

**Thorpe St Andrew Town Council  
Minutes of the Planning and Environment Committee meeting held on  
9 March 2020 at 7.30pm**

- 1 Present:**  
Mr J Fisher (Chairman)  
Mr P Berry Mr T Garner Mrs F Fisher Mr S Snelling  
  
Mr F Bowe

**In attendance:**  
Dr T Foreman (Town Clerk)  
  
13 Members of the public were present

**2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

Member	Item

**3 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2020 were agreed and signed as a true record.

**4 PLANNING ITEMS RAISED BY RESIDENTS**

There were a significant number of objections to The Buck Public House. These were in addition to the letters received prior to the meeting objecting to the application. Representations were also heard regarding 3 Furze Avenue and 10 Acacia Road.

**5 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

20200206 – 6 Furze Ave – No objection

20200224 – 25 Belmore Rd – No objection, except to ensure there is a gap retained with number 27.

20200263 – 10 Armstrong Rd – No objection

20200270 – 15 Charles Ave – No objection

20200336 – 58 St Williams Way – No objection

20200284 – The Buck Public House - the Town Council objects to the retrospective application for The Buck public house (application 20200284). Following a visit to the site, there were significant concerns regarding the restricted access created by the narrowing of the access to the site with bollards. It appears utility vehicles, including refuse collectors, no longer access the site and large vehicles including emergency vehicles are likely to have significant difficulty accessing The Buck, the houses at the rear of the car park, and the Church.

Those who have a right of way are distressed, with the belief that their movements are being monitored and that insufficient safeguards are in place to protect their data. Those residents who are less mobile cannot be dropped to their front door, as taxi drivers and visitors now refuse to now enter the site through fear of being charged or ticketed. In addition to planning policy, these concerns were raised in relation to the right to private and family life, equality legislation, and GDPR.

Being mindful of these concerns, and considering the impact, design, and layout of the development, the Town Council believe the application does not comply with the following:

- Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norwich (2011) (amended 2014) which requires development to create a strong sense of place. That the proposals respect local distinctiveness including the landscape character and historic environment, including conservation areas and the Broads Area.
- Policy EN2 of the Development Management DPD 2015 which states development proposals should have regard to the Landscape Character Assessment, as well as seek to protect and enhance the setting of the Broads Area, conservation areas and historic parks/green spaces.
- Policy GC4 of the Development Management DPD 2015 which states that development will be expected to achieve a high standard of design and avoid any significant detrimental impact. Further, that proposals should pay adequate regard to the environment, character and appearance of an area. It should reinforce local distinctiveness through careful consideration of the appearance of new development including landscaping. It should consider the impact upon the amenity of existing properties.
- Paragraph 127 of the NPPF which states the development should preserve the local character and landscape setting of the area.
- Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 states that special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
- Paragraph 184 of the NPPF says that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of designated heritage asset (including conservation areas), great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration of a heritage asset, and the proposed use of the public house car park, by making it a chargeable local facility, undermines the viability

and potential of The Buck public house, a key asset of community value and asset of historic importance.

In doing so, the Public House, which is the prominent business asset of the site, is reduced in significance and importance on the site; instead it is dominated by the signage and ancillary apparatus to create an income generating car park facility.

20200297 – 39 Bishops Close – Council regrets the loss of the hedge and would like assurance works will not take place during bird nesting season

20200332 – adj 6 Green Lane – No objection

20200357 – 10 Acacia Rd – Objections regarding privacy, that the development is un-neighbourly and overdevelopment. The Council believes the design to be poor with the large flat roof and that the size will obstruct light to the neighbour and create a sense of enclosure.

20200381 – 101 St Williams Way – No objection

BA/2020/0023/COND allow residential occupation, removal of condition 2 of permission BA/2014/0114/COND – Objection to the residential occupation based on its location, access to services and the Councils views concerns raised as part of application BA/2014/0114/COND.

BA/2020/0052/TCAA – Thorpe Hall – G1 remove Leylandii and replace with Hornbeam - No objection

BA/2020/0032/TCAA – 16 Thorpe Hall Close – no objection to the works and given details of site visit, the Council would not object to the felling of the trees.

## 6. ENFORCEMENT NOTICES

Noted.

## 7. DOG AGILITY AREA

The Committee was updated on a plan proposed by three District Councillors to help fund a dog agility area at the Dussindale Park. The Town Clerk explained that the sum being funded totaled £1,500, however with further funds from the Council more work could be achieved in house. It was **RESOLVED** to support the project within the maintenance and capital budgets for the park and that an area in the Queen Elizabeth woods be designated for this purpose.

**8. NORWICH FRINGE PROJECT**

The Committee considered correspondence regarding out of date walking leaflets created by the FRINGE project for Thorpe St Andrew. It was **RESOLVED** to write to them and suggest the installation of way finder signage and accessibility status of the walks they propose.

*The meeting closed at 09:00pm*

*Signed: .....*

*Dated: .....*