred should this application receive planning approval. This will remove the Council's liability for environmental pollution from this redundant asset.
- 8.10 This development incorporates a large area of open space, which equates to circa 16.5ha dedicated to public use between the residential element of the scheme and Thorpe End, whilst also keeping the separation with Thorpe End. This is in accordance with the recently adopted Thorpe End Garden Village Conservation Area Character Statement, which states that *'The immediate surroundings of the Garden Village consist of open fields and scattered woodland which are important in reinforcing the sense of separation from other nearby settlements. Policies in the Broadland District Local Plan (2006) address these areas'*. Furthermore this open space area is significantly in excess of the provision that would normally be sought on a development of this size.
- 8.11 It is also worth noting that this development proposes a new site for a rail halt as part of these proposals (however, this is the land only and does not provide the funding for the halt). The 0.35 ha site could serve residential development at Brook Farm, Broadland Business Park (current and as proposed) as well as

residents of Dussindale. This is in addition/an alternative to the allocated rail halt site to serve the business park in the Local Plan.

8.12 This development includes the provision of a 185sqm community hall and c.700sqm of ancillary retail facilities (indicated as 5 shops on the indicative plan). These are positioned such that the new residents, the new employees at the business park and existing residents to the northeast of Dussindale/south end of Thorpe End can benefit from the facilities proposed.

8.13 Whilst there have been 30 letters of representation submitted in response to this application it is considered that the objections can be broken down into four main areas:

- The gap between Thorpe End and Dussindale should be maintained.
- The development is contrary to the Local Plan.
- The development is premature in advance of the adoption of the Joint core strategy.
- There is a lack of infrastructure in the area and the development will add to traffic problems.

It is considered that the first three points have been addressed in the earlier part of this appraisal and in some respects so has the fourth point. However, it is worth reiterating that this development will provide the relevant hard infrastructure through the link road in particular. Relevant travel plans and transport assessments have been submitted in support of this application, which have been assessed and supported by the highways authority. Furthermore it is considered that the contributions towards/land for community facilities (schools, education, shops and community hall) that are also proposed through this development will be of benefit to new and existing residents in the area.

8.14 At the time of writing this report discussions with Natural England and the Environment Agency were still ongoing in relation to water issues. This conclusion of these discussions will be reported to planning committee either through the supplementary schedule or verbally.

9 CONCLUSION

9.1 This application is for the development of 600 residential properties and 57,480sqm of employment use. Certain elements of the proposal are contrary to the provisions of the development plan and the S106 contributions are not the full package that might usually be expected with a development of this size. However, on balance it is considered that the benefits that this development can provide outweigh these matters. It is also considered that the heads of terms highlighted in the S106 (affordable housing, education,

public transport, libraries and the transfer of the tip) are significant still especially in this period of market decline. Built into this S106 will also be the opportunity to reassesses these heads of terms after a period of years to be agreed during the S106 negotiations.

- 9.2 The benefits alluded to above include the provision of the long standing allocation (through the Local Plan) of employment land at the Broadland Business Park, the provision of the link road from the business park through to Plumstead Road East (again an allocation in the plan and something that is specifically mentioned in the Statement of Focused Changes for the Joint Core Strategy), the large area of public open space, the community facilities, the land for the rail halt and a contribution towards the 5 year housing land supply (including affordable housing).
- 9.3 The recommendation is therefore one that has taken a number of matters into consideration. On balance it is considered that the positives of this application are such that it is acceptable in planning terms. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted.
-

RECOMMENDATION: Delegate authority to the Head of Development Management and Conservation to grant planning permission subject to the satisfactory resolution of the S106 Agreement and subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Application for approval of ALL “reserved matters” must be made to the Local Planning Authority not later than the expiration of 5 years beginning with the date of this decision.

The development hereby permitted must be begun in accordance with the “reserved matters” as approved not later than the expiration of TWO years from either, the final approval of the reserved matters, or in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such reserved matter to be approved.

- (2) Application for the approval of the “reserved matters” for each parcel of land or phase of development shall include plans and descriptions of the:
- i) details of the layout;
 - ii) scale of each building proposed;
 - iii) the appearance of all buildings including the precise details of the type and colour of the materials to be used in their construction;
 - iv) the landscaping of the site.

Approval of these “reserved matters” must be obtained from the local planning authority in writing before any development is commenced and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the details as approved.

