Please note that planning application Item Nos 1-2 will be heard from 10am
Planning application Item Nos 3-13 will be heard from 1.00pm onwards
Please familiarise yourself with this information if you are not in receipt of the agenda.

If the meeting room is busy, please use the upstairs public gallery until such time as your application is heard. You will need to be in the main meeting room if you wish to speak in regard to an application. Please be aware that the Committee can over-run, and if your application is later on the agenda it may be some time before your application is heard.

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

The Development Management process is primarily concerned with issues of land use and has been set up to protect the public and the environment from the unacceptable planning activities of private individuals and development companies.

The Council has a duty to prepare a Local Plan to provide a statutory framework for planning decisions. The Development Plan for South Norfolk currently consists of a suite of documents. The primary document which sets out the overarching planning strategy for the District and the local planning policies is the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. The Strategy is broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and accompanying technical guidance and was adopted by South Norfolk Council in March 2011, with amendments adopted in 2014. It is the starting point in the determination of planning applications and as it has been endorsed by an independent Planning Inspector the policies within the plan can be given full weight when determining planning applications.

South Norfolk Council adopted its Local Plan in October 2015. This consists of the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document, the Wymondham Area Action Plan, the Development Management Policies Document. These documents allocate specific areas of land for development, define settlement boundaries and provide criterion based policies giving a framework for assessing planning applications. The Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan was also ‘made’ in 2014 and full weight can now be given to policies within this plan when determining planning applications in Cringleford. The Long Stratton Area Action Plan is submitted for examination and so the weight to be afforded to emerging policies and allocations is assessed on a case-by-case basis. In accordance with legislation planning applications must be determined in accordance with the policies of the Development Plan, unless material considerations which are relevant to planning indicate otherwise.

The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to achieve sustainable development. The core planning principles contained within the NPPF are summarised as:

- To be genuinely plan-led
- To drive and support sustainable economic development
- Seek high quality design
- Conserve and enhance the natural environment
- Encourage the effective use of land
- Conserve heritage assets

The factors to be used in determining applications will relate to the effect on the “public at large” and will not be those that refer to private interests. Personal circumstances of applicants “will rarely” be an influencing factor, and then only when the planning issues are finely balanced.

THEREFORE we will:

- Acknowledge the strength of our policies,
- Be consistent in the application of our policy, and
- If we need to adapt our policy, we will do it through the Local Plan process.

Decisions which are finely balanced and contradict policy will be recorded in detail to explain and justify the decision and the strength of the material planning reasons for doing so.
OCCASIONALLY, THERE ARE CONFLICTS WITH THE VIEWS OF THE PARISH OR TOWN COUNCIL. WHY IS THIS?

We ask local parish and town councils to recognise that their comments are taken into account. Where we disagree with those comments it will be because:

- Districts look to ‘wider’ policies, and national, regional and county planning strategy.
- Other consultation responses may have affected our recommendation.
- There is an honest difference of opinion.
**AGENDA**

1. To report apologies for absence and identify substitute voting members (if any);

2. To deal with any items of business the Chairman decides should be considered as matters of urgency pursuant to Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act, 1972; [Urgent business may only be taken if, "by reason of special circumstances" (which will be recorded in the minutes), the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion that the item should be considered as a matter of urgency.]

3. To receive Declarations of Interest from Members;
   (Please see flowchart and guidance attached, page 8)

4. Minutes of the Meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 1 February 2017;
   (attached – page 10)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 21)
   To consider the items as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Planning Ref No.</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2016/1447/F</td>
<td>BRESSINGHAM</td>
<td>Harvest House Low Road Bressingham IP22 2DB</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2016/0482/F</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH &amp; RUSHALL</td>
<td>Land North Of Harvey Lane Dickleburgh Norfolk</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2016/2424/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land At Chapel Road And Bunwell Road Spooner Row Norfolk</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2016/2388/F</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Land North Of Stoke Road Poringland Norfolk</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2016/2668/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Old Sale Yard Cemetery Lane Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2016/2837/RVC</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Land North Of Bawburgh Road Bawburgh Norfolk</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2016/2942/DC</td>
<td>CRINGLEFORD</td>
<td>Land South-west Of Newfound Farm Colney Lane Cringleford Norfolk</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2016/0466/O</td>
<td>WOODTON</td>
<td>Land north West Of The Street Woodton Norfolk</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2015/2463</td>
<td>HINGHAM</td>
<td>Land south of Norwich Road, Hingham</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2016/2987/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Land East of 10 and 12 Kets Close Hethersett Norfolk</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2016/3012/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Land To The Rear Of 25 South Croft Hethersett Norfolk</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2017/0252/H</td>
<td>CHEDGRAVE</td>
<td>18 Langley Road Chedgrave Norfolk NR14 6HD</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2017/0046/A</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Diss Leisure Centre Victoria Road Diss Norfolk IP22 4JG</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Sites Sub-Committee;
   Please note that the Sub-Committee will only meet if a site visit is agreed by the Committee with the date and membership to be confirmed.
7. Planning Appeals (for information)  

8. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wednesday 29 March 2017
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

The following guidelines are to assist Members to assess whether a Site Panel visit is required. Site visits may be appropriate where:

(i) The particular details of a proposal are complex and/or the intended site layout or relationships between site boundaries/existing buildings are difficult to envisage other than by site assessment;
(ii) The impacts of new proposals on neighbour amenity e.g. shadowing, loss of light, physical impact of structure, visual amenity, adjacent land uses, wider landscape impacts can only be fully appreciated by site assessment/access to adjacent land uses/property;
(iii) The material planning considerations raised are finely balanced and Member assessment and judgement can only be concluded by assessing the issues directly on site;
(iv) It is expedient in the interests of local decision making to demonstrate that all aspects of a proposal have been considered on site.

Members should appreciate that site visits will not be appropriate in those cases where matters of fundamental planning policy are involved and there are no significant other material considerations to take into account. Equally, where an observer might feel that a site visit would be called for under any of the above criteria, members may decide it is unnecessary, e.g. because of their existing familiarity with the site or its environs or because, in their opinion, judgement can be adequately made on the basis of the written, visual and oral material before the Committee.

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Applications will normally be considered in the order in which they appear on the agenda. Each application will be presented in the following way:

- Initial presentation by planning officers followed by representations from:
  - The town or parish council - up to 5 minutes for member(s) or clerk;
  - Objector(s) - any number of speakers, up to 5 minutes in total;
  - The applicant, or agent or any supporters - any number of speakers up to 5 minutes in total;
  - Local member

Member consideration/decision.

TIMING: In front of you there are two screens which tell you how much time you have used of your five minutes. After four minutes the circle on the screen turns amber and then it turns red after five minutes, at which point the Chairman will ask you to come to a conclusion.

MICROPHONES: In front of you there is a microphone which we ask you to use. Simply press the left or right button to turn the microphone on and off

WHAT CAN I SAY AT THE MEETING? Please try to be brief and to the point. Limit your views to the planning application and relevant planning issues, for example: Planning policy, (conflict with policies in the Local Plan/Structure Plan, government guidance and planning case law), including previous decisions of the Council, design, appearance and layout, possible loss of light or overshadowing, noise disturbance and smell nuisance, impact on residential and visual amenity, highway safety and traffic issues, impact on trees/conservation area/listed buildings/environmental or nature conservation issues.

3. FILMING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS: GUIDANCE

Members of the public and press are permitted to film or record meetings to which they are permitted access in a non-disruptive manner and only from areas designated for the public. No prior permission is required, however the Chairman at the beginning of the meeting will ask if anyone present wishes to record proceedings. We will ensure that reasonable facilities are made available to the public and press to assist filming or recording of meetings.

The use of digital and social media recording tools, for example Twitter, blogging or audio recording is allowed as long as it is carried out in a non-disruptive manner.
**HEALTH AND SAFETY INFORMATION**

| **Fire alarm** | If the fire alarm sounds please make your way to the nearest fire exit. Members of staff will be on hand to escort you to the evacuation point |
| **Mobile phones** | Please switch off your mobile phone or put it into silent mode |
| **Toilets** | The toilets can be found on the right of the lobby as you enter the Council Chamber |
| **Break** | There will be a short comfort break after two hours if the meeting continues that long |
| **Drinking water** | A water dispenser is provided in the corner of the Council Chamber for your use |

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS**

**Key to letters included within application reference number to identify application type – e.g. 07/96/3000/A – application for consent to display an advert**

| **A** | Advert | **G** | Proposal by Government Department |
| **AD** | Certificate of Alternative Development | **H** | Householder – Full application relating to residential property |
| **AGF** | Agricultural Determination – approval of details | **HZ** | Hazardous Substance |
| **C** | Application to be determined by County Council | **LB** | Listed Building |
| **CA** | Conservation Area | **LE** | Certificate of Lawful Existing development |
| **CU** | Change of Use | **LP** | Certificate of Lawful Proposed development |
| **D** | Reserved Matters (Detail following outline consent) | **O** | Outline (details reserved for later) |
| **EA** | Environmental Impact Assessment – Screening Opinion | **RVC** | Removal/Variation of Condition |
| **ES** | Environmental Impact Assessment – Scoping Opinion | **SU** | Proposal by Statutory Undertaker |
| **F** | Full (details included) | **TPO** | Tree Preservation Order application |

**Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations**

| **CNDP** | Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan |
| **J.C.S** | Joint Core Strategy |
| **LSAAP** | Long Stratton Area Action Plan – Pre Submission |
| **N.P.P.F** | National Planning Policy Framework |
| **P.D.** | Permitted Development – buildings and works which do not normally require planning permission. (The effect of the condition is to require planning permission for the buildings and works specified) |
| **S.N.L.P** | South Norfolk Local Plan 2015 |
| **WAAP** | Wymondham Area Action Plan |
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

When declaring an interest at a meeting Members are asked to indicate whether their interest in the matter is pecuniary, or if the matter relates to, or affects a pecuniary interest they have, or if it is another type of interest. Members are required to identify the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which it relates. In the case of other interests, the member may speak and vote. If it is a pecuniary interest, the member must withdraw from the meeting when it is discussed. If it affects or relates to a pecuniary interest the member has, they have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public but must then withdraw from the meeting. Members are also requested when appropriate to make any declarations under the Code of Practice on Planning and Judicial matters.

Have you declared the interest in the register of interests as a pecuniary interest? If Yes, you will need to withdraw from the room when it is discussed.

Does the interest directly:
1. affect yours, or your spouse / partner’s financial position?
2. relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or your spouse / partner?
3. Relate to a contract you, or your spouse / partner have with the Council
4. Affect land you or your spouse / partner own
5. Affect a company that you or your partner own, or have a shareholding in

If the answer is “yes” to any of the above, it is likely to be pecuniary.

Please refer to the guidance given on declaring pecuniary interests in the register of interest forms. If you have a pecuniary interest, you will need to inform the meeting and then withdraw from the room when it is discussed. If it has not been previously declared, you will also need to notify the Monitoring Officer within 28 days.

Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above?

If yes, you need to inform the meeting. When it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.

Is the interest not related to any of the above? If so, it is likely to be an other interest. You will need to declare the interest, but may participate in discussion and voting on the item.

Have you made any statements or undertaken any actions that would indicate that you have a closed mind on a matter under discussion? If so, you may be predetermined on the issue; you will need to inform the meeting, and when it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.

FOR GUIDANCE REFER TO THE FLOWCHART OVERLEAF.
PLEASE REFER ANY QUERIES TO THE MONITORING OFFICER IN THE FIRST INSTANCE
DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A. Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?
OR
B. Does it directly affect me, my partner or spouse’s financial position, in particular:
   • employment, employers or businesses;
   • companies in which they are a director or where they have a shareholding of more than £25,000 face value or more than 1% of nominal share holding
   • land or leases they own or hold
   • contracts, licenses, approvals or consents

YES

The interest is pecuniary – disclose the interest, withdraw from the meeting by leaving the room. Do not try to improperly influence the decision.

If you have not already done so, notify the Monitoring Officer to update your declaration of interests

NO

The interest is related to a pecuniary interest. Disclose the interest at the meeting. You may make representations as a member of the public, but then withdraw from the room.

Does the matter indirectly affects or relates to a pecuniary interest I have declared, or a matter noted at B above?

YES

NO

The Interest is not pecuniary nor affects your pecuniary interests. Disclose the interest at the meeting. You may participate in the meeting and vote.

Have I declared the interest as an other interest on my declaration of interest form? OR
Does it relate to a matter highlighted at B that impacts upon my family or a close associate? OR
Does it affect an organisation I am involved with or a member of? OR
Is it a matter I have been, or have lobbied on?

NO

You are unlikely to have an interest. You do not need to do anything further.
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton, on Wednesday 1 February 2017 at 10.00 am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: V Thomson (Chairman), L Neal, B Duffin, C Gould, M Gray, C Kemp, G Minshull, J Mooney and B Stone.

Apologies: Councillor: F Ellis and A Thomas

Substitute Member: Councillor: N Legg for F Ellis C Foulger for A Thomas

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors), the Planning Decisions Team Leader (C Trett), the Senior Planning Officer (C Curtis), the Planning Officer (H Bowman) and the Design Officer (C Watts).

(30 members of the public were in attendance)

312. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following members declared interests in the matters listed below. Unless indicated otherwise, they remained in the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/2607/F</td>
<td>PULHAM MARKET</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Received photographs from Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0627/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>J Mooney</td>
<td>Other Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Member of Wymondham Town Council but not member of Town Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2134/O</td>
<td>KETTERINGHAM</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Member of Wymondham Town Council but not member of Town Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2499/F</td>
<td>BRACON ASH</td>
<td>N Legg</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
313. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 4 January 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

314. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

The Committee considered the report (circulated) of the Director of Growth and Localism, which was presented by the officers. The following speakers addressed the meeting with regard to the applications listed below.
The Committee made the decisions indicated in the Appendix to these minutes, conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee being in summary form only and subject to the final determination of the Director of Growth and Localism.

### 315. ENFORCEMENT REPORTS

I. Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Diss (ref 2016/8140).

   It was **RESOLVED** that no further action be taken on the matter.

II. Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Diss (ref 2016/8190).

   It was **RESOLVED** that no further action be taken on the matter.
316. **PLANNING APPEALS**

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting closed at 2.00 pm)

_____________________

Chairman
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

NOTE:
Conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee are in summary form only and subject to the Director of Growth and Localism's final determination.

Applications referred back to Committee

1 Appl. No : 2016/2607/F
Parish : PULHAM MARKET
Applicants Name : Mr Paul Schwier
Site Address : Hannah’s Barn Barnes Road Pulham Market Norfolk
Proposal : Conversion of 2no barns to residential unit and holiday let
Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval of Barn A conversion to holiday let

Approved with conditions

1 Full Planning permission time limit
2 In accord with submitted drawings
3 Holiday occupation
4 Window details to be agreed
5 Specific details to be agreed
6 No PD for Classes ABCDE & G (C/e)
7 No PD for fences, walls etc
8 No satellite dishes, tanks etc
9 Domestic Microgeneration Equipment
10 Ecology Mitigation
11 Provision of parking, service
12 Reporting of unexpected contamination
13 Surface and foul water drainage to be agreed

Decision : Members voted unanimously for Refusal of Barn B Conversion and extension to form residential dwelling

Refused

1. Insufficient dimensions to convert to a dwelling without excessive extension
2. Tantamount to a new dwelling in countryside
3. Not sustainable development.

Updates to officer report
The housing land supply figures quoted in the reports for both Norwich Policy Area and Rural Policy Area should be dated March 2016, not December 2016.

Additional condition:
13. SW and FW drainage; details before commencement and implemented before occupation
Other Applications

2  Appl. No : 2015/1461/F
Parish : REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON

Applicants Name : Mr Peter Crockford
Site Address : Land West Of Station Road Harleston Norfolk
Proposal : The re-submission of application to construct 6 new dwellings with access from Tudor Rose Way.

Decision : Members voted 10-0 (with 1 abstention) to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to Approve

Approved with conditions

1  Full Planning permission time limit
2  In accordance with amendments
3  External materials to be agreed
4  Specific details to be agreed
5  Levels to be agreed
6  New Water Efficiency
7  Contaminated land - submit scheme
8  Implement approved remediation
9  Reporting of unexpected contamination
10 Surface Water details to be agreed
11 No dig construction to protect tree
12 Tree planting to be carried out
13 Tree Protection
14 Retention of trees and hedges
15 Provision of parking, service
16 Bathroom windows to be obscure glazed plots 5 and 6
17 No additional windows at first floor plots 5 and 6
18 Boundary treatment to be agreed
19 No PD for fences, walls etc.
20 No PD for Class E (outbuildings) plot 3
21 Barrier to prevent use of Everson Lane by vehicles
22 Ecology mitigation
23 Hours of construction traffic to be agreed

Subject to the views of the Fire Service
Appl. No : 2016/0627/F
Parish : WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Trustees Of J M Greetham No. 2 Settlement
Site Address : Land West Of School Lane Spooner Row Norfolk
Proposal : Proposed erection of 7 residential dwellings

Decision : Members voted 8-3 to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to Approve

Approved with conditions:

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accordance with amendments
3. External materials to be agreed
4. Ecology Mitigation
5. Slab level to be agreed
6. New Water Efficiency
7. Hedge planting
8. Retention trees and hedges
9. Drainage to accord with submitted details & management plan
10. Boundary treatment to be agreed
11. No PD for fences, walls etc.
12. Highway Conditions

Subject to resolution of highway issues and completion of a S106 agreement to secure funding for a TROD path; or a contribution to an extension of the existing school car park; or to fund other works to improve pedestrian safety in the immediate area.

Updates to officer report

The housing land supply figures quoted in the reports for both Norwich Policy Area and Rural Policy Area should be dated March 2016, not December 2016.

Summary of objectors concerns circulated to Members

Highway officers comments:
At this stage there is nothing specific identified other than the suggestion for the TROD within the recreation ground or funding for the improved car park. I do not have a problem with a sum of money being lodged in lieu. However, the sum of £8111 will cover the works cost for the TROD (Edging strips and planings) within the recreation ground only and does not include any bridge over the ditch or any signage that may be required.

The sum of £8111 is unlikely to fund a TROD within highway limits and we have doubts as to whether such a provision along School Lane could be provided satisfactorily.
4 Appl. No : 2016/1973
Parish : KESWICK AND INTWOOD

Applicants Name : Mr B Moss
Site Address : The Exchange, Mulbarton Road, Keswick, Norfolk
Proposal : Demolition of 'The Exchange', and development of land with 4 no. dwellings (2 Detached Houses and 2 Detached Bungalows)

Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval

Approved with conditions

1. Full planning permission time limit – 2 years
2. In accordance with submitted details
3. External materials to be agreed
4. Boundary treatments to be agreed
5. Vehicular access in accordance with highway specification
6. Visibility splays in accordance with submitted details
7. Provision of parking and turning
8. Scheme for off-site highway improvement works (footpath link)
9. Reporting of unexpected contamination
10. Noise attenuation scheme
11. Landscaping scheme
12. Tree protection
13. Surface water details
14. Method of non-mains water disposal to be agreed
15. Details of foul water disposal
16. Water efficiency
17. Slab level to be agreed

Note for officers:
Tree Preservation Order to be considered

Updates to officer report
The housing land supply figures quoted in the reports for both Norwich Policy Area and Rural Policy Area should be dated March 2016, not December 2016.

5 Appl. No : 2016/2134/O
Parish : KETTERINGHAM

Applicants Name : Mr Michael Austin
Site Address : Land To The East Of 5 High Street Ketteringham Norfolk
Proposal : Development of three bungalows (Phased development)

Decision : Members voted 7-4 for Refusal (contrary to officer recommendation, which was lost 5-6)

Refused

Reasons for Overturning Officer Recommendation
Adverse impact on war memorial setting and erosion to the character of the area.

Updates to officer report
The housing land supply figures quoted in the reports for both Norwich Policy Area and Rural Policy Area should be dated March 2016, not December 2016.

Letter from Ketteringham Residents circulated to Members
6  **Appl. No** : 2016/2499/F  
**Parish** : BRACON ASH

Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs Keable  
Site Address : Land East Of Lodge Bungalow Cuckoofield Lane Bracon Ash Norfolk  
Proposal : New residential building with parking (revised application)

Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval

Approved with conditions
1. Full Planning permission time limit – 2 years
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. Building details to be agreed
4. Tree protection
5. Contaminated Land
6. New Access Construction over verge
7. Provision of parking, service
8. Submit Emergency Flood Plan
9. Water entry and exclusion strategies
10. Surface water drainage
11. New Water Efficiency
12. External material colours to be agreed

**Updates to officer report**

The housing land supply figures quoted in the reports for both Norwich Policy Area and Rural Policy Area should be dated March 2016, not December 2016.

Additional condition
12. External material colours to be agreed

7  **Appl. No** : 2016/2635/O  
**Parish** : TACOLNESTON

Applicants Name : Mr J Coston  
Site Address : Land West Of Norwich Road Tacolneston Norfolk  
Proposal : Outline application for 3 self-build plots with details of upgraded access, all other matters reserved.

Decision : Members voted 10-1 for Refusal

Refused

1. Contrary to Policy DM1.3
2. Not Sustainable development – encroachment into countryside

**Updates to officer report**

The housing land supply figures quoted in the reports for both Norwich Policy Area and Rural Policy Area should be dated March 2016, not December 2016.

Letter from agent circulated to Members
Response from officer to agents letter:
Keith Mitchell has commented that in his opinion, the Spooner Row example is not a precedent for Tacolneston:

- Spooner Row was in the Norwich Policy Area without a 5-year land supply
- The S106 Agreement was an obligation arising from JCS Policy 4 for affordable housing
- The restricted value applied to first disposal

The agent has put forward that each plot will only be available to purchase to a person(s) with a recognised local connection and the sale of the plots to the restricted market after the first purchase of the property will be at a 20% discount on the market rate. The market rate to be set by the District Valuer. This is a material consideration in favour of the application however in this instance it is not considered to outweigh the significant environmental harm identified in the report.

In respect of self-build and the SHMA, this is dealt with Part 2 of the document, paras 7.80-7.95; in effect this says that evidence for self-build is very low (from the ‘need-a-plot’ register and from field interviews), but that this effectively reflects the previously low rate of self-build development. The SHMA recommends that the authorities set up a register and/or undertake further survey work. South Norfolk has a register, we know what our requirements are for the first period (permission for 112 potentially suitable plots between 31 Oct 2016 to 30 Oct 2019) and the Council is currently confident that this can be met from permissions for smaller sites which do accord with the Local Plan. There is no separate NPA/Rural Area requirement for self-build

In terms of using the SHMA for calculating land supply, the SHMA has not been tested through the Local Plan process and therefore is not being given weight in terms of calculating five year supply at present; something which was noted in the Inspector’s Report (endorsed by the Secretary of State) for the Wymondham RFC appeal, where the Inspector could ‘not afford significance to the potential for change at this stage’ in terms of moving to the SHMA figures for calculating land supply.

8  
Appl. No : 2016/2793/H  
Parish : HETHERSETT  
Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs N Simpson  
Site Address : 2 Grenville Close Hethersett Norfolk NR9 3AG  
Proposal : First Floor Shower Room Extension  
Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval  
Approved with Conditions  
1  Full Planning permission time limit  
2  In accord with submitted drawings  
3  Matching Materials

9  
Appl. No : 2016/2896/H  
Parish : WORTWELL  
Applicants Name : Miss Pauline Allen  
Site Address : Says Farmhouse 11 Low Road Wortwell IP20 0HJ  
Proposal : Extension to dwelling and conversion of outbuilding  
Decision : Members voted 10-0 for Approval  
Approved with Conditions  
1  Full Planning permission time limit  
2  In accord with submitted drawings
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Appl. No</strong></td>
<td>2016/2897/LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parish</strong></td>
<td>WORTWELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Applicants Name</strong></td>
<td>Miss Pauline Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Site Address</strong></td>
<td>Says Farmhouse, 11 Low Road, Wortwell IP20 0HJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Proposal</strong></td>
<td>Extension to dwelling and conversion of outbuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong></td>
<td>Members voted 10-0 for <strong>Approval</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved with Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Listed Building Time Limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>In accord with submitted drawings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

The Development Management Committee on the 9th November 2016 resolved to approve the application subject to the submission of further noise assessment information to demonstrate mitigation measures to the satisfaction of the Council with advice from the Community Services Environmental Quality Team. While the noise assessment work has now been completed there has been submission of a considerable quantity of additional information received from both the applicant and third parties. Officers have re-evaluated the application and report the proposal back to committee in light of the above factors.
1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
- NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
- NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport
- NPPF 07: Requiring good design
- NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change
- NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
- Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
- Policy 2: Promoting good design
- Policy 3: Promoting good design
- Policy 5: The Economy
- Policy 6: Access and Transportation
- Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
- Development Management Policies
  - DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
  - DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development
  - DM1.4: Environmental Quality
  - DM2.1: Employment and business development
  - DM2.7: Agricultural and forestry development
  - DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development
  - DM3.10: Promotion of sustainable transport
  - DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic
  - DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking
  - DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
  - DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety
  - DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management
  - DM4.4: Natural environment assets – designated and locally important open spaces
  - DM4.5: Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
  - DM4.8: Protection of trees and hedgerows
  - DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design
  - DM4.10: Heritage Assets

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
- South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD 2012

**Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas:**

S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2015/2364
- Demolition of 2x buildings and construction of 7 Storage Silos, 3 Intake Silos, 1 Bunker Storage Area, 1 Machinery Building, 2 Grain Driers and associated infrastructure, plant and machinery
- Withdrawn
Development Management Committee 1 March 2017

2.2 1997/0930 Demolition of existing shed & erection of replacement using former steel framed storage building

2.3 1996/0124 Siting of mobile offices & toilets to replace existing

2.4 1995/1461 Two grain silos

2.5 1994/1111 Erection of radio dish antenna mounted on w of 12.5m high pole

2.6 1994/0530 Erection of 2no hopper grain silos and grain dryer (amendment to permission 07/88/0832/F)

2.7 1993/1022 Storage of 2000 tonnes of fertilizer

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council

Original comments (received 3/08/16)
- Recommends approval.

