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Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time

1.30 pm Blomefield Room

Agenda

Date
Wednesday 22 October 2014

Time
2.30 pm

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 are intending to speak.

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

14/10/2014
SOUTH NORFOLK COUNCIL – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

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 Plan Documents 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 (with amendments to the JCS being adopted in January 2014). It is the starting point in the determination of planning applications and as it is adopted, policies within the plan can be given full weight when determining planning applications.

The remaining ‘saved’ policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003) also carry full weight in the determination process, unless officers specifically advise otherwise.

South Norfolk Council is also in the process of preparing various Local Plan Documents: the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document, Area Action Plans for Wymondham and Long Stratton and the Development Management Policies Document. These documents will allocate specific areas of land for development, define settlement boundaries and provide criteria based policies giving a framework for assessing planning applications. None of these emerging Local Plan documents have yet been submitted for independent examination, and so the weight to be afforded to emerging policies and allocations is assessed on a case-by-case basis.

A further document which also forms part of the South Norfolk Development Plan is the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan. The CNDP was formally ‘made’ (adopted) on 24 February 2014, and full weight can now be given to the policies of the CNDP when determining planning applications in Cringleford parish.

In a number of instances the Council has produced Supplementary Planning Documents which expand upon the policies of the Development Plan; these documents do not change policy or create new policy, but they are a material consideration in the determination of 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.
AGENDA -

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 7)

4. - Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 9)
   To consider the items 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>2013/1793/O</td>
<td>Cringleford</td>
<td>Land south of Newfound Farm Lane, Cringleford</td>
<td>9</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.

6. - Date of next scheduled meeting – Friday 14 November 2014
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.

3. FILMING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS: GUIDANCE

Members of the public and press are permitted to film or record meetings to which they are permitted access in a non-disruptive manner and only from areas designated for the public. No prior permission is required, however the Chairman at the beginning of the meeting will ask if anyone present wishes to record proceedings. We will ensure that reasonable facilities are made available to the public and press to assist filming or recording of meetings.

The use of digital and social media recording tools, for example Twitter, blogging or audio recording is allowed as long as it is carried out in a non-disruptive manner.
HEALTH AND SAFETY INFORMATION

| Fire alarm | 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 |
| Mobile phones | Please switch off your mobile phone or put it into silent mode |
| Toilets | The toilets can be found on your right and left of the lobby as you enter the Council Chamber |
| Break | There will be a short comfort break after two hours if the meeting continues that long |
| Drinking water | A water dispenser is provided in the corner of the Council Chamber for your use |

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

| A | Advert | G | Proposal by Government Department |
| AD | Certificate of Alternative Development | H | Householder – Full application relating to residential property |
| AGF | Agricultural Determination – approval of details | HZ | Hazardous Substance |
| C | Application to be determined by County Council | LB | Listed Building |
| CA | Conservation Area | LE | Certificate of Lawful Existing development |
| CU | Change of Use | LP | Certificate of Lawful Proposed development |
| D | Reserved Matters (Detail following outline consent) | O | Outline (details reserved for later) |
| EA | Environmental Impact Assessment – Screening Opinion | RVC | Removal/Variation of Condition |
| ES | Environmental Impact Assessment – Scoping Opinion | SU | Proposal by Statutory Undertaker |
| F | Full (details included) | TPO | Tree Preservation Order application |

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

| CNDP | Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan |
| J.C.S | Joint Core Strategy |
| LSAAP | Long Stratton Area Action Plan – Pre Submission |
| N.P.P.F | National Planning Policy Framework |
| 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 and works specified) |
| S.N.L.P | South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 |
| Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document – Pre Submission |
| Development Management Policies Document – Pre Submission |
| WAAP | Wymondham Area Action Plan – Pre Submission |
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 -
DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF -

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

YES

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

NO

Pecuniary Interest

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

YES

Related pecuniary interest

NO

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

YES

Other Interest

You are unlikely to have an interest. You do not need to do anything further.

NO

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

YES

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

Is it a matter I have been, or have lobbied on?
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

1. - Appl. No : 2013/1793/O
Parish : CRINGLEFORD

Applicants Name : Barratt Eastern Counties and John Innes Foundation
Site Address : Land South-west Of Newfound Farm, Colney Lane, Cringleford
Proposal : Outline planning permission for a development of 800 dwellings together with a small local centre, primary school with early years facility, Two new vehicular accesses off Colney Lane, associated on-site highways, pedestrian and cycle routes, public recreational open space, allotments, landscape planting and community woodland.

Recommendation : Approval with conditions:

1. Standard time limit
2. Approval of reserved matters
3. A phasing plan to be submitted and agreed
4. Overarching landscaping strategy for whole Housing Site Allocation Area to be agreed and implemented
5. Replacement landscaping within 5 years of planting
6. Retention of trees and hedges unless otherwise agreed
7. Tree protection measures to be agreed as required
8. Hedgerow mitigation measures to compensate for loss of some hedgerow on site
9. Overarching design code for whole Housing Site Allocation Area to be submitted, agreed and implemented through reserved matters applications
10. Materials to be used in construction of all development to be agreed
11. Mineral extraction to be further assessed and agreed as appropriate
12. Ecological enhancements and habitat management plan to be agreed
13. Roads, footways and cycleway layout to be agreed
14. Construction traffic management plan to be agreed
15. Compliance with the construction traffic management plan
16. Wheel cleaning facilities to be agreed
17. Compliance with agreed wheel washing facilities details
18. Access to site from Colney Lane details
19. Colney Lane/Round House Way roundabout improvement works
20. A11 Newmarket Road/Roundhouse Way signalisation works to be agreed by 400th dwelling and completed by 500th dwelling occupation
21. A11/A47 Thickthorn Interchange improvement works to be agreed by 50th dwelling and completed by 100th dwelling occupation
22. Additional access onto Colney Lane to be completed by 750th dwelling occupation if no site access achieved on land to east by this point
23. Travel plan 
24. Provision of cycle parking 
25. Provision of refuse storage 
26. Layout and provision of land for servicing and parking at non-residential uses 
27. Surface water – compliance with submitted Flood Risk Assessment 
28. Foul water disposal strategy to be agreed 
29. Contaminated land – site investigation, verification report and long term monitoring report 
30. Unknown contamination to be reported if found 
31. External lighting to be agreed 
32. Construction management – noise and dust 
33. Scheme of archaeological investigation to be agreed 
34. Hours of use of uses within local centre to be agreed 
35. Hours of servicing and delivery to non-residential uses 
36. Position and specification of any plant and machinery on non-residential uses to be agreed 
37. Restriction of retail to convenience goods only 
38. Restriction of only 500sq.m. floorspace in local centre 
39. 10% renewable or low-carbon energy of total requirement for residential and non-residential uses 
40. Water efficiency of 105 litres per person per day for all new dwellings 
41. Control measures for noise from surrounding roads to be submitted and agreed 
42. Provision of fire hydrants for residential and commercial areas 

Subject to Section 106 agreement to ensure the delivery of affordable housing, land for the primary school, the local centre, open space (including allotments and a community orchard) and a travel plan.

The outline permission would also be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy, which would be collected at the reserved matters stage.

Members should note, there is a potential for this application to be called in the Secretary of State. Once a decision has been made by Members the SoS will advise as to whether he will call-in the application to make the final decision on this application.

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 08: 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
NPPF 13: Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals
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 5: The Economy
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 in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 14: Key Service Centres
Policy 19: The hierarchy of centres
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
ENV 2: Areas of open land which maintain a physical separation between settlements within the Norwich Policy Area
ENV 3: River valleys
ENV 6: Areas which contribute to maintaining the landscape setting of the southern bypass of the city of Norwich
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside
ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)
ENV 13: Sites of regional and local nature conservation interest and geological/geomorphological value
ENV 14: Habitat protection
ENV 15: Species protection
ENV 17: Public access to sites of nature conservation value (Part Consistent)
ENV 21: Protection of land for agriculture
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 10: Noise
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting
SHO 9: Shop sites in major residential developments
SHO 10: Class A3 uses outside the defined Central Business Areas
LEI 2: Village halls and small scale leisure facilities
LEI 6: Smaller scale leisure facilities (Part Consistent)
LEI 7: Open space provision in new development
UTL 15: Contaminated land
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
TRA 2: Safeguarding of the cycle network
TRA 3: Provision of cycle facilities
TRA 13: Corridors of movement
TRA 17: Off-site road improvements

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place-Making Guide 2012

1.5 Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies relevant to this application site</th>
<th>Relevant to Outline (O) or Reserved Matters (RM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEN1 Co-ordinated approach for delivering overall growth</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN2 Protection of heritage assets</td>
<td>O &amp; RM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GEN3 Protection of significant buildings       O & RM
GEN4 Provision of infrastructure           O & RM
ENV1 Provision of landscape corridors       O & RM
ENV2 A11 Landscaping                      O & RM
ENV3 Protection of hedgerows              O & RM
ENV4 Yare Valley protected areas          O
ENV5 Provision of sustainable drainage     O & RM
ENV6 Provision of open space and community woodlands O & RM
HOU1 Housing Allocation                   O
HOU2 Design Standards                     RM
HOU3 Density of development               RM
HOU4 Mix of property types                RM
HOU5 Provision of sheltered housing and care home RM
HOU6 Minimizing energy use in dwellings   RM
HOU7 Space standards                      RM
HOU8 Provision of garages                 RM
HOU9 Provision of affordable housing      RM
HOU10 Protection of heritage assets       O
ECN1 Provision of business accommodation  RM
ECN2 Provision of local shopping facilities RM
SCC1 Provision of primary school          O
SCC2 Provision of medical facilities     O
SCC3 Provision of walking/cycling routes  RM
SCC4 Construction methods for community buildings RM
SCC5 Provision of playing field and play areas O & RM
SCC7 Provision of library facilities     RM
SCC8 Provision of allotments and community orchard O
TRA1 Major estate roads                   O & RM
TRA2 Thickthorn interchange improvements O
TRA3 Provision of walking / cycling routes O & RM
TRA4 Pedestrian and cycle needs           RM


1.8 Circular 02/2013 – Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development (2013)

1.9 Ministerial statements

Neighbourhood Planning (July 2014)

1.10 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan

Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be in spring 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.10.1 Emerging Development Management Policies (Submission version (2014))
DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.2 Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development
DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM2.6 Food, drink and hot food takeaways
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.11 Promotion of sustainable transport
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.15 Pollution, health and safety
DM3.16 Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
DM3.17 Improving the level of local community facilities
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.5 Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open spaces
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

2. Planning History

2.1 2010/1948 Screening opinion for residential development EIA required

3. Other related planning history

3.1 2013/1493/O Outline planning application with all matters reserved (save access) for the creation of up to 650 residential dwellings (use class C3), up to 2,500 sq mtrs of use class A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and D1 floorspace, together with highways works, landscaping, public realm, car parking and other associated works. Refused

3.2 2012/1477/O & 2012/1880/O Total dwellings delivered by these two overlapping permissions: 1,000 NRP North and South Outline masterplans. Total floorspace proposed: approximately 150,000 sq m research and development (an ancillary uses) approved across both permissions. Approved

3.3 2011/1804/O Residential led mixed use development of 1196 dwellings and associated uses including Primary School, Local Services (up to 1,850 sq. m (GIA) of A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1 & B1 uses) comprising shops, small business units, community facilities/doctors' surgeries, sports pitches, recreational space, equipped areas of play and informal recreation spaces. Extension to Thickthorn Park and Ride including new dedicated slip road from A11. Approved

3.4 2001/1852/O & 2008/2347/O Erection of 750 dwellings, school, local shop, community facilities, playing fields, open space, roads, cycleways and footpaths on Land North Newmarket Road Cringleford And Outline application for residential development (626 units) and associated infrastructure including open space and recreational woodland, site for Primary Approved
School, Community facilities and up to 1486sqm mixed use (A1, A2, A3, A4, A5) Neighbourhood Centre (revised Phase 2 - Round House Park) | Phase 2 Round House Park Round House Way Cringleford

4. Consultations

4.1 Cringleford Parish Council (Appendix 3)  

First response (November 2013):
- Prejudicial to the coordinated approach to overall planning for growth in the development boundary stressed in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Average net density of 45 dph far exceeds the figure in the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (CNDP)
- Layout and massing of dwellings are more suitable to an urban-style development than the rural setting of Cringleford.
- More green space should be provided.
- The primary and secondary vehicle access into the site from Colney Lane will create traffic problems. A joint transport assessment would prevent this piecemeal approach.
- No provision is made across the housing allocation for playing fields in line with policy SCC5.

In response to making of Neighbourhood Plan (March 2014):
- Uncoordinated approach to whole site area through two separate applications
- Total number of dwellings in both this and adjacent application (2013/1494/O) exceed neighbourhood plan required by 250.
- Density too high
- Transport and highways impact

Second response (July 2014):
- Disregard other development sites within the development boundary of the Parish (2013/1494/O). Development area must be viewed as a whole.
- Total number of dwellings in both this and adjacent application (2013/1494/O) exceed the CNDP limit of approx. 1200 by 20.8 per cent. This cannot be regarded as approximate.
- Acknowledges that while the proposed net density of 42 dph across the site may be close to its requirement of an approx. average of 25 dph gross, it maintains that densities of 35-65 dph are out of line with HOU2 and HOU3.
- Remains concerned about transport issues and endorse comments made by NCC Highways.
- Proposals for a playing field of 2.5 ha do not comply with policy SCC5 which require a 3.8 ha playing filed. Also concerned about its siting underneath electricity pylons.
Comment made in March 2014 still remain and feels application breaches CNDP.

