



GREAT YARMOUTH
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Development Control Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, 06 July 2022 at 18:00

PRESENT:-

Councillor Annison (in the Chair); Councillors Fairhead, Freeman, Flaxman-Taylor, P Hammond, Hanton, Myers, Wainwright, Williamson, & A Wright.

Councillor Candon attended as a substitute for Councillor G Carpenter.

Councillor D Hammond attended as a substitute for Councillor Mogford.

Mr M Turner (Head of Planning), Ms C Whatling (Monitoring Officer), Mr R Parkinson (Development Manager), Mr G Sutherland (Senior Planning Officer), Mrs S Wintle (Corporate Services Manager), Ms N Jerney (Planning Officer), Ms V-L King (Technical Officer), Mr S Hubbard (Strategic Planning Manager), Mr D Zimmerling (IT Support) & Mrs C Webb (Democratic Services Officer).

Adam (Production Bureau) & Mr Wilson (Norfolk County Highways).

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors G Carpenter, Mogford & B Wright.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor D Hammond declared a personal interest in agenda item 4 as she lived in West Caister which was very close to the application site.

Councillor P Hammond declared a personal interest in agenda item 4, as he was a Caister Parish Councillor, however, he had not taken part in any discussions or voted on any item at Parish Council in relation to agenda item 4 and he reserved the right to both speak and vote on the item.

Councillor Freeman declared a personal interest in agenda item 4, as he was both a Ward Councillor and Parish Councillor for Ormesby St Margaret with Scratby and would not be speaking on item 4 on behalf of the Parish Council.

However, in accordance with the Council's Constitution, they were all allowed to both speak and vote on the item.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the last meeting were confirmed.

4 06-19-0676-O NOVA SCOTIA LAND WEST OF JACK CHASE WAY CAISTER-ON-SEA, GREAT YARMOUTH

The Committee received and considered the comprehensive report from the Senior Planning Officer regarding application number 06/19/0676/O, land at Nova Scotia Farm, wets of Jack Chase Way, West Caister, Great Yarmouth.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that this was an outline planning application with all matters reserved, except access.

The proposal included:-

- up to 665 dwellings
- a local centre with scope for convenience shops, services and community uses including a health centre, land for a primary school, associated infrastructure and open space
- Reserved Matters; appearance, landscaping, layout and scale which covered a site area of 33.6 hectares.

The Senior Planning Officer reported the following supporting information which had been submitted with the application:-

(i) The EIA comprehensively covers impacts on: Agriculture, Air Quality, Archaeology and Cultural Heritage, Ecology, Flood Risk, Drainage and Water Resources, Noise, Socio Economic, Transport, Landscape and Visual and Cumulative and In-Combination Effects.

(ii) Supporting information included:

- Planning Statement
- Design and Access Statement
- Environmental Statement
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Heritage Impact Assessment
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- Landscape Masterplan and Strategy; and
- Development Framework (including Land Use and Access, Density and Building Heights, Green Infrastructure, Circulation).

The Senior Planning Officer showed the Committee an outline of the proposed development site on a map for their consideration. The Senior Planning Officer explained that a small area of the site was situated in the parish of Ormesby St Margaret with Scratby, was adjacent to the parish of Caister-on-Sea and the majority was situated in the parish of West Caister. The Senior Planning Officer further explained which Borough Council Wards the application site was in, the majority of the site was in Caister South Ward, a small area was in Ormesby Ward and the site was adjacent to Caister North Ward.

The Senior Planning Officer showed an indicative plan of the site layout to the Committee. The Senior Planning Officer showed photographs to the committee of the north end of the site looking east and the east west hedge at the north end. The Senior Planning Officer then showed photographs of the northern end of the site looking south, the east west hedge and the gun battery, which would be retained as it was of historical interest.

The Senior Planning Officer showed photographs of the mid-section of the site looking east to Jack Chase Way and the to be retained tree belt on the western side. The Senior Planning Officer then showed photographs of the southern end of the site looking south and east and the western boundary hedge.

The Senior Planning Officer showed photographs of the existing open space and bicycle/pedestrian path to Diana Way which lay on the east side of Jack Chase Way and the A149 roundabout, Jack Chase Way, Norwich Road, Caister.

