

CRINGLEFORD PARISH COUNCIL

SONYA BLYTHE
CLERK OF THE PARISH COUNCIL
THE WILLOW CENTRE
1-13 WILLOWCROFT WAY
CRINGLEFORD NORWICH NR4 7JJ

Telephone 01603 250198

**A meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee was held on Wednesday
5 February 2025 at 7.30pm in The Willow Centre**

Minutes

Present:

Professor T Wang – Chairman (TW)	Mr E Coulthard (EC)
Mr S Chapman (SC)	Mr R Simmons (RS)
Mr Chalangary (JC)	Mrs Dagmar Miller (DM)

In attendance
Parish Clerk – Miss S Blythe

1. To receive apologies for absence

All present.

2. To receive declaration of interests in items on the agenda

None.

3. To receive questions or comments from the public

None present.

4. To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2025

The minutes of the meeting were **approved** and signed.

5. To consider any matters arising.

Item 8 – it was confirmed that there was no legal requirement for the orchard to have two access/exit points, but a risk assessment should be carried out to see whether a second was required.

6. Planning Applications

- 6.1 2025/0152 - 19 Brettingham Avenue, First floor extension within new pitched roof with new front and rear dormer windows. No objection, but recommendation of obscured glass in new window should overlooking the neighbouring property be considered an issue.

6.2 2024/3836 - Land West Of Colney Lane, Development of 406 dwellings (use Class C3) including affordable housing, access, car parking, new areas of open space, landscaping, infrastructure and associated works. Objection (full objection attached to minutes as appendix 1). It was **agreed** that the District Councillor would be asked to call the application into Committee for full consideration.

6.3 **To consider time-sensitive planning applications which have been received since distribution of the agenda**

2024/1974 -42 Keswick Road, 2 storey side extension including balcony to rear. 1.5 storey front extension and alterations. No objection.

6.4 **To note and ratify planning applications responded to since the last meeting due to the deadline date:**

None

**All agreed
Clerk to submit responses**

6.6 **To note the enforcement report.**

Reviewed.

7. To receive an update on progress of the Neighbourhood Development Plan

A meeting had been held with AECOM, who were now working on the housing needs assessment.

The Clerk would ask the Collective Community Planning whether any other consultants would be expected to make contact.

Action Clerk

8. To receive an update on matters affecting new developments

8.1 Big Sky (St Giles Park).

TW noted that the formal nursery opening has been held, which he and SC had attended.

8.2 Tilia Homes (Roundhouse Gate)

No update.

8.3 Barratt David Wilson Homes / Crest Nicholson (Cringleford Heights)

Orchard/allotment transfer update. A meeting had been held with CPCs solicitor, where queries had been raised. He had approached BDWH's solicitors with these. A full response was awaited.

9. To receive and agree actions for correspondence:

9.1 None

9.2 **To consider time-sensitive correspondence which has been received since distribution of the agenda.**

Norwich to Tilbury consultation – details of a webinar were circulated.

10. To suggest items for the next agenda

None

11. To note items for the next newsletter

None.

12. To agree a summary of items to take to Council

None.

13. To agree the date of the next meeting - agreed as 5 March 2025

Meeting closed at 20:30

2024/3836 Land South of Colney Lane

Cringleford Parish Council objects to this application primarily because it lacks connectivity with surrounding developments outside Cringleford Heights. Together with a number of other issues, especially mitigation of nutrient outflows, we do not consider it provides a sustainable solution to the housing needs of the area.

The 406 planned houses within the current Full Application will form an isolated enclave against the Southern bypass if there is no through road connecting the development to Roundhouse Gate and beyond as originally envisaged for the area.