Third response (August 2014)

- The revised plans for the 3.8 ha of recreation ground space is not a usable space with junior football pitches overlaid on top of adult pitches which means that adults and juniors cannot play at the same time
- Still objects to the density of housing per hectare which remains too high.

4.2 Colney Parish Council (Appendix 4)

- Too many dwellings compared to neighbourhood plan requirement
- Inadequate open space and landscape buffers
- Transport and highways impact
- Impact on ecology

4.3 District Members: Cllr C Kemp

- This application ought to be dealt with in public by the Development Management Committee.
- This is a very significant application both for the Parish of Cringleford and for the whole District.
- Its consistency with the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan ought, in the interests of democracy and informed decision-making to be debated in open Committee.

4.4 Cllr Wheatley

- To be reported if appropriate.

4.5 County Councillor

- Traffic concerns and concern over density, leading to parking on narrow roads.

4.6 SNC: Parks and Amenities Technical Manager

- Adequate play areas and open space.
- Concern over the initial plans for two pitches to be provided where the provision is for 3.8ha and there seems to be only provision made for 2.5ha.

4.7 English Heritage

- No specific comments, council’s own heritage specialists to comment on application as needed.

4.8 SNC: Conservation and Design Architect

- Suggest a condition requiring that a Design Code is prepared and agreed to which all future developers and development parcels will have to adhere to ensure appropriate character and quality of development is achieved at detailed design stage.
- Building heights need consideration to create a sense of place and legibility.
- Newfound Farm buildings of local interest, an undesignated heritage asset. Due to trees and vegetation and open space the indicative layout is not considered to have an adverse impact on the setting of these buildings.
4.9 Historic Environmental Services

- No objection subject to appropriately worded conditions for further archaeological works to those already submitted to date.

4.10 SNC: Landscape Officer

- Pleased to note that the Landscape Master plan retains a large proportion of the existing boundary hedgerows and mature trees.
- The two proposed accesses from Colney Lane will require removal of some vegetation, and this might include sections of possibly ‘important’ hedgerows.
- No detailed arboricultural survey or impact assessment at this stage. However, the Masterplan appears to offer scope to ensure that the retained vegetative features are afforded sufficient space.
- Site lies within the NSBLPZ as reviewed by Chris Blandford Associates, but does not encroach upon the 145m Landscaped Protection Zone.
- Would be useful to have a full assessment of the ‘importance’ or otherwise of the exiting hedgerows implicated in the highways proposals at Colney Lane.
- Request landscape conditions to ensure appropriate landscaping is provided.

4.11 SNC: Housing Enabling Strategy Officer

- Affordable housing will comprise of 33% units, proposed tenure of 15% social rented and 85% shared ownership acceptable. To be secured through an accompanying Section 106 agreement.

4.12 Highways Agency (Appendix 1)

- Following extensive discussion on mitigation models, agreement reached.
- Provided conditions for improvement to A11/A47 Thickthorn interchange and Travel Plan it is not considered there would be an adverse impact on the A47.

4.13 Norfolk County Council Highways (Appendix 2)

In principle the site is in a sustainable location and accessible to local services and employment. After significant discussion on highway matters including the impact on the surrounding road network and cycling and walking connectivity the proposals are now considered to be acceptable subject to conditions.

4.14 Norfolk County Council Minerals & Waste

Objection raised over the potential for minerals on site and lack of site investigations undertaken at application stage.

4.15 Norfolk County Council Planning Obligations

Two consultation responses (both before Community Infrastructure Levy was implemented):

- Request land and contribution for primary school
- Request contribution toward secondary school provision in Hethersett.
- Request financial contribution and conditions to provide 13 fire hydrants for the residential uses and further hydrants for commercial (depending on final floorspace approved for each use class)
- Allocation of land and contributions to a sub-library on site, or contribution to an additional library.
- Management of biodiversity areas should be considered.

Third response after (Community Infrastructure Levy was implemented):
- County Council acknowledges that most infrastructure requirements would need to be funded through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) but requests land for primary school and provision of fire hydrants through condition.
- Also request financial contribution for on-site sub-library.
- Financial contribution for management of biodiversity areas also suggested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.16</th>
<th>Norfolk County Council Public Rights Of Way Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are no registered Public Rights of Way within the application site or adjacent vicinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drawings show future pedestrian/cycle access leading into areas of green infrastructure. More information should be provided showing the purpose and context of these routes with regard to their future status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.17</th>
<th>SNC: Environmental Services (Flood Defence Officer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject to conditions on final design, ownership and management of surface water drainage features no objections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.18</th>
<th>Environment Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No objection subject to appropriate planning conditions to cover compliance with flood risk assessment, contamination site investigation, contamination verification report and long term monitoring report, and responding to previously unknown contaminants found on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity for foul water disposal, although a separate application to the water company would be required to ensure an appropriate design to the connection to the main trunk sewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measures to improve sustainability suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waste management strategy requested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.19</th>
<th>Anglian Water Services Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anglian Water have identified the works that are required to increase foul sewage capacity and produced a strategy to deal with this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An appropriate planning condition to agree a suitable scheme to prevent foul sewage flooding events is to be agreed in writing with the Planning Authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.20 SNC: Environmental Services (protection)  
• Considered noise, contaminated land, electromagnetic radiation from overhead power cables and air quality. No objection subject to appropriate planning conditions to deal with noise, contaminated land and remediation, and external lighting provision if required.

4.21 Natural England  
• Concern over impact from visitor pressure to Broads Special Area of Conservation and National Park, Broadland Special Protected Area and Ramsar site.
• Green infrastructure needed on site to mitigate impacts.
• Eaton Chalk Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest not affected.

4.22 Norfolk County Council Green Infrastructure & Ecology  
• Proposals have considered the impact on County Wildlife Sites, a management plan will be required to mitigate impacts.
• Bat corridors to north of site must be at least a 10m buffer and must not be lit.
• A comprehensive habitat management plan is required with a minimum of 10 years management before handover to an appropriate authority.
• Lighting plan required for rural fringe nature of the development to consider bats.
• A phasing plan may be required before determination.

4.23 Norwich City Council Natural Areas Officer (Ecology)  
• Agree with opinion expressed by Norfolk County Council Green Infrastructure and Ecology (paragraph 4.20 above)

4.24 Norfolk Wildlife Trust  
• Impact on farmland birds including species such as skylark, linnet and yellow hammer.
• Do not consider that the impacts on habitats outside of the site boundary and on the CWS have been adequately assessed.
• Imperative that mitigation measures are put in place to take account increased recreational impact on the Yare Valley.
• Acknowledges that the issues of provision of green infrastructure and mitigation on the Yare Valley are likely to be addressed within the CNDP.

4.25 Norfolk Constabulary  
• Would like to see all the development constructed to Secure by Design accreditation.
• Further details should be provided at the detailed stage.
• Would also request a financial contribution is made to assist with policing and community safety

4.26 Norfolk Fire Services  
Primary school and local centre would require fire hydrants.
4.27 **British Gas Connections Limited**
No comments received.

4.28 **EDF Energy**
No comments received.

4.29 **National Grid**
No power lines on site managed by National Grid. UK Power Networks are likely to manage the power lines near the site.

4.30 **Sport England**
Response to be orally updated at meeting as appropriate.

4.31 **Norfolk County Council Planning Authority (for schools)**
Any subsequent reserved matters applications for the school building should be determined by the county council if the school is funded by the county council.

4.32 **Local Residents**
3 letters of objections covering a range of issues and 2 letters neither supporting or objecting to the planning application:

- Development proposals fail to conform to the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan, including location of primary access points, loss of trees and hedgerows and too high density.
- Important to see improvements to highway network and contributions to the cost of local upgrades.
- Impact to the landscape and environment, including changes the environment, threatening open green spaces, habitat and farmland.
- Disregard to landscape and environmental policies and landscape designations, including the strategic gap, southern bypass protection zone and the Yare Valley.
- Impact on loss of existing biodiversity and key farmland species in Cringleford.
- Impact of traffic through Colney and adjacent villages and access to the NNUH, including proposed two access points on Colney Lane and safety of existing roads.
- Looks forward to seeing more detailed proposals for the provision of football pitches.
- No objection to the Change of Use from agricultural to residential.

5 **Assessment**

**Location and Description of Site**

5.1 The site is located in Cringleford on the south western edge of Norwich and has a total site area of approximately 28.67 hectares. The site comprises of one parcel of land that extends from Colney Lane, which forms the north-eastern boundary, to a line of overhead electricity cables which forms the south-western site boundary. The site is bounded to the south by agricultural fields leading to the A47 and separated by a narrow strip of land from Round House Way to the east. Agricultural fields are located to the north west of the site with the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital (NNUH) and the Norwich Research Park beyond.
5.2 The site is in the open countryside currently used as agricultural land located within the southern bypass protection zone and the majority of the site is within the designated strategic gap under local plan policies. More recently the area has been re-allocated under the neighbourhood plan to have an allocated housing development area and a landscape buffer zone of 145m to the east of the A47.

5.3 A small number of residential properties are located on the north-eastern boundary of the site, with access from Colney Lane, which includes Newfound Farm and its associated outbuildings. The buildings are not listed but being of local interest are undesignated heritage assets. There are existing trees and vegetation to the boundaries between this group of buildings and the proposed development site.

5.4 There are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Registered Battlefields or Registered Parks and Gardens within 1km of the proposed development site. The site is outside of Cringleford Conservation Area located about 900m to the south-east and the closest listed building is a 19th century Round House, about 400m from the study site.

5.5 The site comprises of a mixture of arable and pasture land, partially enclosed by hedgerows and small blocks of woodland. The topography is relatively flat, with a gentle slope rising from the south west to the north east in association with the nearby Yare River Valley, which is a County Wildlife Site. Site features comprise of a mixture of hedgerows and trees along some of the site boundaries and an existing hedgerow and trees that follow the approximate alignment of Round House Way to the east edge of the site.

5.6 Views into the site are contained from the east by adjacent settlement and to the north by the main tree groups in the Yare Valley. There are views across the site from the A47 corridor to the south, from the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital to the west, from Round House Way to the east and Colney Lane to the north. Elsewhere the site is relatively open. The existing trees and hedgerows which form the boundary to the site are visually important and create a sense of enclosure and maturity in an otherwise urban edge landscape which is dominated by the new housing to the east (Round House Park) and Hospital to the north west. The woodland planting along the A47 corridor is also an important feature of the local landscape helping to separate the urban edge landscape to the north of the A47 from the more open and intact rural landscapes to the south.

5.7 The Yare Valley is an important ecological corridor. Strategic ecological connections in the area follow the river valleys, extending the connectivity between the river valley habitats and the farmland habitats on the valley sides. There are links on the north of the site on the opposite side of Colney Lane to the UEA Broad and surrounding woodland (including Cringleford Woods) via the landscaped area adjacent to Round House Way. There are further links along the north side of the A47, which provides a potential wildlife corridor stretching along much of the length of the dual carriageway and, with the exception of the Thickthorn Interchange, linking with more extensive wildlife habitat to the south east, for example Intwood Carr and wetlands near Keswick, as well as to the north west around Colney Wood and Milestone Plantation.

The Proposal

5.8 The planning application proposes a residential-led development on the land to include the following:

- Up to 800 dwellings;
- A small local centre to the west of the application site;
- A primary school with early years facility, also to the west of the application site;
- Two new vehicle accesses off Colney Lane;
- Recreational spaces and equipped play areas of play;
- Allotments; and
- A community woodland.
5.9 The planning application is in outline form only, which reserves the details of all matters (except access) for determination at a later date. The application includes an illustrative masterplan and supporting information that indicates the broad parameters of land use, density and building heights of the proposed development.

5.10 A revised site layout plan demonstrating open space provision has also been submitted in July 2014. This was in response to the recent refused application 2013/1494. This amended plan sought to demonstrate that the application site could accommodate a playing field as required by a policy under the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan. This matter is considered further in the report below.

5.11 A Screening Opinion (reference 2010/1948) on whether the proposal would require an Environmental Impact Assessment was submitted in November 2010. It concluded that the proposed development would require an Environmental Impact Assessment which was subsequently submitted with this current planning application.

Key Considerations

5.12 The main issues to be taken into account in the determination of this application are an assessment of the proposal against the policies of the development plan, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), relevant material considerations, and whether the application contributes towards achieving sustainable development.

5.13 The Development Plan for the area comprises of the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (CNDP) (2014), which sets out the overall strategy for providing 1,200 additional homes until 2026 on sites dispersed across the Housing Site Allocation Area (HSAA), the Joint Core Strategy for South Norfolk, Broadland and Norwich (adopted 2011, amendments in 2014); and the saved policies of the South Norfolk District Local Plan (2003);

5.14 The CNDP was supported through a referendum and the district council formally made it part of the development plan in February 2014. Policy HOU1 of the CNDP identifies a site for approximately 1,200 dwellings as shown on the CNDP Proposals Map (Appendix 5).

5.15 Policy 9 of the JCS identifies Cringleford as a focus for major growth and development and states that housing will be addressed by the identification of new allocations to deliver 1,200 dwellings. Policy 10 of this strategy goes on further to detail at least 1,200 homes will be delivered at this site, with provision for pre-school and a primary school on site, expansion of existing services nearby, safe pedestrian and cycle routes to the city centre, hospital, research park and Hethel and improved green infrastructure to enable access to the adjacent river Yare valley.