The Senior Planning Officer showed a plan of the indicative layout of the local centre to the Committee which showed that the elements anticipated in the local centre could be accommodated on the site as per the local plan policy including retail units, a care home and a health centre.

The Senior Planning Officer reported the anticipated phasing for the development. A condition is recommended and phasing will be a provision of the s106 agreement relating to triggers for the provision of community infrastructure during the development.

In regard to the indicative phasing plan:

The purple area represented Phase 1; 275 dwellings, traffic signalised junction, southern crossing point and associated infrastructure. A decision would then be made on type of primary school constructed.

The blue area represented Phase 2; 90 dwellings, roundabout junction, northern basin & POS area and associated infrastructure.

The green area represented Phase 3; 215 dwellings, central crossing area, opening

of school, local centre and associated infrastructure.

The orange area represented Phase 4; 85 dwellings, northern POS and associated infrastructure.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that a condition is recommended regarding the submission of reserved matters and the delivery of aspects of the development would be a provision of the s106 agreement.

The Senior Planning Officer highlighted the following points for Member's to consider during the determination of this application:-

- (i) This is an allocated strategic housing site in adopted Local Development Plan. Allocated due to its sustainable location with access to infrastructure, services and amenities.
- (ii) The principle of development has been accepted and therefore requires to be assessed in the context of relevant legislation (as set out in the report) the adopted plan and its policies and any other material considerations; and
- (iii) Within this context responses from statutory consultees and representations from public have been assessed in the report.

The Senior Planning Officer highlighted Local Plan Part 2 Policy CA1, Land West of Jack Chase Way Housing Allocation:-

In addition to assessment of the proposal in the general terms of the adopted development plan consisting of Core Strategy and Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) the application has been assessed against the 24 criteria of LPP2 Policy CA1 specific to the site. It is considered to broadly comply with both adopted development plan and specific policy.

The Senior Planning Officer summarised the public concerns regarding the application as follows:-

Impacts on:

- (i) Highways Infrastructure
- (ii) Natural Environment (specifically hedgerows); and
- (iii) Facilities and Utilities.

The Senior Planning Officer reported the following NPPF Highways considerations:-

111. Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

112. Within this context, applications for development should: a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;

The Senior Planning Officer reported the following Highways infrastructure Proposed Access Strategy:-

- (i) Two principle points of access from Jack Chase Way. The southern access aligning with the Prince of Wales Road having a signalised junction including bicycle and pedestrian elements. The northern access, via a 3-arm roundabout with pedestrian crossing 790m north of Prince of Wales Road .

- (ii) Reduction in speed limit on Jack Chase Way from 60mph to 40mph via a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).
- (iii) New cycle way along Jack Chase Way from the A149 roundabout junction.
- (iv) Toucan (pedestrian and bicycle) crossing between the existing cycleway located on the eastern side of Jack Chase Way and the proposed cycle way on the western side of Jack Chase Way.
- (v) New zebra crossing on Norwich Road, for travel to the site from existing residents in Caister.
- (vi) During Phase 1 of development, existing public transport facilities on Prince of Wales Road / Norwich Road would be used.
- (vii) A new Caister to Norwich bus service would be provided upon first occupation serving existing residents and new residents along Norwich Road and Yarmouth Road.
- (viii) As development progresses, the internal spine loop road will be completed, and will then be serviced by an improved bus service. New bus stops may allow for the diversion of services 1/1a, currently using Jack Chase Way, to serve the site. This will link the site with Great Yarmouth providing a commuter and leisure service.
- (ix) Upgrading of the existing footway section on foot/cycleway along Norwich Road from Prince of Wales Road.
- (x) Speed management measures will be implemented along Ormesby Road that includes pedestrian crossing points; and
- (xi) Cycle stands provided at the village centre to encourage cycling to the centre area.

