



# Long Stratton Town Council

Manor Road, Long Stratton, Norwich, NR15 2XR

Chairman: Mr Kevin Worsley. Clerk: Mrs B Buck

Tel: 01508 530524 Email: [clerk@longstrattoncouncil.info](mailto:clerk@longstrattoncouncil.info)

Website: [www.longstrattoncouncil.info](http://www.longstrattoncouncil.info)

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

**MONDAY 28<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2022 @ 6PM AT THE TOWN COUNCIL PAVILION.**

**In attendance, Councillors Lansdell, Woodham, Baker, Ridgway & Mackenzie. Becky Buck (Clerk)**

**1. To consider apologies for absence**

There were no apologies of absence received.

**2. To receive disclosures of interest and dispensations**

There were no disclosures of interest or dispensation received.

**3. To sign previous planning minutes from meetings held on 14 February 2021**

The minutes of the meeting held 14<sup>th</sup> February were signed as a true record with a spelling amendment of Councillor Ridgway's name.

**4. To discuss and review the information collated to date regarding the amended application 2018/0111 & 2018/0112 1800 home and bypass hybrid application.**

Councillor Woodham read an email received from Councillor Worsley. The comments were noted by the Committee.

The Committee discussed the documents at length and the following observations were approved for recommendation to Council to submit to South Norfolk Planning department.

### Planning Statement.

1. Pg3. Amendment to include the repositioning of the community facilities to create a better located and linked hub, addition of sports pitches, revised public open space and relocation of primary school site. Question: The relocation of the community facilities was submitted in the last application therefore what changes have been made between May and January and how do these changes support LSNP SC6?
2. PG4. Area of white/ agricultural land. 3.2, will this stay as agricultural land? Who will be responsible? Will there be no more building after phase 2?
3. PG5. Policy 3. That at least 10% of the schemes expected energy requirements will be sources from decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy and how opportunities for sustainable construction be maximised. Comment 10% seems low, the evaluation states that this will be achieved via building regs but (Question) If it is a condition of building regs why is this not applied to all dwellings, if it is not a condition of building regs then how will the (min) 10% be delivered?
4. PG5. Policy 4. On sites more than 16 dwellings, 33% affordable housing incorporating approx. 85% social rented and 15% intermediate. Comment, this is not being achieved by the developer who in the evaluation of the planning statement stated that this is 'viable'. LSTC would like to see protection towards not only affordable housing but in accordance with LSNP SC3 for a proportion of dwellings to be prioritised to the residents of Long Stratton. If affordable housing becomes unviable LSTC would like to see evidence of this.
5. PG5, Policy 10. Connectivity. Comment. There is no planned pedestrian/ cycle path to proposed employment area to the South of the development. What are the transport improvements to the bus priority links to the A140
6. PG6, Policy DM1.2 2(e), Delivery of any other infrastructure requirements in a made Neighbourhood Plan. Comment, this point is negated somewhat by DM1.2 3(b) but further clarification about how this has been achieved needs to be

Chairman.....Date.....



# Long Stratton Town Council

Manor Road, Long Stratton, Norwich, NR15 2XR

Chairman: Mr Kevin Worsley. Clerk: Mrs B Buck

Tel: 01508 530524 Email: [clerk@longstrattoncouncil.info](mailto:clerk@longstrattoncouncil.info)

Website: [www.longstrattoncouncil.info](http://www.longstrattoncouncil.info)

sought. In the evaluation it states 'this application has been accompanied by draft s.106 HoT to give effect to this policy. Pg 26 goes further to say that the S.106 is part of the supporting documentation. Question – Please can we see S.106 HoT so that we can pass comment as part of the supporting paperwork for the application.

7. PG9, DM4.2, Sustainable drainage and water management. Question: Has the flooding report from LLFA regarding the flooding in December 2020 been taken into consideration and how has the application been changed to reflect this?
8. PG12, Delivery of the bypass will be before the occupation of the 250<sup>th</sup> property. Question, how will this be monitored?
9. PG12, Western relief road to be delivered before occupation of the 200<sup>th</sup> property, evaluation on PG23 advises that it will be delivered on occupation of the 50<sup>th</sup> property. Question, how will this be monitored and if failure to deliver by 50<sup>th</sup> property occurs will NH automatically be given grace to the 200<sup>th</sup> property as per NPPF?
10. PG12, states that a phasing plan will clearly identify where key infrastructure will be provided in relation to the provision of housing. Question, does this include all infrastructure and not just roads and please can we have a copy for our records?
11. PG13, cycle paths on the west side, states to investigate pedestrian and cycle links. PG26 states that conclusion of the cycle path requires conclusion to negotiations with The Crown Estate. Question. If negotiations have not been successful, how will you ensure connectivity on the west side to the rest of Long Stratton and amenities that are located South of Cygnet House?
12. PG13. Site conditions and constraints states that no more than 1000 dwellings occupied prior to a written agreement with Anglian Water. Question: Relating to item 5 above, the figure of 1000 seems very high especially considering the flooding that has occurred in the last 18 months. Why a 1000 properties? Comment: Recommendation to object to the written agreement being only imposed at 1000 properties.
13. PG13/14. Developer contributions, states, site to contribute to the delivery of infrastructure and facilities in Long Stratton through S106 (for on site infrastructure) and the payment of CIL, including public transport enhancements on the A140 corridor, environmental enhancements to the village centre. Question. Is this objective being purely achieved by delivery of the bypass? If not what other enhancements are proposed which it is not intended LSTC will use CIL.
14. Pg14. 3.8. Safeguarding mineral and waste sites. What is the 'waste' element to that area?
15. Pg17. Biodiversity. Where biodiversity is compromised and compensation applied, who makes the decision to award compensation and who would receive compensation?
16. PG19 3.16, NPPF states 'Plans should set out the contributions expected from the development, this should include setting out the levels and types of affordable housing provision required, along with other infrastructure. Question, when will LSTC see the plans?
17. PG20. 4. Statement of community involvement. Question, what constitutes extensive consultation? The last consultation had with the local community was well over 2 years ago since then the plans have been amended considerably. I would also add the only consultation with the TC is ones we have sought.