Revised comments (received 4/10/16)
- Rescinds comments of the 3rd of August and now recommends refusal.
- Feels it is appropriate to make a formal objection on the grounds that information that should have been available to it was not available within the time scale then required for a response.

Further comments (received 24/10/16) summarised
- We could possibly accept development provided the 15.5 metre height limit and tree screen were retained along with strict controls on noise, traffic and time use.
- The two applications 2015/2364 & 2016/1447 aided slow realisation of the amended scheme for 17 silos reaching 26m high. Few residents are aware or received notification of amendments.
- Officer pre-application advice for 7 silos on website for the 17 silos has misled us and the public. Remain concerned at the scale and impacts the development would have on landscape and life quality.
- No provision for pedestrian access from bus stop to site and no specific mitigation measures imposed.
- No reference to probable adverse effects on the local tourist and hospitality trade.
- Development will reduce aggregated value of adjacent real estate.
- Net loss of jobs when considered over a wide area.
- Site is in open countryside contrary to policy.
- Demolition of structures prior to approval negates ‘land use rights’.

Further comments (received 25/11/16)
Errors of Administration and presentation
Date missing off Site Notice
Incorrect and misleading pre-application advice lodged on website
Failure to notify over wider area, especially amendment increase in scale
Incorrect statement that no Care home is within vicinity
Lack of involvement of public (NPPF)
Non-provision of crane at site inspection as member requested
No definition of actual new silo heights in landscape assessment (DLA Ltd 1549/LVIA/rpt1v2 May ’16)
Road junction first proposal incapable of construction
Distorted view photographs minimising relationship with Bressingham church
Use of photographs not posted on application website
Errors between drawings
The LVIA omits an existing/proposed viewpoint from the south, immediately across the A1066
Need for EIA and involvement of Historic England denied

Lack of documentation
Inadequate/incorrect Sound report by Sharps. Actual noise information/mitigation and attenuation measures deferred
Missing information on previous acoustic and hours of operation condition
Lack of consultation with adjoining District Councils
Lack of drawings/technical details of dryers.
Air pollution information not provided
No reliable information on operating hours
Clearance from MoD and CAA not obtained
Road Junction
Implications for immediately adjacent residential properties.
Type of storage & resultant traffic not defined ...(harvest storage or shipping trade)
Impacts of harvest 24/7 traffic on South Norfolk and North Suffolk road networks not addressed. Impact of traffic through Diss not addressed
Omission of impact on local tourist businesses and employment
No information on Openfield plants to be closed as a result of an approval
Lack of documentation on wildlife habitats.

Errors of Assessment
Mistaken designation. Agricultural processing plant more industrial than agriculture.
Incorrect application of SN New Local Plan policies (see policy section of report and entire assessment)
Lack of concern for value depreciation on surrounding landscape and properties
Overdevelopment: ‘land-use obesity’ (B&FPC description)
Misjudgement of scale, impacts and balance of harm to the historic landscape.
Down-grading of landscape advice
Failure to meet requirements for safeguarding the Waveney Rural River Valley
Impact on the night sky.
Failure to assess net employment impacts resulting from consolidation.
Omission of impact assessment on care home
Demolition of existing plant prior to consent
No effort made to modify plant arrangement to enable retention of
(some) mature trees

3.2 District Member
To be determined by Development Management Committee.

3.3 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team
No objection in principle.
- further noise impact related information should be submitted and approved as part of one of the suggested conditions. Other conditions relating to noise mitigation, hours of deliveries, no generators/air handling without consent, construction management plan, external lighting, contaminated land, air quality shall also be included.

Further comments:

In relation to noise impacts it is considered that enough evidence has been provided such that it can be determined that noise from the grain drying facility is unlikely to cause any significant adverse impacts on the health or quality of life of local residents. It will be important to ensure, however, that noise levels from the facility do not exceed those predicted by Sharps Redmore in their Technical Note Re: Proposed Grain Store Facility Upgrade, Fixed Plant. Sound Attenuation Measures. Update to include all 17x silos dated 31st January 2017. Two conditions are suggested.

3.4 SNC Water Management Officer
No objection
- Suggests conditions for a detailed scheme for surface water scheme prior to commencement of development; and that foul water is disposed by a sealed system or private treatment plant, as indicated on the application details.

3.5 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority
No comments as it falls below their current threshold for providing detailed comment.

Further comments have been requested and will be reported to committee.

3.6 SNC Landscape Architect
Original comments
Removal of existing trees:

The proposal necessitates the removal of 40 trees; no detailed survey or assessment is provided of these, but they all appear to be contemporary with, or more recent than, the existing site developments. From aerial photographs it appears that most of the trees were present (albeit relatively immature) in 1988, and non-existent in 1946. In light of this I am satisfied that no significant specimens will be lost.

Impact on retained trees:
It appears that no arboricultural impact assessment has been undertaken.

Notwithstanding this, the main potential for impact on existing vegetation is where the new silos are proposed adjacent to the mature conifer trees along the west boundary of the site. Whilst these trees are arguably incongruous in the rural setting, they do provide some screening of the existing structures, and will provide an element of evergreen cover for the lower sections of the taller new silos. If the trees were to decline as a result of root
disturbance/damage caused by construction, then this would provide an opportunity for renewal with species more suited to the landscape character.

Visual Impact:
A LVIA (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) has been provided; this has been guided by industry guidelines. Broadly I concur with the findings of the LVIA for most of the viewpoints analysed. However, as there is an element of judgement in the process, my own assessment is marginally different for some of the viewpoint locations; for some of those with residential receptors (especially from the valley) my own judgement would be Moderate/Major Moderate.

What we do not appear to have is an assessment of the significance of effects for the viewpoints illustrated by the four photo montages (viewpoints i- iv). My assessment, based on site observations and also using the montages is that the significance of visual effects for these is: Moderate (i & ii), Major (iii) and Major/Moderate (iv).

Viewpoint iii considers the situation in the vicinity of ‘Wayside’ the dwelling on Halford Lane. In light of this it can be concluded that there is visual harm.

Proposed landscape design:
The scheme is constrained by the land-ownership associated with the site; new planting is limited to the periphery, which is close to the new structures. Unfortunately this relationship with limit the visual effect of the new planting, which will only be able to provide a softening, setting for the structures; substantial ‘screening’ of the new structures will not be possible due to their height (silos will be 26m tall). Ideally planting should be further away to give the best visual effect for mitigation screening, but this is not possible in this case due to the limited ownership.

Some of the proposed planting is outside the ‘red line’ (but within the ‘blue line’); the opportunity therefore appears to exist for the new planting to be extended along the northern land-ownership boundary, possibly even the western one too.

Conclusion:
Whilst agree with much in the LVIA, with the majority of the visual effects being ‘moderate’ a note of caution should be sounded on the significance of effects for some of the residential receptors. Most notably, is the property ‘Wayside’ for which my own assessment of the situation is that the significance of visual effects will be ‘major’ and as such there is harm. The mitigation effect of the new planting proposed as part of this development will be unable to reduce this harm in the long term due to the height of the proposed silos.

Further comments 1/09
This revised plan has addressed what I suggested in my previous comments and has maximised the planting opportunities within the landownership constraints. Remember that this planting will only be able to provide a softening of, and a setting for, the structures; substantial ‘screening’ will not be possible due to their height (silos will be 26m tall).

If the application is approved, we will need to condition implementation of this planting scheme.
It would also be prudent to condition submission and implementation of a management plan.
Further comments 3/11
I have no objections to the revised highways proposals, and my previous comments still stand.

Further comments 16/2
No significant existing trees will be lost.
   No arboricultural impact assessment undertaken, but the main potential for impact on retained trees is the new silos next to the existing conifers. Whilst these trees are arguably incongruous they do provide some screening of the existing structures, and will provide an element of evergreen cover for the lower sections of the taller new silos. If the trees were to decline as a result of root disturbance/damage caused by construction, then this would provide an opportunity for renewal with species more suited to the landscape character.

- A LVIA (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) has been provided. Broadly I concur with the findings of the LVIA for most of the viewpoints analysed. However, as there is an element of judgement in the process, my own assessment is marginally different for some of the viewpoint locations; for some of those with residential receptors (especially from the valley) my own judgement would be Moderate/Major Moderate. What we do not appear to have is an assessment of the significance of effects for the viewpoints illustrated by the four photo montages (viewpoints i- iv). My assessment, based on site observations and also using the montages is that the significance of visual effects for these is: Moderate (i & ii), Major (iii) and Major/Moderate (iv). Viewpoint iii considers the situation in the vicinity of ‘Wayside’ the dwelling on Halford Lane. In light of this it can be concluded that there is visual harm.

- Ideally planting should be further away to give the best visual effect for mitigation screening, but this is not possible in this case due to the limited ownership. The opportunity appears to exist for the new planting to be extended along the northern land-ownership boundary, possibly even the western one too. Planting will only be able to provide a softening of, and a setting for, the structures; substantial ‘screening’ will not be possible.

- In summary, agree with much in the LVIA, with the majority of the visual effects being ‘moderate’ a note of caution should be sounded on the significance of effects for some of the residential receptors. Most notably, is the property ‘Wayside’ for which my own assessment of the situation is that the significance of visual effects will be ‘major’ and as such there is harm. The mitigation effect of the new planting proposed as part of this development will be unable to reduce this harm in the long term due to the height of the proposed silos.

3.7 Anglian Water Services Ltd
No objection/no impact upon their assets.

3.8 SNC Conservation And Design
Original scheme
No objection
There are a number of heritage assets to the south of the site along Fen Street. These are dispersed cottages and farmhouses, which lie on the north side of the shallow Waveney Valley – they are
interpersed with mature trees and hedging, and their setting is therefore relatively enclosed rather than ‘open’. The development is on the north side of the A1066, where the character changes to more open fields. Although the site will be visible due to its size and scale when moving along Fen Street, I do not consider that it will have a direct impact on the setting of the heritage assets, which can be considered to be relatively confined and immediate to the buildings. Impact can therefore be judged on the impact on the wider valley landscape setting to the south of A1066 of which the buildings form a part.

St Johns the Baptist Church, Bressingham lies 1km to the east, so some distance. Although the buildings will be large in scale and industrial in character, they are related to agricultural activity, and therefore not incongruous per se within a rural landscape context when seen within long distance landscape views. Tree planting will further mitigate the impact. The setting of the church is not therefore significantly impacted by the proposal.

The design of the office is a simple traditional form but with a contemporary style, fenestration and materials. The design is appropriate for the context, but I would suggest conditioning materials and details to ensure a quality in the final design.

No further comments to make

3.9 NCC Ecologist

No objection

Further comments received:
Impacts on internationally-designated site:
The site of the proposed development is located approximately 1km north-east of Redgrave and Lopham Fen Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which is also designated as a component unit of the Waveney and Little Ouse Valley Fens Special Area of Conservation and a Ramsar site. The reserve is managed by the Suffolk Wildlife Trust.

The Suffolk Wildlife Trust have noted that no assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed development on Redgrave and Lopham Fen has been undertaken as part of this application. It notes that there are several potential sources of impact which could be generated by the proposal, including operational noise, operational lighting and operational air pollution. Taking into account the facts of the case, including that the proposal is for an expansion of an existing use, it is envisaged that the ecology impacts would not be significant, however it would be prudent for the applicant to provide additional information on the potential ecological impacts on the designated site.

Habitat Regulation Assessment:
As the Competent Authority, South Norfolk Council will also need to undertake a Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) under Regulations 61 & 62 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2012 (as amended). South Norfolk Council may wish to ask the applicant to provide the information to inform the HRA in the form of a ‘ghost HRA’ or similar. In practice this will be informed by the work identifying potential ecological impacts on the designated site described above.
Further comments:

The applicant has now submitted a HRA screening report, which appears to have been completed by ecological consults, Applied Ecology. We accept the conclusion drawn.

However, the report contains an error. It states that Norfolk County Council are the “competent authority”. This is incorrect. As South Norfolk Council will be determining the application, you are the competent authority in this case as defined in the Habitats Regulations and the HRA report needs amending to reflect this. (The removal of the County Council logo on the top of the form should also be undertaken). Technically, what the applicant has provided is information to inform an HRA screening opinion, which SNC as the competent Authority may or may not choose to adopt as the formal record.

In this case, I would suggest that the screening report could be adopted by yourselves, once the error described above has been corrected.

3.10 NCC Highways

No objection

- Subject to detail design, the proposals are considered as acceptable. Recommend conditions relating to providing visibility splays, access / on-site and HGV parking, off-site highways improvement works.

Further comments received:

The revised highway access drawing is virtually identical to the original scheme drawing. The proposal is again a standard Dept of Transport design for a ghost island right turn lane.

I understand that the revision is an option to the original highway access layout.

The principle of the scheme is acceptable, subject to a detailed design. We have not agreed details of signage and as with any highway scheme, accommodation works may be required and these may alter slightly as the scheme progresses.

The principle of the right turn lane was supported by the planning Inspector and is also supported by our safety engineer. We would not be able to support the additional development on the site without the highway improvements.

As far as I can see the revision shows the whole highway layout moved marginally southwards with a slight widening of the road on the southern side being the main difference between the revised and original highway layouts.

There is a lot of vegetation around the entrance to Mill House which overhangs the highway boundary. The accommodation works to the scheme could include a cutting back of the vegetation to reduce and significantly improve any safety effects that the slight change to the road line to the south will have.

The safety engineer has considered the suggestion of reducing the speed limit to 50 mph from the current 60, but does not feel that
there is sufficient development along this section of the A1066 or accident record to warrant the change.

3.11 Health And Safety Executive

No objection

• Do not advise on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission in this case.

3.12 Natural England

Comments:

Require further information - The consultation documents provided by your authority do not include information to demonstrate that the requirements of Regulations 61 and 62 of the Habitats Regulations have been considered by your authority.

Sufficient information should be provided by the applicant for your authority, as the competent authority, to determine whether there will be any likely significant effect on European designated sites. Natural England is particularly concerned that the developer needs to consider any potential impacts which could arise from the expansion proposals, including aerial emissions or hydrological discharges, which have potential, either alone or in combination, to adversely affect any of the European and international sites (SAC and Ramsar) in the vicinity.

We recommend that the applicant should address impacts upon European and Ramsar sites and provide sufficient information in a written document to inform your authority’s Habitats Regulations Assessment, which will need to be undertaken.

Further comments: No objection.

Your assessment concludes that the proposal can be screened out from further stages of assessment because significant effects are unlikely to occur, either alone or in combination. On the basis of information provided, Natural England concurs with this view.

The application site lies 1.2 km from Waveney and Little Ouse Valley Fens Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which is a European site. The site is also listed as Redgrave and South Lopham Fens Ramsar site and additionally, is notified at a national level as Redgrave and Lopham Fens Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The SSSI is a component site of the SAC. Natural England agrees with the conclusions of the HRA that, as the qualifying features of the aforementioned sites are wetland habitats and an aquatic species of spider, are not particularly sensitive to the potential adverse effects of the proposal identified above, and are located at sufficient distance from the development site to ensure they will not be adversely impacted by the development, particularly with regard to aerial emissions or hydrological discharges. We agree that a likely significant effect to these sites can be ruled out both alone and in combination with other plans or projects.

3.13 Suffolk Wildlife Trust

No comments on the specific matter of bats and the proposed demolition and construction on-site.

No assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed development on Redgrave and Lopham Fen has been undertaken as part of this application, although it appears that there are several potential sources of impact which could be generated by the proposal. These include operational noise; operational lighting and operational air pollution. Several of these potential impacts are
included within Natural England’s SSSI Impact Risk ones for the Fen. We request that prior to the determination of this application, further assessment is undertaken to consider the likely impact of the proposed development on the statutory designated site. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NNPF) and South Norfolk Council’s Local Plan (Joint Core Strategy Policy 1 and Development Management Policy DM 4.4) consent should not be granted for development which would result in adverse impacts on such sites.

In addition to the above, although it is noted that screening for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been undertaken, as the nearest statutorily designated nature conservation site is a SAC and Ramsar site, the need for a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010) (as amended)) of this application must also be assessed. As the Local Planning Authority, South Norfolk Council are the competent authority for undertaking a HRA. Also, whilst not a nature conservation matter, we query why the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) does not appear to include assessment of the ‘proposed built’ structures from viewpoints E; F and G.

We also query whether the proposed structures would be visible from Redgrave and Lopham Fen and, if so, to what extent they will cause an impact?

3.14 Other Representations

Significant number of letters of objection have been received from 25 local residents and comments relating to planning related concerns, procedural and administration matters, summarised as follows:

- Recognised area of exceptional landscape quality
- Heritage impacts
- The present facility does not need to be demolished it is in a good state of repair
- No support from local farmers
- Consultation flawed; householders affected not informed, site notices difficult to see.
- Original site notice gave no date for comments. No community meeting held.
- Technical documents not available for the public before the Planning Committee considered the application, including the landscape, air and noise reports.
- Inaccuracies in Planning Statement and supporting information submitted by the applicant.
- Devaluation of property values.
- Damage the increased and continuous background noise will have on our Autistic teenage son.
- Jobs will be lost.
- Proposed structures will radically alter the character of the rural landscape of the River Waveney.
- No evidence to justify the need for additional grain storage facilities within the region.
- Visual effects will be ‘major’ on some receptors and as such there is harm.
• 40 existing screening trees, 30 years old, specifically planted to screen previous building to be cut down and replaced by new young planting.
• Acoustic report not available to members when making their decision, neither had officers the opportunity to consider it. Report reveals that night-time plant noise emissions will be 51dB and thus 25dB over assessed current background sound, causing ‘significant adverse impact’. No proper assessment of noise currently or to be generated.
• Noise levels at unsociable hours are extremely likely to exceed acceptable levels.
• Application restricts its assessment on impacts to the few properties immediately adjacent. Noise assessment should be carried out over a wider area.
• Not all of the land needed for the offsite road works appears to be in the control of the Highways Authority.
• Waveney House Appeal. The Planning Committee was informed that the nearest bus stop was 1km distant with no footpath serving the site and that approval would make the development reliant on the use of private vehicles conflicting with (NPPF) aims of achieving sustainable development. This factor seems to be ignored in the report to Committee for this much larger development.
• Contrary to National Planning Policy Framework, Joint Core Strategy and the SN Local Plan Policies. (see entire assessment)
• Proposals will overshadow nearby properties and will be totally out of keeping with the village.
• Dirt and noise caused during the demolition of the old buildings and construction of the new ones will be considerable. The noise and pollution from the operation of the new facility with its increased capacity will also be highly intrusive.
• Fox Covert and Fen Farm Barn does not currently have significant planting within or adjacent to the boundaries, as implied in para 4.21 by the Conservation & Design Officer.)
• Impact on near neighbours and their businesses (including B&B’s) do not appear to have been given adequate consideration. Photomontages/viewpoints deceptive and do not show several important viewpoints.
• Tree planting will not screen silos which will result in detrimental visual impact.
• Increased traffic impacts including noise and disturbance from HGV movements and tail backs on Fen Street.
• Plans fail to show any of the surrounding residential properties and their close proximity to the grain store.
• Not realised the height and revised number of silos. Information impossible for the layman to ascertain.
• Weigh bridges will cause stopping and starting of engines and dust.
• There will be nothing to shield the noise and the visual impact.
• It will only be possible for less than half the trees shown to be planted on land owned by Openfield. The others will have to be planted on land owned by another party.
• Report states the development will cause visual harm, not reflected in the report summary.
• Plans show at committee failed to show any of the surrounding residential properties and their close proximity to the grain store.
• Increase in allergens from the grain dust which, with the removal of the screening trees, will also cause an increase in allergies already suffered.
• Proposed road layout by BSP Consulting does not show or take into account two houses opposite the grain store.
• Proposed highways scheme will increase danger when turning into and out of site.
• Adverse impact on tourism as the harvest peak coincides with the tourist season.
• Lorry movements will not be evenly spaced and will probably cause congestion (one at least every 4 minutes).
• Severe negative visual impact.
• Significantly reduce the viability of local businesses and value of assets.
• Notes conditions and comments regarding historic planning permissions for the site. Reference to 1988 conditions imposed on the height of the permitted development on the site at 15.5 metres.
• Increase in vehicle movements on and off the site. At the moment heavy goods movement start at around 04.30am and continue all day. Increasing this by 170% would be a massive intrusion on my life and the business.
• If the site entrance could be moved 500 metres west of its current location then it would exit opposite an open field and not disturb the five neighbours that live so close.
• Junction to site very likely to result in another serious accident or fatality due to slow moving traffic and turning across high speed road.
• The 3 grain driers make a lot of noise and could be located to the rear of the site where they would be onto open field and not disturb anyone.
• Represents a major industrial development in a quiet rural location.
• Will cause a loss of visual amenity.
• 117 meters away from our home, Grade II Listed Building. New on site roads indicate an increase in traffic, which will create noise and disturbance, impacting negatively on all nearby residents. Demolition of existing buildings will release hazardous materials into the air (asbestos).
• If planning permission is given strict attention should be given to managing asbestos, appearance of new structures, lighting and the restricting the proximity of the access roads to residents at the east end of Wilney Green. (multiple issues covered across entire assessment)
• Pre-application from 5th August 2015 on website for this application, this is misleading. Incorrectly lodged on applications by Openfield
• The development requires an Environmental Impact Assessment.
• Eastern visibility splays not deliverable without taking out Paul Rackham Limited’s hedge at Four Winds.
• Questions if the internal site area provides sufficient parking space for queuing HGVs.
• Not enough stopping distance and parking for one vehicle in the central waiting lane.
• Misleading and contradictory information on planning application.
• Civil Aviation Authority should be consulted due to the height of structures. This is the height at which red lights will have to be attached that will be visible from a considerable distance. Height of proposals not accurately represented in original report or Planning Statement. They are at least 29m high, 10% higher than suggested in Officers documents.
• Scale of development, two thirds of size as terminal at Tilbury and larger than Ipswich port terminal. (the entire assessment assesses the multiple issues associated with the scale of the development)
Application predicts 2174 inward movements during August. Equates to 9 deliveries per hour.
Drawings misleading. Appear partly clad in a block type manner whereas structures proposed will be stainless steel, which can cause glare from sunlight and could be a road hazard.
Tree planting shown on east side of proposals are partly within 3rd party land.

In addition, one objector has employed a noise consultant and raised a number of concerns, summarised as follows:
- Noise survey data not available before committee.
- Assessment does not include a survey of existing background noise levels, or plant types/ model numbers.
- Provides only the simplest of predictions of likely noise at some but not all noise sensitive receptors.
- Predictions use estimates and assumptions not qualified in report.
- Background noise at some receptors at night are different to own library data, which indicate significant adverse impact.
- Adverse health effects.
- Not sufficient information to make accurate assessment of noise impact on residential amenity.
- Limited data indicates that there will be a significant impact to amenity in the local community.

A significant volume of further third party representations have been received since the committee meeting of the 9th of November. These include reference to issues set out above and also highlight the following:

Mill House would not sell their land to facilitate any necessary highway improvements
Impacts upon Bressingham and Redgrave Fen must be established
Alternative sites for the proposal exist
Heritage impacts have not been properly assessed
Applicant’s LVIA is flawed and objectors have commissioned independent assessment
Numerous FOI requests
Impact on Waveney Valley must be considered
Grain dust can be explosive, impacts of this have not been fully assessed
Surface water drainage and Foul water drainage implications have not been properly considered

Independent traffic survey and assessment submitted

1 letter of support received, summarised as follows:
- Consider the development to be very positive for our business and the local community as it ensures that barley can be supplied from the local area rather than sourcing and transporting it from further afield.
- The proposals will contribute to the success of Tivetshall Maltings.

4 Assessment

4.1 As outlined in the introduction of this report, there has been submission of a considerable quantity of additional information received from both the applicant and third parties. In light of this Officers have re-evaluated the proposal in light of the above factors. The following assessment sets out this re-evaluation.
4.2 It should be noted that a site visit was conducted by some members of the Development Management Committee on the 15th February. Details of this are contained within appendix 2.

Site description and proposals

4.3 The site consists of a collection of buildings and structures on a site which is operating as a grain storage/drying facility (use class B2) and is owned/operated by Openfield Agriculture UK.

4.4 The site is located in the open countryside between Bressingham and South Lopham with direct access to the A1066 which lies to south of the site.

4.5 There are neighbouring residential properties abutting the application site: Four Winds and Waveney House. It should be noted that the rear garden of one of these properties has an extant planning permission to create a new industrial unit (2015/2856).

4.6 There are also properties to the south of the site beyond the A1066, these are the White House which is a bed and breakfast business and The Mill House. Further south on Fen Street there are a number of residential properties including listed buildings. To the east of the site beyond the adjacent agricultural land is a residential property, Wayside. To the north, north-east and north-west are a number of properties including Fenners which is a registered care facility.

4.7 The site has been used as a grain store since the 1970’s by different operators with Openfield Agriculture Ltd having acquired the site in 1999.

4.8 The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of 5 buildings (it should be noted that demolition has already taken place on-site) and construction of 17 storage silos, 10 intake silos, 1 dust box, 1 machinery building, 3 grain driers and 6 bulk out load hoppers, an office & laboratory block and 2 weighbridges and a new permanent and temporary access for construction vehicles and upgrading of on-site roadways.

