

DEREHAM TOWN COUNCIL

At a meeting for **Plans** at the Assembly Rooms on **Tuesday 10th January 2017** at **7.00pm**.

Present: Councillors P Duigan (Chair) H Bushell, H Clarke, L Goreham, R Hambidge, K Millbank, C Jordan, L Monument and T Monument, A Bowyer, H Clarke, B Frith, H Rogers

Also present: County and District Councillor W Richmond, District Councillor A Webb, S Simpson, Town Clerk T Needham, Deputy Town Clerk J Barron.

1. **To receive apologies for absence.**
Apologies for absence were received from Councillor A Bowyer.
2. **Declaration of Interest.**
Councillor Frith declared a pecuniary interest in 33 Quebec Road. Councillors K Millbank and R Hambidge declared a personal interest in the application of 33 Quebec Road as they know the applicant.
3. **16/125/1408/HOU 15-19 Neatherd Road**
Single storey extension to form sitting room and extra bedrooms including forming a car port for Mr & Mrs Beardon
No objection
- 16/126/1417/CU Mid Norfolk Railway Preservation Trust**
Occasional Change of Use of tea room at Dereham Station to a Licensed Venue for Civil Marriage/Partnership for Mr C Robinson
No objection

Councillor B Frith left the meeting.

- 16/127/1482/HOU 33 Quebec Road**
Single storey extension to rear of house for Frith Associates Ltd
No objection

Councillor B Frith rejoined the meeting.

- 16/128/1454/H Former Malthouse – Land South of Norwich Road**
Full planning permission sought for the repair and refurbishment of the existing Maltings, including the access road, associated service yard installations, hard and soft landscaping/public realm surrounding the Maltings and other associated infrastructure works.
Outline planning permission with all matters reserved, with the exception of access, for the construction of 127 residential dwellings, garages, parking, vehicular access with Norwich Road, estate roads, public open space, play areas, landscaping amenity green spaces with

sustainable drainage systems and associated infrastructure for Anglia Maltings (Holdings Limited (T/A Crisp Malting Group)
 No objection, no comment

16/128/1455/LB

Former Malthouse – Land South of Norwich Road

Removal of later extensions and internal alterations/external repairs to allow return to use as a maltings for Anglia Maltings (Holdings) Ltd (trading as Crisp Maltings Group).

No Objection.

Subject	Comments	Recommendations to either make the application acceptable or to improve the design.
Amenity to existing properties.	The Council was concerned that the flats to the northern end of the site would over dominate and overlook the existing properties. There were concerns that the amenity of the properties could be affected in the way that the new road is laid out affecting deliveries, refuse collection and septic and emptying.	A swept path analysis should be carried out on the proposed road layout to ensure that the amenity of the existing properties is not affected.
Tree Planting	The Tree planting could create considerable interest.	To add value to the site thought should be given to the choice of trees in order to create the feel of an arboretum. Trees should be selected for interest and be clearly labelled.
Pedestrian and vehicle shared surface.	Shared surfaces usually have natural traffic calming features. The long western	Some form of feature to reduce the speed of traffic should be introduced or space allocated for

	section of shared use has no natural features to slow vehicles.	pedestrians.
Eastern Road adjacent to the open space.	This seems superfluous, there is no access leading of it and it detracts from the amenity of the open space.	Consider removing this road and extending the open space. If this road is a requirement emergency access, consideration should be given to making this a home-zone type street with measures to make the other route more attractive so that this route becomes a home zone area.
Open Space		While DC11 does not require an area for sports, it would facilitate the design if there was a small area where ball games could be played. Careful consideration should be given to how the open spaces are fenced given the considerable road frontage. The Town Council should be given the opportunity to be party to the 106 agreement relating to play areas and open spaces, with the option of adopting the play areas and open spaces.
Paths	Consideration should be given to linking the site with potential future developments to the East of this site.	A pedestrian cycle link should be constructed to the Eastern boundary so that a link could be completed to Greenfields road when other land is developed.
Transport	The widening of the access, extending the no parking zone and the yellow box	If it is not included in the application, the no parking zone should continue on the north side of Norwich Road

	<p>junction is welcomed.</p> <p>The conclusion that no mitigation, to counter the increased traffic, is feasible seems weak. While the increase in traffic is small a small increase can have a significant detrimental impact on the network (see DfT Guidance on Transport Assessment para 4.92). A small increase in traffic can therefore be considered detrimental.</p>	<p>as well as the south side.</p> <p>This development along with the Orbit homes application 3PL/2006/1397 should be looked at together so that there is a coordinated approach to highways mitigation.</p>
Cycling Accessibility	<p>A non-motorised user audit should have been carried out in accordance with Design manual for roads and Bridges HD 42/05. Without such an audit it is not possible to effectively assess the sustainability of the site for non-motorised transport.</p> <p>The Town Council has a Cycling champion, a footpaths champion, there</p>	<p>While the development should not be required to improve the Highway network or correct existing problems, the development does have to demonstrate that the development site is sustainable. The NPPF clearly states that for a site to be sustainable the use of sustainable modes of transport must be maximised. Cycling and walking are included as sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>The assessment carried out is simplistic and does not identify potential barriers to</p>