- (3) Prior to the submission of any reserved matters for each phase or parcel of land an Implementation Phasing Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which identifies the phases of infrastructure, structural landscaping and development parcels.
- (4) Prior to the commencement of development of the hereby approved scheme, junction improvements at the Postwick Interchange shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with the Local Highways Authority and the Highways Agency and be available for public use.
- (5) Prior to the commencement of development a detailed scheme for the link road between Peachman Way and Plumstead Road East as indicated in principle on drawing number 2718R/01/15 Revision A shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The detailed link road as maybe approved shall be completed and available for public use prior to the first occupation of any parcel or phase of development.
- (6) Prior to the commencement of development full details of soft landscaping proposals for the hereby approved link road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include, as appropriate:
 - Planting plants.
 - Written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment.
 - Schedules of plants, noting species planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate.
 - Implementation timetables.
- (7) Prior to the commencement of development of (i) the hereby approved link road and subsequently (ii) any parcel or phase of the business park element as may be submitted through a reserved matters planning application, a schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum of 5 years shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for its implementation.
- (8) Concurrently with the detail required to be submitted in respect of Condition 2 the following details shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority:

- the layout of the site and any development thereon which shall be based upon an accurate survey of the site and to include levels (existing and proposed), gradients, sections in relation to adjoining sites
 - an accurate plan showing the position, height and spread and species of all existing trees and hedges within and on the boundaries of the site including measures for their protection during the course of the development of the site
 - the landscaping of the site (including any proposed changes to existing ground levels, means of enclosure and boundary treatments, hard surfaced areas and materials, planting plans, specifications and schedules, existing plants to be retained and showing how account has been taken of any underground services)
 - the layout of foul sewers and surface water drains
 - water efficiency measures
 - the provision, alignment, height materials of all walls, fences and other means of enclosure
 - provision to be made for the parking, loading and unloading of vehicles
 - the provision to be made for the storage and disposal of refuse
 - Details of the siting and design of housing for public utilities (e.g. electricity sub-stations).
- (9) Prior to the commencement of development of each parcel or phase of the business park element of the approval full details of both hard and soft landscape proposals shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include, as appropriate:
- Proposed finished levels or contours
 - Means of enclosure
 - Car parking layouts
 - Other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas
 - Hard surfacing materials
 - Minor artifacts and structures (furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting)
 - Proposed and existing functional services above and below ground e.g. drainage, power communications cables, pipelines, etc, indicating lines, manholes, supports etc)
 - Retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant.

Soft landscape details shall include:

- Planting plants
 - Written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment)
 - Schedules of plants, noting species planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate
 - Implementation timetables.
- (10) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the following plans and documents:
- Indicative plan 2718R/01/15 Revision A (13th July 2009)
 - Location plan 2595/1900 Revision C (13th July 2009)
- (11) The development hereby permitted shall be restricted to no more than 600 houses, 49,676sqm of B2/B8 general industrial/storage use, 7,805sqm of B1 use and 1,035sqm of A1 retail/D1 community use. The zoning of which shall be as per the indicative layout of drawing number 2595 1903 Revision A.
- (12) No individual Class A1 retail unit (as identified in the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987) shall exceed 500sqm.
- (13) No residential property as may be proposed by the submission of reserved matters planning applications shall exceed 3-storeys in height.
- (14) No building as may be proposed by the submission of reserved matters planning applications shall exceed 15m in height.
- (15) Prior to the commencement of the business park element of the development hereby permitted full details (in the form of scaled plans and/or written specifications) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority to illustrate the following:
- a) Roads, footways, cycleways, foul and on-site water drainage
 - b) Roads and footways
 - c) Foul and surface water drainage
 - d) Visibility splays
 - e) Access arrangements
 - f) Parking provision in accordance with adopted standard
 - g) Loading areas
 - h) Turning areas
- (16) No works shall commence on site until the details of Wheel Cleaning facilities for construction vehicles have been submitted to and approved in writing by

the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. For the duration of the construction period all traffic associated with the construction of the development permitted shall use the approved wheel cleaning facilities as maybe approved.