The Senior Planning Officer showed a photograph to the Committee detailing the Jack Chase Way junction with Prince of Wales Road, and the view to the north and the south . The Senior Planning Officer showed a number of detailed maps and diagrams which indicated how the road improvements/changes would be implemented. As the impact on highway infrastructure was a key public concern, the following highlight the proposed highway measures which make up the proposed access strategy to mitigate impacts:-

- (i) A new Caister-on-Sea to Norwich bus service.
- (ii) Traffic calming measures along Ormesby Road consisting of pedestrian refuge islands, controlled pedestrian crossings and adjustments to bus stops and new pedestrian links.
- (iii) New zebra crossing on Norwich Road.
- (iv) New off-road cycleway along the north side of Norwich road.
- (v) New cycle parking stands in the centre of Caister.
- (vi) Cycle way-marking signs across Caister to provide a leisure/tourist cycle route.
- (vii) New bus shelters on Norwich Road & Prince of Wales Road.
- (viii) Widening of Jack Chase Way and Norwich Road approaches to the A149 roundabout junction with Norwich Road.
- (ix) A new cycleway along the western side of Jack Chase Way.
- (x) Controlled crossings on Jack Chase Way to link the site with the village.
- (xi) Reduction of the speed limit on Jack Chase Way to 40 mph; and
- (xii) Promote, monitor and manage travel habits of the development's residents through the Travel Plan secured in the s106 agreement.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that main public concerns to the Highways infrastructure as follows:-

- (i) Reducing function of Jack Chase Way will cause traffic to divert through Caister.

Proposed mitigation: Improvement of roundabout A149 with Jack Chase Way, traffic calming on Ormesby Road, vehicle flow sensitive traffic signal at the junction of Jack Chase Way and Prince of Wales Road.

Traffic model assessment: vehicle travel neutral weekday and summer holiday period JCW 20% quicker than through Caister.

(ii) Too far to existing schools.

Proposed pedestrian and bicycle crossings and improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities off site will help facilitate non vehicle travel.

The new primary school will be on site and be closer to the existing residents than the existing primary school so should help reduce vehicle trips.

The Senior Planning Officer reported the main public concerns to the Natural Environment:-

(i) Removal of hedgerow on Jack Chase Way

(ii) Loss of habitat

(iii) Surface Water Flooding; and

(iv) Loss of Grade 1 Agricultural Land.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that as outlined on p34 of the report the EIA demonstrates that while acknowledging the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land, there would not be major adverse impacts on the natural environment.

Proposals include mitigation to offset adverse impacts including hedge planting and enhancement through new landscaping with retention of hedgerows where possible. Amongst other things there would be a neutral impact on plants and reptiles with opportunities for species enhancement.

The Senior Planning Officer showed a series of slides to help the committee on the matter of the removal of hedgerow required to facilitate access as this was a key matter in public representations. The length of hedgerow to be removed was 870m and the length to be planted was 1,548m. The Senior Planning Officer reported that as an addendum to the proposed s106, the Council proposed an additional provision to require the retention of existing hedgerows excepting to provide approved access prior to the commencement of development.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that in regard to the Natural Environment, the conclusion was, in this case, and where other adverse impacts have been identified, these are considered to be outweighed by the sustainability benefits of the location of this development.

The Senior Planning Officer then reported on the facilities and utilities:-

(i) Foul Sewers

(ii) Schools; and

(iii) Primary Health Care.

The Planning Officer then reported the planning obligations to the Committee:-

Habitats Mitigation £185.93 per dwelling – Total £123,643.45

Healthcare 0.75ha land allocation within the local centre with financial

contribution for primary and community, intermediate, mental health and acute health care services £1,604,506.

Community centre contribution £692 per dwelling- Total £460,180

Education 2.0ha site at no charge with a pro-rata contribution for 2 class entry primary school (187 places / 420 place school x £9 million) = £4,007,142.

Community use agreement (school land)

Library service expansion scenario £244 per dwelling -Total £162,260- or no expansion required scenario £75 per dwelling – Total £49,875

Green infrastructure (works to public rights of way) £150 per dwelling – Total £99,750

Open space provision 10.57ha and long term management

SuDS provision and long term management.

Affordable Housing 20% provision – Total 133 dwellings

Local centre and healthcare facility - A site of up to 1.75 hectares, to include the Health Centre Site (0.75 hectares)

Travel Plan and bus service to Norwich

Retention of hedgerows prior to the commencement of development excepting as to provide approved access.

NCC s106 Monitoring Fee: Levied at a rate of £500 per obligation for Norfolk County Council.

Marketing scheme to be agreed and implemented to advertise site for care home/ retirement /sheltered housing.

Marketing site for the local centre availability.

Prevent use and development of the 0.33ha land other than for safeguarded care home / retirement / sheltered housing use, in order to avoid it being unavailable or incapable of delivering that part of the policy.