The amount of development proposed is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>FOOTPRINT</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storage Silos</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3308m²</td>
<td>26m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake silos</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>503m²</td>
<td>17m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dust Box</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112m²</td>
<td>8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178m²</td>
<td>24m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Driers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>152m²</td>
<td>16.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead bulk out-loading hopper</td>
<td>2 x 3 bins</td>
<td>104m²</td>
<td>17.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; laboratory block</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>636m² (floor area 580 m²)</td>
<td>11.6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyor / elevator for crop handling</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighbridges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9 There has been criticism that the height of the silos/structures proposed has been misrepresented to date. For the avoidance of doubt, the heights quoted above are considered to be an accurate reflection of what is proposed. It should also be noted that gantries are included within the development as shown on the submitted plans.
4.10 The applicant has advised that the upgrade to the facility is required following modernisation of the farming industry in recent years, as well as to ensure that the grain store complies with EU food standard regulations.

4.11 The new silos will be used to either store grain or as required dry grain.

4.12 In order to support the increase in traffic movements to the site, significant access improvements are proposed as well as a temporary access for use by construction vehicles.

4.13 The improvements include the creation of a right hand turn land into the site on the A1066.

4.14 Additional landscape planting is also proposed along the northern, eastern and western boundaries of the site. It is evident that some trees on-site will be removed as part of the proposal.

4.15 Principle of development
Planning law requires that applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration in determining planning decisions.

4.16 The relevant policy considerations relating to the site are those contained in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015 as well as national policy guidance.

4.17 The JCS sets out the longer term vision and objectives for the area and outlines the strategic policies for shaping future development. JCS Policy 5 advises that the local economy will be developed in a sustainable way to support jobs and economic growth both in urban and rural locations. This includes the promotion of appropriate new and expanded businesses.

4.18 At South Norfolk level, Policy DM1.3 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan is applicable. Of particular relevance is part 2 which states:

*Permission for development in the Countryside outside of the defined development boundaries of Settlements will only be granted if:*

- c) Where specific Development Management Policies allow for development outside of development boundaries or
- d) Otherwise demonstrates overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environment dimensions as addressed in Policy 1.1.

4.19 Policy DM2.1 (Employment and business development) is also particularly relevant to this proposal, and in particular parts 1 and 6 which state:

- (1) Development proposals which provide for or assist the creation of new employment opportunities, inward investment and / or provide for the adaptation and expansion of an existing business will be supported unless there is a significant adverse impact in terms of Policies DM 1.1, 1.3 and other policies of the Local Plan.

- (6) Proposals for the expansion of existing businesses located in the Countryside should not have a significant adverse impact on the local and natural environment and character of the Countryside and should protect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

4.20 In considering the scheme against part (1), it is considered that the scheme would result in inward investment, as demonstrated in the supporting economic case put forward by Openfield which indicates a £10 million investment at the site, new employment
opportunities through the projected 6 full-time equivalent jobs, and the expansion of an existing business and as such a scheme should be supported unless significant adverse impact would occur, or other material considerations dictate otherwise.

4.21 It is considered appropriate at this point to address the concern expressed by third parties in relation to the availability of alternative sites. There is no policy requirement within DM2.1 or any other relevant policy which requires the applicant to explore the availability of other sites, given the nature of his proposal, and the fact that it represents an expansion of an existing operation.

4.22 In considering the scheme against part (6) it is evident that it is necessary to consider the following impacts, and specifically whether significant adverse impacts would occur:

- Landscape impact
- Impact upon the natural environment
- Amenities of neighbouring occupiers

Landscape impact (including the impact on heritage assets)

4.23 As well as part 6 of Policy DM2.1, Policy DM.4.5 (Landscape Character and River Valleys) of the Local Plan states:

_All development should respect, conserve and where possible, enhance the landscape character of its immediate and wider environment. Development proposals that would cause significant adverse impact on the distinctive landscape characteristics of an area will be refused._

_All development proposals will be expected to demonstrate how they have taken the following elements (from the 2001 South Norfolk Landscape Assessment as updated by the 2012 review) into account:_

- The key characteristics, assets, sensitivities and vulnerabilities;
- The landscape strategy; and
- Development considerations.

_Particular regard will be had to protecting the distinctive characteristics, special qualities and geographical extents of the identified Rural River Valleys and Valley Urban Fringe landscape character types._

4.24 For the avoidance of doubt, the proposals are considered to lie within Character Area B4 Waveney Tributary Farmland within the South Norfolk Landscape Assessment. It should be noted that a resident has made a representation stressing the need to consider the contents of Character Area A5 Waveney Rural River Valley in the decision-making process. This report assesses assess the proposal in the context of both of the above, given the sites relationship to both character areas.

4.25 The application has been accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) which follows the relevant industry guidelines.

4.26 Concern has been expressed at the validity of the LVIA submitted by the applicant, and objectors have prepared their own submission via the Landscape Partnership. The contents of this document have been considered by officers who are satisfied that they have followed industry standards (Landscape Institute).

4.27 With regard to the overall landscape and visual impact, the Council’s Landscape Architect has assessed the proposal.
4.28 DLA Ltd’s LVIA has been guided by industry guidelines. The Council’s Landscape Architect broadly concurs with the findings of the LVIA for most of the viewpoints analysed. However, as there is an element of subjective judgement in the process, his own assessment is marginally different for some of the viewpoint locations; for some of those with residential receptors (especially from the valley) his own judgement is Moderate/Major Moderate. The absence of viewpoint material from the south has not prevented officer’s from assessing the landscape impact of the proposal satisfactorily.

4.29 SNC’s Landscape Architect noted that an assessment of the significance of effects for the viewpoints illustrated by the four photo montages (viewpoints i-iv) was not provided. His assessment, based on site observations and also using the montages, is that the significance of visual effects for these is:

Viewpoints i & ii – Moderate Harm,
Viewpoint iii – Major Harm, (view from Halford Lane as seen on committee site visit)
Viewpoint iv - Major/Moderate Harm

4.30 In light of this it can be concluded that there is visual harm. The mitigation effect of the new planting proposed which maximises the opportunities available within the applicant’s control, as part of this development will be unable to reduce harm in the long-term due to the height of the proposed silos.

4.31 A submission entitled Review of Applicant’s Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been produced by the objectors’ landscape consultant (The Landscape Partnership). This document considers the applicant’s LVIA and makes recommendations for further study and re-assessments some of which pick up on comments already made by the Council’s Landscape Architect. In addition, a ‘Focussed Visual Impact Assessment’ (produced by The Landscape Partnership) has recently been submitted by the objectors; the Council’s Landscape Architect will review this providing further comments as necessary which will be reported to the Development Management Committee.

4.32 In considering these comments in the context of the relevant planning policy requirements set out in DM2.1 and DM4.5 it is apparent that if there is significant adverse effects resulting from the proposal then the proposal should be refused. Officers consider that the level of harm identified above, which indicates major harm from a single viewpoint, would represent less than significant adverse effects when taken as a whole.

4.33 With regard to the impact upon trees, and mindful of the requirements of Policy DM4.8, the Landscape Architect has confirmed that the proposal necessitates the removal of 40 trees; no detailed survey or assessment is provided of these, but they all appear to be contemporary with, or more recent than, the existing site developments. From aerial photographs it appears that most of the trees were present (albeit relatively immature) in 1988, and non-existent in 1946. In light of this I am satisfied that no significant specimens will be lost.

4.34 In terms of the impact on retained trees, the main potential for impact on existing vegetation is where the new silos proposed are adjacent to the mature conifer trees along the west boundary of the site. Whilst these trees are arguably incongruous in the rural setting, they do provide some screening of the existing structures, and will provide an element of evergreen cover for the lower sections of the taller new silos. If the trees were to decline as a result of root disturbance/damage caused by construction, this would provide an opportunity for renewal with species more suited to the landscape character. On a point of clarification, it is proposed that the landscaping/tree protection condition will require the re-planting of any tree which is subsequently lost for a period of 5 years from the proposed development being brought into use. The submitted plans indicate that all of the proposed new planting can be accommodated within the application site.
4.35 It has also been suggested by the Council’s Landscape Architect that it would be prudent to have a planning condition to agree a suitable management plan for the site, this is considered to be an acceptable suggestion.

4.36 There are a number of Public rights of Way (PROW) that traverse the surrounding land but do not enter the application site. As noted above the development will affect the wider landscape setting however I do not consider that it will directly affect any PROW to a significant degree. Whilst the visual impact from the PROWs will be altered, the form of development is typical of agricultural industrial development and is on an established site and as such it is not an inappropriate form of development to be viewed from these PROWs.

4.37 In respect of landscape impact and impact upon trees, the scheme is considered, on balance, to satisfy the requirements of the relevant part of Policy DM2.1 and policies DM4.5 and DM4.8.

Heritage impacts

4.38 In respect of assessing the impacts of a proposal upon heritage assets as required by Policy DM4.10 which states:

All development proposals must have regard to the historic environment and take account of the contribution which heritage assets make to the significance of an area and its sense of place, as defined by reference to the national and local evidence base relating to heritage.

Change of use, alterations and extensions affecting the significance of a designated heritage asset, including its setting, must have regard to and positively respond to, that significance.

Proposals must sustain, and where possible enhance and better reveal the significance of the asset and make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness. Proposals must show how the significance of the heritage asset has been assessed and taken into account by reference to the Historic Environment Record, suitable expertise and other evidence/research as may be necessary.

Considerable importance and weight must be given to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their settings and the character and appearance of conservation areas.

Development should avoid causing any loss to a heritage asset, or harm to it. Substantial harm or total loss will only be justified where it can be demonstrated that it is necessary to achieve substantial benefits or where the retention of the asset is unsustainable, no viable alternatives can be identified and the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefits of bringing the site back into use.

Less than substantial harm will only be justified where there are public benefits that outweigh the harm. In carrying out this planning balance, less than substantial harm will be afforded considerable importance and weight.

Proposals which adversely affect the significance of a heritage asset will only exceptionally be permitted where clear and convincing justification is provided.

4.39 The Council is also aware of its duties under S66 (1) of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 in respect of considering listed buildings and their setting.

4.40 With the above in mind, the Senior Conservation and Design Officer has undertaken a detailed appraisal of the proposal, and confirmed the following:

4.41 It is noted that there are a number of listed buildings within the vicinity of the site, principally located to the south (on Fen Street) and east of the site, concentrated around the junctions of the A1066 with Church Lane and School Road, including St Johns the Baptist Church 1km to the east which is Grade I Listed. Many of the listed buildings have significant planting within their curtilage or adjacent to their boundaries which will soften the impact of the development. Furthermore, none of the listed buildings are larger properties set within
'estate land' in which longer landscape views would be an important characteristic. Rather they are generally detached farmhouses and cottages set within smaller curtilages and as such their character may viewed in their immediate setting instead of wide expansive views.

4.42 The Senior Conservation and Design Officer considers that the development is therefore acceptable from the point of view of its impact on the setting of the listed buildings.

4.43 In consideration of the Council's duties under S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990, the Council has given special attention to the desirability of preserving the buildings or their settings and any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. It is considered that those listed buildings within the vicinity, including their setting, by virtue of the reasons set out in paragraph 4.41 above would not adversely affect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed buildings or their setting.

4.44 Concern has been expressed at how the impact upon heritage assets has been undertaken, including how the proposal will be clearly visible from a number of heritage assets. Officers are satisfied it has correctly assessed the proposal in light of relevant guidance and requirements.

4.45 It is also relevant to highlight that Historic England are currently consulting on a draft version of a document entitled “Settings and Views of Heritage Assets”. It is clear from this draft that there is a distinction when assessing views between the impact on wider landscape character/visual amenity and the impact on setting in terms of its contribution to the significance of an asset and how it is experienced. It is considered that the Council’s Senior Conservation and Design Officer has been consistent with this approach in assessing the proposal, albeit it should be acknowledged that this is still at draft stage and can be given little weight at present. The following are extracts from the draft document referred to in order to demonstrate this point:

4.46 Paragraph 5 states that

“Views, however, can of course be valued for reasons other than their contribution to heritage significance. They may, for example, be related to the appreciation of the wider landscape, where there may be little or no association with heritage assets. Landscape character and visual amenity are also related planning considerations. The assessment and management of views in the planning process may therefore be partly or wholly separate from any consideration of the significance of heritage assets. This advice therefore directs readers elsewhere for approaches to landscape and visual impact assessment and amenity valuation (paragraph 14).”

4.47 Paragraphs 13 to 15 state:

Landscape Assessment and Amenity

13 Analysis of setting is different from landscape assessment. While landscapes include everything within them, the entirety of very extensive settings may not contribute equally to the significance of a heritage asset, if at all. Careful analysis is therefore required to assess whether one heritage asset at a considerable distance from another, though intervisible with it – a church spire, for instance – is a major component of the setting, rather than just an incidental element within the wider landscape. Being tall structures, church towers and spires are often widely visible across land- and townscape but are unlikely to be affected by small-scale development, unless that development competes with them, as tower blocks and wind turbines may. Even then, such an impact is more likely to be on the landscape values of the tower or spire rather than the heritage values, unless the development impacts on a designed or associative view.
14 Assessment and management of both setting and views are related to consideration of the wider landscape, which is outside the scope of this advice note. Additional advice on views is available in Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd edition, published by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (in partnership with Historic England).

15 Similarly, setting is different from general amenity. Views out from heritage assets that neither contribute to significance nor allow appreciation of significance are a matter of amenity rather than of setting.

4.48 Concern has been expressed at the lack of consultation with Historic England, particularly given the location of St John the Baptist Church to the east of the site.

4.49 Regulation 5 A(i) and 5 A(ii) of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Area Regulations 1990 (as amended) refer to when to consult Historic England, and this was updated in 2015. This confirms that consultation is required where the Local Planning Authority consider that the development would affect the setting of a listed building or Conservation Area. Officers considered that the setting of listed buildings including the St John the Baptist Church would not be affected, and as such Historic England were not notified.

4.50 The Senior Conservation and Design Officer has also assessed the design merits of the scheme within their assessment, having regard to the requirement of planning policy to promote a high standard of design at all levels and for all forms of development with good design expected to address connections between people and places as well as the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environments (NPPF, para 61) and at a local level the Council has set out its design aspirations in Policy DM3.8.

4.51 It is necessary to acknowledge that the majority of the proposal is made up of functional items i.e. silos etc and as such the ability to influence their design is limited. In the context of the proposed office building, the design is considered to be acceptable by the Senior Conservation and Design Officer subject to agreeing suitable external materials via planning condition than is the case where a building is being considered. I concur with this view.

4.52 Reference has been made to the external finish of the silos, a condition has been suggested to agree the finish in acknowledgement of the importance of reducing the visual impact of these insofar as is practically possible.

4.53 It is necessary to acknowledge that the majority of the proposal is made up of functional items i.e. silos etc and as such the ability to influence their design is more limited than is the case where a building is being considered.

4.54 In terms of heritage impact, the scheme is considered to comply with the requirements of the relevant part of Policy DM2.1 and Policy DM4.10 and the proposal would conflict with the requirements of S66 (1) of the Listed Buildings Act 1990.

Impact upon the natural environment

4.55 Policy DM4.4 (Natural environmental assets – designated and locally important open space) of the Local Plan is also applicable. This states:

a) The highest status natural environmental assets are identified on the Policies Map and in supporting evidence, and will be protected from any significant harmful impact arising from new development. New development impacting on these designated sites will be required to contribute positive improvement of these natural environmental assets where opportunities arise. International, National and County-wide level sites will be accorded the
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highest levels of priority.

b) At the Important Local Open Spaces identified in paragraphs 4.32 – 4.44 and on Maps 4.4 (1) – (6) and on the Proposal Map, development will only be permitted where it retains the open character and appearance of the site, where it respects the contribution which the identified open site or open frontage makes to the form and character of the Settlement and where there is no significant adverse impact on the setting of any existing building. New development impacting on these designated sites will be required to contribute positive improvement of these natural environmental assets where opportunities arise.

c) Developers will need to work with partners to evolve strategies to enable individual new development sites to contribute most effectively to the opportunities for the establishment and positive improvement of coherent ecological networks, Biodiversity Enhancement Areas and multi-functional Green Infrastructure Networks.

4.56 An ecological assessment was submitted with the application, which considered the ecological implications for the site, and the applicant has also recently provided further ecological information in order to assist the Council in screening the proposal in view of the requirements of the Habitat Regulations given the existence of Redgrave and Lopham Fen which lies approximately 1km to the south-west of the application site which is designated as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (as part of Waveney and Little Ouse Valley Fens SAC); a Ramsar site; a National Nature Reserve (NNR), and a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), it is also a Suffolk Wildlife Trust reserve.

4.57 As competent authority, the Council has screened the proposal in accordance with the requirements of the Habitat Regulations in light of the above status of Redgrave and Lopham Fen, with input from its own ecologist, who have concluded on the basis of the information provided that there would not be a significant impact so as to require an appropriate assessment to be undertaken. Natural England has confirmed that it agrees that significant effects are unlikely to occur.

4.58 In the context of DM4.4, it is considered that the proposal would not cause any harm to any designated sites as identified in part a) of the policy. In terms of part b) of the policy the scheme would have no impact on any identified important local open spaces. Finally, in the context of part c) of the policy, the scheme proposes significant additional planting around the perimeter of the site which provide ecological enhancement.

4.59 The County Ecologist has assessed the submitted information and concluded that it is necessary to attach a condition to any approval to require working methods and mitigation as set out in the ecology report. This is considered acceptable.

4.60 Having regard to part 6 of Policy DM2.1 and DM4.4 it is considered that the proposal, including the proposed mitigation, would not give significant adverse impacts in terms of the natural environment.

Amenities of neighbouring occupiers

4.61 As well as part 6 of Policy DM2.1, Policy DM3.13 refers to residential amenity and policy DM3.14 is concerned with minimising and reducing emissions and other forms of pollution.

4.62 DM3.13 states:

(1) Development should ensure a reasonable standard of amenity reflecting the character of the local area. In all cases particular regard will be paid to avoiding: a. Overlooking and loss of private residential amenity space b. Loss of day light, overshadowing and overbearing impact c. Introduction of incompatible neighbouring uses in terms of noise, odour, vibration, air, dusts, insects, artificial light pollution and other such nuisances. Planning permission will be refused where proposed development would lead to an
excessive or unreasonable impact on existing neighbouring occupants and the amenity of the area or a poor level of amenity for new occupiers.

(2) In considering applications which may result in an increase in noise exposure, account will be taken of the operational needs of the proposed and neighbouring businesses, the character and function of the area including background noise levels at different times of day and night and the need to protect areas of rural tranquillity. (3) Development will not be permitted where the proposed development would generate noise or artificial light which would be significantly detrimental to the amenity of nearby residents or the occupants of other noise sensitive uses. Proportionate mitigating measures including limiting conditions will be used to reduce the potential noise or artificial light impact to an appropriate level whenever practical to do so.

4.63 DM3.14 states:

a) All development should minimise and where possible reduce the adverse impact of all forms of emissions and other forms of pollution, and ensure that there is no deterioration in water quality or water courses.

b) When assessed individually or cumulatively, development proposals should ensure that there will be no unacceptable impacts on: i. Air quality ii. Surface and ground water quality iii. Land quality and condition iv. Health and safety of the public

c) Permission will only be granted on or near contaminated land if it is subject to remediation which will make it safe for the proposed use. On a contaminated site or one suspected to be contaminated or within 250 metres (or on more if considered appropriate on a risk based approach) of an existing or disused landfill site, applications will need to be accompanied with an assessment of the extent of contamination on the site and any possible risks.

d) Developments which may impact on air quality will not be permitted where they have an unacceptable impact on human health, sensitive designated species or habitats, and general amenity, unless adequate mitigation can be ensured. Development will not be granted in locations where it is likely to result in an Air Quality Management Area being designated or the worsening of air quality in an existing Air Quality Management Area.

e) Permission will not be granted for development on or in the vicinity of hazardous installations including high pressure gas and oil pipelines unless the development would not give rise to additional public risk.

4.64 Concern has been expressed that the proposal would cause harm to the amenities of local residents, including those at the Fenner's Care facility, in terms of noise and air pollution.

4.65 The Council consider that those neighbours whose amenities are most affected are Four Winds and Waveney House, Wayside, White House B&B and The Mill House, with properties located further away affected to a lesser degree.

4.66 In terms of noise, following on from the previous committee resolution to submit and agree a package of mitigation measures to prevent unacceptable impacts being caused by noise for the site, the applicant has submitted further documentation on this subject including mitigation proposals.

4.67 This information has been reviewed by the Council's Environmental Protection Team who have advised that the predicted noise levels would not be excessive and would be unlikely to cause significant adverse impacts to health or quality of life of nearby residents subject to the imposition of two conditions. The first condition requires the implementation of the mitigation measures set out in the technical note prepared by Sharps Redmore which are design features and attenuators to the fixed plant on-site (burners, drier fans, aeration fans). The second condition relates to noise monitoring to be carried out to ensure the required noise levels are not being exceeded. It is considered that this will prevent unacceptable noise levels from being experienced by neighbouring receptors, most notably Four Winds, Wayside and Waveney House.
With regard to noise impacts, it is acknowledged that the construction works associated with the proposal, including construction traffic need to be considered. In order to minimise the impacts from the construction phase, conditions requiring the following will be used:

- Agreement of on-site parking for construction workers
- Temporary access to be closed upon development being brought into use
- Agreement of a construction environment management plan
- Restriction on delivery times
- Hours of operation for construction to be agreed.

It is necessary however to highlight that due to the scale of development and the proximity of those dwellings closest to the site may experience some level of disruption for the period of construction.

In the context of Policy DM3.13 and noise, it should be noted that part 1 criterion c refers to avoiding the "introduction of incompatible neighbouring uses in terms of noise......" With this in mind, it is necessary to recognise that this scheme is not introducing a new use, as the site is already, and has been for some time, in this use. In considering this it is also necessary to take account of part 2 of DM3.13 and the fact that the character and function of the area at present has this use.

With regards to part 3 of Policy DM3.13, this highlights that development should not be permitted where the proposed development would generate noise which would be significantly detrimental to the amenity of nearby residents. Again in making a decision in the context of this part of the policy it is considered reasonable to take into account the fact that the lawful use of the site has generated noise up until recently, and any assessment of impact should recognise this point. The submitted noise report uses this rationale.

Furthermore, part 3 highlights that proportionate mitigation measures will be used to reduce impacts, as is being employed here.

Concern has been expressed at the lack of background noise levels not being taken and a lack of regard for BS 4142:2014 a method for assessing industrial noise impacts. In light of the harvesting season having ended and the subsequent demolition works on-site the applicant did not undertake an assessment that would have reflected the noise levels that have been produced lawfully on-site. To undertake one now would not give an accurate representation of how the site has operated. The applicant however has undertaken a modelling exercise which has predicted the likely noise environment arising from the existing site which has been compared with those predicted for this development proposal. In terms of using BS4142:2014, it should be noted that this is not the only means of assessing the noise related impacts of such a scheme. In terms of assessment of noise impact from the proposed development, the predicted noise levels are not considered excessive and would be unlikely to cause any significant adverse impacts to the health or quality of life of nearby residents, even with the property windows open. It should be noted however that the noise from the facility when operational is likely to be clearly audible in a quiet rural environment. Concern has been expressed regarding extra noise from traffic movements. In respect of the road traffic noise, no detailed assessment has been submitted. Whilst it would have been useful, it is accepted that additional HGV movements onto the public road is unlikely to lead to significant adverse impacts in respect of noise.

Concern has been expressed at the lack of background noise levels not being taken and a lack of regard for BS 4142:2014 a method for assessing industrial noise impacts. In light of the harvesting season having ended and the subsequent demolition works on-site the applicant did not undertake an assessment that would have reflected the noise levels that have been produced lawfully on-site. To undertake one now would not give an accurate representation of how the site has operated. The applicant however has undertaken a modelling exercise which has predicted the likely noise environment arising from the existing site which has been compared with those predicted for this development proposal. In terms of using BS4142:2014, it should be noted that this is not the only means of assessing the noise related impacts of such a scheme. In terms of assessment of noise impact from the proposed development, the predicted noise levels are not considered excessive and would be unlikely to cause any significant adverse impacts to the health or quality of life of nearby residents, even with the property windows open. It should be noted however that the noise from the facility when operational is likely to be clearly audible in a quiet rural environment. Concern has been expressed regarding extra noise from traffic movements. In respect of the road traffic noise, no detailed assessment has been submitted. Whilst it would have been useful, it is accepted that additional HGV movements onto the public road is unlikely to lead to significant adverse impacts in respect of noise.

Concern has been expressed at the lack of background noise levels not being taken and a lack of regard for BS 4142:2014 a method for assessing industrial noise impacts. In light of the harvesting season having ended and the subsequent demolition works on-site the applicant did not undertake an assessment that would have reflected the noise levels that have been produced lawfully on-site. To undertake one now would not give an accurate representation of how the site has operated. The applicant however has undertaken a modelling exercise which has predicted the likely noise environment arising from the existing site which has been compared with those predicted for this development proposal. In terms of using BS4142:2014, it should be noted that this is not the only means of assessing the noise related impacts of such a scheme. In terms of assessment of noise impact from the proposed development, the predicted noise levels are not considered excessive and would be unlikely to cause any significant adverse impacts to the health or quality of life of nearby residents, even with the property windows open. It should be noted however that the noise from the facility when operational is likely to be clearly audible in a quiet rural environment. Concern has been expressed regarding extra noise from traffic movements. In respect of the road traffic noise, no detailed assessment has been submitted. Whilst it would have been useful, it is accepted that additional HGV movements onto the public road is unlikely to lead to significant adverse impacts in respect of noise.

