



Minutes of the Rackheath Parish Planning Committee meeting  
On Monday 8<sup>th</sup> March 2021 at 6.30p.m  
Via Zoom video conference

*Anne Tandy*

Anne Tandy, Parish Clerk

**Present: Pippa Nurse (Chair), Joel Whymark, Julie Hunt**

**Also in attendance: Anne Tandy, Parish Clerk and RFO**

- 1. Apologies from Stephen Oakley who cited a prior appointment. All approved the absence.**
- 2. There were no declarations of interest.**
- 3. There were 8 members of the public in attendance.**

Comments and concerns raised by Rackheath Hall residents.

- Not accepting any of development or changes to the environment.
- Concerns about increased traffic on Hall access road, privacy & security.
- Concerns that public will walk around the Hall's privately owned land and associated parkland to Hall.
- Rackheath Hall is Grade 2 listed and its history and heritage landscape should be preserved & protected.
- The feel of the development is contrary to policy in relation to green assets.
- Concerns about the covenant on the main access road to the Hall which will be impacted by increased traffic.
- Entrance to application site is dangerous due to its location on a blind spot on Wroxham Road and close to NDR.
- EDP comments about vast swathes of land being opened up to public access.
- Raises concerns about the precedent for future development.
- Concern about all the developments taking place locally. Small development could set a precedent for future development of the parkland which would impact on the historical parkland and buildings.
- Concerned about the development and walk/cycle ways but where this will lead and how it fits into the larger plan.
- Parkland and Hall sit within landscape buffer. Confusion over what is protected and what is not.
- What the proposal doesn't say is just as important as what is presented in the plan.

- Concern over public using historical bridge which will cause decay to a heritage asset  
- Hall residents pay management fees to maintain this asset.
- Traffic Modelling on the application was based before the NDR – traffic volumes and flows very different now.

**4. The Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Monday 8th February 2021 will be considered at the next meeting.**

**5. To make recommendations on the following planning applications:**

**a. 20210036:**

- 1) Outline permission for up to 43 dwellings
- 2) Change of use of land for public open space & connecting cycle/pedestrian routes

**Location:** Land at Home Farm, Rackheath Park, Rackheath, NR13 6LP

**Application Type:** Hybrid Application

The Committee aligned the application with the Rackheath neighbourhood plan (NP)

**HOU1 Affordable housing should be dispersed through the development.**

- No detail about supported housing or bungalows at this stage.
- Unclear if 12 or 14 affordable homes

**HOU2 Character and Density**

- The plan reflects a village feel but is isolated from the main settlement of Rackheath with poor connectivity
- Housing has a “town house” feel and does not reflect the woodland area or architecture of Rackheath Hall. Therefore, deemed to be out of character with the heritage and the surrounding landscape.
- Plans submitted make it difficult to determine height but there does appear to be Dormer windows suggesting 3 storey houses which is not in line with NP. Designs need to be low level to ‘sink in’ not stand out.
- The application site has its own entrance and no link to the hall access road but may lead to inadvertent use of the drive which need to be mitigated against as Rackheath Hall residents are subject to a covenant requiring them to maintain the Hall access road and historic bridge.
- Routes around the development are reasonable but comments raised by Norfolk Police about lack of natural surveillance are echoed by the Committee.
- Affordable housing has been sited at the rear of the development and grouped together in one area - this is viewed as an enclave and not supported by the NP.

**HOU3 High Quality Public Realm**

- Cycle parking - not defined. Will need to be addressed particularly for the affordable housing area which will be limited on space.
- The boundary marking also needs more detail. The council would like to see soft boundaries of fences and hedges used. Front facing areas should have fencing should match the post and rail design already evident within the immediate area.

- Wheelie bin housing is not stated but given the style of properties this is unlikely to be a concern except on the affordable housing where it should be factored in and detailed further.

#### **ENV1 Drainage**

- Flooding is not considered an issue as the land in question is high level but the scale and futureproofing of drainage needs to be clarified.
- Permeable material should be used - this will need to be detailed further.

#### **ENV2 Climate**

- No detail provided

#### **ENV3 Tree belts and wildlife habitats**

- In conjunction with the landscape map supplied in the application there would appear to be the need for tree felling at the entrance and details of the number of trees involved should be provided. The required splay would suggest a significant area would need to be cleared to provide a clear outline. The council request further detail.
- Proposed cycleways are not linked to the main settlement of Rackheath and are deemed as “leisure routes” rather than commuting routes, thus making this development unsustainable and encourages residents to use their cars.
- The proposed routes are not well linked up and encourage the public to meander on to private land.
- Whilst these proposed “leisure routes” provide benefits, the creation of varying routes opens the Hall and Parkland up to public invasion and abuse and provides no real benefit to Rackheath community.
- The development is not sympathetic in design or materials and has failed to blend in with the existing landscape. The topology of the land will mean that this development will be visible it visible for some distance.

#### **EN4 Trees and soft site boundaries**

- The new tree belt specified as a boundary to the Hall access road needs to be wider to match others in the village, for example the tree belts at the rear of Wilde Road, Jubilee Park, etc

#### **ENV5 Historical impact**

- By carving up the parkland it is not respecting the historical significance of the site and is not in keeping with its heritage. Rackheath Hall is a heritage asset that should be protected. It also provides scope for expansion/new development submissions.
- Rackheath Hall is in close proximity to the development and the application does not align with the Statement of Common Land made by the owners previously.
- The committee finds that the application does impact on the historical importance of the area, subjects the bridge which is classed as a heritage asset to public access (although it is funded privately).
- Contrary to the Joint Core Strategy Objective 9 – the area is classed as “key landscapes”

- Should community access be given at the expense of preserving heritage assets?