Delivery timescales and mechanisms for infrastructure / trigger points.

In the conclusion assessment, the Senior Planning Officer reported the planning balance:-

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Local Planning Authority to make its determination in accordance with the Development Plan

The application is assessed to be broadly in accordance with the development plan and in particular Policy CA1. Potential negatives can be mitigated with

appropriate planning conditions and planning obligations where necessary.

Sustainable location close to range of services and public transport

Can deliver 665 houses toward core strategy housing target

Traffic impacts can be mitigated

EIA demonstrates that while acknowledging the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land, there would not be major adverse impacts on existing natural environment.

It is considered that there are overriding sustainability benefits of allowing development in this location.

The EIA also concludes that impacts on landscape and the setting of heritage assets can be safeguarded and mitigated. This complies with policy CS10 of the Core Strategy and E5 of LPP2

There will be an adverse impact on the removal of hedgerow (870m) along Jack Chase Way, this will be mitigated with hedgerow replacement 1,548m elsewhere on site. The hedgerow is less 40 years old, its removal is required to provide access with forward visibility splays and will allow the new neighbourhood, local centre and school to integrate physically and visually connecting with the adjoining part of the village

The EIA identifies measures to mitigate any significant adverse impacts from the proposed development. These can be addressed with the recommended conditions and through the commitment of the applicant to provide significant community infrastructure.

The Senior Planning Officer reported that the officer recommendation was for approval as the proposal complies with Policies CS1, CS2, CS3 (as amended by Policy UCS3 in the Local Plan Part 2), CS4 (as amended by Policy UCS4 in the Local Plan Part 2), CS6, CS7 (as amended by Policy UCS7 in the Local Plan Part 2), CS9, CS10, CS11, CS12, CS13, CS14, CS15 and CS16; Local Plan Part 2 : Policies UCS3, UCS4, UCS7, GSP1, GSP5, GSP6, GSP8, A1, A2, H1, H2, H3, H4, H13, R1, R5, R7, E1, E4, E5, E6, E7, C1, I1, I2, I3 and Policy CA1.

Approve application 06/19/0676/O subject to:

The conditions set out in the report or as amended by the Head of Planning , the completion of a S106 Agreement within a 3 month or longer period if deemed required by the Head of Planning including the provision of the travel plan, Norwich bus service and retention of hedgerows prior to development excepting those to be removed to form access to the site suitable confirmation from Natural England of the LPA's Appropriate Assessment.

The Chairman reported his concerns regarding the increase of vehicular movements

on a daily basis along Jack Chase Way which would be impacted by the reduction in speed to 40mph and that motorists would choose travel through Caister to avoid this. The Senior Planning Officer reiterated that Highways had modelled the traffic flow and that using Jack Chase Way would be 20% quicker than travelling through Caister on a neutral workday or holiday.

Mr Wilson, NCC Highways, reported that the application had a robust travel strategy and package of highways measures and travelling along Jack Chase Way would be a minute quicker than the alternative route through Caister and therefore it seemed that the impact for motorists would not be too severe.

Councillor P Hammond questioned this statement as how could Jack Chase Way be only a minute quicker if the speed limit was being reduced by 20 mph and with 5 pedestrian crossings to navigate.

Councillor P Hammond reported that Policy CS2 stated that secondary & tertiary villages in the LPP2 only required a housing supply of 110 houses and that as West Caister was a tertiary village, why were 665 homes being proposed. The Development Manager reported that these homes were required to meet the housing growth required as part of the Council's Core Strategy. The secondary & tertiary villages would then pick up the windfall number of homes required to meet the Core Strategy targets. This development of 665 homes was the biggest allocation in the Borough required up until 2030 and was in a sustainable community within a sustainable position in the Borough.

Councillor Williamson asked for confirmation that the developers would provide a site of 2 hectares for the school and associated playing field. The Senior Planning Officer reported that 1.2 hectares was allotted for the school with 0.8 hectares allotted for the playing field.

Councillor Freeman asked for clarification regarding the proposed traffic calming measures from the First & Last PH leading into Ormesby. The Senior Planning Officer reported that a TRO would be obtained for traffic calming measures along Ormesby Road, Caister only.

