

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
5	Senior Planner	09.02.2026	<p>Amendment to the conditions following discussions with the agent. Alterations are shown in bold.</p> <p><u>Condition 02</u> Details of the appearance, landscaping, internal access, layout and scale (hereinafter called 'the reserved matters') shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.</p> <p>Reason: This is a planning permission in outline only and the information required is necessary for the consideration of the ultimate detailed proposal.</p> <p><u>Condition 09 deleted and replaced with:</u> The submission of any reserved matters application pursuant to this outline consent shall be accompanied by details of car parking facilities for each residential plot within the development and a 'heat map' showing the parking facilities provided.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that adequate provision is made on the site for the traffic generated by the development.</p> <p><u>Condition 19</u></p> <p>A. The approved development must not commence until a Faunal Enhancement Plan has</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Alterations are noted and none of the alterations materially affect the report as published to Members.

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<p>been submitted to, and been approved by, the local planning authority. The plan must show the type, and proposed locations for 15 integrated bat boxes and 15 integrated bird boxes within new dwellings and details for incorporating these (i.e., height and orientation). The plan must show where hedgehog holes must be created in solid boundaries within the approved development to create a 'hedgehog highway'.</p> <p>B. Prior to occupation of the final dwelling hereby approved, photographic evidence of all installed boxes, and photographic evidence of hedgehog holes created within the approved development, must be submitted to, and be approved in writing by, the local planning authority to fully discharge the condition. Thereafter, the installed boxes shall be retained for compliance.</p> <p>Reason: To provide a measurable gain for biodiversity as required by the NPPF, and maximise opportunities to enhance biodiversity as required by Core Strategy Policy 12.</p> <p><u>Condition 22</u></p> <p>The following activities must not be carried out under any circumstances during the construction phase.</p> <p>a. No fires to be lit on site within 10 metres of the nearest point of the canopy of any retained tree/hedgerow on the proposal site.</p>	

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<p>b. No equipment, signage, fencing etc shall be attached to or be supported by any retained tree on the application site,</p> <p>c. No temporary access within designated root protection areas without the prior written approval of the District Planning Authority.</p> <p>d. No mixing of cement, dispensing of fuels or chemicals within 10 metres of any retained tree/hedgerow on the application site.</p> <p>e. No soak- aways to be routed within the root protection areas of any retained tree/hedgerow on the application site.</p> <p>f. No stripping of top soils, excavations or changing of levels to occur within the root protection areas of any retained tree/hedgerow on the application site.</p> <p>g. No topsoil, building materials or other to be stored within the root protection areas of any retained tree/hedgerow on the application site.</p> <p>h. No alterations or variations of the approved works or protection schemes shall be carried out without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To protect existing trees and hedgerows within the site.</p> <p><u>Condition 25</u></p> <p>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/drawings:</p>	

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dwg No: 333102543-0101 – Site Location Plan • Dwg No: 110535-PEF-ZZ-XX-DR-TP-00001 Rev P05 – Site Access Arrangement; and • Dwg No: 110535-PEF-ZZ-XX-DR-TP-00002 Rev P03 –Vehicle Tracking of Site Access <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
6	Mr Wood (neighbour at 52 Main Street, Lowdham)	03.02.2026 and 10.02.2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested that if planning permission is granted, a condition be attached requiring the landing window facing their rear garden area to be fitted with obscure glazing. • The tandem car parking spaces are less than the minimum width due to obstructions. • The swept path is for a delivery van not a fire engine. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The request for obscure glazing is addressed at paragraph 7.39 of the report and by condition 09 on page 88 of the agenda papers. • The plans show a heat pump for each dwelling located to the side of each driveway, there would still be space for two cars to park in a tandem arrangement. • NCC Highways require a turning area for a long wheelbase delivery vehicle as opposed to a fire engine. They raised no objections to the proposed turning area as shown on the site plan.
6	Mr Jacob Dignam (neighbour at 48a Main Street, Lowdham)	06.02.2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States that the red line boundary on the submitted site location plan is incorrect as it includes land within his ownership, therefore incorrect notices have been served. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agent has responded to the land ownership issue, see below:-

