Special Meeting of the Development Management Committee
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Mr M Edney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Mrs F Ellis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Mr C Gould</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Mr L Hornby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Mr N Legg</td>
<td></td>
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<td>Mr R Savage</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time

9.00 am Kett Room

Agenda

Date
Tuesday 18 June 2013

Time
10.00 am

Place
Council Chamber
South Norfolk House
Swan Lane
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

Contact
Caroline Heasley    tel (01508) 533685
South Norfolk District Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

Email: democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Website: www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

PLEASE NOTE that any submissions (including photos, correspondence, documents and any other lobbying material) should be received by the Council by noon the day before this meeting. We cannot guarantee that any information received after this time will be brought to the Committee’s attention.

The order of the agenda may change at the discretion of the Chairman, so it is advisable to arrive at the commencement of the meeting.

If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance

Large print version can be made available
The Development Management process is primarily concerned with issues of land use and has been set up to protect the public and the environment from the unacceptable planning activities of private individuals and development companies.

The Council has a duty to prepare Local Development Documents (DPDs) to provide a statutory framework for planning decisions. The Development Plan for South Norfolk currently consists of a suite of documents. The primary document which sets out the overarching planning strategy for the District and the local planning policies is the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. The Strategy is broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and accompanying technical guidance and was adopted by South Norfolk Council in March 2011. It is the starting point in the determination of planning applications and as it has been endorsed by an independent Planning Inspector the policies within the plan can be given full weight when determining planning applications. South Norfolk Council is also in the process of preparing its Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD, Area Action Plans and Development Management DPD. These documents will allocate specific areas of land for development, define settlement boundaries and provide criterion based policies giving a framework for assessing planning applications.

In accordance with legislation planning applications must be determined in accordance with the policies of the Development Plan, unless material considerations which are relevant to planning indicate otherwise.

The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to achieve sustainable development. The core planning principles contained within the NPPF are summarised as:

- To be genuinely plan-led
- To drive and support sustainable economic development
- Seek high quality design
- Conserve and enhance the natural environment
- Encourage the effective use of land
- Conserve heritage assets

The factors to be used in determining applications will relate to the effect on the “public at large” and will not be those that refer to private interests. Personal circumstances of applicants “will rarely” be an influencing factor, and then only when the planning issues are finely balanced.

THEREFORE we will:

- Acknowledge the strength of our policies,
- Be consistent in the application of our policy, and
- If we need to adapt our policy, we will do it through the Local Plan process.

Decisions which are finely balanced, and which contradict policy will be recorded in detail, to explain and justify the decision, and the strength of the material planning reasons for doing so.

LOCAL COUNCILS

OCCASIONALLY, THERE ARE CONFLICTS WITH THE VIEWS OF THE PARISH OR TOWN COUNCIL. WHY IS THIS?

We ask local parish and town councils to recognise that their comments are taken into account. Where we disagree with those comments it will be because:

- Districts look to ‘wider’ policies, and national, regional and county planning strategy.
- Other consultation responses may have affected our recommendation.
- There is an honest difference of opinion.
1. To report apologies for absence and identify substitute voting members (if any);

2. To deal with any items of business the Chairman decides should be considered as matters of urgency pursuant to Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act, 1972; [Urgent business may only be taken if, "by reason of special circumstances" (which will be recorded in the minutes), the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion that the item should be considered as a matter of urgency.]

3. To receive Declarations of Interest from Members;
   (Please see flowchart and guidance attached, page 6)

4. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 8)
   To consider the applications as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Planning Ref No.</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2011/0505/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land North of the A11 at Park Farm Silfield Road Wymondham</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2012/0371/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land to the East and West of Rightup Lane Wymondham</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Sites Sub-Committee;

   Please note that the Sub-Committee will only meet if a site visit is agreed by the Committee with the date and membership to be confirmed.
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

The following guidelines are to assist Members to assess whether a Site Panel visit is required. Site visits may be appropriate where:

(i) The particular details of a proposal are complex and/or the intended site layout or relationships between site boundaries/existing buildings are difficult to envisage other than by site assessment;

(ii) The impacts of new proposals on neighbour amenity e.g. shadowing, loss of light, physical impact of structure, visual amenity, adjacent land uses, wider landscape impacts can only be fully appreciated by site assessment/access to adjacent land uses/property;

(iii) The material planning considerations raised are finely balanced and Member assessment and judgement can only be concluded by assessing the issues directly on site;

(iv) It is expedient in the interests of local decision making to demonstrate that all aspects of a proposal have been considered on site.

Members should appreciate that site visits will not be appropriate in those cases where matters of fundamental planning policy are involved and there are no significant other material considerations to take into account. Equally, where an observer might feel that a site visit would be called for under any of the above criteria, members may decide it is unnecessary, e.g. because of their existing familiarity with the site or its environs or because, in their opinion, judgement can be adequately made on the basis of the written, visual and oral material before the Committee.

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Applications will normally be considered in the order in which they appear on the agenda. Each application will be presented in the following way:

- Initial presentation by planning officers followed by representations from:
- The town or parish council - up to 5 minutes for member(s) or clerk;
- Objector(s) - any number of speakers, up to 5 minutes in total;
- The applicant, or agent or any supporters - any number of speakers up to 5 minutes in total;
- Local member
- Member consideration/decision.

TIMING: In front of you there are two screens which tell you how long you have left of your five minutes. After four minutes the circle on the screen turns amber and then it turns red after five minutes, at which point the Chairman will ask you to come to a conclusion.

MICROPHONES: In front of you there is a microphone which we ask you to use. Simply press the button to turn the microphone on and off

WHAT CAN I SAY AT THE MEETING? Please try to be brief and to the point. Limit your views to the planning application and relevant planning issues, for example: Planning policy, (conflict with policies in the Local Plan/Structure Plan, government guidance and planning case law), including previous decisions of the Council, design, appearance and layout, possible loss of light or overshadowing, noise disturbance and smell nuisance, impact on residential and visual amenity, highway safety and traffic issues, impact on trees/conservation area/listed buildings/environmental or nature conservation issues.

Please note: In accordance with the Council’s constitution no one may make photographs, film, video or other electronic recordings of the meeting without the Chairman’s consent
HEALTH AND SAFETY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire alarm</th>
<th>If the fire alarm sounds please make your way to the nearest fire exit. Members of staff will be on hand to escort you to the evacuation point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phones</td>
<td>Please switch off your mobile phone or put it into silent mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td>The toilets can be found on your right and left of the lobby as you enter the Council Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>There will be a short comfort break after two hours if the meeting continues that long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td>A water dispenser is provided in the corner of the Council Chamber for your use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Key to letters included within application reference number to identify application type – e.g. 07/96/3000/A – application for consent to display an advert

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Advert</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Proposal by Government Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Certificate of Alternative Development</td>
<td>HZ</td>
<td>Hazardous Substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Change of Use</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Existing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Reserved Matters (Detail following outline consent)</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Proposed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Full (details included)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Outline (details reserved for later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Householder – Full application relating to residential property</td>
<td>RVC</td>
<td>Removal/Variation of Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Application to be determined by County Council</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Proposal by Statutory Undertaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.P</th>
<th>Structure Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.N.L.P</td>
<td>South Norfolk Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.D</td>
<td>Permitted Development – buildings and works which do not normally require planning permission. (The effect of the condition is to require planning permission for the buildings and works specified).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C.S</td>
<td>Joint Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.P.P.F</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

When declaring an interest at a meeting Members are asked to indicate whether their interest in the matter is pecuniary, or if the matter relates to, or affects a pecuniary interest they have, or if it is another type of interest. Members are required to identify the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which it relates. In the case of other interests, the member may speak and vote. If it is a pecuniary interest, the member must withdraw from the meeting when it is discussed. If it affects or relates to a pecuniary interest the member has, they have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public but must then withdraw from the meeting. Members are also requested when appropriate to make any declarations under the Code of Practice on Planning and Judicial matters.

Have you declared the interest in the register of interests as a pecuniary interest? If Yes, you will need to withdraw from the room when it is discussed.

Does the interest directly:
1. affect yours, or your spouse / partner's financial position?
2. relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or your spouse / partner?
3. Relate to a contract you, or your spouse / partner have with the Council
4. Affect land you or your spouse / partner own
5. Affect a company that you or your partner own, or have a shareholding in

If the answer is “yes” to any of the above, it is likely to be pecuniary. Please refer to the guidance given on declaring pecuniary interests in the register of interest forms. If you have a pecuniary interest, you will need to inform the meeting and then withdraw from the room when it is discussed. If it has not been previously declared, you will also need to notify the Monitoring Officer within 28 days.

Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above?

If yes, you need to inform the meeting. When it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.

Is the interest not related to any of the above? If so, it is likely to be an other interest. You will need to declare the interest, but may participate in discussion and voting on the item.

Have you made any statements or undertaken any actions that would indicate that you have a closed mind on a matter under discussion? If so, you may be predetermined on the issue; you will need to inform the meeting, and when it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.

FOR GUIDANCE REFER TO THE FLOWCHART OVERLEAF.

PLEASE REFER ANY QUERIES TO THE MONITORING OFFICER IN THE FIRST INSTANCE
What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?

OR

B Does it directly affect me, my partner or spouse's financial position, in particular:
   - employment, employers or businesses;
   - companies in which they are a director or where they have a shareholding of more
     than £25,000 face value or more than 1% of nominal share holding
   - land or leases they own or hold
   - contracts, licenses, approvals or consents

The interest is pecuniary – disclose the interest, withdraw from the meeting by leaving the room. Do not try to improperly influence the decision

If you have not already done so, notify the Monitoring Officer to update your declaration of interests

The interest is related to a pecuniary interest. Disclose the interest at the meeting. You may make representations as a member of the public, but then withdraw from the room

Does the matter indirectly affects or relates to a pecuniary interest I have declared, or a matter noted at B above?

The Interest is not pecuniary nor affects your pecuniary interests. Disclose the interest at the meeting. You may participate in the meeting and vote

Have I declared the interest as an other interest on my declaration of interest form? OR

Does it relate to a matter highlighted at B that impacts upon my family or a close associate? OR

Does it affect an organisation I am involved with or a member of? OR

You are unlikely to have an interest. You do not need to do anything further.
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

Key to letters included within application reference to identify application type – e.g. 2013/0001/A – Application for consent to display and advert

A  Advert                          G  Proposal by Government Department
AD Certificate of Alternative Development HZ Hazardous Substance
CA Conservation Area                 LB Listed Building
CU Change of Use                       LE Certificate of Lawful Existing development
D  Reserved Matters                  LP Certificate of Lawful Proposed development
   (Details following outline consent)
F  Full (details included)             O  Outline (details reserved for later)
H  Householder – Full application relating to RVC Removal / Variation of Conditions
   residential property
C  Application to be determined by County SU Proposal by Statutory Undertaker
   Council

Key to abbreviations used in recommendations

S.P  Structure Plan
S.N.L.P  South Norfolk Local Plan
P.D  Permitted Development – buildings and works which do not normally require planning permission. (The effect of the condition is to require planning permission for the buildings or works specified).
J.C.S  Joint Core Strategy
Special Development Management Committee 18 June 2013

1. **Appl. No**: 2011/0505/O
   **Parish**: WYMONDHAM

   Applicants Name: Pelham Holdings Ltd
   Site Address: Land North Of The A11 At Park Farm Silfield Road Wymondham
   Proposal: Proposed development to include up to 500 dwellings, Community facilities, site infrastructure including new access roads, public rights of way and drainage, green infrastructure including public open spaces and structural landscape planting and new playing pitches relating to Wymondham High School.