5.16 Alongside this, consideration should be given to the supply of land for housing in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA). Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. The council is working towards demonstrating a five year land supply in the Norwich Policy Area and whilst very close to the required supply, at present cannot demonstrate this. This leads to relevant housing policies being out-of-date. Any decision for housing development should therefore be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the harm.

5.17 The principle of development has therefore been established through the current made neighbourhood plan for the site. It is noted that the land is currently greenfield, grade 3 agricultural land and has several constraints including the southern bypass protection zone as identified within policy ENV6 of the local plan, it is partially within the strategic gap
between Cringleford and Hethersett under policy ENV2 of the local plan and within open
countryside under policy ENV8 of the local plan. However the allocated housing site in the
CNDP supersedes these policies as it has been made part of the development plan more
recently. The principle of development has already been established under the CNDP.

5.18 The key considerations for this development are therefore compliance with policies within
the neighbourhood plan in particular in number and density, the principle of the non-
residential uses, highways and transport, design and heritage, landscaping and open,
public rights of way, affordable housing, contamination, water and flood risk, residential
amenity, ecology, minerals, renewable energy and local financial considerations.

Compliance with neighbourhood plan

5.19 The neighbourhood plan for Cringleford sets out policies which have been identified by the
community, considered through the neighbourhood plan process, examined and amended
by an examiner from the Planning Inspectorate and once agreed through a referendum in
Cringe ford was made into part of the development plan.

5.20 As part of the development plan a neighbourhood plan should have significant weight.
However, in the absence of a five year land supply the policies relating to housing are out-
of-date. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF in this instance requires development to be approved
without delay unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably
outweigh the benefits. The adverse impacts are considered further below.

5.21 In relation to the current application there are a number of policies in relation to the
environment, housing, economy, the community and transport. There are also overarching
policies to guide how development comes forward in Cringleford.

Co-ordinated approach

5.22 Policy GEN1 of the CNDP seeks to ensure there is a coordinated approach between
developers and authorities to deliver housing and infrastructure. Concern has been raised
in representations made on this application at the lack of cohesiveness between this
application and the recently refused application (2013/1494) on the adjacent land within the
HSAA by Land Fund.

5.23 There have been significant discussions between the developers for both sites and the
council to ensure the development is cohesive and ensures the delivery of required
infrastructure. Whilst a joint application and Section 106 agreement would be the optimal
way forward, this has not been an approach the separate applicants wanted to take. The
council has therefore considered other ways to ensure the developments delivered are
cohesive.

5.24 The key matters which require a cohesive approach are delivery of the required
infrastructure identified in the CNDP and a cohesive approach to design, access and
landscaping in particular where the two sites adjoin each other.

5.25 The CNDP requires the delivery of a site for a primary school, a 3.8 ha playing field,
allotments, community orchard, good pedestrian and cycle links and a new sheltered
housing scheme and care home.

5.26 These requirements are met within this current application as detailed below in the report.
The different requirements are either secured now through a S106 agreement, or as with
cycle and pedestrian links will be secured at the reserved matters stage of the application.
The provision of a care home was proposed under application 2013/1494, but provision can
still be made on this site for this requirement under policy HOU5 of the CNDP as a future
scheme comes forward. The application is therefore considered to accord with policies
GEN1 and GEN4 of the CNDP.
5.27 The provision of medical facilities for the increased demand from the new development is also a requirement of policy SCC2 of the CNDP. There has been no evidence presented by the local health authority to request that provision is made on site. In the absence of the evidence to demonstrate the increased demand it is not reasonable to refuse the current application on the basis of no healthcare facility being provided.

5.28 Policy SCC7 of the CNDP requires provision for additional library facilities for the library service that serves the proposed development. There is a statutory duty for Norfolk County Council to provide a library service, monies from Community Infrastructure Levy could be used for this if required.

Housing numbers and density

5.29 The neighbourhood development plan requires “Approximately 1,200 new homes should be dispersed across the Housing Site Allocation Area as shown on the Proposals Map” under policy HOU1 of the CNDP.

5.30 The CNDP also identifies in policy HOU3 “To preserve the open and green character of the village and its role in the urban/rural transition zone, net building densities should average approximately 25 dwellings per hectare (gross) across the Housing Site Allocation Area (HSAA).”

5.31 The proposed development of 800 dwellings in itself does not exceed the identified approximate level of 1,200 dwellings. Concern has been raised however that 1,200 dwellings is exceeded when considering the recently refused application 2013/1494 on the adjacent land within the HSAA for 650 dwellings.

5.32 In considering the overall numbers proposed under the CNDP, the Examiner at the examination for the CNDP was concerned that the required density policy along with the amount of land available in the HSAA would be too small to enable all policies to be met.

5.33 The Examiner suggested amendments to the policies of reducing the landscape buffer (thus increasing the HSAA in size), and changing the density policy to gross rather than net. The Examiner concluded that with these changes the 1,200 houses could be accommodated. This conclusion included the assumption that some land would be required for the proposed Thickthorn junction improvement, as identified in policy TRA2 of the CNDP. A proportion of land from the HSAA could be required to enable this improvement work to occur.

5.34 If at a later date it is proven that this land is not required for a highway improvement scheme then a revised application could be submitted for 650 dwellings on the site for application 2013/1494 which would exceed the 1,200 dwellings. An assumption however was made in the examination of the CNDP that this land would be required (see paragraph 50 of the Examiner’s report) when identifying the number of dwellings in policy HOU1. If at a later date this situation does occur the council would have to consider any revised application on the site for application 2013/1494 on its planning merits. It is not reasonable to refuse this current application being considered on the basis more than 1,200 dwellings could come forward across the HSAA however, provided other policies are met such as density.

5.35 The second issue on number of dwellings has also been considered in relation to the required density. There has been significant discussion over the proposed density of dwellings, and the interpretation of the above policy on density. The policy wording suggested the net building density should be approximately 25 dwellings per hectare (dph) gross. A net figure cannot be expressed as a gross figure, the figure must be either one or the other. The inclusion of the word net in the policy has led to extensive discussion. This however can be clarified by the text in paragraph 54 of the Examiner’s report for the CNDP.
5.36 In this section of the Examiner’s report, the concern over density is discussed. The Examiner concluded that the approximate density of 25 dph should be gross to accommodate all the development within the HSSA. The calculation of gross density can include all associated land within the application site, including the school and local centre. The Examiner gave clear consideration to the ability to meet the housing number of 1,200 and a sufficient density to ensure effective public transport or local services are viable within paragraph 53 of the Examiner’s report.

5.37 The inclusion of the word net in the policy wording unfortunately can only be concluded to have been included in the policy by mistake. It was retained from the original wording. The Examiner’s report provides some clarification to this matter, as does the submission made by South Norfolk Council to the examination clearly requesting the Examiner to state this policy was gross. Given the above facts and the requirement of paragraph 58 of the NPPF which seeks to ensure policies within neighbourhood plans seek to optimise the potential of a site to accommodate development it is considered that the density should be 25 dph gross. The average density of the proposed development is therefore 28 dph, which is considered to accord with policy HOU3 of the CNDP as it is approximate to 25 dph.

5.38 It should be noted however that whilst this density is considered to be approximate to the required density, if the whole HSAA was built at this density it would lead to 1,344 dwellings. Whilst applications on the remainder of the HSAA are separate decisions to be considered on their merits, this decision does affect policy HOU1 of the CNDP. In considering whether this resultant effect on total numbers of dwellings there are two material considerations from the NPPF that should be considered. Paragraph 58 of the NPPF requires neighbourhood plans to optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, and paragraph 14 requires consideration of the harm weighed against the benefits of a proposal in the absence of a five year land supply.

5.39 The requirements of the neighbourhood plan are given significant weight in the consideration of these issues, particularly in light of the recent ministerial statement in July 2014 which identified the Government’s clear intention for neighbourhood planning to give local people an opportunity to ensure they get the right types of development for their community while also planning positively to support strategic development needs. The fact the site is allocated for housing and the current absence of a five year land supply must also be given weight however. Given that the application site is allocated for housing, this slight higher density and potential resultant higher number of dwellings across the HSAA is considered to be acceptable in this instance and not result in any adverse impact that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of delivering housing on this allocated site. The proposed density of 28dph is considered, however, to be approximate to the required density of 25dph.

5.40 Concern has also been raised over the variation in density shown on the indicative density parameter plan submitted with the application. This plan indicates that some areas of housing would increase to 65 dph. Whilst this is not the density that the parish council wished to see in the emerging neighbourhood plan, the wording of policy HOU3 was amended by the Examiner to “average approximately 25 dph gross”. The density therefore does not have to be uniform across the site, provided the overall gross density is approximately 25 dph. The varying density would be of benefit as it would offer a mix of house types and sizes.

5.41 The proposed development is therefore considered to accord with policies HOU1 and HOU3 of the CNDP.

5.42 The remaining policies relevant to this application from the CNDP include ENV1, ENV3, ENV4, ENV5, ENV6, HOU2, HOU4, HOU5, HOU6, HOU7, HOU8, HOU9, ECN1, ECN2, SCC1, SCC3, SCC5, SCC6, SCC7, SCC8, TRA1, TRA3 and TRA4 and are considered further below in the relevant section of the report.
Principle of non-residential uses

5.43 The development proposes a small local centre of up to 400sq.m. and a primary school with early years facility.

5.44 The provision of a primary school is welcomed by South Norfolk Council. Policy 10 of the JCS identifies the need for an additional primary school for this proposed growth, which is further identified under policy SCC1 of the CNDP. Secondary school provision would be at Hethersett Academy. The provision of land for the primary school would be secured through a Section 106 agreement, with Community Infrastructure Levy monies delivering the actual school building and contributing towards expansion at Hethersett Academy therefore adequately addressing this requirement.

5.45 The provision of a local centre would help meet the aims of policy TRA3 of a walking neighbourhood, providing services to the new dwellings that can be accessed on foot or cycling. The scale of the proposed local centre (400sq.m.) would not require an impact assessment on surrounding existing defined centres, and the choice of location is considered to be sequentially preferable as it seeks to support the new dwellings. The proposed local centre is therefore considered to be acceptable under policies TRA3 of the CNDP, local plan policies SHO2 and SHO9, policy 6 of the JCS and sections 2, 4 and 8 of the NPPF.

4.46 The requirements of policy ECN1 and 2 of the CNDP relate to the provision of small-scale employment uses which consider the impact on surrounding residents, highway network and environment. Policy ECN2 also specifically restricts retail to convenience goods only. The precise layout and floorspace of the local centre would be determined through reserved matters applications. A condition is recommended to ensure no more than 500sq.m. of local centre floorspace is provided, as this would then require a retail impact assessment to be submitted. A condition is recommended to restrict retail use to convenience goods only. Conditions are also recommended for the agreement of any plant or machinery, hours of servicing and delivery and the provision of cycle stands to ensure the local centre has an acceptable impact in line with these policies.

Highways and transport

5.47 There has been significant discussion through the course of this application on the highway impact from the proposed development. Whilst it was recognised the site is in a sustainable and accessible location, the impact on the A47, A11 and local roads, along with cohesiveness with the adjacent development site (2013/1494) were matters of discussion with the Highways Agency (Appendix 1) and Norfolk County Council (Appendix 2) respectively.

5.48 The proposed development would take its primary access from Colney Lane to the north of the application site. There may be requirement for a second point of access in the form of a T-junction on Colney Lane, but this would only be dependent on whether or not links are provided to the adjacent development. Suitable planning conditions can ensure these are adequately provided in either instance. In relation to the connection to the proposed adjacent development through walking and cycling, the key routes are considered to be acceptable but will be subject to further discussion at the reserved matters stage which will approve the layout of all development. The issue of cohesiveness between the two developments is therefore considered to be adequately addressed.

5.49 Improvements to walking and cycling links at the Colney Lane/Round House Way roundabout are also agreed to be provided through condition.
5.50 The connection of Round House Way to the A11/Newmarket Road has been considered, and through the use of a condition to require agreement of the design of junction improvement measures by occupation of the 400th dwelling and implementation of the agreed scheme by the occupation of the 500th dwelling, the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the safe and free flow of traffic.

5.51 The impact on the functioning of the Thickthorn interchange has also been discussed with the Highways Agency and Highway Authority. After discussion it was concluded that the impact on Thickthorn interchange could be adequately mitigated if an improved junction design was agreed prior to occupation of the 50th dwelling on this development, and the construction of the approved design prior to occupation of the 100th dwelling. This is recommended to be secured through condition.

5.52 It is important to note that this development is considered to be acceptable subject to the above condition relating to the Thickthorn interchange. The proposed development under application 2013/1494 was recently refused due to conflict with TRA2 of the CNDP, which requires no development to prejudice the delivery of improvements to this junction. The current application being considered however does not cover any land that could be required for junction improvement schemes due to the distance from this junction, and therefore would not prevent the delivery of such schemes. Therefore policy TRA2 of the CNDP is not considered to be compromised with this current application.

5.53 A travel plan is also to be secured through condition and the accompanying Section 106 agreement.

5.54 Subject to the recommended conditions the proposed development is acceptable to the Highways Agency and Highway Authority, and is considered to be in accordance with policy TRA1 of the CNDP, local plan policies IMP8 on the safe and free flow of traffic and IMP9 on the protection of residential amenity.