- (17) Prior to the commencement of any works a Construction Traffic Management Plan and Access Route which shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Norfolk County Council Highway Authority together with proposals to control and manage construction traffic using the 'Construction Traffic Access Route'. For the duration of the construction period all traffic associated with the construction of the development shall comply with the Construction Traffic Management Plan and use only the Construction Traffic Access Route and no other local roads unless approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority
- (18) No works shall commence on the site until the Traffic Regulation Order for the prohibition of vehicles on Green Lane between Smee Lane and Low Road has been secured by the Highway Authority.
- (19) The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until an Interim Travel Plan has been submitted, approved and signed off by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority, such a Travel Plan shall accord with Norfolk County Council document `Guidance Notes for the Submission of Travel Plans` or be produced using the Workplace Travel Plan Generator Tool, www.worktravelplan.net. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied prior to implementation of the Interim Travel Plan. During the first year of occupation an Approved Full Travel Plan based on the Interim Travel Plan referred to shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The Approved Full Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable and targets contained therein and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied subject to approved modifications agreed by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority as part of the annual review.
- (20) No development shall take place within the site until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has:
 - a) caused to be implemented a programme of archaeological evaluation in accordance with a first written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority; and next
 - b) submitted the results of the archaeological evaluation to the local authority; and next
 - c) secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological mitigatory work in accordance with a second written scheme of

investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

- (21) Concurrently with the submission of the “reserved matters” required by Condition 1 above a desk study (A) must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority in line with current good practice guidance. The report must include a conceptual site model and risk assessment to determine whether there is a potentially significant risk of contamination that requires further assessment.

Based on the findings of the desk study a site investigation and detailed risk assessment (B) must be completed to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originated on the site. The report must include:

- (a) A survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination
- (b) An assessment of the potential risks to; human health, property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland, service lines and pipes, adjoining land, groundwaters and surface waters, ecological systems, archaeological sites and ancient monuments.

The report must also include a revised and updated conceptual site model and detailed risk assessment. There must be an appraisal of the remedial options, and proposal of the preferred remedial option(s). This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11' and other accepted good practice guidance.

Based on the findings of the site investigation a detailed remediation method statement (C) must be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Remediation must bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing or mitigating unacceptable risks to the identified receptors. The method statement must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site cannot be determined as Contaminated Land as defined under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The Local Planning Authority must be given a minimum of two weeks written notification of the commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following the completion of the remedial measures identified in the approved remediation method statement a verification report (D) (also called a validation report) that scientifically and technically demonstrates the effectiveness and success of the remediation scheme must be produced. Where remediation has not been successful further work will be required.

In the event that previously unidentified contamination (E) is found during the development, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken as set out above and where remediation is necessary a remediation method statement and post remedial validation testing must be produced and approved in accordance with Condition the above.

- (22) Prior to the commencement of any parcel or phase of development a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants as maybe required shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Norfolk County Council.
- (23) Prior to the commencement of each parcel or phase of development (including the road scheme), full details of any external lighting to be erected on site shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The equipment shall be installed, operated and maintained in accordance with the approved plans.
- (24) All existing trees, shrubs, and other natural features not scheduled for removal shall be fully safeguarded during the course of the site works and building operations (see BS5837 : 2005 – Trees in relation to construction). No works shall commence on site until all trees, shrubs, or features to be protected are fenced along a line to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority in accordance with Figure 2 of the above BS standard.

Such fencing shall be maintained during the course of the works on site. No unauthorised access or placement of goods, fuels or chemicals, soil or other materials shall take place inside the fenced area.

Reasons:

- (1) The time limit condition is imposed in compliance with the requirements of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- (2) The application is submitted in Outline form only and the reserved matters are required to be submitted in accordance with the requirements of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995.
- (3) To secure an orderly and well designed development in accordance with Policy GS3 of the Broadland District local Plan (Replacement) 2006.
- (4) To ensure that the highway network is adequate to cater for the development proposed in accordance with Policies GS3 and TRA14 of the Broadland District Local Plan (Replacement) 2006.