   Recommendation: Authorise DGL to Approve subject to Sec. 106 Agreements (including provision of subway) or Refuse in default

   1. Outline Permission Time Limit.
   2. Approved Plans.
   3. Reserved Matters.
   4. Phasing Scheme - relating housing construction to provision of roads, cycle-ways, footways (on and off-site): foul drainage; surface water drainage; green infrastructure; open spaces (including adult recreation and children’s play areas); ecological mitigation measures; structural landscaping; community facilities; bus routes/facilities.
   5. Design Code to be agreed.
   6. Max. number of dwellings per phase and in total (500).
   7. Green Infrastructure and Open Space Management Scheme(s).
   8. Landscaping details and implementation.
   9. Children’s Play Areas to SNC standard.
   10. Archaeological Evaluation.
   11. Details of Foul water drainage (treatment off-site).
   12. Details of Surface Water Drainage (SUDS) and management.
   13. Fire Hydrants to be provided.
   14. Min. 10% renewable energy generation/use.
   15. Code Level 4 for Water.
   18. Location of access and construction compounds to be submitted and agreed with reserved matters applications.
   19. No occupation before development linked to County Highway.
   20. Details of roads, footways, cycleways, parking, loading/turning areas.
   22. Construction traffic management plan and route.
   23. Wheel cleaning.
   24. Travel Plan.
   25. Improvement works to Thickthorn Junction.

   Subject to Section 106 Agreements to secure contributions and triggers for delivery of infrastructure and facilities:
   a. Subway and drainage for rail bridge
   b. Education
   c. Library
   d. Affordable Housing
   e. Community facilities
   f. Green Infrastructure
   g. Compliance with Infrastructure Delivery Plan including off-site highway improvements
h. School dual use
i. Travel Plan Monitoring fee
j. New foul drainage

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
- NPPF 4: Promoting sustainable transport
- NPPF 6: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
- NPPF 7: Requiring good design
- NPPF 8: Promoting healthy communities
- NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
- Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
- Policy 2: Promoting good design
- Policy 3: Energy and water
- Policy 4: Housing delivery
- Policy 6: Access and transportation
- Policy 7: Supporting communities
- Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment
- Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
- Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities
- Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
- ENV 8: Development in the open countryside
- ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains
- ENV 14: Habitat protection
- ENV 15: Species Protection
- IMP 2: Landscaping
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic
- IMP 9: Residential amenity
- IMP 10: Noise
- IMP 15: Setting of listed buildings
- IMP 18: Development in conservation areas
- SHO 8: Local and rural shops and services
- SHO 9: Shop sites in major residential developments
- LEI 7: Open space provision in new development
- LEI 9: Joint provision and dual use of recreational facilities
- TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
- TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities
- TRA 17: Off-site road improvements
- TRA 19: Parking Standards
- WYM 12: Impact of new buildings on vistas and views of Wymondham Abbey towers
- WYM 14: Public open space allocations in Wymondham

South Norfolk Place Making Guide

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2008/0790
- Up to 3000 dwellings; 96,000sqm
- Withdrawn
- B1, B2 and B8; 3 local centres etc.
3. Consultations

3.1 Wymondham Town Council
Refuse: Insufficient information to give full response. Should require full application to cover both Pelham Homes and Endurance sites. Have concerns about the following:
- Scale of combined development would stifle and suffocate the existing communities.
- Outside Development Limit and pre-empts the Area Action Plan.
- Proposals should be planned in a co-ordinated manner for the benefit of the community as a whole.
- Need to address problem of Rail Bridge on Silfield Road including flooding. Traffic lights would increase queues and congestion. Needs improvement to access to Station.
- Not enough information on improved pedestrian and cycle links to town centre.
- No mention of improving disabled access to the Rail Station platforms which should be required.

3.2 Local Member
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Play And Amenities Area Officer
No comments received

3.4 NCC - Children's Services
No comments received

3.5 NCC Minerals And Waste Planning Officer
No comments received

3.6 DEFRA
No comments received

3.7 GNDP – Sandra Easthaugh
No comments received

3.8 Planning Policy
- NPPF – Note presumption in favour of sustainable development and also where there is not a 5 year housing land supply (as is the case in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich Policy Area) unless there are adverse impacts that outweigh it.
- JCS – Note most relevant policies 2, Promoting Good Design; 3, Energy and Water; 4, Housing delivery; 10, Wymondham (allocation of at least 2200 dwellings).
- Wymondham Area Action Plan (WAAP) – Currently carries little weight, but the application sites have been selected as preferred option for housing allocation following assessment of alternatives put forward.
- Site is self-contained and not intrusive into the countryside.
- Would not adversely impact on the setting of the Town or Abbey.
- Would not impose on the open area between Wymondham and Hethersett recognised as important in the JCS.
- The applications adequately address the policy considerations in the emerging WAAP.

- Note caveat that links (especially pedestrian and cycle links) need to be improved, especially at the rail bridge on Station Road. Developer should contribute financially to deliver such
improvement as well as solving the local flooding problem under the bridge.

- Pleased to note new school; retail and community facilities; bus access routes; care home; and contribution to improve Thickthorn junction.
- Offers opportunities for improved access to rail station and potential public transport interchange.
- Note compliance with WAAP in terms of limiting vehicular access to southern end of Rightup Lane and no vehicular access to the site via Park Lane.
- Ideally need wider buffer to Lizard CWS.
- Pleased to see open space proposals – 2007 study identified a particular shortage of informal open space in Wymondham, but note shortfall in provision of formal open space (WAAP suggests 5Ha).
- Geophysical survey has identified few sites of archaeological interest on the land.

Conclusions

- No significant adverse impacts that would outweigh the presumption in favour of this development.
- Although total number and densities are slightly above those anticipated in WAAP, it would be difficult to object in view of the land supply shortage.
- Note shortfall in formal open space and the need to ensure delivery of improved connectivity in the area of the rail bridge.

3.9 Conservation Officer

The Environmental Statement notes potential impact on heritage assets including Wymondham and Lizard Conservation Areas, Wymondham Abbey (Grade I); Coll’s Farmhouse (Grade II); and other listed buildings around the rail station, cemetery and within the historic core of Wymondham.

- Proposals to realign Silfield Road and create open space will enhance setting of Coll’s Farmhouse which already has a residential context.
- Listed buildings at station, cemetery and in core of Wymondham will not be significantly affected.
- Proposals recognise views available to Wymondham Abbey as a focal point and suggest these are retained in the layout to create a sense of place.
- Development will impact on the character of the area which adjoins the Lizard Conservation Area. The existing trees and vegetation along the Conservation Area boundary are to be retained and allotments and a community orchard are proposed along this part of the site. Residential development is to be limited to 2.5 storeys in this area with no vehicular access along the boundary. The Conservation Area is significantly rural in character and although the development will have an impact, I do not consider this will be adverse, as the layout and uses create an appropriate transition between the existing rural character and more urban character of the proposed development.

The proposal has considered the impact on heritage assets and the design has been developed in order to minimise any harm to setting or character.
3.10 English Heritage  
Do not wish to comment in detail. General observations:
- No direct impact or adverse impact on setting of designated heritage assets.
- Archaeological potential of site should be explored.
- Any reference to vernacular traditions at detailed design stage should be undertaken with rigour as modern house types rarely

3.11 Norfolk Fire Service  
No comments received

3.12 Environmental Services (Protection)  
- Should provide for sustainable surface water drainage.
- Discharge to existing watercourses should not exceed greenfield run-off rate.
- Promote rainwater harvesting.
- Promote adoption of drainage systems to ensure future maintenance.
- Other general drainage advice given.

3.13 British Gas Connections Limited  
No comments received

3.14 Norfolk County Council – Planning Obligations  
Monitoring/ Administration fee = £900

Education
- Existing Primary schools at capacity. New 5-11 Primary School is required to serve the development although this proposal alone is not sufficient to fund its provision (needs 1000 houses minimum). Consequently County Council raises objection because the funding of adequate Primary School provision is not certain. Notwithstanding the above, the following contributions would be sought.

(Note: Linking both applications by legal agreement produces a development of 1230 dwellings which is sufficient to fund the new school.)

Primary
- 1.5 Ha Site provided free of charge for a 1.5 FE (315 places) primary school, plus further 0.5Ha reserved for potential purchase by NCC if 2FE (420 place) school is required to serve wider area.
- Proportion of build costs relating to the 127 primary school places needed for this development (£2.076m to fund 127 places out of a £5.15m total cost for a 315 place 1.5 FE primary school).

Secondary
- 70 secondary (11-16) places at £17,546 each = £1,228,220
- 14 sixth form places at £19,029 each = £266,406
- Total Secondary = £1,494,626

Fire Service
- 1 fire hydrant required per 50 dwellings plus 1 each for the school and care home to be installed by the developer and required by planning condition (£844 each).

Library Provision
- Require contribution to enhance library stock at £60 per dwelling (500 x £60 = £30,000)
3.15 Norfolk Wildlife Trust

Object
- Should take account of combined impact of this proposal with 2012/0371 and all Wymondham growth should be considered via the AAP.
- Concern regarding recreational impacts on the Lower Wood SSSI (Ashwellthorpe). Site has inadequate parking and wet paths are vulnerable to increased visitor pressure.
- Increased disturbance to The Lizard, Wade’s Pit and Silfield Nature Reserve.
- Not convinced that provision of new green space and footways will prevent increased recreational pressure on County Wildlife Sites.
- Not clear where Great Crested Newt reception site is located and if it will be free of disturbance.
- Need more green space to minimise impacts on the County Wildlife Sites such as proposed by NWT in 2008.
- Although further development in this area should not proceed unless steps are taken to provide new green infrastructure, we do not necessarily take the view that it is the responsibility of individual developers alone to provide green infrastructure above that recommended by Natural England and South Norfolk Council may wish to explore other avenues of provision of new green space.

3.16 Lower Yare Second I D B

No comments received

3.17 Highways Agency

Directs condition on any approval
- No more than 156 dwellings completed (or 250 cumulatively with 2012/0371 whichever is sooner) before improvements carried out to Thickthorn Junction.

3.18 Norwich District Comm. Health Centre

No comments received

3.19 Police Architectural Liaison Officer

- Support proposed principles of design to deliver ‘safe place’ in accordance with guidance.
- Financial contributions required to meet extra cost of policing.

3.20 Keith Mitchell - Housing Strategy Manager

Council’s Economic Consultant who confirms that a reduction (from 33%) to 25% provision of affordable housing is justified for these applications in view of the construction costs. (*This does not take account of any additional contribution made to improve pedestrian/cycle connectivity in the area of the rail bridge***).

3.21 Sport England

- Quantity of playing fields proposed is in line with NPFA standard but changing facilities in adjoining community building is not ideal for cricket – require pavilion overlooking pitch.
- Suggest financial contributions should be made to improve indoor sport facilities.
- Need to agree phasing of sport facilities delivery with the new development.
3.22 EDF Energy No comments received

3.23 Historic Environment Service Recommend condition for archaeological evaluation

3.24 Natural England -
- Does not object to development
- Suggest condition 'Green Infrastructure Statement'
- Initial concerns regarding impact on Lower Wood SSSI, County Wildlife Sites and protected species now satisfied

3.25 Anglian Water Services Ltd
- Wymondham Sewage Treatment Works has adequate capacity to serve the development.
- Foul Sewerage Network does not have capacity and AW are in discussion with developers to address this constraint.
- Recommend conditions requiring details of foul and surface water drainage strategy to be implemented before new dwellings are occupied.

