

COUNCIL MEETING – 13 FEBRUARY 2013

At the meeting of the Sprowston Town Council held at Sprowston Diamond Centre, School Lane, Sprowston on Wednesday 13 February 2013, the following Members were present:-

Mr K Lashley – Chairman

Mr J W Bracey - Mr R J Knowles
Mr W F Couzens - Mrs B J Lashley
Mr R B Dyball - Mr J H Mallen
Mrs S A A Dyball - Mr C L Noble
Mrs H Tovell

In attendance

Mrs J Hunt - Town Clerk and Responsible Financial Officer
Mrs E Elliot - Committee Officer
Mrs J Leggett - County Councillor Old Catton and Sprowston West

9 Members of the public
2 Representatives from Beyond Green
Press Correspondent

13/041. DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY AND OTHER INTERESTS

Member	Minute No & Heading	Nature of Interest
Mr J W Bracey	13/045 - Planning Application 12/1516	Non-pecuniary interest as a Member of Broadland District Council
Mr R J Knowles	13/045 Planning Application 12/1516	Non-pecuniary interest as a Member of Broadland District Council

13/042. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Written apologies for absence were received from Mrs A Harper, Ms M Ho, Mrs M R Roberts and Ms C T Rumsby and verbal apologies from Mr C E Cutting.

13/043. RESIDENT'S QUESTIONS

On the motion of Mrs S A A Dyball, seconded by Mrs B J Lashley it was **RESOLVED** that the meeting be adjourned to receive residents' questions on matters concerning the town. Residents were reminded that their questions should be addressed to the Chairman who would, assisted by the Town Clerk, reply.

Mr Hughes commented that Anglian Water had placed an advert asking the public to contact them with ideas on how to protect the environment and queried whether we were looking after the environment. He questioned the need to build on green field sites. Acknowledging there was a need for low cost housing Mr Hughes felt it should be achieved in other ways. He asked if there had been any consultation as to what local people wanted and what would happen to infrastructure while all these brownfield sites were not being utilised. He queried the demand for this level of additional housing and suggested the need to revisit and utilise the assets already available.

13/043. RESIDENT'S QUESTIONS (CONTINUED)

Mr Walsh stated that the Greater Norwich Development Partnership's overall proposal was totally unrealistic and unnecessary, focussing on Sprowston. He advised that the application should not be considered in isolation as it was in addition to existing proposals, which already had approval. He commented that if the number of homes proposed at the Blue Boar Lane and White House Farm developments were added to the Beyond Green development there would be over 4,500 homes, potentially doubling the population of Sprowston. Mr Walsh said to support these proposals would create a city within a city. He queried whether Sprowston could accommodate so many people and if it was desirable? He acknowledged there was a demand for housing but asked that there be some scale to development and not ruin what Sprowston already had. He felt it would be a repeat of Hethersett and Wymondham and requested the Council to be critical of the proposals, suggesting there was insufficient infrastructure to support them. Mr Walsh commented on the behaviour of Norfolk County Council, the largest land owner of the area proposed for development in Sprowston, and asked the Town Council to stand up and be counted, make their voice heard and protect Sprowston.

Mrs Howes expressed concern with regard to flooding and the potential dog leg, which would be created on the Wroxham Road if proposals for an East West link road between the North Walsham Road and the A1151, opposite Sprowston Manor, went ahead. She also stated that she felt the pavements were too narrow for wheelchairs and push chairs.

Mr Tovell commented that the overall concept was that someone had decided Sprowston would have 10,000 plus homes and queried the use of prime agricultural land. He suggested that the onus was on the land owner, Beyond Green, Broadland District Council and the County Council to curb the level of density. He foresaw that there would be a wall of development, stating that on a crude average the population of Sprowston would be larger than Aylsham. He advised that he was not against the idea of development but it would be a very large concentration of people and needed to be looked into. Having had discussions with Beyond Green he commented that they were a very good PR company but suggested people must not be too influenced by them. Mr Tovell also stated that having to park cars on the road reflected the kind of density this development was talking about.

The meeting was reconvened.

13/044. CORRESPONDENCE

A copy of the Norfolk Police and Crime Plan 2013 - 17 and questionnaire was circulated.

13/045. PLANNING APPLICATION 2012/1516

Mr C L Noble raised a number of issues stating that the development was in the wrong place, it should be on the A11/A47 corridors and only when allocated sites had been fully built out.

Whilst accepting that some development had to take place he expressed his concerns with infrastructure, drainage, inadequate school and healthcare provision, design of the site, scale, density, timing, nature, scope of the whole development and population growth.

He also stated that if Broadland District Council were to pre-empt the decision of the appeal against the Joint Core Strategy it would be improper and not sound, and

13/045. PLANNING APPLICATION 2012/1516 (CONTINUED)

Broadland District Council should defer their decision until the full ruling has been received.

Mrs B J Lashley stated that the East of England Development Plan had said Norfolk needed an extra 76,000 homes. Norfolk County Council, Norwich City Council and Broadland District Council worked out a joint core strategy deciding where development was to take place, but those times were different from today and the Joint Core Strategy is out of date.

She noted that there were no minimum parameters throughout the application, except for housing, and there was insufficient green space. As to density she could not find any indication of beds per hectare and suggested some areas could be terribly dense whilst others less so. There was a lot of information about the number of dwellings but not how close they are together.

The design of three and four storey buildings was out of character for the area and dwelling accommodation should be limited to 2.5 storeys except in parts of the main square where two living storeys above a shop could be permitted. Referring to blocks of flats, some that she was familiar with in other areas had lots of green space around them, but not in this application.