5.55 The promotion of walking and cycling as required under policies SCC3, TRA3 and TRA4 have been indicated at the outline stage to an acceptable level on the indicative local connectivity plan and will be implemented through reserved matters applications.

Design and heritage

Layout and design

5.56 The application is in outline only with all matters reserved except for access. The proposal is supported by a detailed Design & Access Statement along with an indicative layout which has been informed by a local connectivity framework, and land use, density and building heights parameter plans.

5.57 The submitted plans have been considered against the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide and Building for Life criteria. The overall layout and design principles shown so far are considered to be broadly acceptable. The overall building heights required further consideration to ensure a strong ensure of place and legibility is created throughout the development. However to ensure that good design is achieved at the reserved matters stage a design code is recommended to be agreed through condition. This will ensure all future developers and development parcels will achieve a good character and quality of development at the detailed design stage.

5.58 A Building for Life Assessment has been carried out but due to the outline nature of the application it is not possible to achieve green scores under all questions. It is considered that seven of the questions would currently be scored as amber and five green as further details would be required to fully assess these at the reserved matters stage. This is considered to be acceptable due to the outline nature of the application.
5.59 The outline proposal is therefore considered to comply with policy 2 of the JCS and provisions within section 7 of the NPPF. Further detailed design at the reserved matters stage will consider the layout and form of development to accord with policies HOU2, HOU4, HOU7 and HOU8 of the CNDP.

Archaeology and Heritage Assets

5.60 Policy ENV9 of the local plan and policies GEN2 and GEN3 of the CNDP require consideration to be given to any potential heritage assets on the site. An archaeological field evaluation has been carried out on the site which found features of archaeological interest including at 16th/17th century kiln and a number of pits. The Historic Environment Service has requested a further scheme of written investigation to be conditioned at the reserved matters stage.

5.61 There are no listed buildings in close proximity to the application site, the closest being the Round House, a Grade II listed building which is located north west of the A11/Newmarket Road roundabout over 550m from the application site boundary. This building is surrounded to the west by mature vegetation and is at some distance from the application site. The setting of this listed building is therefore not considered to be affected by the development proposed.

5.62 The buildings that form Newfound Farm on Colney Lane have been considered to have some heritage interest as non-designated heritage assets, as identified in policy GEN3 of the CNDP. The proposed development has been considered in relation to the setting of these assets, but due to the existing trees and vegetation there is not considered to be an adverse effect on the significance of these buildings.

5.63 The development therefore accords with policy IMP15 of the local plan, Section 12 of the NPPF and Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Landscape and open space

Landscape

5.64 The site is located within the Yare Tributary Farmland character area as identified in the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide. The development is also within the southern bypass protection zone as identified within policy ENV6 of the local plan, partially within the strategic gap between Cringleford and Hethersett under policy ENV2 of the local plan and within open countryside under policy ENV8 of the local plan as detailed earlier in the report.

5.65 The development would have most visual impact at the local scale from viewpoints along Round House Way and Colney Lane. The visual impacts from the wider landscape will be limited, particularly as the young vegetation alongside the A47 matures. There will be a significant landscape impact in terms of the change from rural to semi-urban landscape character, but with the potential to enhance the landscape setting this impact would be mitigated to some degree.

5.66 Under the requirements of policy ENV1 of the CNDP a 145m buffer zone is to be provided along the A47, to the west and south boundaries of the site. This land is not included within the development proposals for this application. Neither is the development within the protected areas as identified within policy ENV4 of the CNDP.

5.67 The overall landscape impact however must be considered in light of the fact there is a housing allocation on this site under the CNDP and the presumption in favour of sustainable development under paragraph 49 of the NPPF. The overall landscape impact is therefore considered to be acceptable.
5.68 The indicative landscape masterplan shows the retention of significant trees on site which is welcomed. The final layout at reserved matters stage would consider the siting of development and impact on trees, a condition is recommended to ensure no removal of trees and vegetation unless agreed with the council, and details of tree protection to be submitted and agreed.

5.69 The proposed access into the site would remove a section of hedgerow along the north of the site. Whilst this is regrettable, the wider benefits of the scheme of delivering up to 800 dwellings must be weighed against this loss. An assessment on the historic and archaeological value of the hedge has also not been submitted despite requests for this. However, the site is allocated for residential development and access must be achieved into this site. The proposed access is acceptable in highways terms and so the proposed access points on balance are considered to be acceptable in relation to loss of existing hedgerows. To mitigate against this loss a condition is recommended to protect all existing retained hedges on site, and for appropriate mitigation measures to improve the remaining hedgerows on site. The proposed development is therefore considered to be in accordance with policy ENV3 of the CNDP and policy 1 of the JCS.

Open space and playing pitches

5.70 Open space is shown in the indicative site layout, along with equipped play areas. A total of 1.4ha of child playspace and 3.6ha of open space is to be secured through the accompanying S106 agreement. The precise location and connection of these would be identified at the reserved matters stage to accord with policy ENV6 of the CNDP. Allotments of 0.4ha in size and a community woodland are also indicated to be provided on the indicative masterplan. These are required under policy SCC8 of the CNDP.

5.71 The CNDP also requires the overall development area to provide playing pitches totalling 3.8ha in area, and in one location. These should be capable of accommodating football pitches and cricket pitches. This application would provide the site for the required school, and the recently refused application (2013/1494) to provide the required playing pitches.

5.72 In the absence of a current planning application for the remainder of the Housing Site Allocation Area (HSAA) the applicants for this application being considered have submitted an indicative plan to demonstrate the pitches could be provided on land within their ownership if required. However, it would only be reasonable to request they provide the proportion of the required 3.8ha if the other site did not come forward as they only own a proportion of the land. This would lead to potentially a smaller playing pitch on 2.5ha of land. However, if the other site came forward the full provision could then be made on separate land within the ownership of Land Fund. The provision of the playing pitches on this current application would be triggered if development did not come forward on the other site (2013/1494) within an agreed timescale in the accompanying S106.

5.73 A plan has been submitted to demonstrate how 3.8ha could be provided on this current site. Whilst some of the adult and junior pitches overlap, this is still considered to meet the requirements of policy SCC5 of the CNDP.

5.74 On the matter of density, the applicants have suggested that the provision of this playing pitch further reduces the density of their development. However, as this is only demonstrated as a fall-back position and is not within the red line for this current application it cannot be considered presently under this application for impact on density. This matter has already been considered in the report above.
Public Rights of Way

5.75 There are no designated public rights of way affected by the proposed development. Norfolk County Council Public Rights of Way Officer has asked for further information on the cycle and pedestrian access points leading into areas of green infrastructure in particular their future status. The location and layout of these would be secured through reserved matters applications. A condition is recommended for the details of these to be submitted and agreed to the council in conjunction with the local highway authority.

Affordable Housing

5.76 The proportion of affordable housing required by Policy 4 of the JCS for a development of this size is 33% and this percentage has been met by the applicants. The tenure mix of 85% social rent and 15% intermediate ownership has also been agreed with the applicants. This provision would be secured through a Section 106 agreement. The location and dispersal of affordable housing as required by policy HOU9 of the CNDP would be determined at subsequent reserved matters stages.

Contamination

5.77 The potential for contamination on site has been considered, but given the previous use as agricultural land the risks are considered to be lower. However, given the sensitive nature of the proposed development conditions are recommended for further on site assessment, verification and if required remediation work.

Water and flood risk

5.78 The requirement for water conservation under policy 3 of the JCS would require all dwellings to meet code level 4 for water usage, which is recommended to be conditioned. This would also meet the intention of policy HOU6 of the CNDP. The issues of surface water and foul water are considered further below.

Surface water

5.79 The site is in the lower risk flood zone 1, but due to the size of the site surface water requires careful consideration. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted with details of how flood risk will be minimised through the use of sustainable drainage systems (SUDs). This identifies that the site is a mixture of sand, gravels and deposits of clay, leading to further site investigations being required. The precise measures to attenuate surface water and long term maintenance and management of the surface water drainage scheme are to be submitted and agreed through condition. The requirements of policy 1 of the JCS and policy ENV5 of the CNDP are therefore considered to be met subject to final design through condition.

5.80 The Environment Agency raise no objection but would like appropriate planning conditions to ensure compliance with the submitted FRA to meet the requirements of paragraph 103 of the NPPF to not to increase flood risk elsewhere.

Foul water

5.81 There is capacity for the treatment of foul water from this development at Whittingham Sewage Treatment Works, but to ensure there is no increased risk from flooding with the addition of this development a foul water strategy is recommended to be conditioned.
Other matters

5.82 A Water Framework Directive Assessment is required by the Environment Agency. In line with the advice given in the National Planning Policy Guidance, this is a separate assessment which the Environment Agency must undertake if planning permission is granted.

5.83 A waste management strategy to re-use and recycle products from the construction phase where possible has also been requested by the Environment Agency. This is recommended to developers to ensure the most efficient use of resources, but in the absence of any standards set out in the development plan this cannot reasonably be conditioned.

Residential Amenity

5.84 Local Plan policy IMP9 requires that new development does not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents. A development of this scale will inevitably increase the level of activity within the local area, including during the construction phases.

5.85 The additional dwellings will lead to further traffic movements, additional noise from residents, and impacts on outlook and privacy for some existing residences in Round House Park and dwellings on Colney Lane to the north of the site. These impacts will be mitigated by the proposed layout which includes areas of open space located adjacent to properties on Colney Lane. Proposed dwellings to the west of Round House Way would be at sufficient distance to the existing dwellings on the east of Round House Way to not lead to a significant loss of amenity to those existing residents on Round House Park.

5.86 The extent of the impact on existing residents will to a large degree be due to the final design of dwellings, which would be agreed through reserved matters phases. The height of buildings and positioning of building plots and windows will all require due consideration to ensure there is no significant adverse impact on residences. The impact on highway traffic has been considered above through the highways and access section of this report.

5.87 The remainder of the Housing Site Allocation Area does not currently benefit from a current permission, but there is some landscaping on the boundary of the site for this current application and adjoining proposed residential land. This creates some separation, which along with the final details within the reserved matters would enable an appropriate layout to be agreed that would lead to a good standard of residential amenity.

5.88 Other local plan policies relating to impact on residential amenity include policy IMP10 (Noise). The noise assessment indicates that the noise levels would be broadly acceptable, but it is recognised that there would be a certain level of noise from the surrounding key roads. It is considered this could be appropriately mitigated through control measures for which a condition is recommended to identify and agree these.

5.89 The provision of a local centre and school could also lead to an impact on residential uses from noise and light pollution. These impacts could be mitigated at the reserved matters stage, but to ensure these impacts can be adequately controlled conditions are recommended for any external lighting, hours of servicing and delivery for non-residential uses, hours of use of local centre uses and any plant and machinery to be agreed.

Ecology

5.90 Policies ENV14 and ENV15 of the local plan require protected habitats and species to be considered before granting permission for any development. In the instance of this site the presence of farmland birds such as skylarks, linnets and yellow hammers have been considered on the site, along with increased visitor pressure to adjacent County Wildlife Sites and the need to ensure good links to green infrastructure (access to the countryside for recreation).
5.91 Visitor pressure to the Broads Special Area of Conservation and National Park, Broadland Special Protected Area and Ramsar site have all been considered through the appropriate assessment for growth identified within the Joint Core Strategy and was found to not have a significant adverse impact. The impacts of this development on Eaton Chalk Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest has also been considered but the proposed development is no considered to have an adverse impact on this site in the view of Natural England.

5.92 Following consultation with Norfolk County Council ecologists it has been identified that appropriate mitigation for farmland birds could be secured through a S106 agreement. CIL monies from this site would also provide money towards surrounding green infrastructure such as County Wildlife Sites.

5.93 The detailed design at a reserved matters stage would need to ensure appropriate bat foraging corridors are maintained, lighting controlled in sensitive areas and mitigation of the loss of existing hedgerows on site through replacement planting. A condition is also recommended for a habitat management plan to ensure surrounding habitats are appropriate managed. The provision of landscaping to ensure green infrastructure and habitat corridors are created would also be addressed at the reserved matters stage.

Mineral extraction

5.94 The site has been identified by Norfolk County Council as likely to contain mineral deposits of use. The site is identified within the Minerals Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document (2013) as a mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel, which should be safeguarded and not ‘needlessly sterilised’ by other development. This policy direction is reiterated in paragraph 143 of the NPPF.

5.95 Further site investigation was required by Norfolk County Council to ascertain further detail on the mineral deposits under the site but unfortunately this has not been undertaken by the applicants.

5.96 It is considered however that a suitably worded condition could require further site investigation and if appropriate recovery of any mineral deposits from the site prior to the construction of any development on the site.

Renewable energy

5.97 Under the requirement of policy 3 of the JCS, all new development over 10 dwellings is required to generate 10% of its required energy use from renewable or low-energy sources. This is also supported by policy HOU6 of the CNDP. This is recommended to be conditioned and subsequently addressed at the reserved matters stage.

Local Financial considerations

5.98 Section 143 of the Localism Act on Local Finance Considerations requires consideration to be given to the financial benefits a development would bring to the council through grant income, such as New Homes Bonus. This development would also be liable for CIL, although the precise amount would only be calculated at the reserved matters applications stages once residential floorspace was known.