3.26 Environment Agency
- Remove earlier objection on flood risk grounds subject to imposition of the following conditions:
  - Runoff restricted to peak of 10.6 l/s/Ha as detailed in the Flood Risk Assessment:
  - Details of all surface water management schemes to be agreed:
  - Submit calculations to prove surface water scheme is sized to accommodate 1 in 100 year rainfall event (plus climate change allowance):
  - Details of future maintenance and management to be agreed.

3.27 NCC Highways (See full text in Appendix 1)
- The applications are considered jointly as they are integrated and have overarching highway and transport issues.
- Development of this scale needs to accommodate significant vehicular traffic increase as well as providing a commodious and highly connective route for cyclists and pedestrians under the rail bridge on Station Road to access the main part of the Town and its services to ensure the development is as safe and as sustainable as possible.
- Note proposed improvements for pedestrian and cycle provision at London Rd/ Station Rd junction, along Station Rd and Silfield Rd, and improved shared surface for The Lizard. However, there is a lack of highway land available to provide full 3m cycleway/footway for whole length of Silfield Rd. Pinch points down to 2m achieved only by reducing carriageway to 5.5m and opposite footway to 1.5m.
- Widening of the footway under the rail bridge to 2m is proposed but this compromises the width and capacity of the carriageway with traffic lights and one way traffic working.
- Proposal to narrow carriageway under the rail bridge in order to widen foot/ cycleway is not acceptable as it fails to adequately accommodate all users of the highway, being sub-standard for pedestrians and cyclists, lacking in long term capacity and imposing unnecessary delays on vehicles 24 hours a day.
- This scale of development should ideally have an access from a Type 1 Road (6.5m carriageway, 3m cycleway and 2m footway) with at least 2 points of access to the major road network of at least Type 1 standard. This development does not have this.
- The site can be provided with adequate bus connection.
- A solution to the flooding under the rail bridge should be provided before any new dwellings are built.
- While the site is preferred for many reasons (proximity to Town Centre, employment and rail station), the proposals are inadequate to deliver a well connected sustainable development.
- The Highway Authority objects to the application for the following reasons:
  1. The proposed development does not adequately provide off-site facilities for pedestrians/cyclists/people with disabilities (those confined to a wheelchair or others with mobility difficulties) to link with local services. Contrary to NPPF and Development Plan Policies T2.
  2. The proposal does not have adequate access or is remote from a Main Distributor Route, as classified in the Highway Authority’s Route Hierarchy published by Norfolk County Council. The proposal, if permitted, would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to safe sustainable development in transport terms. Contrary to NPPF and Development Plan Policies T2.
  3. The proposal is inaccessible from local service centre provision conflicting with the aims of sustainable development, the need to minimise travel, and the ability to reduce the reliance on the private car as represented in national and local policy. Contrary to NPPF and Policy 5 of Norfolk’s 3rd Local Transport Plan, entitled Connecting Norfolk.

- If a subway were provided under the rail line and the existing footway were removed to widen the carriageway at an early stage of the development, then the benefits would be significant enough to allow the Planning Authority to consider granting planning permission, provided the other proposed improvements were also delivered.

3.28 Wymondham Nature Group
- Pre-empts Area Action Plan and LDF.
- Increased risk from additional resident’s footfall and their pets to Silfield Nature Reserve as well as County Wildlife Sites at The Lizard and Wade’s Pit.
- Increased flood risk to Bays and Tiffey Rivers.
- Lack of useful green space provision places more pressure on Wildlife Sites. Should provide greater area of green space.

3.29 Wymondham Heritage Society
No comments received

3.30 South Norfolk Green Party
Object
- Premature before Area Action Plan (AAP).
- Pelham and Endurance applications should be considered together.
- Need to find alternative to the route under Rail Bridge.
- Requires a new link road from London Road to the north-west funded by local large developments.
- Take opportunity to repair roads and drainage.
Special Development Management Committee 18 June 2013

- Direct pedestrian and cycle link to Town Centre required, off-road at the Rail Bridge.
- Should require 50% social housing or properly regulated cheap housing for rent.
- Better to address pressures on key services and provision of sustainable energy via the AAP before consent is given.
- Need to leave margin adjacent A11 to take account of traffic and road noise.
- If transport issues can be addressed, this is a better location for development than north of Tuttles Lane eroding the strategic gap between Hethersett and Wymondham.

3.31 Bride Hall Developments
- No objection in principle but Traffic Assessment fails to take account of other approved and proposed developments on former Sale Ground and Rightup Lane.

3.32 Local Residents 256 copies of a duplicate objection letter (227 from Wymondham; 5 Hethersett; 4 Wicklewood; 5 Carleton Rode; 3 Silfield; 4 Norwich; 8 Others).
- Should consider combined impact of Pelham and Endurance applications together as they are linked. Should be a single application.
- Scale of combined development will stifle and suffocate the existing communities.
- Outside current Development Limit and pre-empts the Wymondham Area Action Plan and LDF. Need such long term plans to ensure development is co-ordinated in context of Wymondham as a whole for the benefit of the community as a whole.
- Re-aligning Silfield Road in favour of the new development rather than outlying settlements is wrong and would compromise highway safety.
- Application does not explain how the problem of the Rail Bridge is to be overcome. Traffic lights would increase queues and make exit from Cemetery Lane and The Lizard more difficult.
- Insufficient information on provision of pedestrian and cycle links to the Town Centre.
- Providing additional school playing fields remote from the High School is not a sustainable solution.
- No reference to improvements for disabled access to the Rail Station platforms.
- Access to A11 is poor via Station Road then London Road, Ayton Road or Harts Farm Road.

Additional objections from other letters:
- Flooding problem under rail bridge must be addressed.
- Road system would be overloaded and The Lizard would become a rat-run.
- Question the need for new houses when there are so many existing up for sale.
- Because most people will be employed in Norwich and along the A11 corridor, the new housing should be sited where it has good access to the A11 such as the Hethersett side of Wymondham and some scope on the Suton/ Spooner Row side.
- Little consideration for impact on infrastructure and school places.
- Loss of productive farmland.
• Need new primary school and high school before such large housing schemes are considered.
• Would require more car parking in Town Centre.

• Harm farmland setting of Colls Farm (listed building) and its neighbours.
• Noise and disruption during construction.
• Linkage and increased use of Public Rights of Way network would lead to increased security and safety issues. Should stop-up PROW linking Rightup Lane with Silfield Street.
• Require a road interchange from Silfield Road to the A11.
• Rail bridge should be reconstructed with two lane carriageway and footways each side.
• Noise disturbance and harm because too close to the A11.
• Must address any contamination issues.
• There are other areas more suitable, such as Tuttles Lane/ Norwich Common.
• Detrimental effect on the unique community and quiet character of The Lizard Conservation Area.
• Precedent for further development towards Ashwellthorpe.
• Scale too large, will create a ‘new town’. Should be a number of smaller initiatives.

3.33 District Councillor: Robert Savage

Object
• Unacceptable amount of traffic on roads not capable of taking the volume, contrary to IMP8.
• Existing traffic congestion will be made worse. Rail bridge constraint will extend congestion on to Silfield Road.

4. Assessment

4.1 See combined assessment with following item 2012/0371.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tony Pierce – tpierce@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Chris Trett – ctrett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2. **Appl. No**: 2012/0371/O  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: Endurance Estate Strategic Land And Landowners  
Site Address: Land To The East And West Of Rightup Lane Wymondham NR18 9NB  
Proposal: Mixed use development of up to 730 dwellings, up to 128 bed care home / homes (in one or two buildings), up to 250 square metres of retail / commercial floor space, a new primary school together with all other associated temporary and permanent infrastructure, including new access arrangements, sport pitches, allotments and community orchard.

Recommendation: Authorise DGL to Approve subject to Sec. 106 Agreements (including provision of subway) or Refuse in default

1. Outline Permission Time Limit.
2. Approved Plans.
3. Reserved Matters.
4. Phasing Scheme - relating housing construction to provision of roads, cycle-ways, footways (on and off-site): foul drainage; surface water drainage; green infrastructure; open spaces; ecological mitigation measures; structural landscaping; community facilities; bus routes/ facilities.
5. Design Code to be agreed.
6. Max. number of dwellings per phase and in total (730).
7. Max. retail/ commercial floorspace (250sqm).
8. Green Infrastructure and Ecological Mitigation Management Scheme.
9. Minimum 20m buffer zone to CWS boundary.
10. Children’s Play Area to SNC standard.
11. Design and provision of open space areas.
12. Landscaping details and implementation.
14. Details of Foul water drainage (treatment off-site).
15. Details of Surface Water Drainage (SUDS) and management.
16. Fire Hydrants to be provided.
17. Min. 10% renewable energy generation/ use.
21. Location of access and construction compounds to be submitted and agreed with reserved matters applications.
22. No occupation before development linked to County Highway.
23. Details of roads, footways, cycleways, parking, loading/ turning areas.
24. Details to secure service/ emergency access to the Lizard.
27. Wheel cleaning.
28. Travel Plan.

Subject to Section 106 Agreements to secure contributions and triggers for delivery of infrastructure and facilities:
- Subway and drainage for rail bridge
- Education
- Library
Special Development Management Committee

- Affordable Housing
- Community facilities
- Green Infrastructure
- Compliance with Infrastructure Delivery Plan including off-site highway improvements
- School dual use
- Travel Plan Monitoring fee
- New foul drainage

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework

NPPF 4: Promoting sustainable transport
NPPF 6: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
NPPF 7: Requiring good design
NPPF 8: Promoting healthy communities
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy

Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4: Housing delivery
Policy 6: Access and transportation
Policy 7: Supporting communities
Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan

ENV 8: Development in the open countryside
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains
ENV 14: Habitat protection
ENV 15: Species Protection
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 10: Noise
IMP 15: Setting of listed buildings
IMP 18: Development in conservation areas
SHO 8: Local and rural shops and services
SHO 9: Shop sites in major residential developments
LEI 7: Open space provision in new development
LEI 9: Joint provision and dual use of recreational facilities
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities
TRA 17: Off-site road improvements
TRA 19: Parking Standards
WYM 12: Impact of new buildings on vistas and views of Wymondham Abbey towers
WYM 14: Public open space allocations in Wymondham
2. Planning History

2.1 2008/0790  
Up to 3000 dwellings; 96,000sqm  
B1, B2 and B8; 3 local centres etc.
Withdrawn

3. Consultations

3.1 Wymondham Town Council  
- Outside Development Boundary so contrary SNLP policy ENV8 (development in open countryside) and ENV2 (open land between settlements) also pre-empts LDF and Area Action Plan
- Contrary SP1 – does not protect historic character and setting of historic market town and its agricultural surroundings
- Contrary SP4 and IMP7 – unacceptable strain on public and social infrastructure such as education and welfare
- Loss of agricultural land contrary to ENV21
- Contrary IMP8 - Traffic concerns on already congested network
- Concerns over treatment and disposal of surface and foul water.
- Imbalance in open space, need more formal space including sports pitches with facilities in accordance with SNC Standards
- Recommend placing formal sport space near school to allow its use by school as well as others

3.2 Local Member  
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Public Right Of Way  
No comments received

3.4 NCC - Children's Services  
No comments received

3.5 NCC Minerals And Waste Planning Officer  
- Accept any minerals remaining are not economically viable to extract, no objection

3.6 DEFRA  
No comments received

3.7 GNDP - Sandra Easthaugh  
No comments received

3.8 Planning Policy  
- NPPF – Note presumption in favour of sustainable development and also where there is not a 5 year housing land supply (as is the case in the Norwich Policy Area) unless there are adverse impacts that outweigh it.
- JCS – Note most relevant policies 2, Promoting Good Design; 3, Energy and Water; 4, Housing delivery; 10, Wymondham (allocation of at least 2200 dwellings).
- Wymondham Area Action Plan (WAAP) – Currently carries little weight, but the application sites have been selected as preferred option for housing allocation following assessment of alternatives put forward.
- Site is self-contained and not intrusive into the countryside.
- Would not adversely impact on the setting of the Town or Abbey.
- Would not impose on the open area between Wymondham and Hetherssett recognised as important in the JCS.
- The applications adequately address the policy considerations in the emerging WAAP.
• Note caveat that links (especially pedestrian and cycle links) need to be improved, especially at the rail bridge on Station Road. Developer should contribute financially to deliver such improvement as well as solving the local flooding problem under the bridge.
• Pleased to note new school; retail and community facilities; bus access routes; care home; and contribution to improve Thickthorn junction.
• Offers opportunities for improved access to rail station and potential public transport interchange.
• Note compliance with WAAP in terms of limiting vehicular access to southern end of Rightup Lane and no vehicular access to the site via Park Lane.
• Ideally need wider buffer to Lizard CWS.
• Pleased to see open space proposals – 2007 study identified a particular shortage of informal open space in Wymondham, but note shortfall in provision of formal open space (WAAP suggests 5Ha).
• Geophysical survey has identified few sites of archaeological interest on the land.

