

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

ADDENDUM REPORT

12th JULY 2023

UPDATES TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Item 4 – Application 06/22/0747/F: Land at Guinevere Road & Camelot Road

1) Clarifications to Officer Report:

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- Page 33 (of Agenda Pack) – consultation

As a departure from adopted local plan policy it is worth mentioning that the application was advertised as both a major development and a departure from policy, by site notice and advertisement in the press, for the period 30/09/22 – 28/10/22. This accords with the requirements for such applications, as set out in Regulation 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure Order) 2015.

ARCHAEOLOGY

- Page 29 (of Agenda Pack) – consultee response
- Page 43: Section 16 – Archaeological impact
- Page 50: Recommendation - Conditions 8, 10 and 11

In response to the Historic Environment Service comments as presented in the Committee Report, the applicant has actually undertaken a pre-development investigation at the site comprising archaeological trial trenching. The on-site excavated trenches contained remains that required investigation, but none provided conclusive evidence of origin. No archaeological finds were recovered from these remains or from topsoil/subsoil deposits resulting from excavation. The precise processes that have formed these remains are unknown, and could be due to steam-powered agricultural practices and/or use of the site as a compound during construction of the surrounding area. To corroborate, the archaeologist compared other local investigations and found few archaeological remains to have been recorded during previous interventions in the immediate vicinity. As a result, it is considered there is no archaeological interest at the site.

The applicant submitted their proposed methodology and post-survey results [Archaeology Report Number CB739R v.1.1] to the Historic Environment Service, who have in turn confirmed the trial trenching was adequate and no further archaeological work is required.

As an update to the Committee Report, it is confirmed that no archaeological conditions are required.

Proposed conditions 8, 10 and 11 are removed from the recommendation.

UNILATERAL UNDERTAKING & PLANNING OBLIGATIONS – EAST OF ENGLAND AMBULANCE TRUST

- Page 28 – Comments from Norfolk & Waveney Integrated Care System Estates – “ICS Requirements”
- Page 45: Section 19 – Planning Obligations
- Page 46 – Recommendation Part (i)

The East of England Ambulance Trust (EEAT) has identified a number of features required of a care home. The Committee Report was written on the understanding that the non-financial items listed under para 19.1 (page 45) had been agreed with the applicant to be included in the planning obligations. The applicant has since clarified they agreed that the features (or similar versions thereof) would be provided in the development, but would be done so to address other legislation and provided through other regulations.

As a result, the following amendments are required:

- At least one emergency lifting device per floor (inflatable).

The applicant has stated the care home would be equipped with full hoists as opposed to inflatable lifting devices. The hoists within the care home provide a more than suitable method of lifting residents should they require assistance.

The EEAT saw these as an emergency and mobile feature, although the proposal would provide appropriate alternatives. Nevertheless, this is a matter for Building Regulations and care home Licencing rather than something to be secured through Planning.

- Provision of a stretcher lift that is fire proofed.

The applicant has confirmed the lifts in the proposal are already large enough to accommodate a stretcher and up to five paramedics/people. Should emergency evacuation ever be needed, fire stretchers are located within the stair wells.

The EEAT saw these as an important basic safety feature for a care home, but this is a matter for Building Regulations and care home Licencing rather than something to be secured through Planning.

- At least one Automated External Defibrillator.

The applicant has stated that, ordinarily, an external defibrillator would not typically be provided within the care home, pointing out that they're often provided on external walls of buildings for the use of the community, not internally in care homes for their sole use.

The EEAT saw these as an important basic safety feature for community use, taking the community to include the residents within the facility. Whilst many care homes would provide community features or be within a wider care campus, this proposal is rather more isolated. It would not be unusual for the surrounding community to assume a care home would include a defibrillator for emergency use, and it is considered necessary for the development to include an external defibrillator and provide immediate emergency help for residents and visitors alike.

However, it is more appropriate for a Defibrillator to be required by planning condition rather than Unilateral Undertaking.

- An ambulance bay close to the entrance.

An ambulance bay has been provided in the proposal and is shown on the submitted site plan. Condition 2 will require the development to be undertaken in accordance with the site plan, so will require inclusion of the ambulance bay. The applicant notes they have also proposed 6 EV charging points, in line with current building regulations requirements.

However, it is more appropriate for an ambulance bay to be provided and required to be retained by planning condition rather than as part of a Unilateral Undertaking.

TREE PROTECTION

- Page 32 – Comments from Arboricultural Officer
- Page 40: Section 13 – Impact on Trees
- Page 50: Recommendation - Condition 7
- Page 52: Recommendation – Conditions 18 and 19

A local Councillor has requested clarification over the proposed tree protection measures. The Council's Tree Officer has identified the value which the tree belt along the southern boundary provides, and is expected to provide, for a significant time yet.

As part of the construction, activities must be excluded from the tree belt wherever possible.

The application includes an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) which looked at tree health, value and longevity, and found that whilst the woodland belt is substantial, no trees would be considered the greatest status, within Categories A (high arboricultural value) or B (moderate arboricultural value). Many were of low value (Category C) or requiring removal regardless of whether the development proceeds due to being dead / diseased (Category U).