5.99 However the benefits the scheme would deliver need to be weighed against the different issues raised above and put into the planning balance when considering the merits of the application.
Appropriate Assessment and Environment Impact Assessment

5.100 The proposal would not affect the integrity of any internationally protected sites (Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation) individually or in accumulation with other permitted development and extant consents in the surrounding area and therefore, in accordance with Regulation 61 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, it is considered that the development would not have a significant impact on any protected habitats and accordingly no Appropriate Assessment of the development is required.

5.101 The proposals have been considered against the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2011. The environmental, social and economic impacts have all been considered and are adequately addressed as detailed in the above report and subject to the recommended conditions.

Other matters raised

5.102 It should be noted that there is remaining land in the HSAA in the ownership of these applicants which is not proposed to be developed for housing. Whilst concern could be raised of the potential for this land to be used for further housing, a proportion of this land is within the landscape buffer zone and there are power cables running from north to south (although potentially could be undergrounded) through this section of the site which reduces the developable area. However, if the required density policy was met along with open space and all associated infrastructure requirements there is a potential that further housing could come forward on this site. This cannot lead to this current application being refused however, as the proposals are considered to meet the requirements of the development plan.

5.103 Norfolk Constabulary has responded with suggestions relating to design and requirements for contributions for the policing of this new development. The detailed design would be considered at the reserved matters stage of the application. In relation to contributions unfortunately there is no requirement under adopted policy for a contribution to be made to the police. Also no monies are identified through Community Infrastructure Levy for the police. It is therefore not reasonable to request any form of financial contribution from developers for this application.

5.104 There are 132KV power lines running outside the development proposals for this site. There are also lower voltage 11KV power lines that run along the south west boundary of the site and transect the site to the south. It is feasible to underground these power cables, which would require a separate consent under separate legislation on electricity transmission.

5.105 The provision of fast broadband connections is required under policy SCC6 of the local plan. This matter is controlled by communications providers which does give the local planning authority limited input into enabling this. The existing development at Round House Park however has been confirmed to have access to fast broadband, but this is a matter which would be reviewed again at the reserved matters stage.

Conclusion

5.106 The proposed development is considered to comply with policies within the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (2014), the Joint Core Strategy (2011, amendments adopted 2014), the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
5.107 The application for 800 dwellings at this site would provide a significant amount of housing toward the overall housing land supply in the Norwich Policy Area on an identified housing allocation, which will contribute to deliver the planned growth within the Norwich Policy Area. The site is in a sustainable location and therefore under paragraph 49 of the NPPF should be considered in the context of a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In the absence of a five year land supply development should be approved without delay if relevant policies are out-of date unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

5.108 In this instance, following extensive discussions over the highway impact of the scheme an acceptable solution was found. Conflicts with the loss of hedges were balanced against the benefit of the scheme, and other issues raised have been suitably addressed through recommended conditions.

5.109 Detailed consideration has also been given to the policies within the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan. The proposals are broadly in compliance with the policies, but the density of housing is recognised to be slightly higher than identified within policy HOU3 of the CNDP. This has been considered on balance with all material considerations, but given that this is an allocated site the delivery of housing is considered to be a significant benefit. The concerns of the parish council have been given extensive consideration to see if the proposals put forward meet the requirements of the neighbourhood plan.

5.110 In this instance the outline proposals are considered to meet these requirements and there are not considered to be adverse impacts that significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Therefore it is recommended the application is approved subject to conditions, approval of reserved matters to meet further neighbourhood development plan policies and a completed Section 106 agreement to secure the identified infrastructure in this report.
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INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB) have been providing technical advice to the Highways Agency (HA) with respect to the Newfound Farm development proposal. Our most recent response in relation to Newfound Farm was provided in PB Technical Note 02 dated 25th April 2014. This set out our position based on progress with the neighbouring proposed development known as ‘Land West of Cringleford’ and in light of AECOM’s technical note titled ‘Development Impact on Thickthorn Interchange’ dated 24th March.

1.1.2 On 29th April AECOM issued an updated version of the document titled ‘Development Impact on Thickthorn Interchange’ now dated 15th April 2014 along with an additional note titled ‘Development Impact on Thickthorn Interchange: Operational Assessment’. The latter note has been prepared to test the impact of the traffic generated by Newfound Farm upon the Thickthorn interchange.

AECOM TECHNICAL NOTE ‘DEVELOPMENT IMPACT ON THICKTHORN INTERCHANGE’ (UPDATED 15 APRIL 2014)

2.1.1 There doesn’t appear to be any explanation as to why the document titled ‘Development Impact on Thickthorn Interchange’ has been re-issued. Looking through the above note with the previous version it appears the flow inputs have changed as follows:

- Increase in total junction flows in sensitivity tests 1 & 2 in the AM peak in tables 2 & 3 by 124 PCU’s.
- Decrease in total junction flows in sensitivity tests 1 & 2 in the PM peak in tables 2 & 3 by 155 PCU’s.
- Increase in total junction flows in sensitivity test 4 in the AM peak in table 4 by 124 PCU’s.
- Increase in total junction flows in sensitivity test 5 in the AM peak in table 5 by 322 PCU’s.
- Decrease in total junction flows in sensitivity test 4 in the PM peak in table 5 by 155 PCU’s.
- Decrease in total junction flows in sensitivity test 5 in the PM peak in table 5 by 185 PCU’s.
- Increase in total junction flows in sensitivity test 5 in the AM peak in table 6 by 323 PCU’s.
- Decrease in total junction flows in sensitivity test 5 in the PM peak in table 6 by 185 PCU’s.

2.1.1.1 The changes in flows are not shown to alter the overall percentage impacts as shown in tables 7 & 8 and the purpose of the note remains in terms of stating that if you increase the background traffic at the A47/A11 junction, the proportional impact of development traffic will reduce. However, for the HA to consider the impact of a development upon a junction it is not sufficient to base an assessment upon changes in flows alone so we look to AECOM’s operational assessment of the junction and our comments are provided in section 3 of this note.
3 AECOM TECHNICAL NOTE: DEVELOPMENT IMPACT ON THICKTHORN INTERCHANGE: OPERATIONAL ASSESSMENT (29 APRIL 2014)

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 The following AECOM LinSig models of the Thickthorn junction have been reviewed:

- Thickthorn Junction_v7_(150414)_For_Technical_Note_Base (the Base Model);
- Thickthorn Junction_v6_(280414)_For_Technical_Note_HN_Improvements (the Improvements model).

3.1.2 Given AECOM submitted two technical notes to the HA recently we refer to them in the remainder of this technical note as follows:

- Development Impact on the Thickthorn Interchange updated 15th April 2014 (the "first" TN);
- Development Impact on Thickthorn Interchange: Operational Assessments dated 28th April 2014 (the "second" TN).

3.2 Base model review comments

General Layout

3.2.1 The base model represents the existing roundabout layout (i.e. without the proposed Hothersett capacity improvements).

3.2.2 Ideally, the A11 East arm lane 4 could have been coded as a flared lane about 70m long. This would be consistent with the approach used on the A11 West where two 130m flares have been included.

Controllers and Stage Streams

3.2.3 Single stage streams have been used for each of the two (East and West) controllers. This method of control differs from the earlier submitted model (Thickthorn Junction_v8 (180913)-TA Models) when each controller had 3 stage streams, one for each of the three nodes. We would request clarification whether these changes have been made to reflect the current MOVA method of control.

3.2.4 It is noted that the stage sequence for the West controller differs in the PM peak, from the AM peak. This results in the A47 South circulatory and entry phases (A and B) running twice in the same cycle. We would request clarification whether these “double greens” reflect the current sequence mainly used by MOVA in the PM peak.

B1172 Give-Way entry

3.2.5 We observe that the upstream signalled node (all West entry) may create 1) better gap seeking opportunities for the B1172 entry traffic during the inter-greens and 2) more restricted entry during the green periods when platoons of priority traffic are passing the entry than the ‘standard’ ARCADY coefficients allow. There may be some justification, therefore, to give consideration to increasing the maximum flows to cater for both a) and increasing the coefficients to cater for b).

3.2.6 We would request that the B1172 entry lane movements are coded so that they are shown to give-way to all four circulatory lanes on Arm 7.

Lane Structure and Link Connectors

3.2.7 Lane 1 of B1172 (lane 2/1) should carry traffic bound for the A47 (North) only and not traffic bound for the downstream circulatory as well. This lane acts as a short flare and to have the higher A11-bound flows using it would result in over-optimistic model results. Lane 2 should carry all A11 East traffic which proceeds into downstream circulatory lanes 1 and 2.
3.2.8 The lane use at circulatory arms 9 and 10 (Newmarket Road and A11 East) allows the model to create weaving movements which probably would not occur in reality. Certain routes through Arm 10 should therefore be disallowed.

Traffic Flows

3.2.9 The Base model contains two flow scenarios:

- Scenario 1: 2012 AM Peak Base Flows (08:00-09:00);
- Scenario 2: 2012 PM Peak Base Flows (17:00-18:00);

3.2.10 It is understood from the technical notes that the reason for the original discrepancies between the AECOM and CCE 2012 Base Flows is that the AECOM flows were derived from a survey carried out on 11th June 2011, and the CCE flows from a survey carried on 29th April 2012. No reasons are identified, however, for the remaining flow differences. In the second Technical Note dated 29th April, AECOM states that the 2012 CCE flows have been adopted for the revised assessments.

Results

3.2.11 Tables 1 and 2 of the second technical note compare the base model maximum degrees of saturation and combined mean maximum queue, for each approach with those from the Mott MacDonald base model.

3.2.12 The method used for the comparison does not allow one to compare individual lane queues and, in particular, to see if there is a significant risk of excessive circulatory lane queues causing upstream congestion. The model results indicate that in all but one section, this risk would probably be negligible. The exception is in the case of the A11 (East) circulatory arm, where the queues in lanes 2 and 3 (flared lane) could possibly constrain upstream traffic.

3.2.13 It is agreed that, overall, Tables 1 and 2 show that the Mott MacDonald and AECOM 2012 base model results are reasonably similar. This does not, however, necessarily indicate that the AECOM Base Model accurately replicates the actual junction performance, since it does not appear to have been validated against observed conditions.

3.3 Improvements Model Review

General Layout

3.3.1 The Improvements model layout represents the existing roundabout layout, as modified by the proposed Hathorsoft capacity improvements.

3.3.2 The comment in the equivalent Base model review section applies.

Controllers and Stage Streams

3.3.3 The comments in the equivalent base model review section apply.

B1172 Give-Way Entry

3.3.4 The comments in the equivalent Base model review section apply.

Lane Structure and Link Connectors

3.3.5 The comments in the equivalent base model review section apply, except for the one concerning Lane 11/2, on the A47 (South) circulatory section.

Traffic Flows

3.3.6 The Improvements model contains eight scenarios, which are noted as Tests in the second TN;

- Scenarios 1 & 2: 2026 (AM & PM Peak) Base + Committed Flows (Test 1);
- Scenarios 3 & 4: 2026 (AM & PM Peak) Base + Committed + Newfound Farm (NFF) Development Flows (Test 2);
3.3.7 The first TN states that AECOM has used the same method as CCE to derive the 2026 Base + Committed flows. These flows which are contained in the second TN Appendix D tables, agree with the model Scenario 1 and 2 flows. The other model Scenario flows also agree with the equivalent tables in Appendix D.

3.3.8 It is noted, however, that the AECOM forecast flows seem to be lower than their equivalent CCE flows. For example, a comparison of the AECOM and CCE 2026 Base + Committed flow scenarios reveals the following total flows through the junction:

- AM Peak: AECOM = 8072 / CCE = 8468 (a difference of 396 PCUs);
- PM Peak: AECOM = 7537 / CCE = 7615 (a difference of 78 PCUs).

3.3.9 It is not known why these flows differ so dramatically but for consistency for all authorities attempting to review the development impacts upon the Thickthorn interchange we would advise that the flows should be the same as per the CCE assessment.

3.3.10 It is not uncommon that assessments undertaken by two different consultants would produce differing flows but the authorities are dealing with the review of two developments upon the same junction at roughly the same time. We have reached a position where we are content with the flows input into the assessment prepared by CCE and therefore feel it is appropriate that the same flows are used in AECOM’s assessment. We may not have made this clear in option 2 of the conclusion in our previous technical note dated 25th April although AECOM have previously been open to what flows should be modelled as per the email from Nick Anderson to Roger Chenery on 3rd April.

3.4 Results

3.4.1 Based on the current assessment it is noted from the model results that, in most cases, the circulatory queues do not appear to pose a significant risk of causing upstream congestion. One exception is in the A11 (East) circulatory arm, lane 2 and 3 (flared lane) queues which, in the PM peak scenarios, could possibly constrain traffic at the A47 North node.

3.4.2 Tables 4 to 10 of the second TN contain the Improvements model results. The DoS and mean maximum queue are displayed using the same method as for the base model results.

3.4.3 In tables 11 and 13, comparisons are made between the DoS results for the following scenarios:

- 2026 Base + Committed (excluding LWOC flows) both without and with NFF flows (Test 1 vs. Test 2);
- 2026 Base + Committed (including LWOC flows) both without and with NFF flows (Test 3 vs. Test 4).

3.4.4 The second TN Summary states that the NNF development traffic alone (i.e. not including the LWOC development) would increase the maximum degrees of saturation by less than 6% and, if the LWOC development were to take place, by 9%.