Conclusions

• No significant adverse impacts that would outweigh the presumption in favour of this development.
• Although total number and densities are slightly above those anticipated in WAAP, it would be difficult to object in view of the land supply shortage.
• Note shortfall in formal open space and the need to ensure delivery of improved connectivity in the area of the rail bridge.

3.9 Design Officer Approve - See Appendix 2

3.10 Conservation Officer The Environmental Statement notes potential impact on heritage assets including Wymondham and Lizard Conservation Areas, Wymondham Abbey (Grade I); Coll’s Farmhouse (Grade II); and other listed buildings around the rail station, cemetery and within the historic core of Wymondham.
• Proposals to realign Silfield Road and create open space will enhance setting of Coll’s Farmhouse which already has a residential context.
• Listed buildings at station, cemetery and in core of Wymondham will not be significantly affected.
• Proposals recognise views available to Wymondham Abbey as a focal point and suggest these are retained in the layout to create a sense of place.
• Development will impact on the character of the area which adjoins the Lizard Conservation Area. The existing trees and vegetation along the Conservation Area boundary are to be retained and allotments and a community orchard are proposed along this part of the site. Residential development is to be limited to 2.5 storeys in this area with no vehicular access along the boundary. The Conservation Area is significantly rural in character and although the development will have an impact, I do not consider this will be adverse, as the layout and uses create an appropriate transition between the existing rural character and more urban character of the proposed development.
The proposal has considered the impact on heritage assets and the design has been developed in order to minimise any harm to setting or character.

3.11 English Heritage
Do not wish to comment in detail. General observations:
- No direct impact on designated heritage assets but has potential to affect setting of Lizard Conservation Area.
- Note proposed allotments, play area, community orchard and landscaped buffer will provide some mitigation if properly managed.
- Archaeological potential of site should be explored.
- Any reference to vernacular traditions at detailed design stage should be undertaken with rigour as modern house types rarely.
- Care required in the relationship of the school building and the associated public space.

3.12 Environmental Services (Protection)
- Condition Foul Drainage
- Condition external lighting
- Condition submission of 'Construction Environmental Management Plan'
- Condition noise insulation/ attenuation scheme

3.13 British Gas Connections Limited
No comments received

3.14 National Planning Casework Unit
Acknowledged receipt of ES

3.15 NCC- Planning Obligations
Monitoring/ Administration fee = £900

Education
- Existing Primary schools at capacity. New 5-11 Primary School is required to serve the development although this proposal alone is not sufficient to fund its provision (needs 1000 houses minimum). Consequently County Council raises objection because the funding of adequate Primary School provision is not certain. Notwithstanding the above, the following contributions would be sought.

(Note: Linking both applications by legal agreement produces a development of 1230 dwellings which is sufficient to fund the new school.)

Primary
- 1.5 Ha Site provided free of charge for a 1.5 FE (315 places) primary school, plus further 0.5Ha reserved for potential purchase by NCC if 2FE (420 place) school is required to serve wider area.
- Proportion of build costs relating to the 185 primary school places needed for this development (£3.025m to fund 185 places out of a £5.15m total cost for a 315 place 1.5 FE primary school).
Secondary
- 102 secondary (11-16) places at £17,546 each = £1,789,692
- 20 sixth form places at £19,029 each = £380,580
- Total Secondary = £2,170,272

Fire Service
- 1 fire hydrant required per 50 dwellings plus 1 each for the school and care home to be installed by the developer and required by planning condition (£844 each).

Library Provision
- Require contribution to enhance library stock at £60 per dwelling (730 x £60 = £43,800)

Environment
- Contribution of £50 per dwelling towards mitigation works and improvements to local County Wildlife Sites
- Object – should wait for Area Action Plan
- Should not be permitted unless impacts on The Lizard, Wade’s Pit and Silfield nature reserve can be fully mitigated and compensated
- Requires additional buffer green space to protect County Wildlife Sites
- Need to maintain water quality standards

3.16 Norfolk Wildlife Trust
- Object – should wait for Area Action Plan
- Should not be permitted unless impacts on The Lizard, Wade’s Pit and Silfield nature reserve can be fully mitigated and compensated
- Requires additional buffer green space to protect County Wildlife Sites
- Need to maintain water quality standards

3.17 Highways Agency
Directs condition on any approval
- No more than 194 dwellings completed (or 250 cumulatively with 2011/0505 whichever is sooner) before improvements carried out to Thickthorn Junction.

3.18 Norwich District Comm. Health Centre
No comments received

3.19 Upper Yare And Tas IDB
No comments received

3.20 Police Architectural Liaison Officer
- Standard general advice on crime prevention in layout details
- Holding objection - request developer contributes to cost of necessary police infrastructure (being calculated)

3.21 Keith Mitchell - Housing Strategy Manager
- Council’s Economic Consultant who confirms that a reduction (from 33%) to 25% provision of affordable housing is justified for these applications in view of the construction costs. (This does not take account of any additional contribution made to improve pedestrian/cycle connectivity in the area of the rail bridge).

3.22 Norfolk Fire Service Station Master
No response

3.23 Sport England
- Note advice in “Spatial Planning for sport: creating local policy”
- 750 dwellings requires 4.32Ha of open space of which 2.88Ha should be for outdoor sport with appropriate changing, parking and access
- Require maintenance scheme by condition
- Contribution to indoor sport facilities
3.24 EDF Energy  
No comments received

3.25 Historic Environment Service  
Recommends condition for archaeological evaluation

3.26 SNC Ecologist  
Recommends conditions:-
- Require Ecological Management Plan for mitigation, enhancement and management for all phases of the development.
- Minimum 20m buffer zone to CWS.
- 10% buildings to have built-in bird boxes and 5% bat boxes.
- Timing of vegetation clearance to avoid nesting season or following approval by ecologist.
- Implementation of mitigation measures from ES (Sections 6.101 and 6.106).

3.27 Natural England -  
- Does not object to development
- Suggest condition ‘Green Infrastructure Statement’
- Initial concerns regarding impact on Lower Wood SSSI, County Wildlife Sites and protected species now satisfied

3.28 Anglian Water Services Ltd  
- Wymondham treatment plant has available capacity for this development
- Foul sewerage network does not have adequate capacity and AW are in discussion with developer - request condition to agree details
- Recommend condition to agree details of surface water drainage

3.29 Environment Agency (19 April 2012)  
Foul Water
- Condition details of foul drainage to be agreed
- Concern that an environmental permit may not be granted for a new sewage treatment plant, but note discussions with Anglian Water regarding connection to existing plant
- Note: constraints on capacity of existing infrastructure system will require that improvements are phased to be available to meet new demand at appropriate time

Surface Water
- Condition surface water drainage details to prevent increased flood risk
- General advice
- Note potential for ground gas associated with landfill
- Encourage green infrastructure and multi-functional green space
- Encourage sustainable construction, energy, water and waste management
- Encourage drainage designed to minimise pollution risk

3.30 NCC Highways (See full text in Appendix 1)  
- The applications are considered jointly as they are integrated and have overarching highway and transport issues.
• Development of this scale needs to accommodate significant vehicular traffic increase as well as providing a commodious and highly connective route for cyclists and pedestrians under the rail bridge on Station Road to access the main part of the Town and its services to ensure the development is as safe and as sustainable as possible.

• Note proposed improvements for pedestrian and cycle provision at London Rd/ Station Rd junction, along Station Rd and Silfield Rd, and improved shared surface for The Lizard. However, there is a lack of highway land available to provide full 3m cycleway/ footway for whole length of Silfield Rd. Pinch points down to 2m achieved only by reducing carriageway to 5.5m and opposite footway to 1.5m.

• Widening of the footway under the rail bridge to 2m is proposed but this compromises the width and capacity of the carriageway with traffic lights and one way traffic working.

• Proposal to narrow carriageway under the rail bridge in order to widen foot/ cycleway is not acceptable as it fails to adequately accommodate all users of the highway, being sub-standard for pedestrians and cyclists, lacking in long term capacity and imposing unnecessary delays on vehicles 24 hours a day.

• This scale of development should ideally have an access from a Type 1 Road (6.5m carriageway, 3m cycleway and 2m footway) with at least 2 points of access to the major road network of at least Type 1 standard. This development does not have this.

• The site can be provided with adequate bus connection.

• A solution to the flooding under the rail bridge should be provided before any new dwellings are built.

• While the site is preferred for many reasons (proximity to Town Centre, employment and rail station), the proposals are inadequate to deliver a well connected sustainable development.

• The Highway Authority objects to the application for the following reasons:

  1. The proposed development does not adequately provide off-site facilities for pedestrians/ cyclists/ people with disabilities (those confined to a wheelchair or others with mobility difficulties) to link with local services. Contrary to NPPF and Development Plan Policies T2.

  2. The proposal does not have adequate access or is remote from a Main Distributor Route, as classified in the Highway Authority’s Route Hierarchy published by Norfolk County Council. The proposal, if permitted, would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to safe sustainable development in transport terms. Contrary to NPPF and Development Plan Policies T2.

  3. The proposal is inaccessible from local service centre provision conflicting with the aims of sustainable development, the need to minimise travel, and the ability to reduce the reliance on the private car as represented in national and local policy. Contrary to NPPF and Policy 5 of Norfolk’s 3rd Local Transport Plan, entitled Connecting Norfolk.

• If a subway were provided under the rail line and the existing footway were removed to widen the carriageway at an early stage of the development, then the benefits would be significant enough to allow the Planning Authority to consider granting planning permission, provided the other proposed improvements were also delivered.
3.31 Wymondham Nature Group  
Object  
- Impact on County Wildlife sites requires buffer zones and wider linked green spaces  
- River Tiffey vulnerable to potential pollution from proposed treatment plant  
- Loss of hedgerows along Rightup Lane  
- Concern at Flood Risk to Bays River and Tiffey  

3.32 Wymondham Heritage Society  
No comments received  

3.33 Green Party  
- Pre-empts Area Action Plan  
- Should consider alternative access route to London Road  
- Assess potential for ‘rat-running’ along Silfield Street and Vendon lane  
- Ensure no harm to Tiffey Valley, The Lizard and woodland areas – support Norfolk Wildlife Trust concerns  
- Should not approve treatment plant discharging to River Tiffey  

3.34 The Lizard Charity  
- Likely congestion at Station Road rail bridge and ‘rat-running’ through The Lizard  
- Proposed treatment plant discharging to River Tiffey is unacceptable and contrary to EA rules for Wildlife Sites  
- Prefer ‘barrier planting’ rather than hedge planting along edge of development.  