Councillor D Hammond was concerned what would happen if an accident occurred on Jack Chase Way and the Police closed the road at the roundabouts at each end. This would mean that motorists would be trapped in the estate and unable to leave/enter. Councillor D Hammond asked Mr Wilson if he had modelled this. Mr Wilson informed the committee that they only modelled traffic movements under typical circumstances.

Mr Cogman, applicants agent, addressed the committee and reported the salient areas of the application. He highlighted that the application site was designated in the LPP2 and would provide much needed homes in the borough, including 20% affordable homes.

Ms Sherman, Persimmon Homes, addressed the highways and environmental concerns of local residents. She reported that it was a robust and safe application and the design scheme was sensitive to its surroundings. A new housing range would be launched on this development and she respectfully asked Members to approve the application.

Councillor Myers asked for an assurance that the 134 affordable homes would meet the house size requirements as set out in the National Framework Guide. Ms Sherman assured Cllr Myers that all homes would be built to standard.

The Chairman requested that dust emanating from the development be managed better than it had been on the persimmon sites in Bradwell. Ms Sherman reported that valuable lessons had been learnt and that dust suppression would be handled through a Construction method Statement & management plan.

Councillor Williamson asked what green credentials the new homes would have as standard. Ms Sherman reported that they would have EVCP but would not have air source heat pumps installed as standard until the building regulations changed in 2025.

Mrs Rumble & Mr Cole, objectors, addressed the Committee and highlighted the environmental impact of the development. They accepted that homes were needed in the borough but this was the wrong site for the development. The local infrastructure, for example, doctors surgeries and schools, were already stretched to breaking point and could not support a development of this size. Downgrading the speed limit on the bypass would lead to more people driving through Caister and creating a rat-run. Local school children would have to walk 6km a day to get to school and back and cross Jack Chase Way at peak times which was an accident waiting to happen. Mr Cole asked if an over-pass or under-pass crossing could be included in the design to keep children safe crossing the road. Residents would be subject to noise nuisance and CO2 pollution and they asked the committee to refuse the application.

Mr Wood, Caister-on-Sea Parish Councillor, addressed the Committee and reiterated the concerns regarding road safety of school children crossing the busy Jack Chase Way to get to school. Mr Wood alleged that 30% of drivers who used Jack Chase Way exceeded the speed limit and that there 5,800 vehicular users every day during the peak summer holiday weeks. The Parish Council were dismayed that 40 year old hedgerows and trees would be removed which would have a huge detrimental affect on the local wildlife, such as hedgehogs, bats and a pair of nesting peregrine falcons. The Parish Council were very concerned that the village did not have the infrastructure to cope with this development which was not the right thing for the village of Caister or the northern parishes and he urged Members to reject the application and enter into further consultation/dialogue with local residents.

Cllr Penny Carpenter, Ward Councillor, addressed the Committee and reiterated the concerns of the objectors and Parish Councillor. She urged Persimmon to consider incorporating a pedestrian overpass into the design scheme to keep local school children safe on their daily journey to and from school, similar to the one provided for residents of West Caister. Cllr Carpenter was concerned that Caister would turn into a rat-run used by motorists who wished to avoid the 5 crossings on Jack Chase Way. Cllr Carpenter reported that Caister had an ageing retired population and that the existing doctors surgery was under immense strain and would not be able to cope with the influx of new patients as a result of this development and she asked the committee to refuse the application.

Councillor Myers reported that he shared the concerns of the objectors, Parish Councillor & Ward Councillor and that he supported their request for a pedestrian overpass. In his view, the infrastructure should be brought forward and included in phase 1 of the works and not phase 3, but he was aware that this was contrary to central government requirements.

Councillor A Wright was very concerned, once again, at the loss of grade 1 and grade 11 agricultural land, the down-grading of Jack Chase Way to 40mph, and the loss of trees, hedgerows and the resulting environmental impact on the area.

The Chairman reminded Councillor Wright that he was a member of the Local Plan Member Working Party who had agreed the site inclusion in the LPP2 and which had subsequently been adopted by Council.

Councillor P Hammond reiterated his earlier concerns of the downgrading of the speed limit on Jack Chase Way from 60mph to 40mph which would most likely result in numerous accidents and even loss of life and he could not support this application.

Councillor D Hammond was concerned that the site would be cut off from the main community of Caister by Jack Chase Way and it would become a second class housing development.

