

Tasburgh Parish Council Planning Committee Meeting
Tuesday 1st March 2022, 7pm
held in Tasburgh Main Village Hall,

Present

Jill Casson, Matthew Read, Preston Thomas, Adrienne Watts, Keith Read, Andrew Patrick, Brian Hill and Tina Eagle (Parish Clerk)

Members of the Public Present: District Councillor Michael Edney and 44 members of the public were also present.

1. Election of Chair

Jill Casson, proposed by, Preston Thomas seconded by, Keith Read all in favour.

2. Declarations of interest

None

3. Public participation and exchange of information.

The Chair welcomed Michael Martin, Director of Land, Zarah Developments and Jason Parker, Parker Planning Services to the meeting. The Chair reminded those present that the Land North of Church Road is already an approved site. It was noted that the Developer/Agent would provide a short presentation to the meeting, after which time members of the public would be invited to raise their questions. All questions would be taken into consideration especially those relating to the planning material considerations information leaflet provided.

Zarah Development/Parker Planning

The Agent/Developer advised they had been aware of this site for sometime and had approached the District Council who were supportive of an affordable housing scheme.

Members of the public present raised a number of questions with regards to the proposed planning application. Summary as follows:

- Various concerns were voiced regarding the additional increase in vehicles from the proposed development accessing the A140 from Church Road.
Agent/Developer: advised this had already been considered by Highways who had confirmed the increase was acceptable.
- What evidence supports the need for the addition of 34 new dwellings?
Developer/Agent: The evidence was provided by the District Council
- Why has there been an increase from 20-34 dwellings?
Developer/Agent: Again, this had been identified in the South Norfolk Local Plan
- Concerns with regards to adequate drainage and sewage for the development especially as flooding already occurs in Lower Tasburgh.
Developer/Agent: advised that a Drainage Strategy for the application is yet to be completed and finalized.
- Would the design build be energy efficient to include solar panels, and air source heat pumps?
Developer/Agent: confirmed this would be the case and would also include electric charging facilities.

Councillor Andrew Patrick and 1 member of the public joined the meeting

- Concern that the design was in isolation and had no connection with the rest of the village.
Developer/Agent: **agreed** this would be reviewed.
- Would there be adequate school spaces available?
Councillor: It was noted there is a fixed formula for housing developments that the school would use.
- Concern that the archaeological survey was not recent and had been taken from information provided in 2016.
- Agent/Developer : **agreed** this would be looked into.
- Was the developer/agent aware that the Loke was privately owned
Agent/Developer: confirmed they were aware this was the case.
- What guarantees are there that the developer will not sell onto another Housing Association?
Agent/Developer: As they are the Housing Association this will be held in perpetuity
- Agreement that the site needs development but the design and layout is totally out of character to the rest of the village.
Agent/Developer: **agreed** the design and space would be looked at.
- Concerns that the land behind the development could lead to similar developments in the future.
Agent/Developer : advised the owner of the land in question had confirmed they had no intention to sell in the future.
- Concerns that the proposed build appears to be modular in design rather than a traditional build.
Agent/Developer: reported that would not be the case.
- With no Community Infrastructure Levy available on affordable housing is there anything that can be offered in terms of better opportunities to enhance access and additional footpaths?
District Councillor: reported that the majority of County Council funding is allocated to Adult and Social Care with very little being allocated to Highways.

4. To consider Planning Appl: 2022/0087

Location: Land North Of Church Road Tasburgh Norfolk

Proposal: Proposed 34 no. affordable dwellings including vehicular means of access from Church Road, additional car parking and pedestrian access for use by Tasburgh Primary School.

Having reviewed the information presented and taking into account public comments received it was **agreed** to object to the application proposed by Matthew Read seconded by, Preston Thomas all in favour, for the following reasons:

Highway Issues:Traffic Generation

It was noted that the access via the Church Road junction is already narrow at the point of entry into the proposed development. With no current footpaths for pedestrians and an increase in the volume of traffic this would have an impact on residents in Church Road. The County Council purchased a strip at the front of the proposed site some years to address the issues at the narrow section of Church road and recommend this is considered as part of the development.

Layout and density of building design

The proposed application is urban in design and both the design and layout are not in keep with the character of the rest of the village, which encompasses a mix of smaller and larger houses including bungalows. No mention is made of building materials to be used and consideration needs to focus on a mix of housing.

Effect on listed buildings and conservation

Consideration needs to be taken into account of the nearby listed buildings of Church of St Mary, Old Hall Farm and the Norfolk Archaeological Trust Tasburgh Enclosure which is a scheduled monument site.

Capacity of physical infrastructure, e.g. in the public drainage or water systems

Concerns were raised with regards to drainage and the sewage system. A more detailed report is needed to ensure that any systems put in place are appropriate to ensure that flooding problems do not occur in Lower Tasburgh which already is a flood risk area.

5. Councillor/s to take planning applications

It was **agreed** Preston Thomas would receive the planning applications for the meeting on **15th March 2022**

The meeting closed at 8.20pm