3.35 The Lizard Residents Association  
- Station Road rail bridge would cause delays and congestion. Note flooding problem  
- Difficulties anticipated emerging from The Lizard to join traffic on Station Road  
- Low bridge on The Lizard means higher service/delivery vehicles have to access via unmade track via Rightup Lane. This route should not be blocked  
- Concern at potential harm to The Lizard Pastures County Wildlife Site and character of the ‘secluded’ Lizard Conservation Area  
- Concern at use of The Lizard and unmade track to Rightup Lane as an unofficial diversion when flooding makes Station Road bridge impassable – danger to other users  
- Suggest clear signage to prevent through traffic and 20 mph speed limit  

3.36 Local Residents  
- 405 signature petition objecting.  
- Should consider combined impact of Pelham and Endurance applications together as they are linked. Should be a single application.  
- Scale of combined development will stifle and suffocate the existing communities.  
- Outside current Development Limit and pre-empts the Wymondham Area Action Plan and LDF. Need such long term plans to ensure development is co-ordinated in context of Wymondham as a whole for the benefit of the community as a whole.  
- Application does not explain how the problem of the Rail Bridge is to be overcome. Traffic lights would increase queues and make exit from Cemetery Lane and The Lizard more difficult.
- Insufficient information on provision of pedestrian and cycle links to the Town Centre.
- No reference to improvements for disabled access to the Rail Station platforms.
- Access to A11 is poor via Station Road then London Road, Ayton Road or Harts Farm Road.
- Flooding problem under rail bridge must be addressed.
- Road system would be overloaded and The Lizard would become a rat-run.
- Question the need for new houses when there are so many existing up for sale.
- Because most people will be employed in Norwich and along the A11 corridor, the new housing should be sited where it has good access to the A11 such as the Hethersett side of Wymondham and some scope on the Soton/ Spooner Row side.
- Little consideration for impact on infrastructure and school places.
- Loss of productive farmland.
- Need new primary school and high school before such large housing schemes are considered.
- Would require more car parking in Town Centre.
- Noise and disruption during construction.
- Linkage and increased use of Public Rights of Way network would lead to increased security and safety issues. Should stop-up PROW linking Rightup Lane with Silfield Street.
- Require a road interchange from Silfield Road to the A11.
- Rail bridge should be reconstructed with two lane carriageway and footways each side.
- Must address any contamination issues.
- There are other areas more suitable, such as Tuttles Lane/ Norwich Common.
- Detrimental effect on the unique community and quiet character of The Lizard Conservation Area.
- Scale too large, will create a 'new town'. Should be a number of smaller initiatives.
- The Lizard CWS and River Tiffey require larger buffer zones to protect wildlife including water voles and otters.
- Loss of field north of Rightup Lane used by dog-walkers. Should provide alternative as replacement.
- Density too high.
- Threat to wildlife of the area, fauna and flora. Need to secure compensation for harm.
- Potential smell from proposed sewage treatment plant.
- Should prove need for houses and retail proposal.
- Should ensure adequate funds are secured to ensure infrastructure is completed and managed if developer has financial difficulties.
- Need to secure additional foul drainage and its management before housing built.

3.37 District Councillor: Robert Savage

- Object under SNLP policies IMP8 traffic; IMP9 residential amenity; IMP10 noise and ENV8 development in open countryside
Concern at increased traffic volumes and congestion related to the restriction at the Station Road rail bridge. Queues will lead to loss of air quality and noise harming the amenities of those living in the vicinity

Concern at new treatment plant if not AW adopted, implies lower standards and potential harmful impact

Highlight problem of flooding under rail bridge on Station Road

Assessment

Introduction

Although planning applications are normally assessed on their individual merits, the two applications above are interdependent in several respects. This mostly relates to linked provision of community facilities (including a new Primary School) and highway improvements, but the layout of the proposals has also been planned to complement each other. In these circumstances and to avoid further repetition, the two applications are assessed together.

If the applications are approved, then they will need to be linked by legal agreement to ensure the overall development is implemented in a coordinated manner, with the necessary infrastructure, facilities and other works being provided at appropriate stages of the development.

A development of this scale clearly involves a very wide range of considerations which are not all dealt with in detail in this report. The assessment has been structured to identify and assist Members to consider what I consider to be the main issues and is presented under the following headings.

- The development proposals – in summary.
- Principle of development – policy and land supply.
- Infrastructure – Highways and drainage.
- Community facilities – Education; Open Space; Care Home; Shops; etc.
- Housing – Layout and Design; numbers; density; heights.
- Landscape impact.
- Ecology.
- Heritage Assets.
- Residential amenity – existing residents.
- Implementation and phasing.
- Developer contributions – Sec. 106 Agreement

The development proposals – in summary

The main components of the outline applications are as follows:-

2011/0505 – Site area 29.9ha (Pelham Holdings Ltd)

- Total site area 29.9 Ha.
- 500 dwellings on 13.8 Ha giving average density of 36 units/ Ha. Dwelling sizes from 1 to 5 bedrooms and up to 2.5 stories.
- Affordable Housing comprising 25% of the above (or 15% with contribution to subway)
- 0.2 Ha for Community Hall/ changing rooms/ storage (approx.300sqm).
- 9.5Ha Open Space including park, linked ‘village greens’, structural landscaping and habitat areas.
- Children’s play areas (minimum 3).
- Funding for MUGA on High School campus
4.6 Supporting Documents:
- Environmental Statement
- Design and Access Statement
- Planning Statement
- Arboricultural Assessment
- Ecological Assessment
- Transport Assessment
- Landscape and Visual Appraisal
- Affordable Housing Statement
- Statement of community involvement
- Contamination Report

4.7 2012/0371 – Site Area 41.8ha (Endurance)
- Up to 730 dwellings on 19.6ha giving average density of 35.7dph.
- Dwellings up to 3.5 stories.
- 0.38 Ha for 128 bed Residential Care home.
- Affordable Housing comprising 20% of the above. **UPDATE**
- Commercial floorspace (local shop) – up to 250sqm.
- 1.75 Ha for new Primary School.
- 15.4 Ha Green Space

4.8 Supporting Documents:
- Environmental Statement
- Design and Access Statement
- Planning Supporting Statement
- Utilities Statement
- Sustainability Statement
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report
- Interim Travel Plan

**Principle of development**

4.9 Wymondham is identified in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) as a location for major growth including at least 2,200 dwellings (policies 9 and 10). In addition, there is currently not a 5 year housing land supply in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich Policy Area, so there is a presumption in favour of permitting sustainable development as set out in paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

4.10 Although there are a range of more detailed constraints and considerations to take into account before determining the applications, the sites are not subject to any overriding constraint such as flood risk or other designation that would rule out the possibility of development in principle.

4.11 Members will be aware that the application sites have been selected as part of the Council’s published preferred options for development in the emerging Wymondham Area Action Plan. Little weight can be given to this designation at the current time because the process is still at an early consultation stage. However, the selection of this land does reflect the absence of any overriding constraint that could outweigh the presumption in favour of sustainable development. I conclude that there is no reason to object to the principle of development in this location.
Highways

4.12 JCS Policies 10 and 20 highlight the need for the provision of safe and direct pedestrian and cycle routes as well as enhanced public transport. This is in line with the NPPF section 4 which promotes sustainable transport. SNLP policies TRA 1 and 2 also promote the provision of pedestrian and cycle routes.

4.13 In addition to new road, cycleway and footway networks within the development, the applications propose modification and improvement to the existing highway network. Improvements to Silfield Road and Station Road are constrained by the width of highway land available in some locations, but a 3.2m wide footway/cycleway is proposed for the majority of their length to improve pedestrian and cycle access to the Town Centre. A new spine road through the development is proposed which would take much of the additional traffic away from Silfield Road, joining with an improved section of Rightup Lane (which is to be closed to vehicles beyond the former BOCM Mill and existing row of dwellings). Enhancements are also proposed to a cycle and pedestrian route via The Lizard which would provide an alternative non-vehicular access to and from the northern section of the land. The development is accessible by bus and is in close proximity to the Wymondham rail station.

4.14 However, as noted by the Highway Authority and in the emerging Area Action Plan (AAP), a significant obstacle to the development of this area is the constrained width of the road and footway as it passes under the rail bridge just north of Silfield Rd/Rightup Lane/Station Road junction. The situation is aggravated by localised flooding caused by problems with the surface water drains in the vicinity. The comments of NCC Highways on the applications highlight the severity of the issues raised by the railway bridge. The deficiencies and constraints may be summarised as:

- The drain and outfall of the highway drainage into the River Tas requires renewal to prevent future flooding;
- The footway under the Bridge is too narrow for pedestrians to pass;
- There is no safe cycling provision under the Bridge;
- The road layouts under and either side of the Bridge restrict traffic capacity and;
- There is no vehicular access or provision for pedestrians and cyclists that could readily provide an adequate alternative to the Bridge.

4.15 Taking these into account, officers and the developers have put considerable efforts into overcoming these constraints to make the development acceptable, in terms of both road access and pedestrian/cyclist connectivity.

4.16 A solution to the flooding problem is presented by the applicants with a replacement outfall to the river. In all of the discussions, the developers maintained that a scheme of improvements under the Bridge involving signal controls and widening of the footway (Option 6B), along with enhancements for cycles and pedestrians along the Lizard would be sufficient to rectify the above deficiencies; meet highway safety standards and provide permanent and adequate access to their whole development of 1230 dwellings.

4.17 Council officers have, however, repeatedly insisted that improvements to the Lizard, which is also constrained by a height restriction under the railway, do not provide sufficient connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists to the whole development. While a signalized road improvement scheme may enhance vehicular capacity and mitigate traffic impacts of a limited scale of development, without an alternative means of access to the town centre, it could not be an acceptable solution for an urban extension of 1230 homes. Officers concluded, therefore, that a subway under the railway for cyclists and pedestrians is
necessary to allow widening of the vehicular access under the Bridge and much improved connectivity. Along with a package of other highway improvements along Silfield and Station Roads, this could make a deficient situation marginally acceptable.

4.18 A pedestrian/cycle subway under the railway next to the bridge on Station Road would bypass the extremely narrow bridge and make the pedestrian/cycle route much more attractive and convenient, providing a sustainable link between the development and the rail station and the Town’s other facilities. Provision of such a subway would overcome the Highway Authority’s concern about the quality of this linkage and enables them to support the applications. The developers, however, have maintained that, while a subway is desirable, it is not essential and that their proposals (a signalised junction control under the Bridge and improvements to the Lizard) would deliver acceptable access and connectivity to the town centre.

4.19 Although the applicants have control over land each side of the railway, provision of the subway would require the involvement of Network Rail for the works under the track and embankment. Funding will also need to be secured to ensure that the subway can be provided at the earliest possible stage of the residential development.

4.20 This facility would remedy the existing constraint and inconvenience experienced by people approaching or leaving Wymonham to the south, not least those who already live in the Silfield Road/Park Road area. It would also improve access to the rail station and thereby encourage greater use of rail transport. Notwithstanding these incidental benefits, the subway is considered essential to provide an adequate level of sustainable connection between the proposed development and the facilities north of the railway. To ensure delivery of the subway it will be necessary for a Section 106 Agreement to be concluded between the County Council (as Highways Authority), Network Rail (as land owner), and the owners/developers of the land to be developed. The Legal Agreement would need to confirm cooperation of all parties to allow the subway to be constructed before housing development proceeds and provision by the developers.