Councillor R Hanton reported that the bypass had been built for a reason; to take the traffic away from the centre of Caister, and he was concerned that Caister would become a rat-run resulting in detrimental road safety and congestion and he would not support the application.

Councillor Wainwright reported that the borough desperately needed homes, especially for young people. The site was part of the adopted LPP2 and Council's were being forced to build by central government and we needed homes in the northern parishes and he would support the application. However, he did support the inclusion of a pedestrian overpass if the developers would fund this to aid road safety for local school children, though he was doubtful that Persimmon would agree to the extra spend as NCC Highways had approved the proposed highways scheme.

Councillor Freeman reported that he had listened carefully to the debate and he urged common sense and that officers and representatives from Persimmon to get together and consider all the points which had been raised at the meeting to see if they could further improve the scheme to allay some of the fears. He agreed that we needed houses but he was concerned regarding the access from the site and the need for a pedestrian overpass for local schoolchildren to use.

Councillor Candon confirmed that the borough urgently needed homes and, especially for young people. The site had been allocated in the LPP2 and the committee should support the Local Plan policy and approve the application.

Councillor P Hammond reported that if permission was granted, Persimmon could still land-bank this development and the Council would still not get there much needed homes. In reality, this application could take anywhere between 7 to 10 years to build out. A similar application at East Anglian Way had been refused and upheld at appeal due to highway concerns; so why not this application. Why was this application refused in 2001. The Senior Planning Officer reported that this was due to it being premature to the development plan.

Councillor Williamson reported that he agreed with Councillor Candon, that the site was in our LPP2 and the borough needed homes, especially affordable homes for young people, and he would support the application. When the homes were built out and lived in, once the trigger point had been passed, the supporting infrastructure would be built out with government funding.

Councillor Myers asked what the probability was that we would loose at appeal if we refused the application. The Development Manager reported that robust reasons for refusal would be required that could be defended at appeal.

Councillor Wainwright reiterated the need for houses and that if a pedestrian overpass could be negotiated for road safety then the application should be supported.

A member of the gallery shouted out and accused Councillors of taking bribes in brown envelopes to support this application and that they should be disgusted. Councillor Wainwright vehemently denied this allegation and asked that if this person continued to act in this manner then he would have no option but to take him to court. The Chairman asked the person to remain quiet, otherwise, he would have him removed from the chamber. The person apologised to Cllr Wainwright and the committee and the meeting continued.

The Development Manager summed up the application to the committee and reminded members that they could only vote for the application in front of them this evening which did not include a pedestrian overpass over Jack Chase Way.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that the borough desperately needed houses, especially affordable homes, and the development would deliver 20% AH. He reminded those Councillors who were present tonight, and who sat on the Local Plan Working Party, who had approved the site to be included in the LPP2, that they should adhere to the policy and support the application. Unless the Committee had valid reasons to refuse the application, this would put the Council in a vulnerable position.

Proposer: Councillor Candon

Seconder: Councillor Williamson.

Following a vote, 8 for and 4 against; it was RESOLVED:-

That application number 06/19/0676/O be approved, as the proposal complies with Policies CS1, CS2, CS3 (as amended by Policy UCS3 in the Local Plan Part 2), CS4 (as amended by Policy UCS4 in the Local Plan Part 2), CS6, CS7 (as amended by Policy UCS7 in the Local Plan Part 2), CS9, CS10, CS11, CS12, CS13, CS14, CS15 and CS16; Local Plan Part 2 : Policies UCS3, UCS4, UCS7, GSP1, GSP5, GSP6, GSP8, A1, A2, H1, H2, H3, H4, H13, R1, R5, R7, E1, E4, E5, E6, E7, C1, I1, I2, I3 and Policy CA1.

Approve application 06/19/0676/O subject to:

The conditions set out in the report or as amended by the Head of Planning , the completion of a S106 Agreement within a 3 month or longer period if deemed required by the Head of Planning including the provision of the travel plan, Norwich bus service and retention of hedgerows prior to development excepting those to be removed to form access to the site suitable confirmation from Natural England of the LPA's Appropriate Assessment.

5 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Chairman reported that there was no other business being of sufficient urgency to warrant consideration at the meeting.

The meeting ended at: 20:00