In terms of air pollution, the Council's Environmental Protection Team has requested a condition relating to air quality mitigation in order to prevent unacceptable impacts on neighbouring residents occuring.

The proposed silos are of significant scale and will be clearly visible to those residents closest to the application site.
In terms of determining the impact of the scale of the structures on neighbouring properties, it is appropriate to take account of the existing units on this established business site, and indeed acknowledge the existence of others that were recently demolished. In doing so, and having regard to the separation distances to the neighbouring properties it is not considered that the proposal would significantly compromise local residents in terms of loss of daylight, overshadowing or overbearing impact.

Whilst there would be an increase in traffic movements associated with the site, it is evident that some of the increase will be within a relatively short period of time (associated with harvest) and it must be acknowledged that the existing A1066 is classified as a Principal Route within the Norfolk Route Hierarchy. The route is also designated as a Corridor of Movement and envisaged to form a main route for vehicle movements and has significant numbers of traffic associated with this role. As such, from an amenity perspective, it is not considered that the proposal would cause significant additional harm when considering traffic implications.

In terms of the carriageway being brought closer to neighbouring properties as a consequence of the proposed off-site highway works, it is evident that this constitutes a very modest change (indicated to be less than 1m closer to properties to the south of A1066), taking this into account and the fact that the site is already carrying significant volumes of traffic given its status as a principal route in the Norfolk Route hierarchy, the additional impacts are not considered to represent a significant level of harm to the White House B&B or The Mill House.

Concern has also been expressed at the implications on Fenners, which is a care facility. Under the Equality Act 2010 the Council is aware of its duties to consider the impact of development on those with protected characteristics, such as disability. Officers have considered the proposals but must consider all the facts in this matter. There has historically been an existing use on this site with tall structures, although recently removed, which would have established a visual impact and certain level of disturbance to the surrounding area. The increased impact from the new proposals has been assessed but it is not considered there is evidence to merit refusing the application on the basis of adverse impact to those with protected characteristics.

Concern has also been expressed at the implications on local businesses including a B&B. The Council is aware of this business, and would not wish to compromise its viability as a result of any proposed development. However, it is necessary to recognise that the application site has been operating lawfully as a grain storage/drying facility for a significant period of time, and indeed longer than the B&B itself, and the lawful use at present has an impact on the B&B. The proposal is not seeking to introduce a new use, it is not considered that the proposed expansion is introducing a level of harm that would justify recommending refusal on the grounds of impacts upon the B&B.

In summary the scheme is considered to comply with the requirements of Policies DM2.1, DM3.13 and DM3.14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, subject to appropriate in terms of neighbour amenity being imposed.

Traffic impacts

Policy DM3.11 (Road safety and the free flow of traffic) states:
(1) On all sites development will not be permitted that endangers highway safety or the satisfactory functioning of the highway network.

(2) Planning permission will be granted for development involving the formation or intensified use of a direct access onto a Corridor of Movement providing it would not:
(a) Prejudice the safe and free flow of traffic or planned proposals for sustainable transport initiatives along the Corridor of Movement;
(b) Be practical to gain access from the site to the Corridor of Movement via a secondary road; and
(c) Facilitate the use of the Corridor of Movement for short local journeys.

Policy DM3.12 (Provision of vehicle parking) states:

Planning permission will be granted where appropriate parking provision is provided by the developer to serve the needs of the proposed development. Development should provide sufficient parking problems to avoid highway safety problems and to protect living and working conditions locally. In decision making, consideration will be given to local parking / highway conditions.

The appropriate parking provision for a development will be determined using the parking standards adopted by the Council as a 'starting point' which may be varied to reflect local conditions such as the availability of public parking, sustainable travel modes, Travel Plan provisions, and design and conservation objectives.

The development proposes an increase in the tonnages to be stored at the site from the present approx. 30,000 tonnes to 80,000 tonnes, with a corresponding increase in vehicle movements. According to the transport statement, vehicle movements during the months of June, July and August will increase to 122,143 and 161 movements per day respectively. From the previous submission the daily movements for those months for the current 30,000 tonnes is 50, 56 and 81 movements. The nature of these movements will be by HGV or tractors with trailers delivering grain. Some of these will be slow moving right-hand turns into the site across the A1066. Whilst it is accepted that the figures given are peak, it is necessary to consider the figures and nature of movements in highway safety terms.

This site at Bressingham is served directly from the A1066. This road has the designation as a Principal Route within the Norfolk Route Hierarchy. The route is also designated as a Corridor of Movement. In the vicinity of the application site the road is subject to the national speed limit for single carriageway roads of 60mph. Central ladder hatch markings are provided along this section of the A1066 to denote the hazards and to deter overtaking. There has been one serious personal injury accident that occurred outside of the site in 2013 where a vehicle turning right into the site was in collision with a motorcycle.

It is acknowledged from the above that there will be a significant increase in traffic associated with the development, in acknowledgement of this mitigation is proposed in the form of the introduction of right hand turn lane into the application site from the A1066 and an improved site access arrangement.

It is also evident that the existing lawful operating use means that at present large vehicles already visit the site on a regular basis for delivery and collection purposes.

The Highways Authority has carried out an assessment of the submitted information including the safety audit report and they consider that the proposal including the proposed mitigation is acceptable, subject to the detailed design of off-site highway improvements and conditions relating to providing visibility splays, access / on-site and HGV parking loading, unloading and turning areas and provision of site parking for construction workers. As such it is considered that the scheme accords with Policy DM3.11 and 3.12 and is acceptable, subject to conditions including the delivery of the highway improvement prior to the new development being brought into first use.
Concerns have historically been raised that part of the eastern visibility splay is not
deliverable without using third party land at Four Winds. The current proposed site access
would not require third party land to deliver adequate visibility.

The work to formally design the scheme and construct the highway improvement will be
carried out by Norfolk County Council at cost to the applicant under the terms of a formal
section 278 agreement for off-site highway improvements.

The Council has received further representations in respect of traffic matters. This
information is currently being considered by officers and the Highway Authority and an
update will be made to committee as required. In terms of highway related impacts, the
proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of Policies DM3.11 and DM3.12.

Other matters

As highlighted above, an appeal on an adjacent site has been allowed for the erection of a
new industrial unit (our ref 2015/2856). A copy of the Inspector’s decision and approved
plans are attached as Appendix 4.

In terms of the appeal decision, the Inspector considered a condition to secure a right hand
lane into the appeal site, which coincidentally is the same access as this proposed under
this application, would be “necessary, relevant and reasonable given the proposed
intensified use of the access” which to officers reinforces that the approach set out in the
previous application to securing a right turn lane is an acceptable one in planning terms.

Also, the Inspector recognises the existence of the existing enterprise as a material factor
when considering the impact of the proposal on neighbour amenity, which is consistent with
the approach taken by the Council’s Community Protection Team in assessing the
application. The decision states at paragraph 11:

“While the precise use of the proposed development is not fixed, it is likely to generate
additional noise from its operation as an industrial unit as well as the extra traffic
movement. This would have some effect on the living conditions of occupiers of Waveney
House to the south, but set against the context of existing noise from the adjoining
business use and A1066, it would not result in unacceptable harm. Noise generating
equipment could be controlled through appropriately worded conditions.”

With regards to surface water and foul drainage, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been
produced by BSP Consulting to support the application. The FRA advises that the site is at
low risk from flooding from all sources. The Council’s Environmental Team has carried out
an assessment of the proposals and has no objections, subject to suitably worded
conditions that require a detailed scheme for the disposal of surface water to be approved
and a foul drainage assessment to determine the most appropriate treatment facility for the
site. As such it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and accords with Policy 1 of
the JCS and the principles of the NPPF, subject to the conditions noted above.

Policy 3 of the Joint Core Strategy requires that all development proposals of a minimum of
1,000m2 of non-residential floor space will be required to include sources of ‘decentralised
and renewable or low-carbon energy’. Having assessed the proposals, it is considered that
the only floor space created by the proposals is the office and laboratory block which has a
total area of approximately 580m2. As such JCS Policy 3 is not relevant in this case.

Whilst there is no planning policy requirement to specifically explore the possible existence
of alternative sites for this particular type of use, it is evident from the applicant’s
submission that Openfield have carefully reviewed opportunities for alternative sites. The
alternative sites were identified as broadly greenfield sites or currently designated industrial
development, which were not considered appropriate due to their location and initial service
infrastructure costs. The Bressingham site is favoured by the applicant as it is currently in use and is owned by Openfield so there is no additional land acquisition cost. The opportunity to upgrade existing services and road infrastructure also delivers significant investment and cost savings over alternative sites. The overall economic benefit of redeveloping the Bressingham site is estimated to be in the order of £4 million lower cost (40%) compared to alternative sites.

4.99 Concern has been expressed at the perceived lack of adequate consultation. With regards to the consultation process, officers are satisfied that it has fulfilled, and exceeded, all of its statutory requirements as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. It is also considered that a significant period of time has passed since the application was received and the application has been before the Development Management Committee on numerous occasions with all relevant information available to assess the impacts of the scheme which coupled with the level of objection received is satisfied that any individual who wishes to pass comment on the application, whether in receipt of a consultation letter or not have had the opportunity to make representations.

4.100 With regards to the consultation requirements concerning proposals where local aerodromes may be affected or involved, the Civil Aviation Authority requires notification for proposed development over 90m in height above ground level. As the proposals are well below this height it is considered that this requirement has been met. In terms of aviation warning lighting, the structures are below the height where there is a mandatory requirement for them to be equipped with aviation warning lighting.

4.101 Concerns have been raised that the pre-application response dated 5th August 2015 submitted as part of the application as appendix 2 of the Planning Statement is misleading and incorrectly attached to the planning application. Having assessed this it is considered that there is no substantive reason why to not place this on the website as part of the applicant’s submission. For the avoidance of doubt it is also noted that the Planning Statement, paragraph 1.5.2, confirms that the current scheme has been amended since the advice was given.

4.102 Concern has been expressed at the unauthorised demolition of structures on-site. At this time, it is appropriate to acknowledge that the current proposal, if approved, would have allowed for the demolition, whilst this is still a “live” application it is not considered appropriate to consider the unlawful demolition any further at this time.

4.103 With regards to comments received regarding the devaluing of properties, whilst these concerns are acknowledged, this in itself is not considered to be a material planning consideration. In terms of the issues which could contribute to this issue i.e. noise impacts from a development, this report addresses all the relevant material issues.

4.104 Concern has been expressed at the Council’s screening opinion associated with the proposal and how this has concluded that an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is not required. Notwithstanding the Council’s position that it does not necessarily believe that the proposal needs to be screened, it has undertaken one. The screening opinion has concluded that an EIA is not required. The Council consider that its screening opinion is adequate, and that it is reasonable to conclude that an Environmental Statement is not required for the development proposed.

4.105 Concern has been expressed at the failure to explore the applicant’s claims regarding economic benefits. Beyond the contents of part 1 of Policy DM2.1 referred to above which makes reference to where a development will assist with the creation of new jobs, inward investment or provide for adaptation or expansion of an existing business it should be supported unless there is a significant adverse impact, it is not necessary to explore further the benefits claimed. Likewise, it is not considered necessary to establish how Openfield will consolidate its operations for the purposes of making a decision on this planning
application, nor to consider whether the present facility is in a good state of repair and does not need to be demolished, nor to justify the need for such a facility within the region.

4.106 Concern has been expressed in relation to pre-application advice offered in relation to this site. This is not considered to carry any weight in the determination of this application which has been assessed on its planning merits as set out above.

4.107 Given that this is an expansion to an existing facility, and the impacts in terms of the issues outlined above lead to officers concluding that the proposal would not detract from the locality as a tourist or recreation destination.

4.108 Representations have been suggested that alternative configurations of silos be employed on-site, including using smaller silos. The applicant has been made aware of this. The applicant has confirmed that they wish for the application to be determined as submitted.

4.109 In acknowledging the existing status and nature of the use it would not be reasonable in planning terms to require additional pedestrian links such as footpath provision from the nearest bus stop to the application site.

4.110 It is considered that the presentation material used at the previous committee was acceptable and there is no requirement for the Council to publish the photographs it is going to use on their website.

4.111 The lack of information available in respect of conditions attached to previous planning permissions on the site does not prevent officers from assessing the impacts of this scheme.

4.112 It is considered that sufficient information has been submitted to fully understand how the site will operate.

4.113 There is no policy requirement to have the support of local farmers for the proposed development.

4.114 There is no requirement for submitted drawings to include neighbouring properties, the Council is satisfied that the information submitted has allowed officers to fully assess the impacts of the proposal.

4.115 Height restrictions referred to in previous historic permissions for the site do not prevent larger proposals from being positively considered in the future. The Council is required to consider any proposal on its planning merits at that time having regard to all relevant policies and material considerations as it has done in this instance.

4.116 Other legislation requires the safe disposal of asbestos, and a planning permission does not supersede such legislation.

4.117 In representations it has been raised that grain dust can be explosive. This is not a matter covered by planning policy but other health and safety legislation.

Financial considerations

4.118 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

4.119 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
5 Conclusion

5.1 It is acknowledged that significant concern has been raised by the Parish Council and a number of local residents and those concerns raised have been considered in the assessment of this proposal.

5.2 It is necessary for the Council to have due regard to planning law which requires that applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.3 It is clear that Policy DM2.1 is directly applicable to this proposal to expand an existing commercial operation within the countryside, and in particular, part 6 of this policy. Other relevant policies are set out and referred to above.

5.4 It has been concluded that, whilst some adverse landscape impact would occur as a result of this scheme, notwithstanding the proposed mitigation measures in terms of additional planting, however, the level of harm is not considered to represent a significant adverse impact as recognised within policy DM2.1 and DM4.5. Likewise, it is considered that there would be no significant adverse impact in respect of the other areas recognised with part 6 of Policy DM2.1 (natural environment and neighbour amenity) and as such other relevant policies are also complied with such as DM3.13. Nor would there be any significant adverse impact in respect of any other matter i.e. highway safety.

5.5 It is also considered that despite all of the matters raised by third parties associated with this application, there is no material consideration that dictates that the Council should depart from determining the application in accordance with the relevant Development Plan policies.

5.6 Therefore, in light of the above assessment, officers recommend approval of the scheme subject to conditions.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Raine 01508 533841
Chris Watts 01508 533765
craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk and cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016/1447</th>
<th><strong>Development Management Sites Sub-Committee 15 February 2017</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In attendance:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNC Officers - C Raine, C Watts, T Horspole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members/councillors - V Thompson, C Gould, M Gray, G Minshull, C Kemp, B Stone, N Legg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The above Members and Officers attended a formal site visit and viewed the application from the following viewpoints (as denoted on the site visit agenda papers).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewpoint 1</strong></td>
<td>Viewed from Church and associated churchyard and also walked westwards along Church Lane. Members asked what was the distance between the church and site (officer confirmed as approx. 1km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewpoint 2</strong></td>
<td>Viewed from Fen Street. Members noted the intervening vegetation along part of Fen Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewpoint 3</strong></td>
<td>Members viewed site from A1066 and used viewpoint visualisations provided by applicant and third party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewpoint 4</strong></td>
<td>Members noted viewpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewpoint 5</strong></td>
<td>Members noted viewpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewpoint 6</strong></td>
<td>Members noted viewpoint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewpoint 7</strong></td>
<td>Members noted demolition work undertaken. Officer outlined location of silos and grain dryers in context of the remaining buildings on-site. Considered relevant viewpoint visualisations provided by the applicant and third party. Owner of Wayside (Mr Porter) highlighted his concerns to Members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewpoint 8</strong></td>
<td>Members viewed existing site access arrangements and location of White House B&amp;B. Officer outlined proposed access arrangements. Members noted visibility in both directions and observed A1066.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional viewpoint - Fenners Care Home</td>
<td>Members noted viewpoint in the context of application site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Appl. No**: 2016/0482/F  
**Parish**: DICKLEBURGH & RUSHALL

Applicants Name: Mr Chris Smith  
Site Address: Land North Of Harvey Lane Dickleburgh Norfolk  
Proposal: Residential development of land to provide 22 dwellings, together with access, parking and associated infrastructure

**Recommendation**: Authorise Director of Growth and Localism to Approve with Conditions

1. Time limit full permission  
2. In accordance with plans  
3. Standard highways conditions  
4. Future management and maintenance of roads  
5. Details of construction of roads and footways  
6. Off-site highway works for footpath  
7. Construction worker parking  
8. Materials to be agreed  
9. Surface water drainage scheme  
10. Fire hydrant to be provided  
11. Landscaping management  
12. Biodiversity management plan  
13. Contaminated land  
14. Construction management plan  
15. Renewable energy  
16. Water efficiency

Subject to no substantive new comments being received in the remaining consultation period and completion of S106 agreement to secure affordable housing and commuted sum for off-site play equipment improvements.

1. **Background**

1.1 This application was deferred at the Development Management Committee on the 7th December 2016 at the request of Members to allow liaison between the Council, Hopkins Homes, the Highways Authority and Primary School to explore options for an alternative footpath and off-site highways arrangement along Harvey Lane, Dickleburgh.

1.2 Having resolved to defer the application the assessment below sets out the key considerations with regards to the negotiations that have taken place and the subsequent amendments that are proposed as a result of those discussions. The original report and update (Appendix 2) remain applicable and part of the report and recommendation to Development Management Committee. All matters referred to in the original report are relied upon in this recommendation to committee, with this additional report below providing a further assessment on highway matters as requested by the committee.

2. **Consultation responses to revised plans**

2.1 The consultations below are a summary of the comments received since the previous committee resolution, and in light of the formal re-consultation that has taken place on the amended plans, which were placed on the Council’s online planning portal on the 8 February 2017.

2.2 Members should note that the consultation period ends on the 1 March 2017 to give all consultees and neighbours the opportunity to review the revised information within 21 days of the re-consultation and to allow all responses to be taken into account. The committee
recommendation is therefore to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to approve with conditions subject to no substantive new issues being raised after the consultation period expires.

2.3 The proposals have been subject to discussions with Dickleburgh and Rushall Parish Council who attended a meeting on 8 February, chaired by the Council and attended by representatives of Hopkins Homes, the Highway Authority, and Cllr Spratt and Cllr Hudson. The Parish Council noted regret that the revised application was posted online just before the meeting. However, Members should note that the revised proposals were posted online at this time in order to give all consultees and neighbours the maximum amount of time available to review the revised information within 21 days of the re-consultation and to allow all responses to be taken into account in the assessment below, which include the views of the Parish Council.

2.4 Parish Council

Objects

Dickleburgh and Rushall Parish Council has carefully studied the revision to this proposal, and attended a meeting on 8 February, chaired by the planning officer, attended by representative of Hopkins Homes, the Highway Authority, and Councillors Spratt and Hudson. It is a matter of regret for the council that the revised application was posted online just before the meeting, so that issues raised and discussed at the meeting could not be included in the application now under consideration.

This application was deferred by the SNC planning committee, following concerns about the safety of the proposed white line for pedestrians on a road going around a blind bend, as well as other traffic issues. We had hoped and expected the applicants to revise their plans accordingly.

The white line remains in place, and is as dangerous to pedestrians as it ever was. Small changes to the width of the road and the creation of a pavement by the Village Centre Car park have made no material difference to safety.

We are particularly concerned about parents and children walking to and from Dickleburgh Primary School down Harvey Lane. The school's travel plan urges parents to bring their children to school by foot and Norfolk County Council has a much-publicised Walk To School policy. Our experience, borne out by the videos shown at the past meeting, is that to walk behind a white line on the road is hazardous to adults, and potentially lethal for parents with children.

The position of the Parish Council is simple. Any metre-wide pathway around a blind bend into traffic within the village is inviting disaster. The logical, sensible and safe solution - to run a 1.5 - 2 metre path on the south side of the road - has not, we were told at the 8 February meeting, been considered by the applicants.

We have suggested that the planning committee pay a site visit so that members can see for themselves what is not evident on the map, and we still believe that this should take place.

We have significant concerns about the width of the new proposed footpath, and nothing has been done to solve problems at the junction to the Street, also raised at the last planning meeting, but
our main objection is that to introduce a white line pedestrian footway on Harvey Lane would show a reckless disregard for the safety of pedestrians.

2.5 District Member To be reported at committee as appropriate.

2.6 Councillor Spratt County Councillor To be reported at committee as appropriate.

2.7 NCC Highways No objection

In contrast to the earlier proposals Hopkins are now proposing to extend the existing footway on the southern side of Harvey Lane up to the village hall, thereby removing the length of narrow footway adjacent the school, and promoting an extension to the existing 30mph speed limit to cover the whole site frontage. Both of these benefit to the scheme.

The remainder of the scheme is generally in line with that previously considered and we have no further comment to make.

2.8 Representations 14 additional letters of objection received:
- Concerns with Highway Safety
- Little difference from the previous proposals
- Concerns over proposed white-line for pedestrians
- Would hope to see a footpath on the south side of Harvey Lane
- No safe place for pedestrians including children
- 20mph not adhered to
- Car parking on highway
- Road drainage concerns
- Amendments do not improve highway safety
- Surface water flooding already in area
- Concerns about wildlife
- Destroy open space
- Spoil view of open countryside
- Other sites much better suited
- Site should not of been included in original development plan

3. Assessment

3.1 By way of background, the site is allocated in Policy DIC1 of the South Norfolk Local Plan for approximately 20 dwellings and as such the principle of the development continues to be considered acceptable having regard to the assessment set out in the original report and update, attached as Appendix 2.

3.2 Since the previous committee resolution, the following assessment considers how the comments and observations made at the Development Management Committee on the 7th December 2016 have been taken into account, as well as setting out proposed alternative off-site highways arrangements:

*New footpath along front of school along north side of Harvey Lane*

3.3 Paragraph 4.21 of the original committee report (Appendix 2) sets out the comments of the Highways Authority with regards to the proposed width of the footway in front of the school and their concerns regarding with the width of the footpath measuring only 0.9m on the northern side of the Harvey Lane carriageway. The report also notes that the site allocation (DIC1) did not specify what off-site works should be provided, but no highway objection
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was raised to the width of the footpath that complies with the minimum width to be provided, albeit this is typically on short sections of footway. On balance the assessment concluded that whilst not the optimum solution available, it provided a satisfactory arrangement in the context of the requirements of the site allocation policy and that to refuse the application on the grounds of inadequate pedestrian facilities could not be substantiated at appeal and therefore was not recommended as a reason for refusal of the application.

3.4 Having resolved to investigate this further following the committee’s decision to defer the application, a number of further options have been explored to investigate the potential for utilising some of the Primary School’s land to enable a new footway to run on the northern inside edge of the hedging in front of the school, rather than the southern roadside of the hedging as previously proposed.

3.5 The investigations, which have involved discussions with NCC Education Department, have shown that the land in question is currently being used intensively with the western-portion of the school being part of a limited area available for the Pre-School Nursery, and the adjacent eastern-portion forming part of the larger but still limited area of grassed play area. Having received advice from the NCC Education Department, it is noted that any relinquishment of the southern-most portions of these areas to enable a re-sited footway, would require formal approval from the Secretary of State (SoS). Before this could be considered, the approval of both the School Governor’s and the Head Teacher would be required, ahead of NCC Education Department then being willing to put such a request to the SoS.

3.6 Given the current operational use of this land and the limited overall area of the School site available, it is considered that on balance this option is not practical given the constraints noted above and lack of positive feedback from the NCC Education Department to further explore this option. It is also felt that any alternatives, to remove the hedge from the front of the school for example, would not be deliverable, due to the land still required to provide a new footway and the presumption in favour of retaining the hedge when balanced against the requirements of the site allocation policy.

New footway along south of Harvey Lane opposite the school frontage

3.7 With regards to the land to the south of Harvey Lane opposite the school frontage, investigations carried out via the Land Registry show that the land beyond that currently identified as public highway and up to the edge of land in the ownership of properties along Harvey Lane has ‘no known owner’. In view of this and in discussion with the Highway Authority, the developer is proposing an alternative scheme which details the proposed new section of footway along this southern side of Harvey Lane, opposite the school frontage. The Highway Authority has confirmed that this is a preferable option and that it is acceptable that Norfolk County Council uses its powers under section 228 of the Highways Act to claim the required land, subject to any parties coming forward with an interest in this land.

New footway along front of village hall

3.8 In respect to the footpath itself, it is proposed that the new footway will tie into the existing section of footway to the west along the south side of Harvey Lane opposite the school frontage and end opposite the western entrance to the village hall adjacent to where the proposed new footway on the northern side of Harvey Lane starts. The width of the footway is proposed to measure between 1.29m and 1.5m to improve pedestrian safety as well as enabling road widening to take place along the frontage of the school.

New footway along front of village hall

3.9 No changes proposed. The scheme proposes a footway in the existing highway verge adjacent to the village hall on the north side of Harvey Lane. The footway is proposed to measure 1.5 m wide and tie into the proposed pedestrian margin, finishing adjacent the
footway on the opposite of Harvey Lane along the school frontage. A timber knee rail fence is also proposed along the edge of the footway adjacent the village hall car park to prevent cars from obstructing the footway and impeding pedestrian access. The highways authority has raised no concerns or objection to this part of the scheme.

*White-line pedestrian margin along Harvey Lane*

3.10 The Highways Authority previously confirmed that the pedestrian margin on the north side of Harvey Lane is preferable to the current situation where no formal pedestrian margin is currently provided at all. Road widening along limited sections of this part of Harvey Lane is also proposed to improve both pedestrian and vehicle safety. It is noted that the site allocation (DIC1) does not specify what off-site works should be provided in this location and that no highways objection has been raised on this basis. It is therefore considered that to refuse the application on the grounds of inadequate pedestrian facilities could not be substantiated at appeal and therefore could not be a reason for refusal of the application.

