

Planning Committee

05 January 2024

Agenda item number 10

Trowse with Newton Neighbourhood Plan- agreeing to consult update

Report by Planning Policy Officer

Summary

The Trowse with Newton Neighbourhood Plan has been updated since it was last considered by the Planning Committee in August.

Recommendation

That Planning Committee endorse the consultation on the Trowse with Newton Neighbourhood Plan.

1. Introduction

- 1.1. In August 2023, Planning Committee considered and endorsed the Regulation 16 version of the Trowse with Newton Neighbourhood Plan. The report with the appendices can be found here: [Trowse Neighbourhood Plan - Agreeing to consult](#).
- 1.2. Since that time, South Norfolk Council officers have met with those producing the Neighbourhood Plan to talk through some areas where they had raised concerns. The Neighbourhood Plan has subsequently been updated and amended.

2. The changes

- 2.1. It is prudent to consider the changes made. These are as follows.

Amendments to the Plan

Section of document	Amendments
Policy 1: Housing Type & Mix (page 10)	<p>The Parish Council has added a new paragraph of supporting text (para. 28) – ‘The Policy, however, needs to acknowledge that both recent development in Trowse (under the current Local Plan) and any potential future development as part of the East Norwich Regeneration Area (specifically that on the former May Gurney site), meets a strategic need of Norwich and the urban fringe as well as a local need. For strategic housing developments defined as such on the GNLP, which at the time of writing is the former May Gurney site, the housing mix will therefore need to reflect the needs of Norwich and the urban fringe, whilst also taking account of the local parish need.’</p> <p>The policy substantially remains the same, other than that the initial wording of ‘All housing proposals...’ has been amended to ‘Non-strategic housing proposals...’</p> <p>Elsewhere in the first sentence ‘...these should aim to reflect the parish’s need...’ has been amended to ‘...these should aim to have due regard to the parish’s need...’</p>
Policy 2: Design (page 16)	<p>The word, ‘variety’ has been deleted from the first paragraph.</p> <p>Criteria h), which dealt with the orientation of buildings, has now been deleted.</p> <p>Reference to front and back gardens being well-vegetated has now been removed from criterion g).</p> <p>Greater emphasis has been added to the statement within paragraph 3. It now reads, ‘The following design considerations from the Design Codes are <i>especially important</i> to the area and so should carry more weight in decision making.’</p> <p>The reference within original criterion h) to natural surveillance has been deleted, as this is covered by the reference to Secured by Design in the final paragraph.</p> <p>The reference to retaining landmarks (now criterion j) has been amended, for clarification.</p> <p>This paragraph has been re-written, with the term ‘sensitive orientation’ removed. The revised wording now states that new development should be laid out ‘so that people will find it easy to orientate and navigate...’</p>
Section 5 – Development of the former May	<p>Para. 53 (page 23), which originally dealt with the settlement edge of the new development and the need for this to be low density, has been amended. This now refers to the south-eastern edge, and it refers to encouraging a graduated transition into the rural environment, through screening by trees.</p>

Section of document	Amendments
<p>Gurney Site; and Policy 3 – May Gurney Site (page 25)</p>	<p>Para. 54 (page 23/24), discusses general design and character considerations for the May Gurney site, particularly in light of its location adjacent to the Broads Authority Executive Area. This has been amended, removing reference to Trowse and Trowse Millgate as countryside settlements, and removing reference to ‘rural pastoral style’.</p> <p>Para. 55 (page 25) has been amended so that the requirement for buildings to taper down in height towards the edge of the new settlement is less strict. It acknowledges that 4 storey buildings, whilst being out of character with buildings in the historic parts of Trowse village, would be in keeping with certain building heights at Trowse Millgate. The paragraph states that, ‘ideally, heights should taper down from taller apartments in the main part of the site, with buildings becoming lower closer to the rural setting / meadows.’</p> <p>In terms of ‘Overall Design Principles’, the policy now acknowledges that whilst the character of the new development should be cohesive with Trowse village and Trowse Millgate, it should also have its own village feel.</p> <p>Paragraphs three and four of the policy have been replaced. These are the paragraphs which focused on the edge of the development being of a low density, and the development having an agricultural style. The amended wording now encourages taller structures to be located deeper into the site, with a transition to lower storey development, progressing to the south east boundary. It also encourages landscaping on the edge of the development, including tree planting.</p> <p>Paragraph 5 has been amended</p> <p>Under ‘Green Infrastructure’, the first paragraph, relating to views towards the water meadows being protected has been removed.</p> <p>The requirement for new green open space along the river edge has been amended to a new area of urban open space / village green being introduced on site, preferably towards the river edge.</p> <p>The statement requiring natural boundary treatments has been refined to state, ‘where the site transitions into the wider countryside.’</p> <p>The statements ‘the right tree in the right place’ and ‘with those trees recently felled replaced and incorporated into the design’ have been removed. Paragraph 3 under ‘Green infrastructure’ now more generally includes a preference for streets to be tree-lined, where possible.</p>