The AIA proposes removal of 4 stand-alone trees (lime, silver birch and alders) and 8 groups, within Category C, and 2 Category U plum trees, all to accommodate the footprint of the building and the car parking. These are all behind (to the north of) the area of denser tree cover alongside Sidegate Lane.

The Committee meeting presentation will illustrate this with plans and images.

It was always anticipated that there would be some loss of tree cover as a result of allocating the site for development, although planning applications should always seek to minimise and then compensate any losses as expected by Condition 4.

Proposed Condition 12 is intended to secure a high quality landscaping scheme which will need to compensate and address the loss of biodiversity and biomass from these removals.

Proposed Conditions 17 and 19 are intended to secure the landscaping scheme's timely provision, maintenance and retention of the landscaping scheme for 10 years after planting.

Proposed Condition 18 operates to prevent any further tree removals or works within 10 years without prior agreement from the LPA.

Proposed Condition 7 shall be amended to require an Arboricultural Method Statement to be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of development, to ensure the most appropriate protection and methods of construction around the trees, in addition to the protective fencing already described therein.

LEAD LOCAL FLOOD AUTHORITY – REQUESTED CONDITION

An error in the drafting of the Committee Report resulted in the LLFA's requested planning condition being omitted from the list in the Report. The LLFA have no objection to the development subject to this condition being imposed. It is recommended that the following additional condition for surface water flooding is added to the list of Conditions:

Condition:

The development shall be built in accordance with the submitted Drainage Strategy and the following additional supporting documents:

- Letter from Calabrian Ltd | Subject: Beauford Way, Great Yarmouth – Supplementary Soakaway Testing | Calabrian Limited | Ref: 7177/010/RJH/rjh | Rev: N/A | Dated: 22 June 2022
- Assessment of Water Quality and the appropriate Water Treatment | LNT Construction [assumed] | Ref: N/A | Rev: N/A | Dated: N/A
- SuDS Maintenance Manual data Sheet for Attenuation Soakaway | BSP Consulting | Ref: MM-AS-01 | Rev: V1 | Dated: November 2016
- SuDS Maintenance Manual data Sheet for Inspection Chamber | BSP Consulting | Ref: MM-GS-02 | Rev: V1 | Dated: November 2016
- SuDS Maintenance Manual data Sheet for Permeable Paved Driveway | BSP Consulting | Ref: MM-PP-01 | Rev: V2 | Dated: June 2015
- SuDS Maintenance Manual data Sheet for Gullies | BSP Consulting | Ref: MM-GS-02 | Rev: V1 | Dated: November 2016
- SuDS Maintenance Manual data Sheet for Catchpit | BSP Consulting | Ref: MM-GS-02 | Rev: V1 | Dated: November 2016
- GYRG Response to LLFA Comments Letter P01 | BSP Consulting | Ref: 22-0350 | Rev: N/A | Dated: 30 March 2023
- MicroDrainage GYRG Greenfield Runoff Calcs output page | BPS Consulting | Ref: N/A | Rev: N/A | Dated: 30 March 2023
- Letter from Calabrian Ltd | Subject: Beauford Way, Great Yarmouth – Supplementary Soakaway Testing | Calabrian Limited | Ref: 7177/014/RJH/rjh | Rev: N/A | Dated: 29 March 2023
- GYRG Response to LLFA Comments Letter P03 | BSP Consulting | Ref: 22-0350 | Rev: P03 | Dated: 17 May 2023
- Covering Letter to LLFA | Subject: RE: Application 06/22/0747/F – Proposed 66 Bedroom Care Home, Gorleston-on-Sea | LNT Construction | Ref: N/A | Rev: N/A | Dated: 21 June 2023

- Boundary Treatments & Garden Furniture drawing | LNT Construction | Ref: B-07 | Rev: N/A | Dated: 08 March 2023.

The schematic drainage layout adopted must be that demonstrated in the final submitted drainage strategy drawing (Drainage Strategy | BSP Consulting | Proposed 66-bed Care Home Guinevere Road, Great Yarmouth, NR31 7RA | Ref: GYGR-BSP-ZZ-XX-DR-C-SK240 | Rev: P04 | Dated: 17 May 2023). The approved scheme will be implemented prior to the first use of the development.

The reason for the condition is : -

To prevent flooding in accordance with adopted local policies CS13 and E1, and National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 167, 169 and 174 by ensuring the satisfactory management of local flood risk, surface water flow paths, storage and disposal of surface water from the site in a range of rainfall events and ensuring the SuDS proposed operates as designed for the lifetime of the development.

2) Updated recommendation:

The recommendation remains to Approve as described on Page 46 of the Report, but with the following amendments:

At Part (i) –

The required Unilateral Undertaking should not include the emergency lifting devices, external defibrillator, ambulance bay, nor stretcher lift expectations.

At Part (iv) -

Conditions 8, 10 and 11 (archaeology) - delete.

Condition 7 (tree protection measures) – amend to require submission and approval of an Arboricultural Method Statement as well as protective fencing barriers.

New Conditions are recommended to secure:

- the provision and retention of an ambulance bay close to the care home entrance.
- the provision and retention of an external defibrillator available to residents, visitors and the public.
- the specific surface water drainage requirements agreed with the LLFA.