3.11 In response to the comments received at Development Management Committee on the 7th December 2016 and the Parish Council, raising concerns about the principle of providing a white-line pedestrian margin, further investigations have been carried out to explore whether it would be possible or reasonable to expect the developer to purchase additional land along part of the southern side of Harvey Lane opposite some of the proposed pedestrian margin to enable a new footpath to be provided and additional highway widening to take place. Having investigated this further and discussed with the Highways Authority and developer, it is apparent that the land is within third party ownership and that it would therefore not be practical or reasonable to require the developer to purchase the land having regard to the site allocation policy that does not specifically require this. As such it is considered that the proposed pedestrian margin continues to offer the optimum solution available within the existing highway constraints and site allocation.

*Relocation of speed limit signs*

3.12 The revised improvements now include proposals to support the relocation of the 20mph speed limit to the east of Harvey Lane where the proposed pedestrian margin starts. The existing 30mph speed limit signs are also proposed to be relocated to the east of the development site, as requested by the Highways Authority.

*Amendments to internal parking arrangements*

3.13 With regards to internal parking arrangement, the site layout has been amended to reduce the reliance on tandem car parking spaces. It is acknowledged that there are still some instances of where tandem car parking occurs, however it is considered that the revised layout ensures the street scenes are not overly dominated by car parking which helps to create a varied character across the site. Whilst this has led to tandem parking in some instances, this is required to remove cars from the street scene and is considered to be acceptable in design terms. The layout of the development in respect of car parking is therefore on balance considered acceptable in accordance with the requirements of policies DM3.12 and DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Summary

3.14 In summary, it is considered that the alternative highway arrangements proposed provides the optimum solution available within the context of the requirements of the site allocation and available highway land. The Highway Authority has confirmed that the proposed alternative arrangements are preferable to those originally proposed and that it is acceptable that Norfolk County Council uses its powers under section 228 of the Highways Act to claim the required land to enable the footpath along south of Harvey Lane opposite the school frontage to be provided, subject to any parties coming forward with an interest in this land.
As referred to above, it is also necessary to acknowledge that the site allocation does not specify the precise off-site works that should be provided. On this basis, it is felt that the scheme provides a satisfactory alternative arrangement in the context of addressing the impacts of the development proposals as well as meeting the requirements of the site allocation. Members should also note that to expect the proposed highway improvement works to solve existing problems beyond the impacts of the development proposals would not be considered reasonable to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development and that it would be difficult to substantiate a refusal on these grounds. As such the arrangements proposed are considered acceptable in terms of meeting the committees resolution and the requirements of the Site Specifics Allocations and Policies Document, Policy DIC1 and South Norfolk Local Plan Policies DM 3.11.

Other considerations

Under paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires Councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes. This can be a material planning where self-build has been identified as the method of delivering the site. As no indication of self-build has been given by the applicant it is considered that the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

Section 106 Agreement and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

The application is liable for CIL and a liability notice would be issued with any consent granted. A draft S106 Agreement has been prepared and should consent be granted the S106 would need to be entered into to cover Affordable Housing and a contribution for non-provision of onsite play space and a sum for non-provision of toddler play equipment.

Financial Considerations

Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

Conclusion

The principle of development and consideration of the design, layout, landscape impact etc. were all considered within the previous committee report (Appendix 2), and also having regard to the other matters highlighted above, it is the officer’s recommendation that the proposed development is approved subject to the above conditions and S106 agreement being secured.

With regards to the negotiations that have taken place and the subsequent amendments that are proposed as a result of those discussions, it is considered that they offer satisfactory alternative highways arrangements in the context of addressing the impacts of the development proposed as well as meeting the requirements of the site allocation policy. The potential for further improvements of amending the pedestrian margin to an off-carriageway footpath have been explored but are not considered feasible for the reasons outlined in the report above, and in this instance it is not considered reasonable to refuse the planning application on this basis given the policy wording for this site as detailed above.

As such the arrangements proposed are recommended for approval and considered to meeting the requirements of the Site Specifics Allocations and Policies Document, Policy DIC1 and South Norfolk Local Plan Policy DM 3.11.
4.4 It is considered that the proposals as amended result in a scheme that delivers a high quality design and layout which is well considered for its rural edge location with its own distinctive character that relates positively to its surroundings and existing dwellings. It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 1, 2, 4 and 15 of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan Policies DM1.1, DM1.3, DM1.4, DM3.1, DM3.2, DM3.8, DM3.11, DM3.12, DM3.13, DM3.14, DM3.16, DM4.2, DM4.3, DM4.8, DM4.9, DM4.10 and Policy DIC1 of the Site Specifics Allocations and Policies Document have been met. All other matters are considered acceptable and subject to the imposition of conditions and a S106 obligation the application is recommended for approval, subject to any final comments being received.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Watts 01508 533765 cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Appendix 2

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

1. Appl. No : 2016/0482/F
Parish : DICKLEBURGH & RUSHALL

Applicants Name : Mr Chris Smith
Site Address : Land North Of Harvey Lane Dickleburgh Norfolk
Proposal : Residential development of land to provide 22 dwellings, together with access, parking and associated infrastructure

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions
1. Time limit full permission
2. In accordance with plans
3. Standard highways conditions
4. Future management and maintenance of roads
5. Details of construction of roads and footways
6. Off-site highway works for footpath
7. Construction worker parking
8. Materials to be agreed
9. Surface water drainage scheme
10. Fire hydrant to be provided
11. Landscaping management
12. Biodiversity management plan
13. Contaminated land
14. Construction management plan
15. Renewable energy
16. Water efficiency

Subject to completion of S106 agreement to secure affordable housing and commuted sum for off-site play equipment improvements.

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 06 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design
NPPF 08 : Promoting healthy communities
NPPF 10 : Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF 11 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2 : Promoting good design
Policy 3 : Energy and water
Policy 4 : Housing delivery
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation
Policy 7 : Supporting Communities
Policy 8 : Culture, leisure and entertainment
Policy 15 : Service Villages
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1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.1: Ensuring development management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs
DM3.2: Meeting rural housing needs
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety
DM3.15: Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
DM3.16: Improving level of community facilities
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.3: Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.8: Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design

1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
Policy DIC1: Land north of Langmere Road and east of Limmer Avenue

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas:
S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

2. Planning History

2.1 No relevant planning history.

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council
Object:
- Site specific allocation has prevented this application being the right development
- Breaches a range of planning policies
- Harvey Lane is physically constrained, heavily trafficked rural lane
- Unsafe route that doesn’t meet County Highways Standards
- Additional 200 vehicle movements a day
- Deficiency of education provisions
- Amenity noise and quality of life

3.2 District Member
- To Committee.
- Highway issues
- Layout and density of building design and visual appearance
- Overshadowing/Loss of outlook/Loss of privacy
- Deficiencies in facilities
- Inadequate or inappropriate landscaping or means of enclosure
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.3 Councillor Spratt County Councillor | - Supports the view of the Highway Officer  
- School safety considerations |   |
| 3.4 SNC Landscape Architect | Comments on amendments:  
- Scheme can be approved subject to conditions | Original comments:  
- Concerns over appropriate boundary treatment  
- Subject to revised scheme no objection |
| 3.5 NCC Planning Obligations Coordinator | Comments on amendments  
- Do not alter housing number/mix so previous comments remain unchanged | Comments on original scheme  
- Concern over capacity of primary school, funding through CIL monies.  
- One fire hydrant required  
- Library contribution sought through CIL monies  
- Impacts to green infrastructure connections should be considered, mitigation should be considered. |
| 3.6 NCC Public Rights Of Way | No comments received |   |
| 3.7 NCC Ecologist | Comments on amendments  
- Do not appear to be material to ecology – No further comment | Original comments  
- No objection in principle  
- Condition a Biodiversity Management Plan  
- Suggest reinforcing the boundaries and erecting bat and bird boxes |
| 3.8 Norfolk Fire Service | Comments on amendments:  
- No change from previous |   |
| 3.9 SNC Play and Amenities Officer | No objection, a financial sum in lieu of on-site provision to be spent on improving existing facilities identified with the village is acceptable. |   |
| 3.10 Historic Environment Service | No comments received |   |
| 3.11 Norfolk Police | No comments received |   |
| 3.12 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team | No objection subject to conditions  
- Noise – Air source heat pumps, construction noise  
- Contaminated land  
- Advisory note – Wood burning stoves |   |
3.13 NCC Highways

Comments on final amendments:
- Proposed footway in front of the school measures 0.9m only and is too narrow. This could lead to safety concerns as pedestrians step off the footway into the carriageway to allow others to pass.
- Would prefer new footway on the southern side of Harvey Lane

Original comments and amendments:
- Issue a holding objection as in current form application does not address the requirements of Policy DIC1

3.14 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Officer

Comments on amendments
- No further comment

Original comment
- No objection
- The affordable housing is an acceptable mix and tenure.

3.15 SNC Water Management Officer

Recommend a condition for further site investigations, details and arrangements for maintenance and management of surface water drainage scheme

3.16 Anglian Water Services Ltd

- Water recycling centre will have capacity for flows
- Sewerage system at present has available capacity
- Surface water does not relate to AW operated assets

3.17 Lead Local flood Authority

- Confirmed that they do not wish to make any comments.

3.18 NHS England

No comments received

3.19 SNC Senior Design and Conservation Officer

- Although close to Conservation Area site is some distance from core of village and prevailing character is C20 estates
- Limmer Avenue has a built access which could allow for the site to be connected and integrated into surrounding neighbourhood
- Some materials are not in keeping
- Parking for plots 11 and 12 not satisfactory

3.20 Representations

51 letters of objection, a further 10 after amendments
- Concerns with Highway Safety
- No safe place for pedestrians
- 20mph not adhered to
- Car parking on highway
- Road drainage concerns
- School should be linked to village centre by a footpath
- Amendments do not improve highway safety
- Surface water flooding already in area
- Concerns about wildlife
- Destroy open space
- Spoil view of open countryside
- Loss of privacy
- Noise and dust during construction
- Concerns regarding WW2 pill box
- Other sites much better suited with better
- Insufficient facilities and infrastructure
- Social housing is covered by Saffron
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1 letter of support
2 letter neither supporting or objecting on the following grounds:
• The road needs upgrading
• Footpath link between school and village centre
• Alternative parking space with walking access to the villages communal sites.
• Spaces at school being taken by more children from the village may have a beneficial impact on vehicles using Harvey Lane

4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The site is located in Dickleburgh on land north of Langmere Road and east of Limner Avenue. The site is allocated in the adopted Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD to deliver approximately 20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

4.2 The site itself is approximately 1.1 Ha and comprises all of the land proposed for the residential allocation in Policy DIC1 of the site Specific allocations document. Policy DIC1 sets out the requirements for development of the site and this is set out below.

The application

4.3 The application is a full planning application and seeks approval for all matters including access, parking and associated infrastructure.

4.4 The application proposes the erection of 22 dwellings. These consist of:

Open market housing
3 x 2 bed detached bungalow (1 storey)
2 x 3 bed detached bungalow (1 storey)
3 x 3 bed detached chalet bungalow (1.5 storey)
4 x 3 bed detached house (2 storey)
3 x 4 bed detached house (2 storey)

Affordable housing
2 x 1 bed semi-detached house (2 storey)
3 x 2 bed terraced house (2 storey)
2 x 3 bed semi-detached house (2 storey)

4.5 The application has been amended to address the Highway Authority’s comments relating to off-site highway improvements and amendments to visibility splays and on-site parking arrangements. Further amendments include improvements to the overall site layout and landscaping, which have been negotiated throughout the course of the application.

The main issues for consideration of this application are addressed below.

Principle of development

4.6 Policy 15 of the JCS identifies Dickleburgh as a Service Village in which land has been allocated to provide for approximately 10-20 dwellings between April 2008 and March 2026, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Policy DIC1 sets out the requirements for development of the site and this is set out below:

4.7 Land amounting to some 1.1 hectares is allocated for housing and associated infrastructure. This allocation could accommodate approximately 20 dwellings. The policy requires the developer of the site to ensure the following:
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- A small estate development
- Appropriate boundary treatment on the site’s eastern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the east
- Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place
- Local highways improvements and the provision of a safe access will need to be provided

4.8 The application site comprises of 22 dwellings on all of the land proposed within the adopted development boundary for the residential allocation in policy DIC1 of the site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD and as such the principle of new residential development on this site is consistent with the aims of policy DM1.3 which seeks to permit new housing within a development boundary.

4.9 Members should note that the 22 dwellings proposed is in excess of the 10-20 houses in Service Villages identified in the Joint Core Strategy. However in considering whether this resultant effect on total numbers of dwellings, other material considerations must also be taken into account.

4.10 Part 1 of Policy DM1.3 states that new development should be located so that it positively contributes to the sustainable development. The policy seeks development to be on allocated sites and of a scale proportionate to the level of growth planned in that location, and the role and function of the Settlement within which it is located. The scheme proposed meets the requirements of this policy.

4.11 Paragraph 58 of the NPPF requires that planning decisions should aim to ensure that development, amongst other things:

- Optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks;

4.12 In terms of para 58, providing 22 dwellings on the site whilst still having an average density of approximately 20dph ensuring the efficient use of land, which is reflective of the scale of the local area.

4.13 In summary, whilst the number of dwellings proposed is greater than the approximate figure contained within the allocation, it is considered, that in principle, providing 22 dwellings within the village which is a service centre is, in principle, acceptable, subject to the scheme satisfying the stated criterion set out within the allocation and all relevant planning policies in respect of matters such as design, neighbour amenity, highway safety etc. An assessment of the scheme, against the above is as follows:

4.14 The first criterion within the allocation requires:

- A small estate development

4.15 The scheme comprises all of the land proposed within the adopted development boundary from a single point of access from Harvey Lane. As such it is considered that the proposals represent a small estate development. For this reason the first criterion has been satisfied.

4.16 The second criterion requires:

- Appropriate boundary treatment on the site’s eastern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the east
4.17 The scheme proposes new planting along the east boundary the site, which is consistent with other established boundary treatments to the site and appropriate in this rural context. The Council’s Landscape Architect has confirmed that this is an acceptable approach in this locality, subject to conditions. For this reason the second criterion has been satisfied.

4.18 The third criterion requires:

- Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place

4.19 A Statements and Conditions Report has been prepared by Anglian Water which confirms that the sewerage system at present has available capacity for the proposed flows. For this reason the first criterion has been satisfied.

4.20 The final criterion requires:

- Local highways improvements and the provision of a safe access will need to be provided

4.21 The Highway Authority has no objection to the access arrangements provided subject to conditions and as such the requirement of the further criterion relating to safe access is satisfied. In respect of the off-site highway improvements, they continue to be concerned at the proposed footpath adjacent to the primary school on the northern side of the Harvey Lane carriageway. This is specifically due to the proposed footway in front of the school measuring only 0.9m. A width of 0.9m is the absolute minimum width normally accepted and should ideally be used over short distances only. In this instance the 0.9m wide footway is around 70m long and adjacent a hedge which has the potential to grow out over the footway and further limit its useable width. Given the location of the proposed footway outside a school, where pedestrians are likely to congregate at school drop off and pick up times, it is our view that a 0.9m width is not appropriate in this location. The limited width of the proposed footway fronting the school is compounded by the fact Harvey Lane at this location is narrow and is not intended to be widened. A narrow footway where congestion and vulnerable pedestrians are likely to be at their highest level could lead to safety concerns as pedestrians step off the footway into the carriageway to allow others to pass.

4.22 Whilst acknowledging this concern, considering this in the context of the allocation it is necessary to acknowledge that the allocation does not specify what off-site works should be provided and it is also apparent from the Highway Officers comments that the width of the footpath does comply with the minimum width to be provided, albeit this is typically on short sections of footway. On balance it is felt that the scheme, whilst not the optimum solution available, it does provide a satisfactory arrangement in the context of the requirements of the allocation. It is considered that to refuse an application on the grounds of inadequate pedestrian facilities could be substantiated at appeal.

4.23 In terms of the four stated criterion, it is considered that the scheme has satisfied all of these requirements.

4.24 Given the contents of paragraph 49 of the NPPF it is necessary to determine whether the scheme represents sustainable development having regards to the content of the NPPF.

4.25 Sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. The NPPF goes on to stress in paragraph 8 that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.
4.26 The assessment is undertaken having regard to the three roles expressed within the NPPF, and which have been reiterated in policies DM1.1 and DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of each role also draws upon the relevant local plan policy where relevant.

Economic Role

4.27 The NPPF highlights the economic role as:

"contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation: and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure."

4.28 The scheme would result in some short term economic benefits as part of any construction work and in the longer term by local spending from the future occupants. In summary it is considered that the scheme would bring forward a level of economic benefit.

Social Role

4.29 The NPPF confirms the social role as:

"supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations: and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being."

4.30 Given that the site is allocated it is evident that this site is clearly part of the Council’s strategy for meeting housing need within the district and as such would contribute to the stated social aim of the NPPF to provide the supply of housing to meet present and future need.

4.31 The social role highlights the need for housing to appropriate access to a range of accessible local services. Dickleburgh is identified as a Service Village and defined as having a good level of services and facilities. The site is well located in relation to the local community centre, Dickleburgh Primary School and regular bus services.

4.32 Norfolk County Council has confirmed that there is currently no spare capacity at the primary school and that 5 additional spaces would likely be generated from this development. However, it has been confirmed that additional spaces could be met by providing additional class rooms, improving/re-modelling existing class space etc and that these works would be funded through CIL as this is covered on the District Council’s Regulation 123 list. Therefore there is no objection in terms of primary school capacity.

4.33 It is evident that there is spare high school capacity provision and Dickleburgh is also a relatively short distance to Diss town centre which provides health care and a varied range of services.

4.34 In terms of the affordable housing provision, Policy 4 of the JCS requires 33% of the total number of units to be affordable, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not viable to do so. In this instance the scheme proposes that 7 of the 22 units would be affordable (33%) and is therefore considered acceptable.

4.35 In summary, Policy 15 of the JCS, Dickleburgh is identified as a Service Village and defined as having a good level of services and facilities. It is considered that the lack of available primary school places within Dickleburgh does not result in a scheme which does not fulfil the social role in the context of the NPPF and provides an attractive scheme for future residents. It is therefore considered that the scheme meets the social role of the NPPF.
4.36 The NPPF confirms the environmental role as:

"contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy."

Layout, appearance and scale

4.37 The environmental role also seeks to secure a high quality built environment. The site layout and house types have been subject to revisions during the application process following discussions with the applicant.

4.38 In considering the overall scale of development, regard should be given to the density and form of existing development along Harvey Lane, which aims to reinforce both the cul de sac development along Harvey Lane which helps to establish and define the site. Regard should also be given to the density of development that reduces along the north and west boundaries of the site, in order to provide a transition from the built form along Limner Avenue and Catchpole Walk. With regard to the overall density of development, this averages out at 20 houses to the hectare, which is considered a comparable average density in a rural location such as Dickleburgh, ensuring the efficient use of land, yet is reflective of the scale of the local area.

4.39 Having assessed the overall scale and form of development it is considered that the proposed scheme would respect the existing character and arrangement of development onto Harvey Lane as well as providing an acceptable transition of development to the open farmland to the east of the site, which displays a visual and physical connection to Dickleburgh.

4.40 House types have been considered in the context of the wider surroundings to help reinforce and enhance the local character of Dickleburgh. The house types use traditional forms and materials, yet have a distinctive appearance. House types fronting onto Harvey Lane have been designed to reflect the simple style of housing to the adjoining sites and pick up on the character of Dickleburgh. The height, scale and form of the proposed buildings are considered appropriate for the site and its context.

4.41 Safeguarding residential amenity is also considered to be part of securing a high quality built environment. It is considered that the relationship between the existing dwellings and the proposed properties, as well as the relationship the new dwellings have with one another has been assessed and it is considered that the separation distances are adequate in all respects to safeguard amenity levels of existing and future residents. This also means that the proposal satisfies policy requirements in respect of Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and DM3.14 of the Development Management Policy Document.

4.42 Overall, it is considered that the amended scheme has been well thought out and results in a development with a locally inspired character that relates positively to its surroundings and Dickleburgh. Information has also been submitted that demonstrates how the proposals comply with the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide design.

4.43 It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS, section 7 of the NPPS and policy DM1.4, DM3.9 and DM4.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD have been met.
In terms of landscape impact concern has been expressed about the impact of the development on the open countryside and the rural character of the site. It is evident that there is a need to ensure the development has a defined relationship to the open countryside, particularly to the eastern boundary whilst respecting housing densities and the character of surrounding existing development. The boundary itself is proposed as a functional hedge with trees, giving a clear and defined edge to the village in this location. A hedge to the front of the site to the east of plot no. 22 is also proposed.

In considering this the Landscape Architect has confirmed that he has no objections to the proposals and it is considered that the layout has good visual links to the surrounding countryside to the east, which provides a positive transition from build form to the countryside.

With regards to public open space, Policy DM3.15 requires new housing development to provide adequate outdoor play facilities and recreational open space commensurate with the level of development proposed in order to meet the need of occupants. Paragraph 3.107 of the Local Plan states that ‘any specific local space requirements will be set out in the site allocations policy’. Policy DIC1 makes no reference to any specific open space requirement, however the Councils Recreational Open Space Standards for Residential Areas, requires a minimum amount of children’s play space to be provided unless a financial contribution in lieu of onsite provision for play space if deemed appropriate.

In this case, the Council’s Play and Amenities Officer has assessed the proposals and considers it appropriate to secure a financial sum which can be spent on improving existing facilities identified with the village. A sum has been calculated by the Play and Amenities Officer taking into account non provision of onsite play space and a sum for non-provision of toddler play equipment where the contribution would go to the local authority (SNC) to likely be used for the existing facilities at the Village Hall where there is an identified local need. This provision will be secured through the S106 Agreement.

In summary, whilst the concerns are acknowledged in respect of the impact of the development on the open countryside, it is considered that the current scheme does not lead to significant harm in terms of landscape impact. Therefore subject to a detailed landscaping scheme and management plan to be agreed by condition, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this respect and would accord with the aims of Policy DIC1, DM3.15, DM4.8 and DM4.9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, JCS Policies 1 and 2 and section 11 of the NPPF

Ecology and Protected Species

This application has been supported by an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey (Southern Ecological Solutions, March 2016) which has been assessed by Norfolk County Council Natural Environment Team. The assessment concludes that the proposed development is likely to have a limited impact on protected habitats and species. However, it does state that there is potential for biodiversity enhancement, which could be implemented. As such it is recommended that a Biodiversity Management Plan is conditioned which commits to the recommendations made in the aforementioned report, and also details biodiversity enhancements for the site. The County Ecologist has confirmed that the proposals are acceptable subject to the imposition of the above condition and as such meet the requirements of the development plan and NPPF.
Heritage assets

4.50 There are no listed buildings located within the application site and that the site is not within a Conservation Area. However there is a World War II Pill Box (type 22) located approximately 20m to east of the site. Whilst the pill box is of local interest and can be considered an undesignated heritage asset, it is considered that due to the location of the pill box outside of the site, that the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on the undesignated heritage asset and is therefore considered acceptable in terms of policy DM4.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.51 In addition to the Development Plan policies, S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In consideration of the Council’s duties under those Acts it is considered, for the reasons set out above, that the proposal would not adversely affect the special architectural or historic interest of the heritage asset, which is not listed.

4.52 In terms of the environmental role, on balance it is considered that the scheme fulfils this requirement.

4.53 Having due regard to the above assessment in relation to sustainable development it is considered that this higher number of dwellings proposed is acceptable in this instance and will not result in any adverse impact that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of delivering housing on this allocated site. It is therefore considered to accord with the requirements of the NPPF and also 1 b) of Policy DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and JCS

Other issues

Surface water drainage

4.54 The site lies within Flood Zone 1 which is low risk probability and as such the key issue for this site is the means of surface water drainage.

4.55 The Lead Local Flood Authority has confirmed that it does not wish to make any comments on the application. A condition is considered appropriate to agree details for surface water drainage, including management and maintenance.

Foul water

4.56 The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Rectory Road Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for the proposed flows. Anglin Water has confirmed that the sewerage system at present has available capacity for this development and has raised no objections. Therefore the impacts on the foul water are considered acceptable and accords with Policy 1 of the JCS.

Access and Highways

4.57 Policy DM3.11 requires the safe and free flow of traffic, ensuring highway safety is maintained and the free flow of traffic on the highway network.

4.58 A single point of access is proposed on to Harvey Lane to serve the development and this is acceptable to the Highway Authority.

4.59 The alterations to the junction at Harvey Lane and the Street is acceptable subject to the final design being agreed with the Highway Authority which is to be secured via planning condition.
As referred to above in the report, the Highway Authority consider that the footpath on Harvey Lane adjacent to the school should be re-sited to the opposite side of Harvey Lane for the reasons set out above. In terms of determining the application as submitted officers consider that whilst not the optimum solution it is an adequate one having due regard to the wording contained within the allocation.

Other highway works include the provision of a new pedestrian footpath along the front of the site set behind the proposed open space fronting onto Beccles Road. The footpath will connect to the existing public footpath to the northwest and College Road to the southeast to enable safe access to services in the village.

Amended plans have been submitted to address the technical design amendments required by the Highway Authority. Based on these amended plans the Highway Authority indicate they have no objection to the application subject to the imposition of conditions which include details of the future management and maintenance of the streets within the development, detailed plans of the roads, footways, standard construction specification, and a scheme for onsite parking for construction workers.