4.21 **S106 Agreement to Address Physical Constraints of the Bridge at Silfield Road/Station Road – Draft Heads of Terms**

4.22 **To be entered into by Norfolk County Council, South Norfolk Council, Pelham Homes and Endurance Estates and Relevant Landowners**

*The ‘site’ refers to all land within the red line of the applications 2011/0505 and 2012/0371*

*The ‘Bridge’ refers to the highway land under the railway where Silfield Road meets with Station Road*

4.23 **No works to be carried out on the site until:**

- Design and drawings approved to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority for a signalling scheme, widening of the footway and improvements to drainage and services at and under the Bridge

[Part 1 Schedule] carried out

- Design and drawings approved to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority for a tunnelling scheme providing cycleway and footway connections to Silfield Road and Station Road footways and respective railway station accesses

- All Planning Permission, licences, permits for Network Rail (including granting of any necessary estates including easements as necessary) issued irrevocably for the approved tunnelling scheme.

[Part 2 Schedule] carried out
Before commencement of the 150th dwelling on the site

- Signalling scheme, widening of the footway and improvements to drainage and services at and under the Bridge to be completed and in operation

Before commencement of 751st dwelling on the site

- Not to commence more than the 750th dwelling without having constructed and completed to operational standard the tunnelling scheme

15% affordable housing

Claw back affordable housing - money sum linked to 40% of any subsequent uplift in property values - as per Hethersett

Outline planning permission to be issued with section 106 bridge agreement plus main section 106 agreement

Planning permission to be issued with accompanying section 106 agreements duly executed by 4th October 2013

The early improvements to the drainage and the Silfield Rd/Station Rd junction will minimise any harmful impacts of the early phases of development. During these phases, detailed design and construction of the subway can proceed and be brought into operation before the 751st dwelling. Early agreement to all necessary permissions for the subway will enhance its timely delivery and minimise the risk of developers’ avoiding their responsibility for its provision.

Discussions between officers and the applicants over the cost of the subway provision have concluded that it can be met from the values generated by the overall development. However, taking this and other site abnormal costs into account, such as drainage, a reduction to 15% in the JCS policy level of affordable housing is required to make the scheme viable. This is subject to a clawback provision, should land and property values rise over the construction period. (Further information regarding the funding of the subway will be available to Members on a confidential basis at the Committee Meeting if required – not for publication by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972).

Although the Council and developers have worked together to promote development of the site, the applicants have maintained that the signalised control scheme (Option 6B), along with other improvements, such as to the Lizard, would satisfy any deficiencies or impacts of development on connectivity and highway access. Therefore, the provision of the subway is not included in their amended applications. Nevertheless it is the view of planning and highways officers that the provision of the subway is required.

As it stands, therefore, permission is only recommended to be granted if the applicants agree to a S106 for the provision of the subway, as part of the package of improvements. A period of 15 weeks post Committee resolution is suggested as sufficient time for developers to seek any further clarification from officers and agree wording of the agreement. Otherwise it is recommended that the Director of Growth & Localism be delegated to refuse both applications.

Because the development would feed into an existing constrained highway network, the ideal standards of highway design are not achievable in all respects (as set out in the comments from NCC Highways). The development of these sites is highly desirable however, because of their proximity to the facilities of Wymondham, including the rail
station and their ability to deliver much needed housing without unacceptable harm to other material interests as set out in the rest of this report. With the provision of the subway and the other proposed improvements to South Wymondham’s connectivity, I consider that the remaining shortcomings of these connections are not sufficient to outweigh the benefits and presumption in favour of what can be regarded as a sustainable development.

4.34 I conclude that with appropriate conditions and legal agreement, the development would be consistent with policy including NPPF section 4 (promoting sustainable transport), JCS policies 10 and 20, and SNLP policies TRA1 and 2.

Foul Drainage

4.35 The original submission for the Endurance (northern) application included an option to provide a new treatment plant within the site. This has since been withdrawn from the proposal. Foul drainage will now be provided by a new pumping main to bypass those parts of the local sewerage system that lack capacity, and discharging to the existing treatment plant north of the Town, which Anglian Water have confirmed has adequate capacity. Agreement to the detailed design and timing of implementation can be secured by planning condition and/or legal agreement.

Surface Water

4.36 Although precise details are not available, it is confirmed that a sustainable drainage system will be incorporated into the developments utilising attenuation and storage features where appropriate, to avoid any increased flood risk to the development or the surrounding area as recommended by the Environment Agency.

Community facilities

4.37 Education:

The applications make provision for a new Primary School within the Endurance application site. The developments will fund building a 1.5 form entry school but an option for an additional 0.5ha is to be secured by Section 106 Agreement to accommodate a dual entry form school so that capacity can be created (with other funding) to accommodate demand from other growth in Wymondham. This provision is only achievable, however, with contributions from both developments. A legal agreement is therefore necessary to bind developers of both sites together in ensuring that housing on neither site proceeds unless this facility is available at the appropriate time.

4.38 Financial contributions to fund additional secondary school places are to be secured by legal agreement in accordance with the requirements of the Education Authority. In addition, negotiations have resulted in a requirement to fund a Multi Use Games Area at the High School, in preference to the originally proposed additional playing fields as part of the Pelham application.

4.39 Open Space:

Taken in total, the applications propose approximately 26ha of green space out of the total combined application site areas of about 72ha (36%). This is a high proportion, although it includes both formal and informal spaces and strategic landscaping areas.

4.40 Responding to feedback from their public consultation exercise, the Endurance scheme in particular includes a high proportion of informal space. The site incorporates the substantial areas of informal space in the former mineral workings and around the flooded extraction pit off Silfield Road. In addition, areas are set aside for a community orchard and allotments adjacent to The Lizard residential area. Taken together with the network of connecting green corridors there is a predominance of informal space over formal space available for organised sport. The Council’s own open space standards do not specify a fixed requirement for informal space but set out requirements for “adult/ older children recreation”
which is similar to the area recommended by Sport England for sports provision. The distinction between formal, informal and sport recreation areas is not clear cut and no precise details are available at this outline stage. For the numbers of dwellings proposed, the Council’s standards would require the Endurance site to provide 3.3 Ha and the Pelham Site 2.3 Ha. The Endurance proposal indicates 2.4 Ha of formal open space (including dual use of the school pitches) and the Pelham proposal 2.1 Ha.

Although the area for formal team sport pitches falls short (by 1.1 Ha) of the “adult/older children recreation” space required by the Council’s standards, I am minded to support the open space aspect of the applications. A large proportion of the ‘informal open spaces’ will lend themselves to active recreation of other types to foster healthy lifestyles. The provision of generous green infrastructure also has direct visual and ecological benefits, as well as providing areas for walking and informal recreation to help relieve pressure on other sensitive green spaces in the vicinity which are currently used for similar purposes (including County Wildlife Sites, see below). I consider the benefits of the informal green spaces proposed outweigh the disadvantage of the shortfall of formal sport-pitch space. It should be noted, however, that the Town Council have requested that the development should meet South Norfolk Council’s standards for open space.

Other facilities:-

Members will note that the applications also include a 0.2ha site for a community building (meeting room and/or changing/storage facility) adjacent to the ‘park’ within the Pelham site. A site for small scale retail development is suggested adjacent to Silfield Road and, as mentioned above, areas for allotments and a community orchard are suggested in response to public consultation by Endurance. Financial contributions to enhance the library service will be secured through legal agreement and the Endurance scheme includes provision for a 128 bed care home.

Taken overall, I consider that the level of community facilities to be provided, are acceptable, and consistent with relevant policy, most notably NPPF 8 (promoting healthy communities), JCS 7 (supporting communities) and SNLP WYM 14, SHO8 and 9 and LEI 7 and 9.

Housing – Layout and Design; numbers; density; heights

The applications are in outline for a total of up to 1,230 dwellings (730 and 500). The means of access is the only matter not reserved for later approval but the applicants have provided indications of the distribution, density and maximum storey height of the housing areas. The general design approach is similar across both sites, the intention being to create a range of distinct character areas, seeking to respond to the sites limited features and to their respective positions within the overall scheme.

The ‘character area’ around the new spine road which links through both application sites is referred to as the ‘Community Street’. This area would contain the highest density housing and also the highest buildings (up to 45dph and 3.5 stories in the Endurance scheme; up to 40dph and 3 stories in the Pelham scheme). Other character areas would take inspiration from existing or proposed features such as ‘New Lizard’, ‘Lakeside’ and ‘Peaceacre Park’. The areas adjoining existing development and the periphery of the site have lower densities and building heights. More detail of the intended approach can be found in the submitted Design and Access Statements.

The Council’s Design Officer has carried out an evaluation of the proposals using the ‘Building for Life’ criteria and the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide. A summary of his assessment is attached as Appendix 2. His main areas of concern are where there is insufficient information at this outline stage to be assured that the development will meet the required quality. This issue is to be addressed by imposing a condition requiring that a Design Code is prepared and agreed to which all future developers will have to adhere.
Special Development Management Committee 18 June 2013

Subject to this requirement, the development will comply with NPPF 7 (requiring good design) and JCS policy 2 (promoting good design).

Landscape and Visual Appraisal

4.47 Both applications include appraisals of the landscape and visual effects of the development. The site falls within the Wymondham Settled Plateau Farmland character area, but the assessments also consider impacts on other zones in the wider area. In brief, the appraisals conclude that the development of the site will not have a significant impact on the wider landscape, but the main visual impacts will be to the immediate area and within the site itself. The general mitigation strategy is to retain significant landscape features within the site and to carry out additional planting and creation of green spaces to soften the interface with the adjoining built up area and undeveloped land.

4.48 The existing sites are mostly level arable land from which historic boundaries have largely been removed, although some significant hedgerows remain. The sites are well contained, particularly as they are bounded by the existing built-up area to the north and west and by the A11 to the south and east. The Endurance site contains areas of woodland, including an area of former mineral workings where hollows and spoil heaps remain. One mineral pit, located off Silfield Road has been flooded to form a small fishing lake. The development has been designed to retain these significant features and to incorporate green areas for planting, to soften the appearance of the development and act as 'buffer zones' for the most sensitive adjoining areas. Views out of the site towards Wymondham Abbey are also recognised and the projected layout seeks to preserve these.

4.49 Although the development will clearly result in a significant change in the character of the site itself, the visual impact of the proposals will be limited in the wider area. Inclusion of significant green infrastructure within the development will enhance the quality of the new landscape created. Retention of existing features and additional planting, particularly around the periphery of the site, will help to mitigate the visual impact on the immediate area. Although the loss of large parts of the sites as undeveloped areas will cause some harm, I do not consider that this harm is sufficient to justify withholding permission in the light of the need and commitment to provide substantial growth in the area. In these circumstances the developments will be consistent with NPPF 11 (conserving and enhancing the natural environment) and JCS policy 1 (protecting environmental assets).

Ecology

4.50 Detailed assessments of ecological impact are included in both applications and the comments of relevant consultees are summarised above. I consider that the most notable points to emerge are as follows.

4.51 The nearest SSSI is Lower Wood Ashwellthorpe, approximately 2.5km from the sites. Although there is concern about increased pressure on the site from recreational visitors, English Nature have not raised objection, being satisfied that the amount of green infrastructure provided within the application sites and the degree of separation will mitigate impact to an acceptable level.