Chairman.....Date.....



# Long Stratton Town Council

Manor Road, Long Stratton, Norwich, NR15 2XR

Chairman: Mr Kevin Worsley. Clerk: Mrs B Buck

Tel: 01508 530524 Email: [clerk@longstrattoncouncil.info](mailto:clerk@longstrattoncouncil.info)

Website: [www.longstrattoncouncil.info](http://www.longstrattoncouncil.info)

18. PG22, DM3.10. States, LS is a sustainable location which is currently well served by public transport, which will improve as the development proceeds. Question. How?
19. PG26, Policy LNGS5, Long Stratton TC have already agreed subject to financial terms being agreed to adopt all open space in their parish. Comment. Long Stratton TC have not agreed to take on all open space, LSTC have asked to be given first refusal, there is no guarantee that even with the right financial terms LSTC will resolve to take them on as there are many things to consider. It is worth noting that LSTC will not be taking on the management of SuDS or any other water course elements therefore if SuDS are included under the umbrella of public open space, which the landscape and ecology plan alludes too then this is factually incorrect. Any requests for LSTC to adopt open space including play areas will be received positively and considered carefully.
20. PG29, Recreational open space standards. What maintenance is proposed? Will some areas of open space be left as wild areas? Who will be responsible for maintenance?

## Planning Statement and Neighbourhood Plan.

The following has been observed.

1. LNSP SC1 Housing mix- Only the first paragraph of the NP policy is shown and in addition to this the details of the policy (highlighted) have been overlooked. 'Major residential development proposals (10 dwellings or more) will be supported where they incorporate a significant proportion (circa 70 percent) of two and three bedroom dwellings. Appropriate regard shall also be had to meeting the needs of entry level purchasers on low and medium incomes for example by including flats and terraced housing, and older people through accessible, adaptable general needs housing.' Question – why has only the first paragraph been observed and why has key points been left out of the evaluation?
2. LSNP SC2, Specialist and supported housing. Only the first paragraph is shown in evaluation. Question. Why? Has it been considered in the planning application, if not why not? The policy is consistent with paragraph 62 in the NPPF which states 'the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups should be assessed and reflected in planning policies. The application shows a distinct lack of housing that meets the needs of the older population and those with special needs/ disabilities.
3. LSNP DC7, Landscape and settlement character. Only the first paragraph is shown in evaluation. Question. Why? Has it been considered in the planning application, if not why not?
4. LSNP DC8, Creating successful neighbourhoods - The whole NP policy is shown although in the second paragraph '10 dwellings or more' has been left out after 'Major development proposals'. Question, why has the detail been omitted?
5. LSNP DC9 Strengthening and enhancing Long Stratton's historic core. Only the first paragraph is shown in evaluation. Question. Why? Has it been considered in the planning application, if not why not?
6. LSNP E11 New employment uses in Tharston and E12 Training Long Strattons local workforce - Both of these NP policies have not been listed. Question, why have these policies not been considered?
7. LSNP TC13 Re-establishing The Street as part of the town - Only the first paragraph of the NP policy is shown but is accurate.  
**Developers comments** – The Town Council will be due in the region of £3.5m via CIL payments which can be used for these plans. Agreed actions between NHL/NLL and NCC are:

Chairman.....Date.....



# Long Stratton Town Council

Manor Road, Long Stratton, Norwich, NR15 2XR

Chairman: Mr Kevin Worsley. Clerk: Mrs B Buck

Tel: 01508 530524 Email: [clerk@longstrattoncouncil.info](mailto:clerk@longstrattoncouncil.info)

Website: [www.longstrattoncouncil.info](http://www.longstrattoncouncil.info)

NCC to review A140 pedestrian/cycleway and consider Traffic Management options

NHL/NLL have offered an additional contribution of £250k specifically towards the A140 cycle/pedestrian works. NHL/NLL seeking agreement from NCC that such works will be delivered by NCC, and that the cost is met by the NHL/NLL contribution – together with CIL and/or other funding streams. Question. CIL to be given to the Town Council for infrastructure cannot be earmarked by Developers therefore how will LSNP TC13 be met without the use of CIL given to LSTC? Also, £250k to be given to NCC, will LSTC be consulted on how to spend this to best benefit Long Stratton as the local council we have the best knowledge on where improvements are needed? Question. Why? Has it been considered in the planning application, if not why not?