Contamination

Policy DM3.14 has regard to development and contamination. The Environmental Protection Officer has confirmed that they have no objections to this planning application and has recommend that any approval includes a condition or informative note that in the event contamination that was not previously identified is found, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority and a report submitted that includes results of an investigation and a risk assessment along with a remediation scheme to be agreed and carried out. Subject to the imposition of a condition or an informative note to have regard to contamination, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and in accordance with policies DM3.14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Sustainable construction/renewable energy

Policy 1 and 3 of the JCS require the sustainable construction of buildings and water conservation in addition to requiring 10% of the predicted energy requirements to be delivered by on site decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy. Precise details and compliance with the policy will be secured by condition.

Other considerations

Under paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes. This can be a material planning where self-build has been identified as the method of delivering the site. As no indication of self-build has been given by the applicant it is considered that the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

Section 106 Agreement and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

The application is liable for CIL and a liability notice would be issued with any consent granted. A draft S106 Agreement has been prepared and should consent be granted the S106 would need to be entered into to cover Affordable Housing and a contribution for non-provision of onsite play space and a sum for non-provision of toddler play equipment.

Financial Considerations

Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.
5 Conclusion

5.1 The principle of the application is acceptable on this site allocation and is considered to represent a sustainable form of development. It is considered that the proposals as amended, results in a scheme that delivers a high quality design and layout which is well considered for its rural edge location with its own distinctive character that relates positively to its surroundings and existing dwellings. It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 1, 2, 4 and 15 of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan Policies DM1.1, DM1.3, DM1.4, DM3.1, DM3.2, DM3.8, DM3.11, DM3.12, DM3.13, DM3.14, DM3.16, DM4.2, DM4.3, DM4.8, DM4.9, DM4.10 and Policy DIC1 of the Site Specifics Allocations and Policies Document have been met. All other matters are considered acceptable and subject to the imposition of conditions and a S106 obligation the application is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number    Chris Watts 01508 533765
and E-mail:                        cwwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
### Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
#### 7 December 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2016/0482</td>
<td>Additional letters of objection received (summarised):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Further concerns over highway safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Road not wide enough to accommodate extra volume of traffic or two cars to pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No room for road or pavement to be widened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Pedestrian ‘white line margin’ not safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Removal of verge outside of community centre will compound safety concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Introduction of a 20mph speed limit will not work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Extending the pavement on The Street will not help visibility leaving Harvey Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Marginal carriageway width improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Pedestrians forced to walk on verges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Maintain original objections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer response covering matters raised above are addressed in the Development Management Committee report.

**Additional comments from Parish Council (summarised):**

- Harvey Lane is a physically constrained, heavily trafficked rural lane.
- The new development and its occupancy mix would have a significant impact, it would make an unsafe route, which doesn’t meet County Highways standards, even more hazardous for vehicles and pedestrians.
- The proposed development will account for a minimum of an additional 200 vehicle movements per day, an additional 70000 vehicle movements per year excluding traffic generation caused by goods, services and visitors.
- The impact cannot be mitigated in this location, physical restrictions along the length of Harvey Lane prevent it being widened, even if possible it would be economically unviable.
- Preventing access to Harvey Lane and routing traffic from this development via Beech Way would significantly impact Rectory Road which is also severely challenged.
- The South Norfolk local plan highlights the dependency of cars in the rural environment yet development site(s) with access to better road infrastructure in the village have been overlooked.

Officer response covering matters raised above are addressed in the Development Management Committee report.

**Corrections to report:**

- Paragraph 4.61 on page 33 of the Development Management Committee Agenda should be omitted from consideration as it has been incorrectly included in this report.
• The last sentence on page 28, paragraph 4.22 of the Development Management Committee Agenda should read *It is considered that to refuse an application on the grounds of inadequate pedestrian facilities could not be substantiated at appeal.*

**Additional highways conditions to be agreed:**

• Traffic regulation order to be promoted by NCC.

2 2016/1627 Foul water drainage strategy condition to be added as required by Anglian Water

**Landscape Architect comments on revised plans:**

This is an improved scheme, offering an opportunity to create more of a positive feature of the Chet, and allows for the retention of existing trees.

Without a better survey/assessment of the existing trees it is not possible to ascertain whether or not what is shown on the indicative drawing tallies with the best trees, but this can be resolved at RM stage.

No objections.

**District Member comments on revised plans:**

Confirm application should only be determined by Committee as I have concerns about:

1. Access
2. Services
3. Surface water soakage? Is this a disaster waiting to happen?
4. Intrusion into the Countryside

**Parish Council comments on revised plans:**

Continue to object to this application. The submitted flood and drainage strategy states that flood risk is low to medium risk. Poringland is a known flood risk area and we are concerned that these proposals will create further issues downstream.

The Parish Council are also disappointed to see the plans propose clustered social housing – would prefer to see it integrated with the main development and of a similar build and quality.

**NCC Highways on revised plans:**

Revised plan accords with previous advice, however a plan showing the existing and proposed changes to the junction with the Norfolk Homes development is requested.
Some further comments on internal layout, though recognise that layout is not marked for consideration at this stage.

As advised previously, link to Heath Loke should be removed as this is a private road with no right to access it.

1 email from a local resident requesting a removable bollard be placed on Tubby Drive to prevent through traffic along Tubby Drive which is not a public road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 2016/2153</th>
<th>Correction to report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 4.8 should state total of 106 dwellings across the two (sites (53 on the existing Hopkins Homes site and 53 proposed).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Developer response to ecology query**

Hopkin Homes have provided the following response to the ecological issue highlighted in paragraph 4.31 of the report:

*The only trees being removed relate to the access point. These are small trees which do not have any bat roosting potential. The tree report stated... G15 and a section of H16 should be removed to facilitate proposed layout but will not have a detrimental impact to the local tree stock.*

The ecologist reported that:

*“Despite the sites current negligible/low value for foraging bats enhancements have been recommended within the landscaping scheme and in order for this to be effective a wildlife sensitive lighting scheme should be employed “*

*“Potential roost sites may be present within some of the larger, mature trees featured within the hedge and tree habitats on the site boundary (see photos in Appendix 4). Although no specific features were noted i.e. rot holes, stress fractures etc. these trees were of a size and age where they may have spaces present for roosting bats.*

*The larger trees which might have bat roosting potential are all retained and fenced away from the development during construction. These are photographed in plate 8 in the Ecology report. These trees are not part of G15 at the point of access. As such there is no requirement for further assessment.*

This has been forwarded to the Council's Ecologist who has confirmed that they are satisfied with this explanation and therefore they have no objection subject to the imposition of a condition (condition 10 of the suggested conditions).
**SNC Senior Conservation and Design Officer** has confirmed that the scheme has achieved a Building For Life Score of 11 Greens and 1 Amber.

**Local resident comment:**
The revised layout now shows that there will now, not be a public footpath running to the rear of the gardens in Five Acres. At the moment several of the gardens (No’s 21, 23, 25 & 27) have an open aspect onto the site with no high fencing. We would ask that should planning permission be given for the development that a 1.8 metre high fence be erected by Hopkins Homes, at the boundary of the gardens so that our privacy is protected due to loss of amenity. Also it would mean the new bungalows adjacent will have a proper safe and secure boundary. At a Parish Council meeting held on 19th October (prior to the amended plan being submitted) to discuss the development, Robert Eburne did say that a fence could be erected but this does not appear to have been put forward in the new plan.

We also have a query regarding the footpath/cycle track running through to Five Acres. Would it be possible to incorporate an area for visitor parking? At present the area is used by visitors to Five Acres which, if not replaced would mean that cars would be parked on the road causing obstruction.

**Officer response:**
In respect of the request for fencing, it is understood that this boundary is under the control of the residents of the individual properties on Five Acres rather than Hopkins Homes and as such it would not generally be appropriate to request a condition to undertaken works (in this case a new fence) on a boundary not under the developer’s control.

In terms of the provision of visitor parking for residents of Five acres, there is no planning requirement as a consequence of the proposal itself to provide visitor parking.

**Local resident comment:**
Do not want visitor parking requested in front of their property, other areas of Five Acres can be used for this purpose ie near the existing green. The buffer between my drive and the pathway/cycleway should be reinstated. A fence should be put between my drive and the footway/cycleway to protect privacy.

**Officer response:**
Do not believe the introduction of a fence would represent a positive feature within the streetscene, the absence of any such enclosure does not lead to an unacceptable level of intrusion given the relationship of the dwelling to the footway/cycleway.

**Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council:**
Concern over the issue of the need for a footpath from Lower Stoke to Upper Stoke along Long Lane. The request for this to be considered is in my response sent
on behalf of Stoke PC. We would appreciate it if you could consider making this one of the conditions, when approving this application that funds are made available for the construction of this Trod path by NCC by a 106 agreement or by using part of the CIL money retained by yourselves.

**Officer response:**
It would not be reasonable in planning terms to require the delivery of the aforementioned footpath via either condition or S106 contribution. It should be noted that the scheme is CIL liable, and the Parish Council would receive a proportion of the payment (either 15% or 25% of the CIL payment)

**Historic Environment Services**
continue to have no objection.

**SNC landscape Architect** – No objection subject to a condition to agree updated landscape plan to reflect change in planning layout received.

**SNC Community Services Env Quality Team** – same comments as on original scheme (no objection subject to conditions)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 2016/1838</th>
<th>No updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 2016/2112</td>
<td>Additional conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Landscaping/ boundary treatment N and E boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 3 parking spaces on plot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 2016/2155</td>
<td>One additional letter of objection raising no new issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 2016/2264</td>
<td>Photographs received from agent showing other approved garages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 2016/2364</td>
<td>Letter from the agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This is an existing building and refusal on the basis that it is not an existing building is illogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• This is an existing industrial style building with no agricultural use on the horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building is servable in its current state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can’t understand why cycling along the A1066 is undesirable. This is a major A road so suitable for bikes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The site is close to Roydon, the public house, garden centre, stream museum, vets and wedding venue all accessed by cars, vans, lorries, bikes, pedestrians and bus passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• People do access these by the foot and bike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sansom Lane runs from High Road Bressingham to 150 metres from the site entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Street lighting is irrelevant when discussing rural businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 50% of staff on the site come from Roydon or Bressingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agricultural engineering business has two employees that cycle all year round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider it is well related to a rural town as within</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
2 miles of Diss along an A road.
- Agricultural workers would need to travel to the site yet workers coming to an industrial use could not get there is a sustainable way.
- Cannot understand how the proposal can result in significant social and environmental harm
- The tenants pulled out of 5 year contract which had a specific intended use for the building, building no longer required.
- Storage is not required for sugar beet and grain crops
- The rest of the land is poly tunnels and grass land no interest has been found to rent this land there is a convent on this land which restricts the growing of plants for retail sales
- Applicant has a high volume water licence to enable the continued agricultural/ horticultural use of the use he would not maintain this, if he did not intend to retain the agricultural used of the land.
- The land adjacent to the proposed site is owned by others which is now derelict and is no longer viable for use as shown by Meredith’s bankruptcy,
- Would provide rural jobs so people would not have to travel to Diss
- Policy DM2.7 recognises the need for agricultural contractor buildings to store equipment to serve a wider customer base.
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Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

3. **Appl. No**: 2016/2424/F  
   **Parish**: WYMONDHAM

   **Applicants Name**: Mr James Alston  
   **Site Address**: Land At Chapel Road And Bunwell Road Spooner Row Norfolk  
   **Proposal**: 30 residential dwellings (17 dwellings at Bunwell Road and 13 dwellings at Chapel Road), with associated open space, highways and landscaping works

   **Recommendation**: Authorise Director of Growth and Localism to Approve with Conditions

   1. Standard time limit  
   2. In accordance with plans  
   3. External materials as in accordance with schedule  
   4. Boundary treatments as in plans except for southern boundary to Bunwell Road site which are to be agreed  
   5. Boundary treatment to be agreed to southern boundary of Bunwell Road  
   6. Landscaping management and maintenance arrangements to be agreed  
   7. Highways conditions  
   8. Noise and dust management scheme to be agreed  
   9. Unknown contamination  
   10. Surface water to be agreed  
   11. Foul water to be agreed  
   12. Ecology recommendations and management to be adhered to  
   13. Requirements of energy efficiency statement to be complied with  
   14. Fire hydrant to be provided

Subject to no new substantive issues being raised in remaining consultation period; and

Subject to S106 to secure affordable housing, open space management and maintenance arrangements and contributions in the form of a “schools payment” and a “community payment”. It should be noted that the two aforementioned are offered again as a positive gesture as was the case in the last S106 agreement, however it should be noted that there is no planning requirement to provide them and as such no weight is attached to these in the decision-making process.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
   NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
   NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
   NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
   NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
   NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
   NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
   Policy 2: Promoting good design  
   Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
Policy 15 : Service Villages  

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.1 : Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development  
DM3.1 : Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM3.15 : Outdoor play facilities/recreational space  
DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows  
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design  

1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies  
SPO 1 : Land at Chapel Road  

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012  

2. Planning History  

2.1 2012/2016  
Outline planning application for the development of land to the east of Chapel Road - 13 dwellings and land to the east of Bunwell Road - 20 dwellings  
Approved  

2.2 2014/2472  
Reserved matters approval for 13 dwellings at Chapel Road and 8 dwellings at Bunwell Road, following outline planning permission 2012/2016/O  
Approved  

2.3 2015/2850  
Discharge of conditions from planning application 2012/2016/O, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 22a. Application relates to 8 dwellings at Bunwell Road which have been granted reserved matters approved.  
Approved  

2.4 2016/1592  
Discharge of condition 17 of planning permission 2012/2016/O - materials  
Approved  

3. Consultations  

3.1 Town / Parish Council  
Refuse on the following grounds:  
- Detrimental impact on neighbouring property  
- Not in accordance with outline indicative plans  
- Poor landscaping at Bunwell Rd  
- Flood Risk – unacceptable proposals at both sites  
Amended plans: comments awaited  

3.2 District Member  
To be reported to committee due to impact on neighbour amenity  

3.3 NCC Minerals And Waste Planning Officer  
No comments received.
3.4 NCC Planning Obligations Co-Ordinator

Observations.
There is therefore insufficient capacity to accommodate the children generated by this proposed development.

It is expected that the funding for additional places if necessary would be through CIL as this is covered on the District Council’s Regulation 123 list.

This development will require 1 fire hydrant.

Connections into the local Green Infrastructure (GI) network, including Public Rights of Way and ecological features, should be considered alongside the potential impacts of development. Direct mitigation and GI provision should therefore be included within the site proposal. Mitigation for new and existing GI features identified as strategic shall be funded by the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) through the Greater Norwich Investment Programme. These requirements for consideration and implementation, for both on and off-site GI provision, will help the local GI network to facilitate the development without receiving negative impact and equally, allow the development to integrate and enhance the existing network.

Green Infrastructure within this proposal should respond to the Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure Strategy (2007) which informs the Joint Core Strategy, adopted January 2014. Development proposals are expected to fit with strategic visions for the area and respond to corridors as outlined in the Joint Core Strategy.

Should this development intend to be the first phase of a larger development or vision, consideration will need to be given to how the local GI network will be impacted, adapted and enhanced in the future.

3.5 Historic Environment Service

No objections

3.6 Norfolk Fire Service Station Master

No comments received (see confirmation above from NCC of need for 1 hydrant)

3.7 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team

No objection subject to conditions detailed noise and dust management scheme to be agreed, precautionary contaminated land condition.

3.8 Anglian Water Services Ltd

To be reported to Committee.

3.9 SNC Conservation And Design

No objection to the scheme, footpath link on the Bunwell Road scheme could be re-positioned slightly to improve the scheme.

Amended plans: comments to be reported to Committee.

3.10 NCC Ecologist

Given the length of time that has lapsed since the previous ecological report was undertaken it is considered appropriate to update this document.
Amended report: no objection subject to condition to provide mitigation measures relating to bats, nesting birds, appropriate species planting and habitat for reptiles, amphibians and hedgehogs.

3.11 NCC Highways

Revisions required. These have been provided and further comments to be reported.

Amended plans: comments to be reported to committee

3.12 SNC Housing

Enabling & Strategy Manager

No objection.

3.13 NHS England

No comments received

3.14 NHS Clinical Commissioning Group

No comments received

3.15 Wymondham Medical Centre

No comments received

3.16 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority

Object on basis of concerns over further information needed on the ability of proposed surface water features to accommodate rainfall events, stated run-off rates, post-development run-off rates, flood flow paths, watercourse being discharged into and location of attenuation basin at Bunwell Road site in relation to fluvial flooding.

Additional information: comments to be reported to Committee.

3.17 SNC Landscape Architect

Chapel Road – no comments to make.

Bunwell Road – concerned at shading to Plots 16 & 17 Eastern boundary of site should ideally be in one party’s control to better control management and maintenance.

Amended plans: Bunwell Road - The layout has been adjusted slightly in light of my previous concerns about shading. Whilst the BS shading arcs (shown in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment) have not been plotted on the revised layout, it still appears to the case that shading will affect plots 16 and 17 to a not insignificant degree, though slightly less than for the previous layout. Of course, potential residents may be happy with this situation, but my experience is that shading from neighbours’ trees can be a cause of conflict and therefore it is always better to avoid the issue if at all possible.

3.18 Representations

14 objections received, a summary of these are as follows:

- Exceeds the amount of development proposed in a service village
- Allotments have disappeared from the scheme
- Flood risk, drainage arrangements are insufficient
- Revised Bunwell Road scheme is detrimental to adjacent property (Gladern)
- The Chapel Rd scheme is not under construction as is claimed.
- Overbearing and will change rural location
- Existing residents will be subject to unacceptable overlooking
• Developer not demonstrated an understanding of drainage issues
• Increased traffic and highway safety
• Traffic congestion, leasing to noise and carbon emissions
• Concern at height of proposed buildings in terms of impacting upon broadband speeds.
• Broadband speeds are already slow
• Overlooking
• Noise and disturbance
• Proposal would lead to hedgerow deterioration
• Not consistent with the agreed parameter plan on the outline approval
• Ecology report should be revisited, could result in harm to wildlife including protected species
• Loss of habitat
• Layout is too dense and based around a cul de sac
• Loss of countryside views
• Overbearing and oppressive
• Footpath onto Hill Road should be revisited
• Change character of the village
• Location has no complete pedestrian routes
• Devaluation of properties
• Detrimental impact on infrastructure of village i.e. school is full and oversubscribed,
• Walking and cycling routes around Spooner row are precarious
• Will cause mud on the road
• Trees to southern boundary of Bunwell Road are under the control of neighbouring property.

4 Assessment

Site description

4.1 Spooner Row is a village consisting of several clusters of development. The A11 is to the west and north and the railway line dissects the village. Wymondham is approximately 3 miles to the north.

4.2 The planning application is divided into two parcels of land which have a cumulative area of 2.58 ha. One site is located to the east of Chapel Road and the other is located to the east of Bunwell Road/Hill Road, both sites are agricultural land of grade 3 quality. Both sites are under the ownership of one individual.

4.3 The Chapel Road site is within the northern part of Spooner Row and has residential development to its south and west, these have mostly been developed in a linear fashion. The northern and eastern areas of the site are bordered by open fields with a hedge running along the eastern boundary, save for field access points. There is no other significant vegetation within the site.

4.4 The northern part of Spooner Row has no dominant character with each period of development adopting its own style. This has resulted in the southern aspect of the cluster being predominately detached bungalows and the northern aspect, which is directly opposite the site, being two storey ex-local authority semi-detached dwellings. All of the dwellings in this cluster appear to have large garden grounds and off road parking.

4.5 To the rear of the local authority built dwellings (7 Chapel Road) is a sewage treatment works which provides service for the local authority dwellings. The existing sewage works is accessible only via foot. This sewage works forms part of the Council’s Sewage Works Improvement Programme, where the Council are seeking to upgrade its works to meet the
requirements of Anglian Water. The aim of this programme is for Anglian Water to take adoption of the works and become the provider.

4.6 The row of ex-local authority properties on the western side of Chapel Road amount to 12 dwellings. These dwellings were transferred to Saffron Housing and subsequently only four of them are still in the ownership of Saffron (No's 9, 11, 13 and 18).

4.7 The Bunwell Road site is to the south of the central cluster of development within Spooner Row. The site provides for 3 ha of the overall application site area. The frontage of the site addresses both Bunwell Road and Hill Road. To the east are open fields and to the north and south are residential properties. The opposite eastern side of the road contains open fields and a Grade II listed property which has had a two storey extension, link building and conversion of a garage approved and implemented.

4.8 The dwellings to the north of the Bunwell Road site are semi-detached ex-local authority style houses and those to the south are a mixture of traditional cottages and new build bungalows.

4.9 The majority of the frontage of the site has a hedgerow and there is no other significant vegetation associated with the site. The site contains in its north eastern corner an area of flood risk zone 3.

Proposal

4.10 The application seeks full planning permission for 30 dwellings in the total, with 13 on the Chapel Road site and 17 on the Bunwell Road site

4.11 These consist of the following:

Chapel Road (0.69ha)

5 x 1 bedroom houses
5 x 2 bedroom houses
2 x 3 bedroom houses
2 x 3 bedroom bungalows

All of the above are to be affordable units

Bunwell Road (1.89ha)

2 x 5 bedroom houses
11 x 4 bedroom houses
2 x bedroom houses
2 3 bedroom bungalows

All of the above are to be open market units

It should be noted that there are 8 dwellings on Bunwell Road site and 1 on the Chapel Road site which are being built out under an approved reserved matters scheme (2014/2472) and as such these are not assessed as part of this application.

Key Planning Issues

4.12 Both parcels of land are within development boundary for Spooner Row, with the Chapel Road site covered by allocation SPO1, and as such the principle of residential development is acceptable on both sites, as demonstrated by the previous outline approval for both parcels of land.
4.13 Given that the principle of development is established. The following is an assessment of the particular merits of the scheme:

Chapel Road

4.14 By way of background, it was agreed under the previous outline approval that it was appropriate when considering the two parcels of land under one application to have the necessary affordable housing contribution on a single parcel of land, and the present scheme continues to follow this strategy. This is considered appropriate insofar as the increased number of affordable properties in a single location (13) is not considered an overconcentration into a single location. The total number of affordable units put forward (13) in the context of the total number of dwellings proposed by this application and the 9 being built out under reserved matters approval 2014/2472 represents 33%, this satisfies the requirements of Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy.

4.15 The linear arrangement of the proposed scheme is consistent with the locality, as demonstrated immediately opposite the site, and that previously approved for the site under 2014/2472. The design of the units proposed are considered appropriate for the locality, with the affordable units employing building detailing such as header courses and detailing to the porches. It should also be noted that the materials proposed for these units are consistent with those previously agreed for the site.

4.16 In terms of neighbour amenity, the proposals would have adequate regard for existing neighbouring residents by virtue of the separation distances between new and existing and having regard to the positioning of windows within the new dwellings. It is also evident that the new dwellings are positioned in relation to one another so as to avoid any significant issues being caused between future residents.

4.17 In terms of highway safety, the access arrangements are acceptable in principle, the Highway Authority has requested some minor revisions which the developer has sought to address through amended plans. The further comments of the Highway Authority will be reported to the Development Management Committee.

4.18 The Council’s Landscape Architect has confirmed that they have no objections to the scheme, although final comments on amended plans will be reported to the committee.

4.19 With regard to surface water drainage matters, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has raised an objection to the proposal. Consequently, additional information has been submitted and the LLFA’s views are awaited.

4.20 The County ecologist had remarked that the ecology report should be updated given the passage of time since it was undertaken. The applicant was made aware of this request and a further response has been provided and the Council’s ecologist is satisfied that the proposal is acceptable subject to the requirements of the report being conditioned. This is considered acceptable.

Bunwell Road

4.21 By way of background, a reserved matters application for this site was submitted under 2014/2472, however, it was considered by officers at the time that it could not be taken forward at point because it directly conflicted with the requirements of condition 4 of 2012/2016 which required any reserved matters to be "substantially in accordance with the parameter plans".

4.22 Consequently, the extent of the reserved matters application was reduced to exclude the part of the site layout which was not in accordance with the parameter plan and reserved matters was duly granted for 8 dwellings at Bunwell Road which are presently being built.
4.23 The current proposal is a full application and therefore is not bound by the requirements of the conditions included within the outline approval, including condition 4 of 2012/2016 (as referred to above). On this basis it is necessary to assess the merits of the current application without direct reference to the requirements of the outline application.

4.24 The layout is different to that envisaged under the masterplan referred to in the outline approval, however, the scheme continues to follow broadly the concept of proving a large open space/green at the front of the site. It should also be noted that the open space now proposed continues to comply with the Council’s open space standards. The layout as proposed is considered to be an acceptable one in this particular context. Likewise, the dwelling types are consistent with those approved under the adjacent reserved matters approval and would satisfactorily reflect this edge of village locality.

4.25 In terms of neighbour amenity, the proposals would have adequate regard for existing neighbouring residents by virtue of the separation distances between new and existing and having regard to the positioning of windows in the new dwellings. It is also evident that the new dwellings are positioned in relation to one another so as to any significant being caused between future residents of the two proposed sites.

4.26 The immediate neighbour to the south (Gladern) has mature vegetation between it and the application site. It is acknowledged that it important to secure a suitable boundary treatment here to not only secure adequate privacy levels but also to avoid unnecessary harm being caused to the vegetation. There is some uncertainty over the ownership of this boundary, however, notwithstanding this, the applicant is conscious of this and is agreeable to a suitable boundary treatment to fulfil the above requirements. Condition 5 of the suggested conditions would secure this.

4.27 In terms of highway safety, the access arrangements are consistent with those agreed under the outline approval, Norfolk County Council in their capacity as Highway Authority, has no objection in principle to the proposal, however, some revisions are required. Amended plans have been received and the further comments of the Highway Authority will be reported to the Development Management Committee.

4.28 As above, officers are awaited the views of the LLFA in respect of the additional information submitted.

4.29 As with the above site, the ecologist has confirmed that subject to a condition the application is considered acceptable.