#### **ENV6 Views and vistas**

- The rural feel of the land is lost.
- The GNLP specifies the landscape through the park would be a landscape buffer between Rackheath and Norwich, which will be compromised with this development.

#### **COM1 Linked community**

- Safety of access from Wroxham Road is of concern - safety issues have previously been raised by park residents gaining access to Wroxham Road due to speed, volume and visibility, particularly with queuing traffic at peak times.
- No connectivity to NDR footpaths.

#### **COM2 New community facilities**

- The development is not large enough to provide provision for community facilities.
- Clarification on Section 106 will be required.

#### **COM3 Social spaces, play spaces and parks**

- Green spaces are provided in isolation of any play equipment which would be required. Trim trails and woodland themed play have not been explored.
- The proposed green space would attract visitors from off the site but there is no car parking provision other than a turning bay.

#### **COM4 Community safety**

- No natural surveillance to the rear of properties which compromises security and safety of residents. The high value of these properties may make them targets.

#### **COMS 5 Existing community facilities**

- School access is not walkable and only accessed over the NDR. No access to roadside footpaths.
- Bus service has been deactivated, meaning secondary school age children will not have access to nearby bus stop provision.
- Residents would be reliant on cars to access services.

#### **SER1 Preschool and school provision**

- This application is outside of the 5 year land supply, is not within the allocated housing land, is not supported by the GNLP and therefore will put additional pressure, (which has not been catered for) and would place additional pressure on educational provision and in the catchment.

#### **SER2: Primary Health Care**

- This application is outside of the 5 year land supply, is not within the allocated housing land, is not supported by the GNLP and therefore will put additional pressure, (which has not been catered for) and would place additional pressure on medical care and services in the catchment.

### **TRA1 Public transport**

- The bus stops on Wroxham Road by the North Lodges have been discontinued in both directions so there is no easily accessible public transport.
- Lack of connectivity will impact on Broadland High School pupils. It is not considered sustainable and overly reliant on cars.
- The development has lots of dead ends and it is not clear without detail of road widths how emergency vehicles and services vehicles would navigate the development.

### **TRA2 Pedestrian, cycle and bridleways**

- Inclusion of cycle and footways are attractive but not altogether appropriate.

### **TRA3 Layout and traffic calming**

- There is only one route in and out which should not be an issue given the scale of the housing but the long entrance road will need speed limiting measures.
- Clarity required as to whether roads will be private/adopted or public.
- What will be the speed limit be on site?
- There is the potential to be 80+ cars navigating the development.

### **TRA 4 Residential car parking for new developments**

- Is it not clear what parking will be in place for the affordable housing and needs to ensure that on street parking is not encouraged. Further detail required.

### **In relation to the GNLP:**

- This is not within the land supply or allocated for housing
- There is already a 5 year land supply so this is not needed.
- It would set a precedent for sites outside the GNLP
- The application site sits within the GNLP defined landscape buffer, which should be respected and upheld. This application has the potential to expand, at a later date, moving away from the “small scale development” and therefore losing the green corridor.

### **General Concerns:**

- There appears to be a turning bay/cut off access at the start of the application sites access road – clarification is required to the need for this. Is it a turning bay or a premade access route to further, future development?
- The housing location is not sustainable or in character with the area.
- The housing style, design and does not align with Rackheath Neighbourhood Plan.
- This application will set precedence for neighbouring land – at what point do we stop building on green space?
- Whilst “leisure routes” are desired, we should not be forced to accept additional housing outside of policy or in the wrong location to offset against this.
- If the “leisure routes” are implemented
  - who will own this land and be liable? The landowner, Broadland District Council or Parish Council.

- Will Blue Bell Wood be protected? If so by what means?
- Who will be responsible for monitoring and dealing with dog fouling, littering, vandalism etc within the routes and the parkland? What mechanism will be put into place to address these matters?
- Committee will seek clarification on “vast swaths of land” being open to public access from Broadland District Council

**Mitigations to be considered *should* the development go ahead:**

- The Hall access road and historic bridge on the parkland has a covenant of maintenance by the park residents. It is not considered appropriate that the impact of traffic and the criss-crossing of cycle footpaths will impact on its condition of which the Hall residents would be liable.
- A barrier should be installed at the entrance of Rackheath Hall near the north lodges to restrict vehicular access to Hall residents and deliveries.
- Post & rail fencing and signage should be installed to define private land from public foot/cycleways.
- A contribution made for the upkeep of the hall and associated heritage assets.
- The tree belt on the boundary of the development needs to be wider and additional post and rail fencing around the external perimeter of the development to demarcate the boundary with the parkland.
- Foot/cycleways to link up with the NDR and Tesco along Wroxham Road.

**6. To receive information about decisions, appeals and any other planning matters:**

- a. Details of planning decisions approved by BDC were reported by the Clerk.

Date of Decision:	01 March 2021
Development:	Single storey rear extension
Location:	Hillside, Green Lane West, Rackheath, NR13 6LT
Decision:	Planning Permission Granted

Decision Date:	03/03/2021
Application Number	20202255
Development Address:	Oakwood House, Wroxham Road, Rackheath, NR13 6LY
Development Description:	Change of use to residential and erection of general-purpose building for storage of wood, gardening equipment and domestic workshop area
Decision:	Full Approval

- b. The Committee heard of a notification from Broadland District Council Street Numbering for the amendment of an address in the parish.

All business being addressed the Meeting was concluded at 20:31