4.52 Similar concerns are expressed about increased pressure on several County Wildlife Sites (CWS's) close to the site, including The Lizard and Wades Pit which is immediately adjoining. Mitigation is provided by the green infrastructure within the application sites acting as a counter-attraction to spread or divert the impact of additional footfall. Access to the CWS’s directly from the sites is also to be restricted and managed to selected routes by reinforcing boundaries and improved footpaths. It should also be noted that the County Council propose a levy of £50 per dwelling to fund further works within CWS’s to manage and mitigate the impact of additional visitors. Because these are outline applications, further details would be required by condition to secure the precise design, layout and future management of the green infrastructure to ensure it has the desired mitigation effect.
A Construction and Environmental Management Plan will also be required to safeguard the CWS’s from potential dust or other pollution during the construction phase.

The only protected species to be found requiring specific mitigation measures is the Great Crested Newt which has breeding colonies in the area. A capture and translocation programme of any individuals found within the site will be required. The development will involve creation of additional habitats (eg as part of SUDS) so that the net impact is found to be acceptable.

4.53 The Council’s Ecologist has also stressed the importance of mitigating the impact of development on the adjacent CWS and recommends a number of conditions including a requirement that an Ecological Management Plan is agreed to ensure the satisfactory detail, implementation and future of the mitigation measures.

4.54 While I acknowledge the continued concerns of local organisations, I place significant weight on the fact that Natural England and the Council’s own Ecologist do not raise objection to the applications, provided that further details of the mitigation measures are agreed and secured by planning condition. In these circumstances the development is consistent with NPPF 11 (conserving and enhancing the natural environment), JCS policy 1 (protecting environmental assets) and SNLP policies ENV 14 and 15 (habitat and species protection).

Heritage Assets

4.55 Members will note that neither English Heritage nor the Council’s Conservation Officer raise objection having assessed the potential impact on the various listed buildings and Conservation Areas in the vicinity. The greatest potential for impact is in respect of the adjacent Lizard Conservation Area, but the development will include undeveloped areas to provide a buffer and transition between the new housing and the Conservation Area such that any impact will be acceptable.

Residential Amenity

4.56 A development of this scale will clearly increase the level of activity within the area, including during construction. Much of the additional vehicular traffic is ultimately likely to be along the new spine road and the end of Rightup Lane which should disperse the impact somewhat rather than solely impacting on Silfield Road. Nonetheless residents in the area are likely to experience an increase in traffic levels, especially during peak hours. However, Station Road and Silfield Road are already busy radial routes serving the Town and in the context of the policy requirement for growth, I do not consider that any increase in traffic disturbance could be argued to be unreasonable.

4.57 The more direct impacts on existing residential properties will be mitigated by the proposed layout which includes areas of open space around much of the site’s edge and in other areas is adjacent to properties with substantial rear gardens. The areas proposed for higher density and higher building heights are well away from the interface with existing properties. The precise details of layout and design would be agreed at the reserved matters stage, but I see no reason to object to the proposals as currently presented on the grounds of harm to residential amenity. I conclude that the proposals are consistent with SNLP policies 9 and 10.

Local Financial Considerations

4.58 In considering the applications for housing, a new school, open space and other community facilities, members may have regard to the following as material considerations of the development:

- Contribution of New Homes Bonus to 'Your Neighbourhood, Your Choice' budgets
Specific Development Management Committee 18 June 2013

4.59 Specific figures cannot be assigned at this stage, as they would be dependent on future market conditions, pace and phasing of development and detailed mix and tenure of housing provided.

Implementation and Phasing

4.60 Infrastructure Delivery Plans (IDP) have been submitted (see Appendices 3 and 4) to identify the triggers (mostly in terms of the numbers of houses built on each site) for the delivery of the main infrastructure elements and financial contributions:

- highway, pedestrian/ cycleway works (including drainage under rail bridge);
- Green Infrastructure;
- bus routing and stops;
- Travel Plan and Obligation monitoring fee;
- Thickthorn junction improvements;
- education facilities and High School MUGA;
- library service contributions
- green infrastructure contribution;
- fire hydrants;
- community facilities contribution and open space;
- ecological management plan
- Affordable Housing;
- foul drainage improvements.

4.61 It should be noted that the IDPs do not include delivery of the subway at the rail bridge which officers consider is essential to the development of both sites. While this and other details remain the subject of discussion, the IDPs (and consequently the applications) are not currently acceptable (see comments on highways above).

5 Conclusion

5.1 The principle of developing the sites is acceptable and the various constraints and sensitivities that arise could be addressed by mitigation and infrastructure/ service improvements. However, the key constraint on this land is its inadequate connectivity with the remainder of Wymondham caused by the poor existing highway network and the severing effect of the railway line. Officers are prepared to support the applications if Legal Agreement is first reached to guarantee delivery of a cycle/ pedestrian subway at the rail bridge (as set out at paragraphs 4.21 to 4.28), but without this key feature, the quality of the connections for such a large development is not acceptable.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tony Pierce – tpierce@s-norfolk.gov.uk

Chris Trett – ctrett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Dear Mr Pierce,

**South Wymondham: Proposed Housing Development by Endurance Estates Strategic Land Ltd and Pelham Holdings Ltd**

Thank you for consulting the Highway Authority on the above applications. Please note that whilst there are two applications all matters have been considered together due to the integrated nature of the proposals and the overarching highways and transport issues. Furthermore the proposed phasing allows development of the two application sites independently but with joint provision of infrastructure.

The applications have been supported by Transport Assessments which have analysed the impact of the proposals upon the surrounding highway network. As you are aware the Highway Authority has been in discussions with the developers for some considerable time in an effort to agree a suitable transport mitigation package for these two inter-dependent applications in order to ensure the developments, if consented, will be safe and sustainable. Much of that effort has concentrated on the railway bridge area of Station Road and how to balance the need to accommodate the very significant increased levels of traffic from the developments as well as provide a commodious, attractive and highly connective route for pedestrians and cyclists under the railway line to Wymondham town centre and it’s services to ensure the development is safe and as sustainable as possible.

To try to provide a commodious route for pedestrians and cyclists from the development to the town centre the developers are proposing improvements from the London Road/Station Road junction, along Station Road and for the full length of Silfield Road as well as using the existing pedestrian route under the railway via High Banks and the Lizard. However, lack of highway land or land in the control of the developer prevents the provision of a full 3.0m shared-use footway/cycleway along the whole length of Silfield Road and Station Road and on into Wymondham. Adequate provision is made across the London Road junction and along Station Road as far as the railway bridge. Widening of the very narrow footway under the railway bridge to 2m is proposed but this compromises the width and capacity of the carriageway as the developer does not control land to widen the footway/cycleway of 3m without narrowing the carriageway. Along Silfield Road much of the proposed footway/cycleway provision is below the 3.0m standard with several pinch points of below 2m and these improvements have been achieved at the expense of reducing the carriageway width of Silfield Road to 5.5m and the western footway to 1.5m. A toucan crossing is proposed to allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross Silfield Road near the existing mini-roundabout where the footway/cycleway crosses from the south side to the north side to go under the railway bridge.

At the railway bridge the developers have produced a range of potential improvements to try to
address the very narrow footway under the railway bridge. The final developer proposal is to widen the footway to 2m by reducing the existing carriageway width down to 5.5m width and replacing the mini-roundabout with traffic signals so that there is only one way working under the bridge. The Highway Authority considers that the scheme fails to accommodate adequately for all users of the highway, being sub-standard for pedestrians and cyclists, lacking in long term capacity and imposing unnecessary delays on vehicles 24hrs a day. It is considered essential that this fundamental link between the development and the town centre adequately provides for all users of the highway. It is deemed a prerequisite that all road users, particularly those most vulnerable such as pedestrians and cyclists, are accommodated safely under the railway line in a manner which provides for an attractive, highly connective route. It is the Highway Authority's view that without such enhanced provision the sustainability credentials of this site are severely and unacceptably compromised. The Highway Authority considers that a new pedestrian/cyclist subway alongside the railway bridge is a practical and affordable solution at this location that must be provided by the developers.

In terms of vehicular access strategy, a development of the scale proposed (approx 1250 dwellings in total) should be accessed from a Type 1 road which has a minimum width of 6.5m with a 2m footway and a 3m cycleway flanking the carriageway. This access road should have at least two points of access to the highway network onto roads of at least Type 1 standard. This is not the case with these development proposals where Silfield Road and Right-up Lane are below Type 1 standard both in carriageway and footway/cycleway provision and whilst an improved Station Road provides one point of access the other point of access is over the A11 out into the countryside and rural roads.

The existing bus service on Silfield Road that would be able to be diverted into the new development as it is built out. It is assumed that the bus operator will increase the frequency of service as the patronage from the new development increases.

Flooding under the railway bridge occurs whenever there is very heavy rainfall which leads to the temporary closure of Station Road to through traffic. The developer has designed a mitigation scheme which should reduce the frequency of flooding. This improvement should be completed before any dwellings are built to ensure that future network disruption on the primary access to this major growth area is minimised.

Whilst it is acknowledged that in principle the site's location has major potential benefits due to it's proximity to the town centre, employment provision and the rail station, unfortunately it is considered that the currently proposed highways / transport mitigation package is inadequate to deliver a well connected sustainable community and that the applications, which are dependent on each other coming forward, should be refused.

The Highway Authority therefore recommends a highway objection for the following reasons:-

**Inadequate Provisions for Pedestrians, Cyclists or People with Disabilities**

**SHCR 02** The proposed development does not adequately provide off-site facilities for pedestrians / cyclists / people with disabilities (those confined to a wheelchair or others with mobility difficulties) to link with local services. Contrary to NPPF and Development Plan Policies T2

**Inadequate Access to Route Hierarchy**

**SHCR 06** The proposal does not have adequate access to or is remote from a Main Distributor Route, as classified in Highway Authority's Route Hierarchy published by Norfolk County Council. The proposal, if permitted, would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to safe sustainable development in transport terms. Contrary to NPPF and Development Plan Policies T2

**Transport Sustainability**

**SHCR 33** The proposal is inaccessible from local service centre provision conflicting with the aims of sustainable development, the need to minimise travel, and the ability to reduce the reliance on the private car as represented in national and local policy. Contrary to NPPF and Policy 5 of Norfolk's 3rd Local Transport Plan, entitled Connecting Norfolk.

Notwithstanding the above advice, if a subway were to be provided to segregate vulnerable road users from vehicular traffic under the railway line at an early stage of construction of the development the Highway Authority considers that the additional benefit accruing from the provision of the subway and removal of the footway under the railway bridge to provide a widened carriageway would be significant enough to allow the Planning Authority to consider granting permission for the development provided the other sub-standard
elements of highway infrastructure identified above are improved as currently proposed by the developers.

I am aware that the developers have been asked to consider committing to the building of the subway but consider that the development is acceptable without the subway. That said the developers have indicated that they would be prepared to accept conditions/S106 to secure the provision of the subway and removal of the footway under the railway bridge to provide a widened carriageway subject to the applications being granted planning permission. The Highway Authority considers that it would be reasonable for the Planning Authority to grant permission if the subway and other works can be secured. In this scenario the Highway Authority would ask to be consulted on appropriate conditions.

If you require further clarification on the comments offered, or wish to discuss the contents of the County Council’s recommendation please contact me at david.higgins@norfolk.gov.uk or on 01603 222789.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Principal Engineer (Major & Estate Development)
for Director of Environment, Transport & Development

www.norfolk.gov.uk

---

To see our email disclaimer click here http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer
Summary of Building for Life and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide evaluation for applications 2012/0505 and 2012/0371

This is a significant site immediately to the south of Wymondham town centre, which is defined by a variety of attractive assets, for example extensive views into the countryside, proximity to The Lizard Conservation Area and views across the historic market town of Wymondham and the Abbey Towers. The proposals successfully capitalise these key assets by creating a well structured building layout that builds on the quality of Wymondham and its surroundings.