As to the road layout there are close knit groups of straight streets and whilst Sprowston does have some straight roads there is space between them with gardens big enough for plants and trees. Mrs Lashley felt the design was not in keeping with Sprowston. Referring to parking she noted there were no garages and that parking would be provided via courtyards and/or on-road, commenting that previous advice was to avoid courtyard parking as it is not overlooked and is subject to crime. She suggested that every street could be lined with cars parked half on the pavement. Whilst appreciating the desire for more use of public transport, walking and cycling she felt that people were wedded to their cars.

According to the plans each phase of development would take approximately 18 months, so the overall scheme would take 9 years if not more to complete. Nobody should have development on their doorstep for that length of time.

With regard to community facilities 2000 square metres is not very much community space for a health centre, nursery, two schools, a community building etc. The Town centre does not seem to have any public toilet provision. To be viable it will have to attract people from elsewhere and will require this type of facility.

When Broadland District Council carried out a landscape quality survey they said the land to the north of Sprowston was of medium landscape quality. Why are we taking medium value land when there is low value land such as that to the north of Hellesdon near the growth triangle?

There is little reference to the archaeological value of the land to be used. If the application is passed there should be a clear condition that a full archaeology survey of the whole area before development takes place.

Broadland's biggest social housing need is for families and this application makes no reference to any social housing built by a social housing company; housing built for rent or shared ownership.

There is also no consideration for older people who need appropriate and purpose built provision. Looking at population changes in Broadland the biggest increase is in older people and we have got to think of the kind of people that might want to live there.

13/045. PLANNING APPLICATION 2012/1516 (CONTINUED)

Mr R B Dyball commented that Church Lane was the last bit of Sprowston which had not been built on and open space should be protected.

Mr W F Couzens stated the original survey for housing needs was conducted years ago, many things had changed since then and we need to reflect that change. The number of houses is now cast in stone by the Joint Core Strategy so we should ensure that the homes built are the homes that we want. We need to stipulate a minimum of 38% affordable housing. Whilst understanding the concept of a walkable neighbourhood 1.5 parking spaces are still insufficient.

Mr Couzens suggested the centre of the development be built first and then developers build outwards. As development will displace dog walkers, bird watches, walkers and cyclists it would be helpful if Beeston Park together with a route through from Church Lane be open to the public prior to work commencing.

Mr J H Mallen commented that this development did not have a sense of balance it was the wrong type of development for this area. He was not against additional housing but felt other avenues had not been explored. The development is too big and economically at the wrong time.

Mrs S A A Dyball expressed concern about flooding and waste disposal, querying if the system could cope. She also felt there would be too much traffic on the roads, particularly at the North Walsham and Wroxham Road roundabouts. Given that Sprowston was currently not well served by buses she questioned if it was realistic to expect an improvement as a result of this development. Regarding transport she stated people will not stop using cars.

Mrs H Tovell expressed concern on the impact of diverting the North Walsham Road through a 20 mph limit and built up area. She felt that there was already enough problems with rat running in Sprowston and the additional residents this development would attract would further exacerbate the situation. The majority of green space for this development is Beeston Park, which is not in Sprowston and does not provide for organised sporting activities or children's play areas. The amenities in Sprowston are already at bursting point, where are all these additional people going to access sports facilities and play areas as there is inadequate provision in the proposed development within the Sprowston boundary?

Mr J H Bracey accepted there was a need for additional housing but thought this development would be rather select commenting that there was nothing for older people.

Mr K Lashley stated that the Council had two options, one to oppose the application or two, to accept the Joint Core Strategy and look to make improvements to the application.

Mr C L Noble proposed to adjourn the meeting for a short break, seconded by Mr Couzens.

The meeting was reconvened.

Mr R J Knowles proposed, seconded by Mrs S A A Dyball to suspend standing order 1Y in order to complete the business of the evening.

Resulting from the debate it was

RESOLVED to make the following response to Broadland District Council

13/045. PLANNING APPLICATION 2012/1516 (CONTINUED)

that Sprowston Town Council assumes the approval of the Joint Core Strategy before the application is determined, if the Joint Core Strategy is not approved the development is outside the development area.

Sprowston Town Council regards it as Broadland District Council's responsibility that the design and suds strategy is approved and signed off as a valid and workable strategy and design.

Beeston Park be considered for public use before any work commences on the proposed development

that recreational ground facilities, SPO1, should be adjacent to schools. SPO2 is not required next to SCHO2 (school) as an adjacent recreational area already exists. SPO2 should be moved to the east. SPO3 to be relocated centrally into the development. Where bowling greens or tennis courts are provided then related facilities should also be included.

to accept the suggestion from the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group to move the proposed east west link road thus moving the town centre to the south.

that the Town Council write to Broadland District Council stating that after a thorough consultation with Sprowston residents the response is that there is grave concerns about the number of properties and density proposed in this development.

that the land use beyond Sprowston Cemetery extension should be of a type which would not preclude it being changed to a cemetery extension in future years, without loss of other essential amenity.

the use of the proposed open space identified for organised games was questioned and the probable ensuing noise given its position adjacent to a cemetery.

that up to 2000 square metres community space is insufficient for the density of the development.

for Broadland District Council to ascertain Norfolk County Council's intentions with regard to future educational needs and suggest that the people of Sprowston feel that a secondary school should be incorporated in this development.

to provide no less than between Broadland District Councils policy minimum and 38% affordable housing.

that the applicants be asked to discuss homes for older people with a specialist provider.

that a full geophysical survey be carried out prior to any development taking place.

13 March 2013

CHAIRMAN