8. LSNP GI18 Green infrastructure management - Only the first paragraph of the NP policy is shown but is accurate. Question. Why? Has it been considered in the planning application, if not why?

## Landscape & Ecology Management Plan

1. PG4, 1.2. States that subject to financial agreements LSTC (the statement still says Parish) will adopt all open space including SuDS. Comment: Reiteration of point 15 under the planning statement. We will look at open space positively and it is our intention to adopt open space however it will be looked at on a case by case basis and dependent on the right financial terms. Under no circumstances will SuDS be adopted by LSTC.
2. PG13 & PG 16 2.18 & 2.26. The statement refers to the SuDS being 1m deep and left accessible. Comment: with the SuDS being 1m in depth this will mean in wet weather the pathways will be flooded, although there are alternatives, this isn't acceptable. Connectivity around Long Stratton is paramount to reducing vehicle motions and if footpaths are inaccessible human nature will be to use a car as opposed to take a longer route. Also, even at 1m, with SuDS being left accessible there is still a risk of drowning therefore all SuDS need to be fenced off on the grounds of Health & Safety.
3. PG 16, 2.28. Statement refers to a large formal play area. Question: Who will install the large play area? NH/NL?
4. Items, 3.12, 3.19, 3.23, 3.26, 3.27, 3.28, 3.30, 5.6, 5.13, 5.17, 5.20, 5.21 & 5.22. All refer to a maintenance schedule and 3.16 refers to planting of replacement trees in the case of a dead tree needing to be removed. Question: Who will carry out the maintenance work? Is it intended that if LSTC adopt the open space then would we be responsible? Will the financial agreement cover resource, training, materials and equipment and for how many years? Can the Council have a breakdown then of the financial sum that would be attached to this level of maintenance and how it has been calculated? Replacement trees – Question, as this covers a wide time span (10-30 years) where would the Council go for replacement trees? Will a nominal sum be included in the S106? How has this sum been determined? If we don't take on open space etc who would? Management companies are known to not last long term therefore how would NH/NL manage the open space in the event management company fails to fulfil this policy requirement?
5. PG28 4.6 – Constructed Wetlands, comment: These need to be fenced on grounds of Health & Safety.
6. PG41, Species & Monitoring. The management plan states that species and habitat will both be monitored by an ecologist as a minimum of once per year. Question: Who will be responsible for arranging this? Who and how will this information be fed to? Who decides who the ecologist would be?

## Design Code

A lot of the points made above are replicated in the design code especially surrounding connectivity, ensuring connectivity is present, SuDS, ensuring they are safe and not impacting connectivity and play areas, who will be responsible for installing play equipment?

Chairman.....Date.....



# Long Stratton Town Council

Manor Road, Long Stratton, Norwich, NR15 2XR

Chairman: Mr Kevin Worsley. Clerk: Mrs B Buck

Tel: 01508 530524 Email: [clerk@longstrattoncouncil.info](mailto:clerk@longstrattoncouncil.info)

Website: [www.longstrattoncouncil.info](http://www.longstrattoncouncil.info)

On PG42 of the design code, referencing street types. All road widths need to allow for essential services such as refuse collection and emergency services. Recent developments such as Tharston Meadows did not allow enough width, and this has caused difficulties for the residents which is something that LSTC would like to protect new residents from experiencing. Can it also be noted that if provision is being made for street parking then road width needs to accommodate both street parking and essential and emergency services.

Throughout the design code there is no reference to dwellings being eco friendly and having a lower carbon footprint such as installing EVC points, solar panels etc.

Where the statement 'where feasible/ should provide' how will feasibility be assessed to ensure maximum delivery?

Other comments

Has there been any studies regarding the air quality of the land by the proposed bypass?

LSTC are concerned that the proposed sports pitches being beside the bypass will mean the school children using them will be inhaling harmful toxins. This was negated in the original masterplan with the community hub being located closer to the heart of Long Stratton. From our last report objecting to the community hub being located to the bypass, NH/NL have addressed some of the reasons for the change of location, one being that if you have to change the topography to create sports pitches you can create problems elsewhere and the changed topography can take years to settle. However, how has this been risk assessed against the air quality of the sports pitches being next to the bypass? Please can we see evidence of this.

Overall LSTC do not object to the applications and welcome the opportunity to work with NH/NL to get the best for the local community, there is a lot of positive contributions such as open space provision and formal play areas however more information is required as there are areas of concern.

*With there being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 7:45pm.*

Chairman.....Date.....