Section of document	Amendments
	The three paragraphs under 'Transport links' have been amended. The references to use of natural screening of parking spaces have been removed, and the paragraph relating to cycle parking facilities now requires these to be located in a number of places within the site.
Policy 4 – Biodiversity and Green Corridors (page 31)	The reference to fauna (criterion [e]) has been removed. The term 'vicinity' has been deleted and has been replaced with 'within or adjacent to a green corridor'. As regards the fifth paragraph, the purpose of this is to ensure that all developments should consider how they can support the green corridors, given that animals, especially birds and bees, will move beyond those corridors. The phrase, 'using species of greater value' has been removed. The final paragraph has been re-worded to improve clarity.
Policy 5 – Local Green Space (page 41)	This has been amended.
Policy 8 – Surface Water Management (page 57)	This element has been removed.
Policy 11 – Sustainable Transport (page 66)	This paragraph has been amended to clarify that improvements to existing facilities can only be required with a view to making the development acceptable. However, existing facilities might need to be improved to facilitate safe sustainable access, such as widening a footway or improving a bus stop. This paragraph has been combined with the previous one.
Policy 12 – Traffic Volumes and Speed (page 67)	The policy has been amended to state that this is essentially in relation to strategic development (including that on the former May Gurney site). The focus is on using junction design and highway infrastructure to minimise traffic generated by the development travelling through the village. The policy also introduces a requirement for such development to introduce a scheme to ensure compliance with the speed limit, especially at the village gateways.

Section of document	Amendments
Policy 13 – Residential parking standards (page 69)	The specific parking standards have now been removed from the policy. Policy text has been added to refer to any on-street parking, potentially due to the needs for visitor parking, being well designed.
Policy 14 – Non-Designated Heritage Assets (page 79)	This has been amended.

Factual Corrections

Section	Factual Correction	
Para 46 (page 21)	There is a typo in this paragraph – ‘country’ should be ‘county’.	This has been amended.
Para 59 (page 27)	Para 59 states that the Whitlingham Country Park is also part of the larger Crown Point Park – which is Grade II listed. Only part of the park is in the registered area, so this is not quite correct. A map of park can be viewed here: CROWN POINT, Trowse with Newton - 1001480 Historic England .	The text does not appear to have been amended, as suggested.
Figure 25 (page 75)	Factual Correction - The listing of photos as ‘Whitlingham Hospital Services & Hospital Blocks’ is out of date, as this site has now been converted into residential homes. Therefore, the listing should be updated to state ‘Whitlingham Hall’.	This has been amended.

3. Proposed action

- 3.1. At this stage, we are considering if the process has been undertaken correctly to date and that the necessary documents have been produced for the consultation. These changes seem generally acceptable, although they will be assessed in the context of the Neighbourhood Plan as a whole as and when our comments, if we have any, are prepared. Therefore, the changes do not alter the original recommendation from August 2023, which is to endorse the consultation.
- 3.2. It should be noted that no other document has changed since August 2023 – those listed in the original report ([Trowse Neighbourhood Plan - Agreeing to consult](#)) are valid.

Author: Natalie Beal

Date of report: 12 December 2023

The following appendix is available to view on [Planning Committee - 5 January 2024 \(broads-authority.gov.uk\)](#)

Appendix 1 – Amended Trowse with Newton Regulation 16 Neighbourhood Plan