4.30 The Council’s Landscape Architect has raised some concern about potential shading to plots 16 and 17 and the possibility of revisions to the layout. The applicant is aware of this request and the amended plans have slightly revised the position of the dwellings on plots 15, 16 and 17 so as to move them away from the trees and increase the size of the gardens to each plot. The Council’s Landscape Architect’s further comments on these revisions re-affirm that shading would occur. On this issue, officers consider that on the basis of the plans submitted it would not envisage that the size and shape of the gardens to plots 15, 16 and 17 would not be so compromised by the adjacent trees so as to render them so un-useable and not be considered a reasonable private amenity space to accompany the dwellings, and therefore justify a reason for refusal.

Other matters

4.31 Conditions are recommended for the reporting of unknown contamination, renewable energy and water efficiency to ensure the proposals comply with the above listed policies.
4.32 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

4.33 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

5 Conclusion

5.1 The sites lie within the development limit and as such the principle of residential development is acceptable as demonstrated by the historic approvals on the site. The scheme provides policy compliant levels of affordable housing and the layouts and house types are considered appropriate to their edge of village locations and would safeguard neighbour amenity. It is considered that subject to positive confirmation from the outstanding consultee responses in respect of drainage and highway matters the scheme is acceptable subject to conditions and a S106 legal agreement.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Raine 01508 533841 craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No**: 2016/2388/F  
**Parish**: PORINGLAND

**Applicants Name**: Mr Sean Marten (David Wilson Homes, Eastern Counties)  
**Site Address**: Land North Of Stoke Road Poringland Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Full planning application for up to 120 dwellings (Phase 2), senior recreation space, children's plays space and associated infrastructure.

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1. Time limit full permission  
2. In accordance with plans  
3. Standard highways conditions  
4. Future management and maintenance of roads  
5. Details of construction of roads and footways  
6. Construction worker parking  
7. Materials to be agreed  
8. Surface water drainage scheme  
9. Foul water drainage strategy  
10. Fire hydrant to be provided  
11. Landscaping scheme and management plan  
12. Biodiversity Management Plan to be submitted  
13. Contaminated land  
14. Construction management plan  
15. Programme of archaeological mitigation work  
16. Renewable energy  
17. Water efficiency

Subject to completion of S106 agreement to secure affordable housing.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 5: The Economy  
Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 14: Key Service Centres  
Policy 20: Implementation
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM3.8 : Design principles
DM3.10 : Promotion of sustainable transport
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM3.14 : Pollution, health and safety
DM3.15 : Outdoor play facilities/recreational space
DM3.16 : Improving level of community facilities
DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.3 : Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
POR 1 : Land at Heath Farm

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas:

S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”

2. Planning History

2.1 2014/0732 Reserved Matters application for 150 dwellings and associated appearance. Approval is sought for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. Approved

2.2 2013/0505 Outline application for up to 100 dwellings with all matters reserved except for access on land to the west of Norwich Road and north of Stoke Road, Poringland Approved

2.3 2013/1986 Outline application with all matters reserved except for access for the construction of up to 150 dwellings and associated infrastructure Approved

2.4 2013/0506 Full application for 150 dwellings and associated infrastructure Refused
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council
Object
- Not given sufficient consideration to the downstream impact of the development
- Inappropriate to site all social housing in one or two areas
- Impact on neighbouring properties on Stoke Road remains a concern.
- If approved better enforcement of planning conditions

3.2 District Members
- Councillor Overton - Determine at Committee. Concerns regarding surface water drainage.
- Councillor Neal - Concerns regarding surface water flooding.

3.3 SNC Senior Conservation and Design Officer
No objection
- The applicant has adequately addressed or provided reasoning in response to my previous comments.

3.4 NCC Ecologist
No objection
- Supports recommendations with regard to mitigation and enhancement.
- Recommends a Biodiversity Management Plan is conditioned.

3.5 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team
No objection
- Recommends conditions being attached to any consent.

3.6 NCC Highways
No objection
- Recommends conditions being attached to any consent.

3.7 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy
No objection
- Welcomes the provision of 2 wheelchair accessible bungalows and that as a result of the developer agreeing to deliver these, 32% of the total number of dwellings to be affordable is acceptable.
- Accepts the principle of Discounted Market Sales units and agrees that the mechanisms proposed for a self-policing approach to ensure that the units remain affordable in perpetuity are acceptable, subject to the completion of the S106 agreement.
- Reservations about the design of the two and three bedroom houses, which are smaller than the usual size. However, acknowledges that they are acceptable to a number of housing associations and as such accepts that these designs can meet need for affordable home ownership through intermediate tenures and as such meet the definition of affordable homes in the NPPF and JCS.

3.8 Anglian Water Services Ltd
No objection
- The proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets and as such, are unable to provide comments on the suitability of the surface water management.
- The water recycling centre at present has available capacity for the proposed flows. Recommends that a foul water strategy is conditioned as part of any approval.

3.9  **NCC Lead Local Flood Authority**  
No objection  
- Confirms that following amendments, the revised drainage strategy addresses the concerns raised in their previous responses.  
- The FRA has been updated in response to the concerns raised by the Parish Council and local residents.  
- Recommends conditions being attached to any consent to provide further details of the surface water drainage scheme as well as a maintenance and management plan setting out the activities required and details of who will adopt and maintain all the surface water drainage features for the lifetime of the development.

3.10  **NHS England**  
No comments received

3.11  **Historic Environment Service**  
No objection  
- Identifies a heritage asset is on the site, in the form of the remains of the ‘buried reserve’ structure associated with the nearby Second World War Stoke Holy Cross radar station.  
- Recommends that an archaeological written scheme of investigation is carried out and approved by the local planning authority in writing prior to development taking place as well as a programme of archaeological mitigation in consultation with the Historic Environment Service.

3.12  **Norfolk Wildlife Trust**  
No comments received

3.13  **SNC Landscape Architect**  
No objection  
- The revised scheme addresses previous concerns.  
- Recommends conditions for a landscape scheme, landscape management plan, tree protection plan and retention of trees and hedges to be submitted.

3.14  **NCC Minerals And Waste Planning Officer**  
No objection  
- The evidence available indicates that an economically viable resource of a safeguarded mineral does not occur on this site.

3.15  **Police Architectural Liaison Officer**  
No objections  
- Recommends that trees to be kept away from footpaths and that planting should not screen of natural surveillance to children’s play space and surveillance across parking bays by active rooms.

3.16  **GP Surgery**  
No comments received

3.17  **Ministry of Defence**  
No objections

3.18  **Richard Bacon MP**  
Concerns raised over flood issues around Phase 1 of the development will be exacerbated by Phase 2. Considers that Phase 2 is premature given the outstanding drainage issues in the immediate area.
3.19 Representations

13 letters of objection received, summarised as follows:

- Significant drainage and flooding concerns
- Too many houses already built in area
- Increase of traffic, sewage, patients at doctors and class size at schools
- Loss of habitat for wildlife
- Loss of privacy
- Lack of bungalows
- Position of social housing unacceptable
- Poor design of properties

4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The site is located in Poringland and forms part of a larger site which is allocated for residential development in the adopted Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD (POR 1: Land at Heath Farm). The application site benefits from an outline planning permission for 100 dwellings, which was granted permission in April 2014 Ref: 2013/0505.

4.2 The whole area allocated for development is 15 hectares. The application site forms only part of that wider site, with an area of 5.4 Ha. The site currently comprises a single field bounded by existing residential development to the east and south. The south eastern corner of the site is immediately adjacent to Old Mill Doctor’s Surgery and associated car park.

4.3 The land immediately to the north of the application site forms the remainder of the site allocation and was granted planning permission in 2014 (ref 2014/0732) for 150 dwellings and is currently under construction.

The application

4.4 The application is a full planning application and seeks approval for all matters including access, parking and associated infrastructure.

4.5 The application proposes the erection of 120 dwellings. Of these, 38 dwellings will be provided as affordable units (32%). As agreed with Planning and Housing Officer the regular 33% affordable requirement has fallen to 32% as a result of the developer agreeing to deliver two fully wheelchair accessible bungalows as part of the affordable housing provision.

These consist of:

Open market housing
- 16 x 3 bedroom houses (2 storey)
- 37 x 4 bedroom houses (2 storey)
- 29 x 5 bedroom houses (2 storey)

Affordable housing
- 10 x 1 bedroom maisonettes (2 storey)
- 2 x 2 bedroom bungalows (1 storey)
- 14 x 2 bedroom houses (2 storey)
- 12 x 3 bedroom houses (2 storey)

The main issues for consideration of this application are addressed below.
Principle of development

4.6 Policy 14 of the JCS identifies Poringland/Framingham Earl as a Key Service Centre in which land will be allocated for small-scale housing growth within the range of 100-200 dwellings, between April 2008 and March 2026, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

4.7 Policy POR1 sets out the requirements for development of the site and this is set out below:

4.8 Land amounting to some 15.3 hectares is allocated for housing and associated infrastructure. This allocation could accommodate approximately 200 dwellings, distributed to the north and the south of the site, separated by open space which will contribute towards Sustainable Urban Drainage schemes.

4.9 The policy requires the developer of the site to ensure the following:

- Suitable vehicular access onto Caistor Lane and Stoke Road, with pedestrian access to enable access to the school via Norwich Road
- Site layout takes account of trees at the boundary protected through TPOs and water mains which cross the site
- There should be sensitive treatment of the western boundary facing the wider landscape and the design should incorporate existing hedgerows and blocks of mature trees within the site design
- The existing arrangement for surface water to drain through an open water course behind properties on Norwich Road and Caistor Lane will need to be formalised with suitable maintenance arrangements put in place
- A full drainage assessment should be carried out prior to development, including on-site and off-site flood risk
- Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place
- Historic Environment Record to be consulted to determine any need for archaeological surveys prior to development
- Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 applies, as this site is underlain by safeguarded mineral resources

4.10 The application site comprises of 120 dwellings on the remaining residential allocation in policy POR1 of the site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD and as such the principle of new residential development on this site is consistent with the aims of policy DM1.3 which seeks to permit new housing within a development boundary.

4.11 Members should note that the overall numbers of dwellings proposed across the entire allocation is in excess of the 100-200 houses in Key Service Centres identified in the Joint Core Strategy. However in considering whether this resultant effect on total numbers of dwellings, other material considerations must also be taken into account.

4.12 Part 1 of Policy DM1.3 states that new development should be located so that it positively contributes to the sustainable development. The policy seeks development to be on allocated sites and of a scale proportionate to the level of growth planned in that location, and the role and function of the Settlement within which it is located. The scheme proposed meets the requirements of this policy.

4.13 Paragraph 58 of the NPPF requires that planning decisions should aim to ensure that development, amongst other things:

- Optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks;
4.14 In terms of para 58, providing 120 dwellings on the site whilst still having an average density of approximately 22dph ensuring the efficient use of land, which is reflective of the scale of the local area.

4.15 In summary, whilst the number of dwellings proposed is greater than the approximate figure contained within the allocation, it is considered, that in principle, providing 120 dwellings in this location which is a key service centre is, in principle, acceptable, subject to the scheme satisfying the stated criterion set out within the allocation and all relevant planning policies in respect of matters such as design, neighbour amenity, highway safety etc. An assessment of the scheme, against the above is as follows:

4.16 The first criterion within the allocation requires:

- Suitable vehicular access onto Caistor Lane and Stoke Road, with pedestrian access to enable access to the school via Norwich Road

The Highway Authority has no objection to the access arrangements provided subject to conditions and as such the criterion relating to access is satisfied.

4.17 The second criterion requires:

- Site layout takes account of trees at the boundary protected through TPOs and water mains which cross the site.

The scheme proposes to retain trees protected through TPOs along the boundaries of the site and has been developed to take into account the water mains that cross the site. The Council’s landscape architect has confirmed that this is an acceptable approach in this locality, subject to conditions. For this reason the second criterion has been satisfied.

4.18 The third criterion requires:

- Sensitive treatment of the western boundary facing the wider landscape, which should incorporate existing hedgerows and blocks of mature trees within the site design.

The scheme proposes a landscape buffer along the western boundary of the site which retains the majority of existing hedgerows and trees. The buffer provides a positive transition between the development proposals and the wider landscape to the west. A ‘habitat enhancement area’ is also proposed in the south west corner of the site, which forms part of the overall drainage strategy and incorporates a drainage basin and additional landscaping in this location. For this reason the third criterion has been satisfied.

4.19 The fourth criterion requires:

- The existing arrangement for surface water to drain through an open water course behind properties on Norwich Road and Caistor Lane to be formalised with suitable maintenance arrangements put in place.

The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have confirmed that the arrangements for surface water are acceptable and that the management and maintenance arrangements detailing who will adopt and maintain the surface water drainage features will be secured by a condition prior to commencement of development to ensure that the arrangements for surface water are satisfactorily managed and maintained. With regards to phase 1, the surface water arrangements have been discussed with the LLFA and the relevant conditions were being discharged imminently at the time of this report being written. For this reason the fourth criterion has been satisfied.
4.20 The fifth criterion requires:

- A full drainage assessment should be carried out prior to development, including on-site and off-site flood risk.

A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and a Drainage Strategy has been prepared by the applicant, which includes details of on-site and off-site flood risk. The LLFA has carried out a detailed assessment of the information submitted and is satisfied that it provides sufficient detail of both on-site and off-site flood risk. For this reason the fifth criterion has been satisfied.

4.21 The sixth criterion requires:

- Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place.

A Statements and Conditions Report has been prepared by Anglian Water which confirms that the water recycling centre at present has available capacity for the proposed flows. A development impact assessment has also been prepared in consultation with Anglian Water to determine a feasible mitigation solution to the risk of wastewater flooding downstream. Anglian Water has requested a condition requiring compliance with the agreed drainage strategy to ensure that there is no unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. It is recommended that this condition be applied to the application should permission be granted. For this reason this criterion has been satisfied.

4.22 The seventh criterion requires:

- Historic Environment Record to be consulted to determine any need for archaeological surveys prior to development.

The Historic Environment Service has been consulted and identified a heritage asset on the site, in the form of the remains of the ‘buried reserve’ structure associated with the nearby Second World War Stoke Holy Cross radar station. Although the heritage asset will not be directly affected by the proposed development, increased accessibility to the site will potentially place it at risk of damage through vandalism and attempts to gain entry. In view of both of these issues mitigation measures have been recommended to ensure that the heritage asset is made safe and also that it is preserved and presented in a manner that ensures local residents are aware of the significance of the visible surface remains. If planning permission is granted, it is recommended that an archaeological written scheme of investigation is carried out and approved by the local planning authority in writing prior to development taking place as well as a programme of archaeological mitigation work carried out in consultation with the Historic Environment Service.

The proposed development site has also previously been subject to an archaeological trial trenching evaluation. Based on the results of the trial trenching no other archaeological work (aside from the mitigatory work associated with the radar station remains) is required within the area of the proposed residential development. Subject to the conditions recommended by the Historic Environment Service, the seventh criterion has been satisfied.

4.23 The final criterion requires:

- Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 applies, as this site is underlain by safeguarded mineral resources

Having established that Core Strategy Policy CS16 is applicable, the applicant has submitted a Geo-environmental report that demonstrates that the nature of the made ground across the site would mean that it would not be practicable for prior mineral
extraction to take place. The evidence available indicates that an economically viable resource of a safeguarded mineral does not occur on this site, and the proposed development therefore will not sterilise a mineral resource. For this reason the final criterion has been satisfied.

In terms of the eight stated criterion, it is considered that the scheme has satisfied all of these requirements.

Given the contents of paragraph 49 of the NPPF it is necessary to determine whether the scheme represents sustainable development having regards to the content of the NPPF.

Sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. The NPPF goes on to stress in paragraph 8 that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.

The assessment is undertaken having regard to the three roles expressed within the NPPF, and which have been reiterated in policies DM1.1 and DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of each role also draws upon the relevant local plan policy where relevant.

Economic Role

4.24 The NPPF highlights the economic role as:

"contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation: and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure."

The scheme would result in some short term economic benefits as part of any construction work and in the longer term by local spending from the future occupants. In summary it is considered that the scheme would bring forward a level of economic benefit.

Social Role

4.25 The NPPF confirms the social role as:

“supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations: and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being.”

4.26 Given that the site is allocated it is evident that this site is clearly part of the Council’s strategy for meeting housing need within the district and as such would contribute to the stated social aim of the NPPF to provide the supply of housing to meet present and future need.

4.27 The social role highlights the need for housing to have access to a range of accessible local services. Poringland/Framingham is identified as a Key Service Centre and defined as having good access to a wide range of facilities and services. The site is also well located in relation to Framingham Earl high school, the Old Mill GP Surgery and regular bus services.
4.28 In terms of the future capacity of educational facilities within the catchment area of the development which include primary and secondary schools, it has been confirmed that there is currently a shortfall of school spaces, however it is acknowledged that additional spaces could be met by providing additional class rooms, improving/re-modelling existing class space etc and that these works would be funded through CIL as this is covered on the District Council’s Regulation 123 list. Therefore there is no objection in terms of school capacity.

4.29 In summary, Policy 14 of the JCS, identifies Poringland/Framingham Earl as a Key Service Centre having access to a good level of services and facilities. It is considered that a lack of capacity of educational facilities does not result in a scheme which does not fulfil the social role in the context of the NPPF and provides an attractive scheme for future residents. It is therefore considered that the scheme meets the social role of the NPPF.

Environmental Role

4.30 The NPPF confirms the environmental role as:

"contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment: and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy."

Layout, appearance and scale

4.31 The environmental role also seeks to secure a high quality built environment. The site layout and house types have been subject to a detailed assessment by the Senior Conservation and Design Officer following discussions with the applicant.

4.32 In considering the overall scale and layout of the development, regard should be given to the density and form of existing development in Poringland and the adjacent site. The proposed housing development would comprise a mix of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bedroom properties. These would include a combination of two storey detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings. Two bungalows are also proposed on east boundary of the site. The scale of the proposed development is considered to be appropriate for its context.

4.33 With regards to the overall design of the site it is considered that the creation of a simple layout around an open space helps provide clear and legible routes across the site. The overall layout and design of the proposed development is therefore considered acceptable.

4.34 House types have been considered in the context of the wider surroundings to help reinforce and enhance the character of the proposals. The house types use traditional forms and materials, yet have a distinctive appearance. A variety of materials are proposed including red and yellow brick, render, pantiles and white uPVC fenestration. These are varied across the site and help to distinguish and define those areas.

4.35 Having assessed the overall scale and form of development it is considered that the proposed scheme would respect the existing character and arrangement of development as well as providing an acceptable transition of development to the open farmland to the west of the site.

4.36 With regard to bin storage, each dwelling has a dedicated and secure bin storage area within its rear garden for both convenience to the householder and to avoid any visual detriment to the external street scene. Where properties are terraced, adequate rear access has been provided in all cases. Travel distances between bin storage areas and the designated collection points have been carefully planned within Norfolk County Council guidelines. Generally, all external private gardens have been carefully planned in terms of...
their size and shape to ensure adequate external storage can easily be accommodated. Provision for cycle storage is provided in garages and rear gardens.

4.37 Overall, it is considered that the amended scheme has been well thought out and results in a development with a locally inspired character that relates positively to its surroundings and Poringland. Information has also been submitted that demonstrates how the proposals comply with the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide design.

4.38 It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS, section 7 of the NPPS and policy DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD have been met.

Residential amenity

4.39 Safeguarding residential amenity is also considered to be part of securing a high quality built environment.

4.40 With regards to the amenity of nearby residential properties, the development site sits to the rear and side of properties which front on to Greenacres Drive, Clearview Drive, Highgrove Court and Stoke Road. These properties are largely characterised by detached bungalows/chalet bungalows and semi-detached properties, within reasonably sized gardens. The layout of the proposed development along both the eastern and southern boundary addresses the relationship with those properties with a natural buffer of between approx. 3m and 6m respectively, which consists of existing and proposed landscaping. All properties are proposed with private gardens to the rear, separating both the proposed and existing houses from one another with good separation distances where back-to-back or side-to-side relationships are proposed. As such it is considered that the distances achieved, coupled with the retention of and further planting of landscaping along the boundaries would ensure that no significantly adverse impact on the amenities of those existing or proposed properties would result.

4.41 In terms of the existing doctor’s surgery located to the southeast of the development site, the layout proposes good separation distances between the properties to the north and the west of the surgery which side and front onto the doctors surgery. Having assessed the proposals it is considered that the relationship between the existing surgery and the proposed properties, are adequate to safeguard amenity levels of existing and future occupiers.

4.42 It is therefore considered that the proposal satisfies policy requirements in respect of Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and DM3.14 of the Development Management Policy Document.

Public Open Space and Landscaping

4.43 1.1 hectares is proposed for open space on the site. This is largely located to the north of the site with a small number of informal open space areas within the development including an area of open space, children’s play area and surface water drainage ponds. The area to the north forms part of the larger site with linked open space on Phase 1.

4.44 In respect to landscaping, a landscape masterplan has been submitted with the application. This indicates that existing trees and hedging along the boundaries of the site are largely to be retained with further landscaping proposed. The scheme proposes a landscape buffer along the western boundary of the site which retains the majority of existing hedgerows and trees. The buffer provides a positive transition between the development proposals and the wider landscape to the west.
4.45 The Landscape Architect has confirmed that he has no objections to the proposals and that the general approach to the landscaping is acceptable, subject to a detailed landscaping and management scheme and tree protection measures, to ensure that existing trees are maintained in good condition during construction. Therefore subject to conditions it is considered that the scheme would accord with the aims of Policy DM3.15, DM4.8 and DM4.9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, JCS Policies 1 and 2 and section 11 of the NPPF.

Ecology and Protected Species

4.46 This application has been supported by an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey which has been assessed by Norfolk County Council Natural Environment Team. The assessment concludes that the proposed development is likely to have a limited impact on protected habitats and species. However, it does state that there is potential for biodiversity enhancement, which could be implemented. As such it is recommended that a Biodiversity Management Plan is conditioned which commits to the recommendations made in the aforementioned report, and also details biodiversity enhancements for the site. The County Ecologist has confirmed that the proposals are acceptable subject to the imposition of the above condition.

Heritage assets

4.47 As noted above, the Historic Environment Service has been consulted and identified a heritage asset on the site, in the form of the remains of the ‘buried reserve’ structure associated with the nearby Second World War Stoke Holy Cross radar station. Although the heritage asset will not be directly affected by the proposed development, increased accessibility to the site will potentially place it at risk of damage through vandalism and attempts to gain entry. In view of both of these issues mitigation measures have been recommended to ensure that the heritage asset is made safe and also that it is preserved and presented in a manner that ensures local residents are aware of the significance of the visible surface remains. If planning permission is granted, it is recommended that an archaeological written scheme of investigation is carried out and approved by the local planning authority in writing prior to development taking place as well as a programme of archaeological mitigation work carried out in consultation with the Historic Environment Service. Therefore subject to these conditions it is not considered that the proposal would result in any harm to the significance of heritage assets and would accord with the Development Plan.

4.48 The proposed development site has also previously been subject to an archaeological trial trenching evaluation. Based on the results of the trial trenching no other archaeological work (aside from the mitigatory work associated with the radar station remains) is required within the area of the proposed residential development. Subject to the conditions recommended by the Historic Environment Service, the seventh criterion has been satisfied.

4.49 In addition to the Development Plan policies, S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In consideration of the Council’s duties under those Acts it is considered, for the reasons set out above, that the proposal would not adversely affect the special architectural or historic interest of the heritage asset, which is not listed.

4.50 In terms of the environmental role, on balance it is considered that the scheme fulfils this requirement.
4.51 Having due regard to the above assessment in relation to sustainable development it is considered that this higher number of dwellings proposed is acceptable in this instance and will not result in any adverse impact that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of delivering housing on this allocated site. It is therefore considered to accord with the requirements of the NPPF and also 1 b) of Policy DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and JCS.

Other issues

Affordable housing

4.52 With regards to the affordable housing provision, Policy 4 of the JCS requires 33% of the total number of units to be affordable, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not viable to do so. In this instance the scheme proposes that 32% of the total number of dwellings are affordable as a result of the developer agreeing to deliver two fully wheelchair accessible bungalows as part of the affordable housing provision. The Council’s Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer has agreed that this is acceptable and welcomes the provision of 2 wheelchair accessible bungalows.

4.53 Members should note that as part of the tenure type being proposed, the developers are proposing that 6 of the 36 affordable units proposed are Discounted Market Sales units (DMSs). These are units that will be provided for sale at a price which is 25% less than the Open Market Value.

4.54 Having taken legal advice on this, it is accepted that DMSs meet the definition of an affordable unit under the NPPF and that it can remain as such in perpetuity, provided it meets certain mechanisms built into the S106. As such mechanisms are proposed in the S106 to ensure that the tenure type remains affordable in perpetuity through a self-policing mechanism.

4.55 In considering this, Members should note that there are risks associated with this approach that if conveyancers do not follow the requirements of the legal agreement then the units may not remain in perpetuity on second or subsequent resales. If we were to be more risk adverse to ensure these units remain affordable in perpetuity the likely requirement would be the Council policing this agreement through assessing eligibility of all future resales for these units. We are not proposing this route, instead having a self-policing S106 agreement which agrees the eligibility criteria through the legal agreement.

4.56 In summary, whilst it is acknowledged that there are some risks associated with this approach, Members should note that the scheme is policy compliant and there would be no future administrative burden to the Council.

4.57 The Council’s Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer has confirmed that the principle of accepting DMSs and the mechanisms proposed for a self-policing approach to ensure that the units remain affordable in perpetuity is acceptable, subject to the completion of the S106 agreement.