- (5) To ensure that the highway improvement works are designed to an appropriate standard in the interest of highway safety and to protect the environment of the local highway corridor.
- (6) To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by appropriate landscape design in accordance with Policies GS3, ENV3 and ENV4 of the Broadland District Local Plan (Replacement) 2006.
- (7) To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by the proper maintenance of existing and/or new landscape features in accordance with Policies GS3 and ENV3 of the Broadland District Local Plan (Replacement) 2006.
- (8) To ensure the satisfactory development of the site in accordance with Policy GS3 of the Broadland District Local Plan (Replacement) 2006.
- (9) To ensure the provision of amenity afforded by appropriate landscape design in accordance with Policies GS3, ENV3 and ENV4 of the Broadland District Local Plan (Replacement) 2006.
- (10) For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure the satisfactory development of the site in accordance with the specified approved plans and documents.
- (11) To ensure that the highway network is adequate to cater for the development proposed.
- (12) To ensure that the Class A uses are ancillary to the development in accordance with the provision of Planning Policy Statement 6.
- (13) For the avoidance of doubt as the details are not included within the current submission and to enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control of the above aspects of the proposal, to ensure an appropriate development for the site as required by policies GS3, GS4 and CS2 of the Broadland Local Plan (Replacement) 2006.
- (14) For the avoidance of doubt as the details are not included within the current submission and to enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control of the above aspects of the proposal, to ensure an appropriate development for the site as required by policies GS3, GS4 and CS2 of the Broadland Local Plan (Replacement) 2006.
- (15) To secure an orderly and well designed development in accordance with Policy GS3 of the Broadland District local Plan (Replacement) 2006.
- (16) To prevent extraneous material being deposited on the highway.
- (17) In the interests of maintaining highway efficiency and safety.

- (18) In the interests of highway safety.
- (19) To ensure that the development offers a wide range of travel choices to reduce the impact of travel and transport on the environment.
- (20) To enable the County Archaeologist to keep a watching brief on the site in accordance with Policy ENV18 of the Broadland District Local Plan (Replacement) 2006.
- (21) To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with policy GS3 of the Broadland District Local Plan (Replacement) 2006.
- (22) To ensure that the development is adequately served by fire hydrants in the event of a fire.
- (23) To ensure the proper development of the site without prejudice to the amenities of the area, and in accordance with Policy GS3 of the Broadland District Local Plan (Replacement) 2006.
- (24) To ensure that trees, shrubs and other natural features to be retained are adequately protected from damage to health and stability throughout the construction period in the interest of amenity in accordance with Policies GS3, ENV4 and ENV5 of the Broadland District Local Plan (Replacement) 2006.

Informatives:

- (1) If this development involves any works of a building or engineering nature, please note that before any such works are commenced it is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consent under the Building Regulations is also obtained. Advice on this point can be obtained from the Building Control Section of the Planning and Community Services Directorate.
- (2) The development involves work to the public highway that will require the approval of the County Council as Highway Authority. It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the public highway, which includes a Public Right of Way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the applicants' responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council. Advice on this matter can be obtained from the County Council's development control officer based at Thorpe Lodge in Norwich – Tel. 01603 430596

- (3) Public utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal and contact should be made with the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on the necessary alterations, which have to be carried out at the expense of the developer.
- (4) If required, street furniture will need to be repositioned at the applicants own expense.
- (5) The applicant is advised that the design of any areas of lagoons or ponds must be notified to NIA prior to grant of subjective planning permission and agreement reached with NIA regarding the design, size and location of such lagoons and ponds as may be necessary.
- (6) This development involves a Travel Plan to be implemented within the scope of a legal Agreement between the applicant and the County Council. Please note that it is the applicants' responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary Agreements under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 or Highways Act 1980 are also obtained. Advice on this matter can be obtained from the County Council's Highways Development Control Group based at County Hall in Norwich. Please contact David Higgins at david.higgins@norfolk.gov.uk

Commuted Sum for Travel Plans

The Highways Authority levies a charge to cover the on-going costs of reviewing and monitoring a Travel Plan annually. The Highways Authority also requires a Bond to ensure that the Travel plan targets are met. Both the Bond and the monitoring charge are secured by a Section 106 Legal Agreement. This is in addition to the sum payable for Planning Obligations covering infrastructure, services and amenities requirements.

An online survey tool is available to assist with annual monitoring. For further information on the survey tool, please contact David Higgins at david.higgins@norfolk.gov.uk

For residential development, Norfolk County Council offers a fully inclusive package covering the writing, implementation, on-going management and annual monitoring of a Travel Plan for 5 years. Up to date costs can be obtained by contacting David Higgins at david.higgins@norfolk.gov.uk. Developers are expected to enter into a Section 106 Agreement to secure the necessary funding before planning permission is granted.

Reasons for the decision:

This application has been considered against the Development Plan for the area, this being the Broadland District Local Plan (Replacement). The policies particularly relevant to the determination of this application are GS1, GS3, GS4, ENV1, ENV2, ENV3, ENV8, ENV20, ENV23, RL5, RL7, HOU4, HOU6, EMP1, TRA2, TRA3, TRA4,

TRA5, TRA7, TRA8, TRA11, TRA12, TRA14, TRA17, TSA2, TSA3 and CS2 of the Broadland District Local Plan (Replacement).