PLANNING COMMITTEE 12 February 2026

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
6	Mr Anthony Northcote (Agent)	06.02.2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The red line location plan is the same as that shown on the previous application on the site 24/00558/FUL. The site layout is based upon a detailed topographical survey and the land registry title plan. The agent is confident, based on the information available, that the correct notices have been served. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any disputes over land ownership are a civil matter between the two landowners. Officers are satisfied that the correct procedures have been followed in terms of the planning application process.
12	Agent (Mr George Machin)	05.02.2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Small gap between two existing homes Small development 2-4 Houses Lack of 5-year housing land supply in the district demonstrates a need for more housing land Highway authority is satisfied an appropriate access can be achieved. Land is not a conservation area or in a flood zone or other protected designation. Planning officers have weighed up the proposal and consider in principle to be acceptable clearly outweighing limited harm. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments all addressed in the report.
12	Resident (Mr Vince Baker)	09/02/2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway concerns cars travel faster than speed limit as well as traffic concerns. The entrance is a blind spot Flooding running off from the field into their land. No main sewage system so septic tanks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports covers all concerns that can be considered at permission in principle stage.

PLANNING COMMITTEE 12 February 2026

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<p>will be required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient properties being built already in the village • Impacts on Character • Amenity impacts, loss of light, overbearing and overshadowing. • Sets a precedent • Why is this considered infill land. 	
14	Ms Quibell (former owner of site)	04.02.2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have raised issue with how previous applications were dealt with and refused including wrong decision being issued leading to judicial review under reference 22/02430/FUL. • Have stated they previously sought legal advice will be watching for any decision made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy context in which the council operates has changed since the previous refusals including the council no longer being able to demonstrate a five-year land supply and consideration of the tilted balance • The judicial review referred to for case reference 22/02430/FUL relates to an administrative error by the Council. The only way to remedy the error was for the Council to take the decision to the High Court via JR (which the Courts agreed to). The correctly issued refusal of planning permission was subsequently tested and dismissed at appeal by the planning inspectorate. This has no relevance to the current case.
14	Spalford Parish	05.02.2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposal based upon highway safety, flood risk and impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitability dealt with within the appraisal

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)	Officer's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> on character and appearance Object to the proposal based upon suitability of the site and whether the site is appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways is a technical detail not under review at this stage Flood zones have changed, and flood risk covered in report Council cannot demonstrate five-year supply
14	Mrs Victoria Cassells	10.2.2026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the application on grounds of services, impact on neighbours, highway impact, loss of ecology/biodiversity, character, noise and pollution Have stated the site is designated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts assessed in appraisal Some matters relate to technical detail stage The site is not designated, policy map does not have any information, policy not aware of any. May be mixing up use of land with designation.
16	Senior Planner	10.02.2026	<p>Correction to the report to show the residual affordable housing figures for the site required is 15 and NOT 17.</p> <p>Table should read (<i>corrections in bold and yellow highlight</i>):</p>	Corrections noted but does not alter the conclusion as this was inserted for information to Members only.

PLANNING COMMITTEE 12 February 2026

Schedule of Communication Received after Printing of Agenda

Item	Correspondent	Date	Points Raised (Summary)							Officer's Response
			1 Bed House/Flat	2no. AF	2no. SO	2 & 2	Millers	0 no.		
			2 Bed house/flat	20no. AR	10no. SO	14no. AR	8no. SO	Millers	6no. AR 2no. SO	
				3no. FH		2no. FH	1no. FH	Bellway & Millers	0 FH	
			2 Bed bungalow	4no. AR	2no. SO	3no. AR	2no. SO	Millers	1no. AR	
			3 Bed house	14no. AR	10no. SO	11 no. AR	8 no. SO	Millers	3no. AR 2no. SO	
				3no. FH		2no. FH	1no. FH	Bellway & Millers	0no. FH	
			4 Bed house	2no. SO 3no. FH		2no. SO 2no. FH	Millers Millers	0 no. AH 1no. FH		
			Total	75no.		60no.		15no.		
			<i>Assessment against the Affordable Housing Delivery Plan (S106)</i>							
			<p>Therefore, the remainder of 15 units from the initial 1000 dwellings (7.5%) would still be provided, and given the marketing carried out, this would be within Key Phase 2, therefore making affordable units in all three phases. This is however subject to Reserved Matters approval being granted. The mix of dwellings and the tenure would need to accord with the above table, which is fixed through the S106 and the Affordable Housing Delivery Plan.</p>							