3.4.5 It appears, however, that changes to the signal timings as shown in Tables 7 and 9, have created some anomalies in these results. For example, the DoS results for the A11 East entry are actually lower with the NFF development flows than without, in three of the four AM and PM peak scenarios (the DoS values are the same in the fourth scenario). Given that this entry would carry the highest development flows into the junction and that it is already over-saturated, one would expect these results to be higher, or at best no lower, in the with-development scenarios. It is apparent from Tables 7 and 9, however, that the allocation of 2 seconds additional green time to the A11 East entry has more than offset the impact of the
development flows. The fact that more capacity was found in the with-development scenarios indicates that it could also be found for the equivalent, without-development scenarios.

3.4.6 Since the junction is over-saturated at three of the five main nodes in 2026, any fully-optimised, without-development scenarios should be (as far as is reasonably achievable) operating at maximum capacity. Thus, it should not be possible to find additional capacity for the with-development scenarios (i.e., the signals cannot not be further optimised). In view of this, it may be argued that a more accurate evaluation of development flow impact would be achieved by first, ensuring that each without-development scenario is as fully-optimised as reasonably possible and then by retaining the same signal times in each equivalent with-development scenario.

3.5 Conclusions

3.5.1 Several issues have been identified with the AECOM base and improvement models in this review. The following main issues were identified with the Base model.

1. A11 East arm lane 4 should be coded as a flared lane.
2. Confirmation is requested regarding the method of control and, in particular, if the A47 South node, PM peak, “double greens” reflect the current MOVA operation.
3. The B1172 entry lane 1 should carry only traffic bound for the A47 North.
4. The B1172 entry lanes should each give-way to all four priority lanes.
5. Consider disallowing some routes through the arm 9 and 10 circulatory sections which have unlikely weaving movements.
6. There is a risk that the lane 2 and 3 queues on the A11 East circulatory section could be excessive in both peak periods.
7. The assessment combines the MMO results across all arms and therefore does not allow one to compare individual lane queues.

3.5.2 The following main issues were identified with the improvements model.

1. Issues 1 to 5 above.
2. The 2026 Scenario flows differ from the equivalent CCE Scenarios. We would advise that the same flows are used as per the CCE assessment for consistency between applications.
3. The PM peak scenario results predict that queues in lane 2 and 3 (flared lane) of the A11 East circulatory section would probably be excessive and cause congestion at the upstream A47 North node.
4. The results comparison tables appear to show that additional capacity was found in order to offset the development flow impact, in particular at the A11 East arm. It is submitted that this should not be practicable if the junction is already, effectively, over-saturated and it indicates that further optimisation of the without-development scenarios may be possible.
5. Consideration should be given to using the same, optimised signal timings from each without-development scenario, in each equivalent with-development scenario.
6. The assessment combines the MMO results across all arms and therefore does not allow one to compare individual lane queues.

3.5.3 AECOM conclude that the "cumulative impacts of the two developments are not material and do not justify the need for further improvements beyond those already proposed as part of the Hethersett North application." We would recommend however that the modelling issues identified above are first addressed.

3.5.4 We would also request that when presenting the results, delay is also included within the respective tables and that the queue and delay results are presented for all lanes of the
junction rather than just the total queue and delay, otherwise the results can be slightly misleading.
Dear Mr Watts

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE) ORDER 2010
PLANNING APPLICATION: 2013/1793
LOCATION: LAND AT NEW FOUND FARM, COLNEY LANE, COLNEY
PROPOSAL: OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR A DEVELOPMENT OF 800 DWELLINGS TOGETHER WITH A SMALL LOCAL CENTRE, PRIMARY SCHOOL WITH EARLY YEARS FACILITY, TWO NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS TO COLNEY LANE

Further to my letter of 31 March 2014 and various emails and meetings since that time, I have now completed a review of the latest submission from AECOM dated 29 April 2014 in support of the planning application.

For completeness and clarity I attach the review documents Technical Note 03 dated 15 May 2014 produced by my consultant Parson Brinkerhoff. You will see that there are a number of issues identified which result in a less than realistic demonstration of the likely traffic patterns with the development in place.

I am aware that it was hoped that this application could be determined at a planning committee later this month. However, I am currently not satisfied that I have a credible Transport Assessment on which to base my formal response to your consultation.

I request that AECOM, on behalf of the applicant, address those issues identified in Technical Note 03 such that the transport assessment is both credible and realistic. I am content that, should it be necessary, discussions of a technical nature can occur directly between AECOM and Parson Brinkerhoff provided they are kept short since I do not intend to commission Parsons Brinkerhoff for further review until such time as a further amended written submission is issued.

In light of the above I have no alternative but to issue a further TR110 directing that planning permission should not be granted until 27 June 2014 to allow time for
further amendment and review. Should matters be resolved before that date I will confirm accordingly.

Yours Faithfully

Roger Chenery
Asset Development Manager
Email: PlanningEE@highways.gsi.gov.uk
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB) has been providing technical advice to the Highways Agency (HA) with respect to the Newfound Farm development proposal. In the last few months we have responded to a number of submissions (comprising technical notes and junction models) by AECOM, who is acting on behalf of the developers.

1.1.2 On 9th June 2014, AECOM issued a technical note, together with a revised Thickthorn junction Base model based upon the proposed Thickthorn Hethersett junction layout. On 20th June 2014, we issued PB technical note 04 containing a review of the revised Base Model.

1.1.3 More recently, on 4th July, AECOM issued another technical note (titled: Modelling of Thickthorn Interchange 2016 Assessment) which the assessment year from 2026 to 2016, presumably due to the latter being the expected opening year for the development. AECOM’s latest technical note is supported by the following LinSig models:

- Thickthorn Junction_v12 (300614)_HN Improvements_2016 Assessment (Base model with proposed Hethersett Improvement layout);
- Thickthorn Junction_v13 (040614)_HN Improvements_2016 Assessment_Potential Improvements (Potential mitigation layout model).

1.1.4 It should be stated that the change to the year of assessment is out of step with the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) requirements. Following a review of the submitted technical note and associated models by AECOM we have the following comments.

2 2016 ASSESSMENT REVIEW

2.1 Traffic Forecasts

2.1.1 The following scenarios were used in each of the submitted models:

- Test 1: 2016 Base + Committed + LWOC (without developments flows);
- Test 2: 2016 Base + Committed + NFF + LWOC (with development flows).

2.1.2 The flows contained within tables 1 to 4 of the AECOM technical note agree with the 2016 flow scenarios in the models.

2.2 Optimisation of Future Year Models

2.2.1 It is noted that for each peak period, the same signal timings were used for the no-development and with-development flow scenarios and that further signal optimisation (i.e. Step 5 as referenced in the AECOM technical note) was not required.

2.3 Operational Assessments

2.3.1 Tables 6 and 7 contain results summaries for the operational assessments following the optimisation. It would appear that in each table, the results for the A47 (North) and A47 (South) arm entries have been incorrectly interchanged i.e. the A47 North arms are showing A47 South results and vice versa.
2.3.2 It is also noted that the total average delays at the bottom of each table, have been calculated using the totals of the Flow and Total Delay columns. Thus, average delays being calculated using the totals of all vehicle movements on all lanes (including circulatory lanes). This has resulted in lower average delays than would be the case if the lower junction turning movement totals only were used in the calculations. In table 12 and 18, the average queues have been calculated using the more usual, turning movement totals only.

2.4 Summary of Queues on Circulatory Lanes

2.4.1 Table 8 contains a summary of the predicted circulatory queues for the Test 2 2016 Base + Committed + NFF + LWoC (with development) AM and PM peak scenarios. Our comments on the table are as follows:

a) The physical lengths used for Arm 8 appear to be based upon the distance back to the upstream stopline. We believe that they should represent the distance back to the A47 (North) on-slip exit. Thus, a length of 90m would be more realistic, equating to an effective length of 68m and a stacking space of 12 PCUs (as opposed to 16 PCUs shown in the table).

b) Lane 10/1 only has a physical length of about 26m back to the point where the lane is shared by traffic exiting to the A11 (East). Thus the effective length should be 26m and the stacking space should be, at most, 4 PCUs.

c) The Arm 12 circulatory lanes are configured so that, in theory, queues could reach back to the upstream A47 circulatory stopline without impeding traffic exiting to the A11 west. In practice, however, the Arm 12 stopline has been modelled as three lanes plus a flare, whereas two lanes plus two flares would be more accurate. Thus, whilst lane 2 might have a stacking space of 9 PCUs (although 7 or 8 would probably be more realistic) lanes 2, 3 and 4 together would probably only accommodate about 9 PCUs in total.

d) We do not agree with the comment below table 8 of the technical note with regard to the A11 East arm circulatory lane 10/2. First, the queue graphs shown do not include the random and over-saturated queue component, which becomes more significant with higher DoS values. Adding this component (the dark blue strip at the bottom of figure 1 below), increases the maximum queue length to about 15 PCUs, which is the same as shown in the main LinSig mean maximum queue results. Second, the queue as a whole, does not begin moving at the start of the green. The front of the queue begins discharging back towards the rear of the queue, about 2 seconds after the start of the green, but the rear of the queue remains static until the queue finally, fully discharges about 33 seconds into the cycle, as shown in figure 1. Thus the rear of the queue, during which it extends back from the stopline more than the 8 PCU stacking limit, is defined by the red box in Figure 1. This duration amounts to about 25 seconds.

The PM peak period queues are not critical, although, as in the case of the AM Peak graph, the random and over-saturated queue component needs to be added to gain a more accurate picture. Although the 8 PCU threshold would then be exceeded on occasions, the queue is only transitory in nature and would be unlikely to cause problems.
2.5 Assessment of Development Impact

2.5.1 We have no comments in connection with tables 9 to 11 except that the A47 (North) and A47 (South) entry results appear to have been incorrectly interchanged i.e. the A47 N arms are showing A47 S results and vice versa.

2.6 Overall Performance

2.6.1 Table 12 contains an analysis of the average delays for the 2016 with and without development flow scenarios. Whilst we agree with the figures derived from the model results, we are not wholly convinced that the proposed development flows would have no significant impact in terms of average delay per PCU. We would like to see the above raised issues of the remaining excessive circulatory flows addressed, before we could agree there is sufficient evidence to support this conclusion.

2.7 Potential Mitigation Measures

2.7.1 We note that these signal time changes have only been made to the Mitigation model with-development AM peak period scenario and not the PM Peak scenario.

B1172 Give-Way Entry

2.7.2 Closer examination of the Hethersett layout indicates that there is no reason why traffic bound for the A11 East, would not utilise the B1172 lanes 2 and 3 (feeding into the downstream lanes 1 and 2). It is suggested that the base model is changed to allow this, before considering whether or not significant further benefit could be obtained by changing to the proposed lane use scenario.

2.7.3 Another issue is the difficulty in accurately modelling give-way entries on partially signalised roundabouts. The ARCADY intercept and slope parameters were developed to model uncontrolled roundabouts and not situations where the priority traffic flow profile comprises platoons interspersed with zero flows during the intergreen periods. As we have stated in earlier technical notes, the little information available suggests that higher intercept and flow values should be used. Without further investigation to determine how this give-way would
behave (perhaps based upon current on-site observations of traffic behaviour), it would be
difficult to show how effective further capacity mitigation would prove to be.

2.7.4 There is also the issue of the increased flows in lane 1. It is possible that with higher flows,
the modelling of this short flare, with long lane give-way parameters may be increasingly
inaccurate, and give over-optimistic results.

2.7.5 A47 (North) Off-slip Lane 1 Flare Extension
We have reservations concerning the proposed extension of the A47 off-slip flare from 35m to
90m in length. The Mitigation model shows that there would be, at most, 6 PCUs using the
flare per cycle (in the 2016 AM peak period). This, together with the relatively short green
times (12 seconds in each period) means that the 90m flare would be underutilised and would
probably bring little additional benefit in terms of capacity.

Mitigation Model
We assume that the proposed lengthening of the A47 (North) off-slip flare has enabled
additional green time to be donated to the opposing circulatory lane and that this increased
capacity, in turn, has allowed an extra second of green time at the A11 (West) entry. The
predicted A47 (North) circulatory (lane 8/1 and 8/2) queues in the AM peak scenarios,
however, are even longer (18 and 20 PCUs respectively) than in the Base model. These
queues not only exceed PB’s stacking space maximum values of 12 PCUs per lane, but also
AECOM’s values of 16 PCUs in table 6 of the technical note.

2.7.7 We also believe that queues are still excessive on the A11 (East) circulatory lanes 1 and 2
(10/1 and 10/2) in the AM peak period and on the A11 (West) circulatory lanes in the PM
peak.

3 CONCLUSION

3.1 Base Model

3.1.1 We believe that some circulatory queues are still excessively long in the Base model. For this
reason, we are not yet convinced that the proposed development flows would have no
significant impact in terms of average delay per PCU. We believe that the queue length
issues need to be addressed before the evidence could be sufficiently strong to determine
whether or not the impact would be significant.

3.2 Mitigation (Potential Improvements) Model

3.2.1 We believe that the efficiency of the capacity improvement proposed for the B1172 entry may
be flawed for the following reasons:

- Consideration should initially have been given, to allow lanes 2 and 3 in the Base model
to carry traffic bound for the A11 (East).