We find the development as currently proposed:

- lacks connectivity other than to Phase 1 of Cringleford Heights i.e. itself, since it shows no proposed permeability with sites to the north i.e. Priscilla Bacon's planned park, the NRP and the Bowthorpe Southern Park, or to the south i.e. Cringleford bus interchange and A11, or to the east (to the local shops) as indicated in CNP Proposals map and the Parish website; it merely makes promises (e.g. Transport Assessment 5.9) for others to fulfil.
- lacks a through road connecting Woolhouse Way and Sorrel Grove as originally envisaged to which the GNLP 0307/0327 policy (cited in the DAS) refers: "a vehicular route through the adjacent development site (reference: 2013/1494), capable of serving as a bus route" (see below for further details). This is in contrast to the claim in 5.62 of BDWH's Planning Statement.
- will create additional car journeys three times lengthier than if a link road were in place, with all traffic from more than 1000 homes disgorging onto Colney Lane – a busy bus route and ambulance red route – which is not sustainable (GNLP Policy 2.1).
- will generate walking times to local facilities far in excess of the calculations presented which are based on radial meterage (DAS 3.4) and not real walking distances in the absence of a link road and associated footpaths, thereby diminishing accessibility.
- has lost an orchard because a SUD has been moved to its original location. Although we note that under Planning Statement 5.34 and the Landscape Masterplan, fruit trees will be placed elsewhere to be detailed at a later stage, this is not a substitute for an orchard; CPC would request involvement in this as such trees, especially espaliers as proposed, will need appropriate varieties and considerable maintenance.
- makes the proposed allotments difficult to access (single access and at the end of the development). They also fall within the A47 Landscape Protection Zone which is excluded from residential and economic development under ENV4 of CNDP. We are concerned allotments fall into this category (since they will be rented out) and also that the open area with an apparently reduced bund will affect noise abatement for the adjacent housing.

- creates an isolated play area, screened from housing by hedging which supposedly has accessible features that appear not to be readily accessible by wheelchair as there is no suitably surfaced path or parking nearby; it also falls within the Landscape Protection Zone. For this and the previous bullet point, the developers will need to show that “it will enhance the landscape and not have an adverse effect on the Strategic Gap ..., wildlife and buffering traffic noise” (CNDP ENV1).

We appreciate that there are issues associated with the Sorrel Grove-Woolhouse Way link road, but these should be resolved and assurances provided that the link will be embedded in the plans, including the S278 agreement, before work commences on Phase 2. Without this, there will be no requirement on the developer to provide a connection and we believe this would put them in breach of the GNLP guidance and TRA4 of CNDP. At a minimum the connection should be according to section 5.7. second bullet of the Transport Assessment – a 6.5m carriageway – and should be secured before approval is given for this application, whoever is to deliver it. Passing the onus of completing this route as presented in the Planning and Transport statements to NCC for future delivery is not acceptable to the Parish Council.

Furthermore, we should like to know what efforts have been made by the developer to start a dialogue with the appropriate owners of the land required for the through road and how far they have progressed.

In any case, we assume that approval of the application will not be imminent as the applicant has not yet mitigated the nutrient outflows from the site using offsite credits as they propose, so there should be ample time to resolve the issue of the through road. Approval of the proposal in the absence of mitigation even as a Planning Condition would be mistaken in our view as it would provide an unfair advantage to this developer over other developers whose applications have been severely delayed until mitigation was in place.

Houses nearest pylons are just 30m from the central point according to the Detailed Layout. Have the consultants determined the noise generated by the cables at this distance?

On the positive side, we welcome the self-builds and we are very pleased to see bungalows being provided (as the Parish requested) to allow residents to downsize if they so desire because we have a dearth of them in Cringleford. Phase 2 raises the percentage of bungalows on the two phases of Cringleford Heights to 1% from 0%. Six bungalows have been provided for social rent and five for the open market. However, according to the Housing Mix and Land Use schedules all those for the open market are of one type – 3-bed Ayb3 – even though the planning portal shows plans for an additional type – 3-bed Belbroughton – which is also shown on the DAS Fig. 68, plots 137-9, but are on the schedule as Ayb3. This needs clarification and it would be nice to see a mix available for the open market, including 2 bed ones. Furthermore, a social rent type on the schedules – Azb3 – is not on the portal.

In summary, we object to this application primarily because the issue of connectivity. This and nutrient neutrality need to be resolved before approval. Furthermore, because this is the last major site to be developed in Cringleford (it consumes most of the GNLP

uplift, Policy 7.1, for Cringleford), we feel it should be considered in full by the District Council's Development Management Committee and will request that it be called in to committee.