	<p>is the Dereham Access Group and Dementia Friendly Dereham Group who could have been consulted in preparation of the plan. Reference is made to the dual use cycle facility along Norwich Road. This should be looked at in detail as this dual use facility does not comply with Standards for Highway with regard to visibility of vehicles exiting from properties (see Local Transport Note 2/08. No assessment has been made of the volume and speed of traffic in the area with regards to cycling; clear guidance is given within Local Transport Note 2/208, that cycle lanes should be considered for the volume and speed of traffic in the vicinity of the development.</p> <p>While road safety has been considered perceived risks have not been considered. Perceived risk is a bigger barrier to cycling than</p>	<p>maximising the use of walking and cycling from the development site to include perceived danger as a barrier to cycling. Further work needs to be carried out on the Audit so that full consideration is given to recognised guidance such as the Design Manual for roads HD 42/05 Non-Motorised User Audits, Local Transport Note 2/08 Cycle infrastructure Design and Sustrans Design Manual.</p> <p>The Assessment should identify particular groups of cyclist to focus on eg. The 'utility' and 'inexperienced' cyclist, identify likely destinations and check for potential barriers or perceived barriers to this group of cyclists. Particular attention should be given to where cyclists need to turn right at any junction. A right turn box for cyclists to turn right into the Maltings from Norwich road should be considered. Advisory cycle lanes should be considered linking the development to likely cycle destinations. Advisory cycle lanes are inexpensive and research for the Transport For London has shown that advisory cycle lanes encourage more people</p>
--	--	---

	<p>the actual risk of accidents.</p>	<p>to cycle.</p> <p>As part of any assessment the applicant should discuss potential routes with the Dereham Access Group, The Footpath Warden and the Town Council's cycling Champion.</p>
<p>Travel Plan</p>	<p>The Travel Plan has identified that, due to the sites central location, there is the potential for many trips to be made by cycle. It has not however demonstrated that conditions on the neighbouring road network is conducive to cycling.</p> <p>The identification of barriers to sustainable travel in Section 4 of the Travel Plan, are not based on any sound evidence. There is a connecting bus service direct to Norwich Train station. It is very doubtful that lack of information about cycle routes is a barrier to people cycling. Section 4 of the Travel Plan is an exact copy of a Travel Plan submitted as part an application to Broadland Council in 2013</p>	<p>A Travel Plan should which is specific to this site should be produced rather than a generic Travel Plan</p> <p>Clear evidence should be produced to demonstrate that the travel plan will reduce the trips generated required for the Transport assessment to be acceptable.</p> <p>Hard measures should be considered so that walking and cycling is more attractive to residents as detailed in the 'Cycling Accessibility' comments.</p>

	for Manor Park Drayton, which is why Broadland District Council is referenced on page 20 of the report.	
--	---	--

17/001/1509/F

40 Market Place

Proposed rear first floor extension for D&A (2147) Ltd

No objection

4. **For information, notification of planning decisions and comments from Breckland District Council**

Planning Permission

3PL/2016/1078/F 58A Norwich Street
 16/102/1186/VAR 7 Quebec Street
 16/117/1365/HOU 43 Greenfields Road
 16/115/1245/F 2 The Cottage, Wellington Road
 16/107/1171/F 13 Rash'e Green
 16/108/1231/F Tesco Stores Ltd, Kingston Road

Consent to Display Advertisements

16/108/1232/A Tesco Stores, Kingston Road
 16/112/1250/A 31 Yaxham Road

5. **Exclusion of press and public**

Proposed by Councillor P Duigan, seconded by Councillor H Bushell it was agreed to exclude the press and public on the grounds that the business to be transacted is confidential and publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest.
--

6. **To consider development of Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan.**

The Neighbourhood Plan has stalled since Breckland announced the increased housing allocation to Dereham. There has been a general dissatisfaction with the new direction of the Local Plan particularly with regard to how it has dealt with the transport issues.

The Council has commissioned studies which would enable the Council to challenge the validity of the Local Plan when it goes to Inspection. It would be more constructive to challenge the Breckland Local Plan at the same time as presenting an alternative. It may be the case that if the Town Council develops an alternative Breckland will not allocate in Dereham and will allow the allocation to be made by the Neighbourhood Plan, but this is thought to be unlikely.

An alternative to the Local Plan would focus on the ability of a plan to improve traffic flows by focusing development to the East of the Town, South of the A47 junction.

Time is very short and if the Council wished to act it would need to act very quickly.

Initial steps:

	Step	Cost	Comment
1	Develop an outline master plan to test whether the alternative is reasonable.	£2,000	This can be carried out in the next week or so.
2	Contact land owners and agents to gauge whether there is an interest in putting land forward.	Postage	As soon as the outline master plan complete.

Assuming there is sufficient landowner interest, the next stage would then be to produce a Project Plan which would show how the evidence to support the plan could be put together and at what cost.

The next stage is likely to be the expensive stage therefore before proceeding there will need to be an assessment of risk of the alternative plan not being supported by Breckland Council or the Local Plan Inspector.

If the Council wished to proceed with the first two steps, a costed plan with an assessment of the risks will be brought back to the Council for consideration before any further commitments are made.

Councillors agreed to commit £2000 to develop an outline master plan to test whether the alternative is reasonable. Also to contact land owners and agents to gauge whether there is an interest in putting land forward.