Policy GS1 New development will only be accommodated within the settlement limits for the Norwich fringe parishes, market towns and villages. Outside these limits, development proposals will not be permitted unless they comply with a specific allocation and/or policy of the Plan.

Policies GS3 and ENV2 only permit development where there would be no unacceptable effects upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area and where consideration has been given to the layout and design of any development proposal.

Policy GS4 seeks to ensure that development is permitted only where there are utilities, services and social infrastructure or if not that they will be at appropriate stages in the implementation of the development.

Policy ENV1 Seeks to protect and enhance the environmental assets of the district including the character and appearance of the countryside, towns, villages and urban areas.

Policies ENV3 requires developers to make arrangements for maintenance of landscaped areas, existing trees and planting.

Policy ENV8 seeks to ensure that areas of landscape value are retained and development that is permitted does not detract from their character, scenic quality or visual benefit to the area.

Policy ENV20 seeks to ensure that archaeological issues are fully looked at in the planning process.

Policy ENV23 states that development should not jeopardise water resources or have a significant adverse impact on the water environment of the area.

Policies RL5 and RL7 relate to the provision of open space on large scale development. They seek to ensure that adequate provision is made in relation to open space.

Policy HOU4 relates specifically to affordable housing provision and sets thresholds over which it will be sought on residential developments.

Policy HOU6 sets the net density for the number of dwellings per hectare that will be sought on estate scale development such as this.

Policies TRA2 and TRA3 are prescriptive and require that a transport assessment and travel plan (respectively) are required to be submitted with major planning

proposals that may significant impacts on the area in which they are proposed form a transport point of view.

Policies TRA4, TRA5 and TRA7 seek to ensure that adequate provision is made for walking, cycling and public transport (respectively) in development proposals.

Policy TRA8 states that the parking provided in relation to a particular development will reflect the use, location and accessibility by non-car modes. Parking and manoeuvring space must be provided in accordance with the Council's adopted standards.

Policy TRA11 states that planning permission requiring a new access onto or off the A47 will only be granted where it provides a junction with other main roads or access to service areas, maintenance compounds and other major transport infrastructure facilities.

Policy TRA12 states that planning permission requiring new access onto or off other principal routes will only be granted where it supports integrates transport and sustainable development objectives.

Policy TRA14 states that development will not be permitted where it would endanger highway safety or the satisfactory functioning of the local highway network.

Policy TRA17 seeks to ensure that new or improved highways incorporate appropriate landscaping and that native species will be used where possible.

Policy EMP1 identifies strategically important employment sites (through the proposals map) throughout the district, of which part of this site is one.

Policy TSA2 identifies the majority of the employment allocation in this application as an area of land that will accommodate a major part of the Norwich Policy Area's employment needs. Policy TSA3 compliments TSA2 by setting criteria for what will be appropriate in the allocated land.

Policy CS2 states that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) should be used for dealing with water on development sites, where appropriate.

This application is for the development of 600 residential properties and 57,480sqm of employment use. Certain elements of the proposal are contrary to the provisions of the development plan and the S106 contributions are not the full package that might usually be expected with a development of this size. However, on balance it is considered that the benefits that this development can provide outweigh these matters. It is also considered that the heads of terms highlighted in the S106 (affordable housing, education, public transport, libraries and the transfer of the tip) are significant still especially in this period of market decline. Built into this S106 will also be the opportunity to reassesses these heads of terms after a period of years as decided during the S106 process.

The benefits alluded to above include the provision of the long standing allocation (through the Local Plan) of employment land at the Broadland Business Park, the provision of the link road from the business park through to Plumstead Road East (again an allocation in the plan and something that is specifically mentioned in the Statement of Focused Changes for the Joint Core Strategy), the large area of public open space, the community facilities, the land for the rail halt and a contribution towards the 5 year housing land supply (including affordable housing).

The decision is therefore one that has taken a number of matters into consideration. On balance it is considered that the positives of this application are such that it is acceptable in planning terms.

This development has been considered through full accordance with Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 1999.

Therefore the application complies with policies GS1, GS3, GS4, ENV1, ENV2, ENV3, ENV8, ENV20, ENV23, RL5, RL7, HOU4, HOU6, EMP1, TRA2, TRA3, TRA4, TRA5, TRA7, TRA8, TRA11, TRA12, TRA14, TRA17, TSA2, TSA3 and CS2 of the Broadland District Local Plan.