

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: 6 January 2025

SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED SINCE THE PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA AND ERRATA

Item No. 8 Section 106 Update Page 6

Cllr Kemp: You are being asked to grant a month's extension for the negotiation of the Section 106 infrastructure agreements. Speaking as a Councillor representing West Winch, I cannot stress enough the importance of the delivery of the proper infrastructure to support what would be the largest ever development in West Norfolk.

The agreement must include -:

- a traffic- lit pedestrian crossing on the A10 at the point of entry to the development;

- construction of a Primary School on site after the first 100 homes (as in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan of 2018) West Winch Primary

- attenuation lakes onsite for the prevention of surface water flooding, and provision for their adoption by a competent authority

- delay of first occupation of homes until the completion and opening of the West Winch Housing Access Road

- delivery of at least 20% affordable housing in line with this Council's policy, to meet local need

- the provision of streetlights for pedestrian and cyclist safety, to encourage Active Travel and deter crime in a high-density urban environment.

Assistant Director's response: The legal agreements pertaining to the Hopkins Homes planning application are complicated matters and require extensive negotiation and refinement. Despite best efforts by all parties, we have not been able to complete the agreements within the specified 4 month period i.e. by 28th December 2024. Authorisation is therefore sought from Planning Committee to finalise and complete all three legal agreements and then the permission can be issued. All the planning obligations cited within the committee report of 28th August 2024 remain unchanged as approved by Planning Committee.

The report does not consider the merits of the application as there is already a Planning Committee resolution to Approve but merely seeks authorisation to finalise the legal agreements and issue the decision. This short extension of time is consistent with delivery programme of the WWHAR.

For clarification, the application site is located within the parish of North Runcton within the West Winch Ward.

ONE Third Party Representations: summarised as follows:

- There is only an assumption that Welcome Thompson was the builder for dwellings along Gong Lane, including Glebe Wood given the similarity in design. Thompson's construction methods are not rare, so there is no case to be made for their conservation.
- Although the dwellings were built by Thompson, the architect, Butler was more distinguished as an architectural historian than as a practicing architect.
- Navenby is a less significant building than Glebe Wood or other Thompson dwellings. Navenby does not form part of the 'terrace' along Gong Lane.
- Navenby is completely hidden from the view so will not impact the feel of the village.
- Glebe Wood is the only unlisted building of historic interest, indicating that none of the other Thompson constructions were individually worthy of preservation. Glebe Wood is recognised not for its architectural merit but its landscaping significance.
- Over the years, most Thompson dwellings have been altered and updated to comply with modern standards and requirements. It is unreasonable for the Conservation Officer to use subjective judgement to cause the applicant expenses. Demolition and rebuild would be more economical and environmentally better solution.
- Questions the Conservation Officer role in preserving and protecting that which is not worth protecting.

Assistant Director's Comments: The contents of the third-party representation are noted. Such comments raised have previously been addressed within the officer's report to committee.

Planning Agent: Sent in images of the wider street scene, which are available to view on Public Access.

TWO Third Party Representations:**ONE in OBJECTION,** summarised as follows:

- Location of the existing west elevation of the barn should remain and the proposed development should not be allowed to extend beyond the existing elevation.
- Reiterate loss of privacy and peace.
- Devaluing neighbour property and maximising sale value of proposed development with a larger dwelling which goes beyond the existing barn foundations and towards the west boundary.
- Size of the dwelling, carport and garage.
- Overlooking impact from windows on the west elevation.
- Regarding Test 1 of the Tests of derogation - the proposed development will have no bearing on the economic fortune of the local building trade and therefore would not have public benefit.

ONE in SUPPORT, summarised as follows:

- The amended plan has taken into consideration the neighbours concerns. Look forward to this attractive building replacing the existing barn.

Conservation Officer: Raises no objection to the proposal and agrees with the suggested conditions within the committee report.

Assistant Director's Comments: The majority of additional comments received and summarised are already addressed within the officer's report. The devaluation of property is not a material planning consideration.

Item No 9/2(c) 24/01488/F Page No. 83

Environment Agency: No further comments to make.

Assistant Director's Comments: The comments from the Environment Agency are noted. The Environment Agency did not object to the application and this comment does not affect the Officer's recommendation.