- The standard ARCADY parameters do not accurately model give-way entries to partially
signalised roundabouts. Also, modelling the short Lane 1 flare with increased flows may
prove to be increasingly inaccurate. Thus, without on-site observations of traffic
behaviour, to more accurately calculate the intercepts and slope coefficients, it is difficult
to see how this entry could be modelled with sufficient accuracy to evaluate the impact of
any capacity changes.

3.2.2 We also consider that the proposed lengthening of the A47 (North) Lane 1 flare would not, in
practice, bring any significant improvement in capacity. The Base model flows and green
times serve to only just clear the current 34m flare and any significantly longer flare would be
underutilised.

3.2.3 We believe that some circulatory queues in the Mitigation model are still excessive, i.e. at the
A47 (North), A11 (East) and A11 (West) nodes.
3.2.4 In order to improve the capacity of the junction, it would probably be more effective to consider the internal circulatory issues, particularly those which would be prone to excessive queues in the future, thus restricting the potential performance of the junction. This may include measures to increase capacity at the A47 (North), A11 (East) and A11 (West) circulatory stoplines.

3.2.5 In conclusion, we believe that the Base and Mitigation (Potential Improvement) models are not as yet fit-for-purpose and that the mitigation measures proposed in the latter model are unlikely to be as effective as suggested by the model results.

3.2.6 In addition to this we would add two caveats. Firstly, we are of the understanding that the JCS for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk is adopted and as such any planning application (whether forming part of the proposed housing numbers from the Local Plan or in addition to) would need to test the impact of development to the end of the Local Plan period. In the case of the JCS, this being 2026.

3.2.7 A full assessment of the impact of the development is necessary and should be based on the performance and character of the strategic road network with Local Plan development to 2026. Ultimately it should not be accepted that individual developments can make the case for soaking up capacity on a first come first served basis where an adopted Local Plan is in place.

3.2.8 Secondly, the submitted 2016 model relies upon the Hethersett improvement being in place which it is unlikely to be by 2016. We would recommend that should AECOM get to a position where mitigation can be agreed for Newfound Farm in relation to the Thickthorn Interchange any approved mitigation would need to be reliant upon the delivery of the Hethersett improvement.
Dear Mr Watts

Criggleford: outline Planning Permission for a development of 800 dwellings together with a small local centre, primary school with early years facility, two new vehicular accesses off Colney Lane, associated on site highways, pedestrian and cycle routes, public recreational open space, allotments, landscape planting and community woodland on Land South-West of NEWFOUND FARM Colney Lane, Cringleford, Norfolk.

Thank you for your original consultation dated 13 October 2013. The Highway Authority has considered the information provided and has the following comments:

The development is in a sustainable location and is close to local employment as well as being within walking distance of the local primary school. The site will deliver significant highway improvements which will mitigate its impact both on the local highway as well as the strategic highway.

The development will take its primary access from a roundabout on Colney Lane. This is to be delivered prior to first occupation of the development. This is a sensitive part of the network and every effort will be made by the developer to ensure that disruption is minimised in particular with regard to emergency access to the hospital. There may be a need for a second point of access which will be in the form of a T-junction on Colney Lane but this is dependant on whether or not links are provided to the adjacent development. The secondary link is conditioned separately below.

Improvements to walking and cycling links are to be provided at the Colney Lane/Roundhouse Way roundabout and these will be delivered at the same time as the access roundabout.

The development also requires the signalisation of the A11 Newmarket Road/Roundhouse Way roundabout. It has been agreed with the applicant that the design of this improvement will be approved prior to the occupation of the 400th dwelling and the scheme itself will be delivered prior to the occupation of the 500th dwelling.
Finally, there are improvements to the A11/A47 Thickthorn interchange which have been agreed by the Highways Agency. These works also conditioned in line with the conditions agreed between the developer and the Highways Agency.

The site will also need a Travel Plan. We are currently in negotiations with the applicant as to whether the Travel Plan will be delivered by the applicant or whether it will be delivered by NCC funded by the developer. There will need to be a S106 in order to secure the funds required to deliver or to bond the delivery of a Travel Plan. The Travel Plan is conditioned below.

Therefore in light of the above and provided a Section 106 Agreement is secured before planning permission is issued, The Highway Authority recommends No Objection subject to the following conditions:-

SHC 06: Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted full details (in the form of scaled plans and / or written specifications) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority to illustrate the following: -

i) Roads, footways, cycleways, foul and on-site water drainage.
ii) Roads and footway.
iii) Foul and surface water drainage.
iv) Visibility splays.
v) Access arrangements.
vi) Parking provision in accordance with adopted standard.
vii) Loading areas.
viii) Turning areas.

SHC 28: Development shall not commence until a scheme detailing provision for on site parking for construction workers for the duration of the construction period has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented throughout the construction period.

Reason: To ensure adequate off-street parking during construction in the interests of highway safety.

SHC 29A: Prior to the commencement of any works a Construction Traffic Management Plan and Access Route which shall incorporate adequate provision for addressing any abnormal wear and tear to the highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Norfolk County Council Highway Authority together with proposals to control and manage construction traffic using the 'Construction Traffic Access Route' and to ensure no other local roads are used by construction traffic.

Reason: In the interests of maintaining highway efficiency and safety.

SHC 29B: For the duration of the construction period all traffic associated with the construction of the development will comply with the Construction Traffic Management Plan and use only the 'Construction Traffic Access Route' and no other local roads unless approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.
Reason: In the interests of maintaining highway efficiency and safety.

**SHC 30A:** No works shall commence on site until the details of wheel cleaning facilities for construction vehicles have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To prevent extraneous material being deposited on the highway.

**SHC 30B:** For the duration of the construction period all traffic associated with the construction of the development permitted will use the approved wheel cleaning facilities provided referred to in Part A.

Reason: To prevent extraneous material being deposited on the highway.

**SHC 39A:** Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted drawings no works shall commence on site unless otherwise agreed in writing until a detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works in the form of the access roundabout as indicated on transport Assessment Figure 6.7 (Site access from Colney Lane) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the highway improvement works are designed to an appropriate standard in the interest of highway safety and to protect the environment of the local highway corridor.

**SHC 39B:** Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the off-site highway improvement works referred to in Part A of this condition shall be completed to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the highway network is adequate to cater for the development proposed.

**SHC 39C:** Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted drawings no works shall commence on site unless otherwise agreed in writing until a detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works in the form of amendments to the Colney Lane/Roundhouse Way roundabout as indicated on drawing number 60163960_RSA_004 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the highway improvement works are designed to an appropriate standard in the interest of highway safety and to protect the environment of the local highway corridor.

**SHC 39D:** Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted the off-site highway improvement works referred to in Part C of this condition shall be completed to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.
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Reason: To ensure that the highway network is adequate to cater for the development proposed.

**SHC 39E:** Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted drawings, prior to the occupation of the 400th dwelling a detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works in the form of the signalisation of the A11 Newmarket Road/Roundhouse Way Roundabout as indicated on drawing number 60163960_RSA_006 Rev C shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the highway improvement works are designed to an appropriate standard in the interest of highway safety and to protect the environment of the local highway corridor.

**SHC 39F:** Prior to the occupation of the 500th dwelling of the development hereby permitted the off-site highway improvement works referred to in Part E of this condition shall be completed to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the highway network is adequate to cater for the development proposed.

**SHC 39G:** Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted drawings, prior to the occupation of the 50th dwelling a detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works in the form of widening and additional lanes of the Thickthorn Interchange as indicated on Cannon Consulting Engineers drawing G871/014 Rev D shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the highway improvement works are designed to an appropriate standard in the interest of highway safety and to protect the environment of the local highway corridor.

**SHC 39H:** Prior to the 100th occupation of the development hereby permitted the off-site highway improvement works referred to in Part G of this condition shall be completed to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the highway network is adequate to cater for the development proposed.

**SHC 39I:** Notwithstanding the two access points on Colney Lane as shown on the submitted drawings namely the roundabout and the T-junction, only the roundabout access (TA Figure 6.7) shall be constructed before 700 dwellings are occupied. Only if a second point of access to the permitted development cannot be achieved onto Roundhouse Way through the adjacent development land to the east, will the second access in the form of a T-junction (TA Figure 6.8) onto Colney Lane be allowed to be constructed. If needed the second access onto Colney Lane will be completed before occupation of the 750th dwelling.
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Reason: To ensure proper and appropriate highway infrastructure for the development and to ensure highway safety.

**SHC 43A:** Prior to the commencement of the construction of the first dwelling hereby permitted an Interim Travel Plan shall be submitted, approved and signed off by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority, such a Travel Plan shall accord with Norfolk County Council document ‘Guidance Notes for the Submission of a Travel Plan’.

Reason: To ensure that the development offers a wide range of travel choices to reduce the impact of travel and transport on the environment.

**SHC 43B:** No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied prior to implementation of the Interim Travel Plan referred to in Part A of this condition above. During the first year of occupation an approved Full Travel Plan based on the Interim Travel Plan referred to in Part A of this condition shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The approved Full Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable and targets contained therein and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied subject to approved modifications agreed by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority as part of the annual review.

Reason: To ensure that the development offers a wide range of travel choices to reduce the impact of travel and transport on the environment.

**Informatives**

**Inf.1:** It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the Public Highway, which includes a Public Right of Way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. This development involves work to the public highway that can only be undertaken within the scope of a Legal Agreement between the Applicant and the County Council. Please note that it is the Applicant’s responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary Agreements under the Highways Act 1980 are also obtained. Advice on this matter can be obtained from the County Council’s Highways Development Management Group based at County Hall in Norwich.

Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, which have to be carried out at the expense of the developer.

If required, street furniture will need to be repositioned at the Applicants own expense.

**Inf. 2:** This development involves works within the public highway that can only be carried out by Norfolk County Council as Highway Authority unless otherwise agreed in writing.

It is an OFFENCE to carry out any works within the Public Highway, which includes a Public Right of Way, without the permission of the Highway Authority. Please note that it is the Applicants’ responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary consents or approvals under the Highways Act 1980 and the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 are also obtained from the County Council. Advice on this matter can be obtained from the County Council’s Highway Development Management Group.
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If required, street furniture will need to be repositioned at the Applicants own expense.

Public Utility apparatus may be affected by this proposal. Contact the appropriate utility service to reach agreement on any necessary alterations, which have to be carried out at the expense of the developer.

Inf. 6: This development involves a Travel Plan to be implemented within the scope of a Legal Agreement between the Applicant and the County Council. Please note that it is the Applicants' responsibility to ensure that, in addition to planning permission, any necessary Agreements under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 or Highways Act 1980 are also obtained. Advice on this matter can be obtained from the County Council’s Highways Development Management Group based at County Hall in Norwich.

Commuted Sum for Travel Plans

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

For residential development, Norfolk County Council offers a fully inclusive package covering the writing, implementation, on-going management and annual monitoring of a Travel Plan for 5 years post completion of the development. Developers are expected to enter into a Section 106 Agreement to secure the necessary funding before planning permission is granted.

If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

David Higgins

Principal Engineer - Major & Estate Developments
for Director Environment, Transport and Development
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Dear Mr Watts,

Re: Re: Application No: 2013/1793
Barratt Eastern Counties and John Innes Foundation
Land at Newfound Farm, Cringleford

Thank you for the amended plans for the above application which have been considered by the Council. The Parish Council recommend refusal of this application for the following reasons:

1. The applicants disregard the existence of other potential development sites within the Development Boundary of the Parish. These include the sites for which Land Fund/Cirrus is seeking planning permission (Application Ref. No. 2013/1494) but also two other sites. Barratt Eastern Counties/John Innes Foundation own land lying to the south of that which is the subject of the
current planning application. Another plot of land (ID 0205 on Map 28 in South Norfolk's Site Specific Allocation document of August 2011) lies adjacent to both Barratt Eastern Counties/John Innes Institute land and also Land Fund/Cirrus properties. The combined area, excluding the Protected Zone identified in the CNDP, may amount to about 27 ha and possesses significant development potential. Upwards of perhaps 600 dwellings could be built there, assuming a density of 25 dwellings per hectare. It is disingenuous of developers to ignore these sites when putting forward their plans. The Development Area of Cringleford must be viewed as a whole.

2. The total number of dwellings proposed in this planning application (800), taken with that proposed for land owned by Land Fund/Cirrus (650), exceeds the limit of ‘approximately 1,200’ given in the CNDP by 20.8 per cent. This is not acceptable to the Parish. An excess of 20.8 per cent cannot be regarded as approximating the 1,200 in the CNDP.

3. While the Parish must acknowledge that a net density for the proposed development of 42 dwellings per hectare across the whole site may be close to its requirement of an approximate average of 25 dwellings per hectare (gross) or 27.9 dwellings per hectare, it maintains that densities of 35-65 dwelling per hectare are out of line with its policies HOU2 and HOU3. In paras. 47 to 56 of his Report, the Examiner expressly recognised that the government's policy of 'localism' enables the promoters of a neighbourhood development plan to choose between meeting the strategic policies on housing numbers by high densities on less land or by lower densities on more land. In using the expression 'approximately average' the Examiner was concerned to ensure that the target of 1,200 dwellings would be met, while
allowing an appropriate mix of property types. For its part, the Parish Council is also concerned to avoid higher densities in order secure its environmental and amenity objectives (CNPD 6.2; ENV6).