An in depth analysis of the form, layout and character of Wymondham has been carried out that helps to create a set of design principles that give the proposals a defined identity based on a set of proposed residential character areas. The analysis has also looked beyond the core of Wymondham to consider how the proposals can be informed by the surrounding land uses, landscape setting and movement network. This includes information about how the site responds to its surrounding land uses, for example its relationship between The Lizard Conservation Area, which forms the boundary to the north east of the site.

The application is supported by a green infrastructure framework that sets out in broad terms how the development could be defined by parks, linked greens, play areas, playing fields and structural landscape planting. While some information is provided about how these areas could interface with residential character areas, we feel that more information needs to be provided about how key elements of the green infrastructure could help to define and enhance streets and spaces throughout the development and how these spaces will balance the needs of residents and roads.

Pedestrian and vehicle movement across the site is proposed through a network of footpaths and streets that allow connections to the existing residential areas of Wymondham to the north and Silfield to the east. We however feel that the detailed design of these routes and whether they form separate pedestrian and cycle routes through the site is unclear at this stage. It is also not known what dedicated routes will be provided outside of the site that connect to the existing built up areas of Wymondham, particularly that overcome the severance of the railway bridge and the B1172 corridor to connect the site to Wymondham town centre. We also feel that there is limited information provided at this stage that shows how streets will successfully interact with open spaces and the green corridors, to create safe and attractive spaces that do not act as a barrier to accessing the proposed green infrastructure network.

It is felt that a Design Code is needed to further define the character of the development and guide the detailed design stage. We feel that this will help to provide a greater level of certainty in terms of what the development could look like beyond outline stage and how the proposals will successfully combine each of the character areas and landscape elements into one coherent development that joins up with the proposed and existing land uses. The applicant should also work with the local planning authority and Norfolk County Highways to come up with a set of proposals that successfully overcome, or much reduces the severance effects of the railway line and B1172 by improving pedestrian and cycleway connectivity to Wymondham town centre.

Assuming that a Design Code can be provided that establishes a set of robust design parameters then I have no hesitation in recommending the applications for approval.

C. Watts 14 February 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silfield Road / Station Road junction</td>
<td>To be provided before completion of 150th unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix for detail Drawing number 24196/006/014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Scheme (Station Road)</td>
<td>To be provided by NCC prior to occupation of the first dwelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Appendix for detail</td>
<td>Funding provided by developer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing number J150-SK:008 Rev C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item: London Road / Station Road Junction

See Appendix for detail

Drawing ITB6047-GA-022 Rev B (Junction)

Drawing 24196-006-011 Rev A (Footway)

Trigger:

To be provided before completion of 200th unit.
Item

Pedestrian / Cycle improvements to Silfield Road (North).

See Appendix for detail
drawing 21496-006-008

Trigger

To be provided before completion of 40th unit.
Item
Pedestrian / Cycle improvements to Silfield Road (Endurance Frontage).
See Appendix for detail
Drawing 24396-006-009

Trigger
To be provided before completion of 100th unit.
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PARK FARM, SOUTH WYMONDHAM

Item
Pedestrian / Cycle improvements to Stiffield Road (South).

Trigger
See Appendix for detail Drawing 24196-006-010

To be provided before completion of 100th unit.
**Item**

Estate Roads Connection

**Trigger**

One estate road and one site distributor road to be provided to agreed locations respectively between points A and B before completion of the 300th unit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus Routing / Stops</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Phase 1 to 3 Plans are indicative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The provision of bus routes and stops will be determined by the requirements of each phase of the EE and PH developments, taking into account the following principles:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Proposed bus routes within the site should be in the order of 6.0m in width.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Bus stops should be located within the site to ensure, as far as practicable, that the majority of residents are within 400m of a bus stop location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Bus stops should be of good quality providing, if appropriate, a shelter, seating and timetable information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Bus stop locations are shown on the attached Phase 1 to Phase 3 Plans and are indicative and subject to discussion / agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus routing and the provision of stops to be provided on the basis of the following principles, which are illustrated on the indicative phasing plans:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1</strong> – use of existing bus routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2</strong> – diversion of existing bus route into the development area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3</strong> – establishment of new bus route to serve the whole development area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The exact routing and location of bus stops will be determined following discussion with the bus operator, EE, NCC and SNC and will respond to the actual phasing of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Council Monitoring Obligation Fee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Council Travel Plan Annual Monitoring Fee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Council Travel Plan Contribution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thickthorn Junction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muga at High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Social / Community</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Provision</td>
<td>Contribution of £60 per Unit payable pro rata on occupation of every 50th unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Contribution of £50 per Unit payable pro rata on occupation of every 50th unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Service</td>
<td>Committee to provision of necessary fire hydrants – 10 at cost of £844 per hydrant totalling £8,440.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>Contribution of £595 per Unit payable pro rata on occupation of every 50th Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>In accordance with the principles established in the Design and Access Statement, the developer will provide a minimum of approximately 2.9ha of land laid out as formal open space and approximately 6ha of land laid out for informal open space and green infrastructure purposes. Delivery of major open spaces to be as set out above. Details to be confirmed in a Phasing Plan to be submitted to and approved by SNC by completion of 50th unit. Prior to the occupation of the first dwelling, the applicants will prepare an Open Space Management Plan that will set out the maintenance arrangements for the open space on the site. This might be by way of commuted sum or establishment of private management company.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ecological Management Plan</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Management Plan</td>
<td>An Ecological Management Plan has been prepared to support the development and to help secure protected species licences. This will be appended to the s106 Agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Affordable Housing</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Provision of a maximum of 25% affordable housing as discussed with Keith Mitchell.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Foul Drainage</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foul Water Infrastructure (off site rising main)</td>
<td>To be provided before completion of the 104th unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carriageway realigned into existing refuge / verge to provide 3.2m footway / cycle way on eastern side and 8.0m carriageway width.

3.2m wide footway / cycle way within Endurance site frontage.
South Wymondham
Infrastructure delivery plan

Endurance Estates (2012/0371)
Item
Stiffled Road/Station Road Junction
(see Appendix for detail:
drawing number ITB047-GA-040)

Trigger
To be provided before completion of 150th Unit.
Option of alternative scheme to be delivered if Pelham scheme comes forward (option 6b Pba – by way of additional financial contribution)
Item
Drainage Scheme (Station Road)

Trigger
To be provided by NCC prior to occupation of the first dwelling. Funding provided by developer.
Item
London Road & Station Road Junction
Dw No ITB6047-GA-022 Rev B (JUNCTION) and
Dw No 24196-006-011 Rev A (FOOTWAY)

Trigger
To be provided before completion of 300th Unit.
**Item**

Pedestrian/Cycle Improvements Silfield Road North  
Der No 24196-006-008

**Trigger**

To be provided before completion of 60th Unit.
Item
Pedestrian/Cycle Improvements Silfield Road
Endurance Frontage

Trigger
To be provided on implementation of the EE development.
Item
The Lizard Links
Dw No ITB047-GA-037 Rev B

Trigger
To be provided before completion of 50th Unit on EE site north of Right Up Lane.
**Item**
Primary Road Link to Primary School

**Trigger**
Primary Road to link Stiffled Road with the Primary School and Rightup Lane to be provided before completion of the 200th Unit.
Item
Estates Roads Connection B

Trigger
One estate road and one site distributor road to be provided to agreed locations respectively between points A and B before completion of the 300th Unit.
**Item**  
On Site Green Infrastructure

**Trigger**
Area 1 before completion of 50th Unit south of Rightup Lane.
Area 2 before completion of 300th Unit south of Rightup Lane.
Area 3 before completion of 50th Unit within Parcel B.
Area 4 before completion of Parcel A.
| Public Transport | The provision of bus routes and stops will be determined by the requirements of each phase of the EE and PH developments, taking into account the following principles:
  1. Proposed bus routes within the site should be in the order of 6.0m in width.
  2. Bus stops should be located within the site to ensure, as far as is practicable, that the majority of residents are within 400m of a bus stop location.
  3. Bus stops should be of good quality providing, if appropriate, a shelter, seating and timetable information.
  4. Bus stop locations shown on the attached Phase 1 to 3 Plans and are indicative and subject to discussion / agreement.

Bus routing and the provision of stops to be provided on the basis of the following principles, which are illustrated on the indicative phasing plans:
  - **Phase 1** – use of existing bus route.
  - **Phase 2** – diversion of existing bus route into the development area.
  - **Phase 3** – establishment of new bus route to serve the whole development area.

The exact routing and location of bus stops will be determined following discussion with the bus operator, PH, NCC and SNAC and will respond to the actual phasing of development. |
| County Council Monitoring Obligation Fee | £3000 |
| County Council Travel Plan Annual Monitoring Fee | Assessed at £500 pa until completion of development. Payment to NCC of the annual monitoring fees to be made by EE upon completion of the s.108 Agreement. |
| County Council Travel Plan Contribution | £600 per Unit Payment to NCC of £600 per Unit. The payments will be made by EE on a pro rata phased basis as follows: £25,000 to be paid on commencement of development and then further instalments paid upon the occupation of each 100th Unit together with a final balancing payment as necessary. Alternatively EE could produce, implement and manage their own Travel Plan upon payment of a performance bond of £500 per unit, which will reduce pro rata as the development is built out. |
| Thickethorn Junction | Implementation of nil detriment scheme prior to occupation of 194 units (as per Highways Agency letter to C. Trett of 27.9.12) |
Bus route phasing plans

Phase 1 - Existing bus routes
- Existing bus stops
- Major bus routes
- Future development areas
- Endurance development areas

Phase 2 - New bus route into area
- Existing bus stops
- Proposed bus route
- Major bus routes
- Future development areas
- Endurance development areas

Phase 3 - Future plans
- Existing bus stops
- Proposed bus stops
- Major bus routes
- Future development areas
- Endurance development areas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Education</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Provision of new school on site and financial contributions as agreed with NCC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muga at High School</td>
<td>A payment of £150,000 to be made towards provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First payment of £50,000 on occupation of 75th unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second payment of £50,000 on occupation of 150th unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third payment of £50,000 on occupation of 200th unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social / Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Provision</td>
<td>Contribution of £60 per Unit payable pro rata on occupation of every 50th Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Contribution of £50 per Unit payable pro rata on occupation of every 50th Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Service</td>
<td>Commit to provision of necessary fire hydrants - 17 at cost of £344 per hydrant totalling £14,348.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community facilities</td>
<td>Contribution of £505 per Unit payable pro rata on occupation of every 50th Unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>In accordance with the principles established in the Design and Access Statement, the developer will provide a minimum of approximately 2.4ha of land laid out as formal open space (including the school pitches) and approximately 13ha land laid out for informal open space and green infrastructure purposes. Delivery of major open spaces to be as set out above. Details to be confirmed in Phasing Plan to be submitted to and approved by SNDC by completion of 50th unit. Prior to the occupation of the first dwelling, the applicants will prepare an Open Space management plan that will set out the maintenance arrangements for the open space on the site. This might be by way of commuted sum or establishment of private management company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecological Management Plan</strong></td>
<td>An Ecological Management Plan has been prepared to support the development and to help secure protected species licences. This will be appended to the s106 Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordable Housing</strong></td>
<td>Provision of a maximum 25% affordable housing as discussed with Keith Mitchell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foul Drainage</strong></td>
<td>Foul Water Infrastructure (off site rising main)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To be provided before completion of the 150th unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>