4. The Parish Council remains concerned about the transport issues generated by these development proposals. It endorses the detailed comments made by Norfolk County Council on this issue and stresses the importance of providing a road network capable of taking buses and utility vehicles. Again collaboration with the developers of adjoining land would have gone some way to reducing the problems of access foreseen for the site. The proposed access points on to Colney Lane remain a worry; the traffic build-up at peak times will be even worse than at present and exiting will be a problem for both the existing properties at Newfound Farm and also those on either side of it, as well as dwellings in the proposed development. The volumes of through traffic likely to be generated by the expansion of the Norwich Research Park have not been taken into account adequately.

5. The proposals for a playing field of 2.5 hectares does not comply with the CNPD Policy SCC5 which requires 'a 3.8 hectare playing field'. The site also runs underneath the electricity pylons which has health and safety issues. This proposal is totally unacceptable to the Parish Council.

6. The Parish Council's comments in our letter of 12 March 2014 still remain and in conclusion, the Parish Council argues that this application breaches the CNPD at a number of significant points and recommends rejection.

Yours sincerely,

Anne E. Barnes
Mrs A.E. Barnes PILCM
Parish Clerk
CRINGELEFORD PARISH COUNCIL  
e-mail clerk@cringlefordparishcouncil.gov.uk

Mrs Anne E. Barnes  
Parish Clerk  
16A Newmarket Rd  
Cringeleford  
Norwich  
NR4 6UE  
Tel. 01603 250198

Mr C. Watts  
Design Officer  
Growth and Localism  
South Norfolk Council  
Swan Lane  
Long Stratton  
Norfolk  
NR15 2XE

12 March 2014

Dear Mr Watts,

Re: Re: Application No: 2013/1793  
Barratt Eastern Counties and John Innes Foundation  
Land at Newfound Farm, Cringleford

Following the acceptance of the amended Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (CNDP) by South Norfolk Council on 24 February, 2014  
Cringeleford Parish Council would like to add to its comments on this planning application (12 November 2013) and again urge the District Council to reject.

1. Contrary to Cringleford Parish Council’s wish for a holistic approach to development in the parish (CNDP 7.1 and Policy GEN1), the applicants have treated the development of their site largely in isolation from that submitted by
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Deloitte on behalf of Land Fund/Cirrus. This impacts on access to their site, where problems have been identified by the statutory authorities, as well as the Parish Council, and upon the number of dwellings allocated to the Development Area. A formal joint proposal would be useful and should be required before planning permission is granted.

2. The applicants also disregard the existence of other potential development sites within the Development Boundary of the Parish. These include the sites for which Land Fund/Cirrus is seeking planning permission (Application Ref. No. 2013/1494) but also two other sites. Barratt Eastern Counties/John Innes Foundation own land lying to the south of that which is the subject of the current planning application. Another plot of land (ID 0205 on Map 28 in South Norfolk’s Site Specific Allocation document of August 2011) lies adjacent to both Barratt Eastern Counties/John Innes Institute land and also Land Fund/Cirrus properties. The combined area, excluding the Protected Zone identified in the CNDP, may amount to about 27 ha and possesses significant development potential. Upwards of perhaps 600 dwellings could be built there, assuming a density of 25 dwellings per hectare. It is disingenuous of developers to ignore these sites when putting forward their plans. The Development Area of Cringleford must be viewed as a whole.

3. The total number of dwellings proposed in this planning application (800), taken with that proposed for land owned by Land Fund/Cirrus (650), exceeds the limit of ‘approximately 1,200’ given in the CNDP by 20.8 per cent. This is not acceptable to the Parish. In his report the Independent Examiner, Timothy Jones, introduced the term ‘approximately’ to permit a degree of flexibility in the determination of the number of dwellings appropriate for the Development
Area of the Parish and to avoid the possibility of the CNDP resulting in fewer
than the 1,200 new dwellings specified in the Joint Core Strategy (Report of
the Examination into the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan 2013-
2026, paras. 37 to 43). Mr. Jones's amendment was not intended to push the
number of houses significantly higher than that envisaged in the CNDP.
Accordingly, an excess of 20.8 per cent cannot be regarded as approximating
the 1,200 in the CNDP. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English
(9th ed., 1995), generally considered authoritative in these matters, defines
approximate as 1) 'fairly correct or accurate' and 2) 'near' or 'next'. The online
Business Dictionary definition of approximately is 'in general, having a high
degree of closeness to accuracy. In mathematics, an approximation is neither
a guess nor an error, but as exact as it possibly could be given the
constraints'.

4. While the Parish must acknowledge that a net density for the proposed
development of 42 dwellings per hectare across the whole site may be close
to its requirement of an approximate average of 25 dwellings per hectare
(gross) or 27.9 dwellings per hectare, it maintains that densities of 35-65
dwelling per hectare are out of line with its policies HOU2 and HOU3. In
paras. 47 to 56 of his Report, the Examiner expressly recognised that the
government's policy of 'localism' enables the promoters of a neighbourhood
development plan to choose between meeting the strategic policies on
housing numbers by high densities on less land or by lower densities on more
land. In using the expression 'approximate average' the Examiner was
concerned to ensure that the target of 1,200 dwellings would be met, while
allowing an appropriate mix of property types. For its part, the Parish Council
is also concerned to avoid higher densities in order to secure its environmental and amenity objectives (CNDP 6.2; ENV6).

5. The Parish Council endorses the Conservation and Design Observations (6 February 2013, sic.) made by the Senior Conservation and Design Architect. It is concerned that too much of the overall design, especially that covering the environment, is left to reserved matters. More detail and fuller commitment is required even at this stage of planning in order to avoid difficulties later on.

6. The Parish Council remains concerned about the transport issues generated by these development proposals. It endorses the detailed comments made by Norfolk County Council on this issue and stresses the importance of providing a road network capable of taking buses and utility vehicles. Again collaboration with the developers of adjoining land would have gone some way to reducing the problems of access foreseen for the site. The proposed access points on to Colney Lane remain a worry: the traffic build-up at peak times will be even worse than at present and exiting will be a problem for both the existing properties at Newfound Farm and also those on either side of it, as well as dwellings in the proposed development. The volumes of through traffic likely to be generated by the expansion of the Norwich Research Park have not been taken into account adequately.

7. In conclusion, the Parish Council argues that this application breaches the CNDP at a number of significant points and recommends rejection.

Yours sincerely,

Anne E. Barnes
Mrs A.E. Barnes PILCM
Parish Clerk
Mr C. Watts
Growth & Localism
South Norfolk Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton
Norfolk
NR15 2XE

12 November 2013

Dear Mr Watts,

Re: Application No: 2013/1793 PP/2895798
Barratt Eastern Counties & John Innes Foundation
Land at Newfound Farm, Cringleford
Construction of 800 dwellings, associated estate roads, garaging, parking and landscaping

Cringeford Parish Council objects to this application and requests South Norfolk Council to refuse permission until the application addresses comprehensively the policies and requirements of the community’s Neighbourhood Development Plan.

This premature application and that of Land Fund Ltd (2013/1494) should not be considered in isolation as the combined housing numbers would far exceed the 1200 acceptable to the village. A key element of the plan is to ensure that developers work together to address housing numbers, infrastructure and growth in a holistic and sustainable way. These applications do not support a collaborative and coordinated approach to expansion of the village.

On the detail of the application the Parish objects to the proposals.
1 Housing Density.
The average net density proposed at Newfound Farm is 45 dwellings per hectare. This figure is too high and far exceeds the figure in the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

2 Designs.
The layout and massing of the dwellings are more suitable to an urban-style development than the rural setting of the village. More green space should be provided as in HOU2 of the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

3 Transport.
The primary and secondary vehicular accesses into the site from Colney Lane will create further problems in a traffic sensitive area. A Joint Transport assessment with other developers would prevent this piecemeal approach, and enable an approach to the site from existing Round House Way roundabouts.

4 Playing Fields.
No provision is made in the total proposed development for playing fields in line with policy SCC5 of the Neighbourhood Development Plan.

The Parish Council hopes that our views will be taken into account and the application refused.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs A. Barnes PILCM
Parish Clerk
Comments for Planning Application 2013/1793

Application Summary
Application Number: 2013/1793
Address: Land South-west Of Newfound Farm Colney Lane Cringleford Norfolk
Proposal: Outline planning permission for a development of 800 dwellings together with a small local centre, primary school with early years facility, Two new vehicular accesses off Colney Lane, associated on-site highways, pedestrian and cycle routes, public recreational open space, allotments, landscape planting and community woodland.
Case Officer: Chris Watts

Customer Details
Name: Mrs Anne Barnes - Cringleford Parish Council
Address: The Willow Centre, 1-13 Willowcroft Way, Cringleford, Norfolk NR4 7JJ

Comment Details
Commenter Type: Parish Council
Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application
Comment Reasons:
Comment: The revised plans for the 3.8 ha of recreation ground space do not conform to the plans shown to us by Barratt Homes. The proposed area is not a usable space with junior football pitches overlaid on top of adult pitches which means that adults and juniors cannot play at the same time.

The Parish Council also objects to the density of housing per hectare which remains too high.
For the attention of Chris Watts, Design Officer, Growth and Localism, South Norfolk Council. Please place this response on the SNC planning website.

Colney Parish Meeting wishes to express its solidarity with Cringleford Parish Council in its opposition to the combined proposed development of 1450 houses on the Newfound Farm site

Cringeford Parish Council created an official Neighbourhood Development Plan which was accepted by the Examiner on the basis of a formal enquiry. This Plan is intended to be a definitive statement as to what allocation of housing the Parish was prepared to tolerate. This is a democratically created local policy which has the mandate of the Cringleford residents

The Examiner noted that “approximately 1200 houses” would be tolerated in the agreed final Neighbourhood Plan, bearing in mind the submission of the Parish Council that no more than 1200 houses would be acceptable

Colney Parish Meeting believes, as does the Cringleford Parish Council, that the combined proposed development of 1450 homes on this combined site goes far beyond any normal definition of “approximately”.

The Meeting therefore joins with Cringleford Parish Council in objecting to this proposal on the grounds that the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan is a democratically agreed document which must guide the South Norfolk Development Management Committee

Furthermore the proposed planning application deviates for agreed landscape and buffer open landscape policies built into the Joint Core Strategy. Even though the Examiner noted that the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan was broadly in agreement with the Joint Core Strategy, Colney Parish Meeting wishes to make it clear that it also opposes this combined development on landscape, density and open space grounds.

There are other areas of objection made by the Meeting in a separate letter to the SNDC Development Management Committee. This letter is attached to this note of the meeting

Hazel Martin
Colney Parish Clerk
Colney Parish Meeting

4 Church Farm
Colney
Norwich
NR4 7TX
01603 457189
2.04.14

Dear Mr Watts,


Colney Parish objects to both the above applications for the following reasons:

- The proposals are contrary to recommendations made by South Norfolk Council regarding the Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone and Strategic and Important Gaps between the villages of Colney, Cringleford, Hethersett and Little Melton.

- Housing: a minimum of 1200 (CNDP/JCS); 1600 – 2200 Barratt/Land Fund. Cringleford concerns plus 400 houses yet to be built remaining from 1100 allocation. Total new houses; minimum 1600, maximum 2600. Most on green field sites, mainly productive farmland. Current number of houses in Cringleford 1200; at a minimum Cringleford would double in size and potentially treble.

- Traffic implications: new traffic -11,000 - 18,000 per day. Even the minimum increase will directly and adversely affect traffic flows through Colney, Keswick, Intwood, Eaton, Earham and Bowthorpe with adverse knock-on effects on traffic through Hethersett, Little Melton, and Bawburgh.

- Colney Lane-Roundhouse Way is the only access to the NNUH and NRP. The increase in traffic will also be detrimental to access to the regional hospital and research park in Colney. The implications of such effects do not appear to be clearly spelt out to many of these communities. Issues raised by both the Highways Authority and Highways Agency still appear to be unresolved.

- The County, City and District ecologists have expressed concerns about the adverse effects of these proposals and although the Environment Agency has no objection it feels more studies should be carried out.

- Colney Parish endorses the objections and concerns raised by Cringleford Parish and other consultees on traffic, landscape and the environment to the planning applications by Barratt and Land Fund.
• It seems clear that consultation on the implications of these proposals do not appear to have been adequately presented to the wider communities affected

• The consultation process is therefore inadequate and further consultations are required before any application is determined.

On a related matter, congratulations are due to Cringleford Parish Council on the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan, (CNDP). The production of such a professional document clearly shows a great deal of thought and effort. However, on the key issues of the number of houses proposed, traffic and other issues, essentially the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan can do little more than implement decisions made in the Joint Core Strategy and by South Norfolk Council.

The detailed responses to these applications made by Cringleford Parish Council on such issues raise concerns about potential liabilities. The cost of producing a Neighbourhood Plan is considerable but is it intended that parishes employ or train fully qualified planners and assume the responsibility arising from disputes with developers or other councils? The financial liabilities could be considerable.

Yours sincerely,

Hazel Martin
Parish Clerk

Email: colneypc@colneypc.freeserve.co.uk
Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan: Proposals Map

KEY

Parish boundary & Neighbourhood Development Plan boundary
Open water
Woodland
Environmentally Sensitive Areas (i.e. SSSIs & CWS)
Open farmland/countryside and Strategic Gap

Conservation Areas
Buildings of Historical interest outside of Conservation Area
Commercial area and business premises
Community buildings
Area under development 2012 (Round House Park)

Yare Valley Walk
Flood Zone
Bus Rapid Transport route
Proposed transport interchange
Development Boundary