Design and layout of affordable homes

4.58 The Council’s Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer has confirmed that the internal floorspace and layout of the one bedroom maisonettes and two bedroom wheelchair bungalows are acceptable. However he has raised reservations about the design of the two and three bedroom houses that are smaller than the usual size, but acknowledges that they are designed with a dining/living room rather than a kitchen/diner which makes them acceptable in principle to some housing associations. The applicant has provided evidence that the designs are acceptable in principle to two locally-active associations and that they would be willing to accept them on this basis. As such the Council’s Housing Enabling and
Strategy Officer has accepted that these designs can meet need for affordable home ownership through intermediate tenures and as such meet the definition of affordable homes in the NPPF and JCS, and Officers agree with this view.

4.59 With regards to the location of affordable housing, this should be mixed within the development to create a balanced community. The application submitted has separated the affordable units into two main areas. 19 are located in the south-west corner of the site and the remaining 19 are located further north and more centrally within the site adjacent to an open space. Within each of the clusters of affordable homes 11 of those units are also proposed as intermediate tenure. Given that the affordable units have been dispersed, officers consider that the distribution of the affordable units as proposed is acceptable and accords with the Development Plan.

Surface water drainage

4.60 A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Drainage Strategy based on the previous work carried out at the outline planning stage have been submitted with the application. Further detailed information has also been provided regarding investigation into the potential use of surface water infiltration on the site and measures to control drainage within the site and also to improve the existing drainage problems for local residents whereby the poorly maintained drainage ditches surrounding the site have led to localised flooding events. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has carried out a detailed assessment of the information submitted and has subsequently confirmed that following amendments, the revised drainage strategy addresses the concerns raised in their previous responses. The FRA has also been updated in response to the concerns raised by the Parish Council and local residents.

4.61 Subsequently a package of measures has been proposed that includes a number of features which will reduce the rate of flow into the wider system and provide additional on-site surface water storage elements, such as swales, attenuation ponds and tanks, storage within permeable paving surfaces (which are tanked) and flow control devices at strategic points around the site to ensure the storage is used efficiently across the entire development.

4.62 With regards to concerns raised locally about Boundary Way, it is noted that the historic flooding to the Boundary Lane is caused by the Boundary Lane development itself displacing an area of flood plain and issues in the design of its own surface water sewers. The proposed drainage strategy introduces measures upstream of Boundary Lane that will alleviate off-site impact currently contributed to by the application site.

4.63 At present, the proposed sites overland surface water discharges into the western ditch due to the nature of the topography and without control or attenuation therefore contributing to flooding downstream and causing extra pressure on the existing system even more so during and after a major storm event. The proposals are to discharge to the same catchment area, however at runoff rates that are lower than the existing Greenfield rate, which will be physically controlled and attenuated to hold back any additional flows from all storm events so that no disruption is caused on or off-site due to the construction of this Phase. The LLFA has confirmed that this approach is acceptable.

4.64 As depicted in the drainage strategy there is an opportunity to infiltrate an amount of runoff which would help replicate the existing situation. This runoff will come from some of the roofs and the total amount that is able to be infiltrated will need to be confirmed as part of the detailed design stage. Subject to conditions recommended by the LLFA, to provide further details of the surface water drainage scheme as well as a maintenance and management plan, setting out the activities required and details of who will adopt and maintain all the surface water drainage features for the lifetime of the development, the surface water strategy is considered acceptable and to accord with NPPF paragraph 103 and 109 and JCS Policy 1.
Foul water

4.65 The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Poringland Water Recycling Centre. A Statements and Conditions Report has been prepared by Anglian Water which confirms that the water recycling centre at present has available capacity for the proposed flows. A development impact assessment has also been prepared in consultation with Anglian Water to determine a feasible mitigation solution to the risk of wastewater flooding downstream. Anglian Water has requested a condition requiring compliance with the agreed drainage strategy to ensure that there is no unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. It is recommended that this condition be applied to the application should permission be granted. Therefore subject to conditions, the impacts on the foul water are considered acceptable and accords with Policy 1 of the JCS.

Access and Highways

4.66 Access into the site is proposed from Stoke Road located in the south-east corner of the site. Off-site highway works required to make the development acceptable were secured at outline stage. These included improvements to Caistor Lane and the provision of a footway from the development to Norwich Road; enhancements to the walk to school route including the installation of a Toucan crossing on Norwich Road in the vicinity of the High School and enhancements to the bus stops on Norwich Road by making them DDA compliant and by providing shelters.

4.67 The Highway Authority has carried out an assessment of the proposed access arrangements and has confirmed that they have no objections subject to conditions. As such it is considered that the proposals accord with Policy DM3.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.68 In terms of car parking, this is proposed in a variety of different forms throughout the development which include predominately on plot parking and some on-street parking. The combination of different parking types proposed ensures that the street scenes are not overly dominated by car parking and helps create varied character across the site. This has led to tandem parking in some instances, but this is required to remove cars from the street scene and is considered to be acceptable in design terms. Where on-street parking has been proposed, this has been kept to a minimum and is well overlooked and broken down with landscaping to help enhance the character of the street. The layout of the development in respect of parking is therefore on balance considered acceptable.

Crime and disorder

4.69 The Committee will note that the Police Architectural Liaison Officer has indicated that should the developer wish to achieve a ‘secured by design’ award, which is a voluntary award aimed at designing out crime in new developments, that a number of minor revisions would be required to the scheme to ensure that planting does not impede natural surveillance and that properties provide better natural surveillance from active rooms across driveways. Since the award is voluntary and the design and layout of the development is satisfactory and achieves good levels of surveillance, the development is considered acceptable in this regard.

Contamination

4.70 Policy DM3.14 has regard to development and contamination. The Environmental Protection Officer has confirmed that they have no objections to this planning application and has recommend that any approval includes a condition or informative note that in the event contamination that was not previously identified is found, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority and a report submitted that includes results of an investigation and a risk assessment along with a remediation scheme to be
agreed and carried out. Subject to the imposition of a condition or an informative note to have regard to contamination, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and in accordance with policies DM3.14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Sustainable construction/renewable energy

4.71 Policy 1 and 3 of the JCS require the sustainable construction of buildings and water conservation in addition to requiring 10% of the predicted energy requirements to be delivered by on site decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy. Precise details and compliance with the policy will be secured by condition.

Other considerations

4.72 Under paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires Councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes. This can be a material planning where self-build has been identified as the method of delivering the site. As no indication of self-build has been given by the applicant it is considered that the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

Section 106 Agreement and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

4.73 The application is liable for CIL and a liability notice would be issued with any consent granted. A draft S106 Agreement has been prepared and should consent be granted the S106 would need to be entered into to cover Affordable Housing.

Financial Considerations

4.74 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The principle of the application is acceptable on this site allocation and is considered to represent a sustainable form of development. It is considered that the proposals as amended, results in a scheme that delivers a high quality design and layout which is well considered for its rural edge location with its own distinctive character that relates positively to its surroundings and existing dwellings. It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 1, 2, 4 and 15 of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan Policies DM1.1, DM1.3, DM1.4, DM3.1, DM3.2, DM3.8, DM3.11, DM3.12, DM3.13, DM3.14, DM3.16, DM4.2, DM4.3, DM4.8, DM4.9, DM4.10 and Policy POR1 of the Site Specifics Allocations and Policies Document have been met. All other matters are considered acceptable and subject to the imposition of conditions and a S106 obligation the application is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Watts 01508 533765 cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No**: 2016/2668/O  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

**Applicants Name**: Mountleigh Development Holdings  
**Site Address**: Old Sale Yard Cemetery Lane Wymondham Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Outline planning permission for residential development only with associated access, parking and public open space on 1.69ha of land. All matters other than means of access are reserved for consideration at a later date.

**Recommendation**: Authorise Director of Growth and Localism to Approve with Conditions

1. Time limit outline permission  
2. In accordance with plans  
3. Standard highways conditions  
4. Future management and maintenance of roads  
5. Details of construction of roads and footways  
6. Off-site highway arrangements to be agreed  
7. Construction worker parking  
8. Materials to be agreed  
9. Surface water drainage scheme  
10. Foul water drainage details to be agreed  
11. Fire hydrants to be provided  
12. Landscaping scheme and management  
13. Tree protection plan to be agreed  
14. Tree retention plan to be agreed  
15. Biodiversity Management Plan to be submitted  
16. Ecological improvements to be implemented  
17. Contaminated land scheme to be submitted  
18. Implementation of remediation scheme  
19. Contaminated land during construction  
20. Construction management plan to be submitted  
21. Renewable energy  
22. Water efficiency

Subject to no substantive new issues being raised in the remaining consultation period and the completion of S106 agreement to secure affordable housing and commuted sum for off-site older children/adult open space.

### 1. Planning Policies

#### 1.1 National Planning Policy Framework

- NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
- NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres  
- NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
- NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
- NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
- NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
- NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
- NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
- NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

#### 1.2 Joint Core Strategy

- Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
- Policy 2: Promoting good design  
- Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
Policy 5 : The Economy  
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation  
Policy 7 : Supporting Communities  
Policy 9 : Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 14 : Key Service Centres  
Policy 20 : Implementation  

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM3.10 : Promotion of sustainable transport  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM3.14 : Pollution, health and safety  
DM3.15 : Outdoor play facilities/recreational space  
DM3.16 : Improving level of community facilities  
DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows  
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets  

1.4 Wymondham Area Action Plan 2015  
Policy WYM 2  

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012  

**Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas:**  

S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”  

S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”  

2. Planning History  

2.1 2002/1143  
Redevelopment of site (64 dwellings) with residential flats and buildings for commercial use plus open space and car/coach park.  
Refused  

2.2 2003/1713  
Resubmission of NW07/02/1143/O for redevelopment of site for mixed development comprising residential & commercial (office) use, landscape riverside walkway  
Approved  

2.3 2009/0835  
Proposed mixed use development comprising 64no. dwelling units and 750 sq mtrs of commercial floor space, with associated access, parking, open space, new station car park and coach parking facilities, and related highway works.  
Refused
Development Management Committee

2.4 2012/1948

Extension of time for implementation of outline planning permission 2003/1713 - redevelopment of site for mixed development comprising residential and commercial office use and landscape riverside walkway

Approved

Appeal History

2.5 2009/0835

Proposed mixed use development comprising 64no. dwelling units and 750 sq mtrs of commercial floor space, with associated access, parking, open space, new station car park and coach parking facilities, and related highway works.

Appeal allowed

3. Consultations

3.1 Wymondham Town Council

No objection

3.2 District Member

No objection

- With this site already being designated for residential development I am happy for this application to be delegated by officers. For too long this has been a blot on the landscape of Wymondham and it is my hope that this application can be processed expeditiously.

3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd

No objection

- The water recycling centre at present has available capacity for the proposed flows. No issues are raised with regards to the water supply.

3.4 SNC Conservation And Design

No objection

- The design and layout of the development and how it relates the Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings will be considered at a future stage.

3.5 NCC Ecologist

No objection.

- The supporting Ecological Assessment has been revised and has improved explanation of impacts which gives us greater confidence in the conclusions that have been drawn.
- A Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP) should be part of any conditions included in a decision.
- The updated report describes recommendations for mitigation for biodiversity impacts relating to construction. You might wish to ensure the measures recommended for minimising impacts during construction are conditioned.

3.6 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team

No objection

- Recommends conditions that require submission of additional site investigation work and an updated and consolidated remediation method strategy and final verification report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NCC Highways</td>
<td>No objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Subject to detailed design, confirms that the access proposals are in accordance with previous comments in response to the planning application. As a consequence I would have no objection and recommend that a stage 1 safety audit is carried out based on the plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- With regards the coach parking, this is not a requirement of the County Council and as such we would not raise an objection to it not being provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>SNC Housing Enabling &amp; Strategy Manager</td>
<td>No objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Overall I feel that the affordable housing issues can be resolved satisfactorily at the Reserved Matters stage, so on this basis I have no objections to the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>NHS England</td>
<td>No objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- This development is not of a size and nature that would attract a specific Section 106 planning obligation. Therefore a proportion of the required funding for the provision of increased capacity within the existing healthcare premises servicing the residents of this development, by way of reconfiguration, refurbishment, or extension would be sought from the CIL contributions collected by the District Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Wymondham Medical Centre</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>NCC Lead Local Flood Authority</td>
<td>No objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The revised drainage strategy addresses the concerns raised in their previous responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- We understand that the Norfolk Rivers IDB has been consulted regarding the proposed discharge into the River Tiffey and that the IDB has noted the requirement for consent applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Recommends conditions, to provide confirmation of the location of the anticipated Anglian Water surface water sewer in the west of the development as well as detailed designs of a surface water drainage scheme incorporating a maintenance and management plan setting out who will adopt and maintain all the surface water drainage features for the lifetime of the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Norfolk Fire Service</td>
<td>No objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Two fire hydrants requested, to be secured by condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>SNC Landscape Architect</td>
<td>No objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>NCC Infrastructure and Economic Growth</td>
<td>No objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Contributions for the delivery of infrastructure and facilities in Wymondham, including Education, Library provision, Bus Rapid Transit, improvements to the Thickthorn junction and Green Infrastructure enhancements will be secured through CIL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.15 Wymondham Green Infrastructure Group No objection

- It is noted that an 8 metre green space buffer and footpath is proposed to be provided along the River Tiffey and the group consider that it is particularly important that this buffer between the development and the river should be high quality and adequately managed in order to enhance and maintain its ecological value.
- It is hoped that this will be progressed at reserved matters stage and the group would be keen to understand more about how this will be put into practice.

3.16 Norfolk Rivers IDB No objection

- The development will require land drainage consent which can be applied for at a later date should the proposed discharge into the River Tiffey.

3.17 NCC Minerals and Waste No objection

- Concludes that the evidence available indicates that an economically viable resource of a safeguarded mineral does not occur on this site.

3.18 Representations 9 letters of objection received and 1 letter of support, summarised as follows:

- Road and traffic safety concerns
- Increased risk of accidents and damage to parked vehicles
- Flooding concerns
- Potential impact on local wildlife due to increased water flow from redirected drainage and pollution from increased traffic
- Aesthetic concerns about a new housing development located in a historic Conservation Area of Wymondham
- Potential visual impact of housing not in keeping with existing buildings at the "gateway" to the town.
- Lack of school capacity and doctors and dental surgeries.

Letter received from the Wymondham Heritage Society raising concerns that the provision for coach parking is not being provided in the current proposal.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application seeks outline planning permission for a residential development with associated access, parking and public open space.

4.2 The application seeks to deal with the key issues of highways access and ‘residential development only’. All other matters are reserved for future consideration and will follow in subsequent Reserved Matters applications to agree an appropriate design and layout of the development and the specific number of dwellings to be provided.

4.3 The site forms part of a site which is allocated for residential and commercial development in the adopted Wymondham Area Action Plan (policy WYM2).

4.4 The original proposal included an element of commercial floorspace. This was subsequently amended by the applicants. As the allocation seeks to have a mixed use, a proposal that only includes residential development would be a departure from policy. As such a reconsultation has been undertaken to advertise the proposal as a departure, and delegated authority is sought to approve the development subject to no substantive new issues being raised.
4.5 The area allocated for development is 1.88 hectares. The application site forms the majority of the allocation with an area of 1.69 Ha. The remainder of the allocation is located immediately to the west of the site and is currently vacant undeveloped land that is in a separate private ownership.

4.6 The site itself is located on land to the west of Station Road and to the north of Cemetery Lane, Wymondham and is currently occupied by a derelict warehouse towards the Station Road frontage, and areas of hard standing and vegetation.

4.7 The northern boundary of the site is formed by the River Tiffey, beyond which is a row of houses fronting Station Road. The site’s southern boundary is formed by Cemetery Lane. On the south side of Cemetery Lane is Wymondham Railway Station, which is a Grade II Listed building along with the nearby Listed Station Cottages and Station Depot. The land immediately to the west of the site is vacant undeveloped land that is in private ownership.

4.8 Members should note that the site has been subject to previous planning applications and was allocated for redevelopment in the now replaced South Norfolk District Local Plan (2003). Outline planning permission for the redevelopment of the site was granted in 2006 (Ref: 2003/1713) and reserved matters consent in 2011 (Ref: 2009/0835). These consents were extended in 2013 by an application to extend the 2006 outline consent (Ref: 2012/1948) but have now expired.

4.9 The main issues for consideration of this application are addressed below.

Principle of development

4.10 Policy 10 of the JCS identifies Wymondham as a Main Town in the Norwich Policy Area for growth of at least 2,200 new houses, up to 20 hectares of employment land and improved services and facilities including expansion of the town centre, enhanced public transport and new education provision.

4.11 Policy WYM2 sets out the requirements for development of the site and this is set out below:

4.12 Land amounting to 1.88 hectares is allocated for mixed use development to incorporate approximately 64 dwellings and an element of commercial use.

4.13 The policy requires the developer of the site to ensure the following:

- Site to contribute to the delivery of infrastructure and facilities in Wymondham through S106 or the payment of CIL, including Education, Library and Fire Hydrant provision, Bus Rapid Transit, improvements to the Thickthorn junction and Green Infrastructure enhancements;
- Heritage statement and field evaluation may be required to assess the impact of the development on the historic environment, in particular the setting of Wymondham Abbey;
- A detailed ecological assessment. New development will be required to provide ecological links and buffers to the nearest green infrastructure, the design of which to be negotiated with South Norfolk Council and other relevant bodies to ensure adequate protection of important ecological sites and maintenance of habitat connectivity. In particular a natural grassland buffer is needed to the River Tiffey and the creation of wildlife corridors will help to link Tolls Meadow to the Lizard;
- Children’s playspace/recreation areas must be provided sufficient to meet the needs of residents of the development. The provision of older children/adult open space will need to be addressed at the time of any application;
- The design of the development must reflect its location in the Conservation Area;
- Opportunity to enhance the gateway to Wymondham and the setting of the railway station;
• Improvements to car and coach parking to be investigated;
• Improved pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre;
• Water supply network issues to be resolved;
• Satisfactory wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place;
• Water mains and sewers crossing site will require mitigation by protected easements/diversion;
• Safeguarding provisions in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 relating to investigation/prior extraction of resources will apply;
• Any potential flooding issues must be addressed/mitigated satisfactorily.

4.14 The application site comprises of the residential allocation in policy WYM2 of the Wymondham Area Action Plan (WAAP) and as such the principle of residential development on this site is consistent with the aims of policy DM1.3 which seeks to permit new housing within a development boundary.

4.15 Members should note that the proposed site, which forms part of the site allocation, excludes land to the east of the proposed site and west of the existing Council owned carpark. The application shows how the remaining part of the site allocation has been considered having regard to access to the remaining part of the site allocation as well as the relevant criteria set out under policy WYM2. The Highways Authority has assessed the proposals and has confirmed that it is possible to provide an access to this part of the allocation from the existing highway, which will not prejudice the remainder of the site allocation coming forward. As such it is considered that proposals are acceptable in this respect.

4.16 Policy WYM2 requires that an element of commercial use is incorporated into the development. Unlike previous schemes there is no such use proposed as part of this planning application. It is acknowledged that whilst an element of the overall employment land allocated in the WAAP is likely to come forward elsewhere in the town, an element of commercial floor space is required as part of this site allocation.

4.17 Following detailed discussions with the applicant, further evidence has been submitted providing justification for not meeting this requirement. In reviewing the evidence submitted, it is apparent that as demonstrated by the Site Accessibility Plan submitted with the application, that the site lies in close proximity to numerous commercial facilities in Wymondham as well as a large industrial estate located off Ayton Road. It is also noted that the WAAP allocates a total of 28.8ha of employment land against a JCS identified requirement/need of 20ha. As such it apparent that there is limited evidence to justify the need for additional floorspace to be provided on the site, which goes above and beyond that required in the JCS, particularly where a lack of demand has been identified.

4.18 On this basis it is accepted that there is limited justification for an element of commercial development to be provided on this site and that on balance, it is accepted that a departure from policy has been justified. As such it is considered that the principle of providing residential development only on this site is acceptable and is constant with the aims of the JCS and Policy DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.19 In summary, it is considered that providing residential development in this location which is a Main Town is, in principle, acceptable, subject to the scheme satisfying the stated criterion set out within WYM2 and other relevant planning policies in respect of highway safety etc. An assessment of the scheme, against the above criterion is as follows:

• Site to contribute to the delivery of infrastructure and facilities in Wymondham through S106 or the payment of CIL
4.20 The application will be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and as such contributions for the delivery of infrastructure and facilities in Wymondham, including Education, Library provision, Bus Rapid Transit, improvements to the Thickthorn junction and Green Infrastructure enhancements will be secured through CIL.

4.21 The provision of two fire hydrants has been requested by the Norfolk Fire Service, which will be secured by condition. As such the first criterion is satisfied.

- *Heritage statement and field evaluation may be required to assess the impact of the development on the historic environment, in particular the setting of Wymondham Abbey.*

4.22 The application is accompanied by a Heritage Statement which provides an assessment of the potential impacts of residential development on the historic environment and the setting of Wymondham Abbey, other nearby listed buildings and the Conservation Area. The Senior Conservation and Design Officer has carried out an initial assessment of the heritage statement and considers that the potential impacts of a residential development in this location can be addressed subject to a detailed assessment of the proposals at the reserved matters stage. For this reason the second criterion has been satisfied.

- *A detailed ecological assessment. New development will be required to provide ecological links and buffers to the nearest green infrastructure, the design of which to be negotiated with South Norfolk Council and other relevant bodies to ensure adequate protection of important ecological sites and maintenance of habitat connectivity. In particular a natural grassland buffer is needed to the River Tiffey and the creation of wildlife corridors will help to link Tolls Meadow to the Lizard.*

4.23 The application is supported by an Ecological Assessment, which sets out the improvements proposed by the scheme included in the list above. These include:

- Contributing to the local green infrastructure network by providing an 8m habitat buffer along the River Tiffey
- Enhancing public access by providing a public footpath along the River Tiffey Corridor within the site; and
- Enhancing the Ketts County Walk and Health Walk routes by providing footpaths on both sides of Cemetery Lane in the vicinity of the site.

4.24 It is clear from the above list that the scheme will provide improvements to the green infrastructure network in terms of habitat connectivity and accessibility. With regards to improvements to nearby County Wildlife Sites these will be met by Community Infrastructure Levy funding as this is covered on the District Council’s Regulation 123 list. The County Ecologist and the Wymondham Green Infrastructure Group has welcomed these enhancements and recommends that a Biodiversity Management Plan be conditioned to understand how the habitat buffer would be managed as well as measures for minimising impacts of development during construction. For this reason the third criterion has been satisfied.

- *Children’s playspace/recreation areas must be provided sufficient to meet the needs of residents of the development. The provision of older children/adult open space will need to be addressed at the time of any application;*

4.25 The applicant has demonstrated that children’s play space can be accommodated on-site in accordance with the Council’s Recreational Open Space Requirements for Residential Areas to meet the requirements of the development. With regards to the provision of older children/adult open space, the applicant is proposing that this will be secured by a financial contribution. The Council’s Play and Amenities Officer has confirmed that this approach is acceptable, subject to agreeing a sum of money to improve existing older children/adult
open space facilities in the local area. This will be secured in the S106 agreement. Subject to a detailed assessment of the Children’s play space/recreation areas being carried out at the reserved matters stage, it is considered that this criterion has been satisfied.

- *The design of the development must reflect its location in the Conservation Area and enhance the gateway to Wymondham and the setting of the railway station.*

4.26 The application seeks outline planning permission for a residential development only. The design and layout of the development and how it relates the Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings will be considered at a future stage, having regard to Policy DM4.10 and S66(1) and S72 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990. Furthermore, the detailed design of buildings and materials to be used will also be agreed at reserved matters stage.

- *Improvements to car and coach parking to be investigated.*

4.27 As part of the proposals, the potential for improvements to car and coach parking for the adjacent station have been investigated with the applicant. It is concluded that based on the evidence submitted with the application, that there is no demand for any additional car and coach parking facilities at this stage. The submitted Transport Statement shows that the Cemetery Lane car park has the capacity for 90 cars, but it is in general no more than 50% occupied. It is clear from this that there is no need for additional car parking facilities near the Station and coach parking facilities are also seen as being adequate as coaches can park outside of the station on Cemetery Lane. The Highways Authority has confirmed that there is no requirement for additional car and coach parking to be provided from a technical point of view and that the current arrangements are adequate. It is therefore considered that this criterion has been met and that the justification for not providing improvements to car and coach parking is acceptable.

- *Improved pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre.*

4.28 The proposed access arrangements include a realigned Cemetery Lane that will increase visibility levels and the safety of pedestrians and cyclists at its junction with Station Road. In addition to this it is proposed that the new Cemetery Lane will include pedestrian footpaths on both sides of the carriageway as opposed to just the northern side of the carriageway between the station and Station Road. With regards to routes through the site, these will need to be investigated at reserved matters stage, to ensure that the site provides easy access to the proposed footpath along the River Tiffey and that it will connect with Station Road to the northeast of the site. Subject to a detailed assessment of the proposals at the reserved matters stage it is considered that this criterion can be satisfied.

- *Water supply network issues to be resolved.*
- *Satisfactory wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place.*
- *Water mains and sewers crossing site will require mitigation by protected easements/diversion.*
- *Any potential flooding issues must be addressed/mitigated satisfactorily.*

4.29 A Statements and Conditions Report has been prepared by Anglian Water which confirms that the water recycling centre at present has available capacity for the proposed flows. With regards to the water supply network, Anglian Water has raised no issues with regards to the water supply.

4.30 In terms of any potential flooding issues, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted with the application, which confirms that the site is at low risk of flooding. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has carried out a detailed assessment of the information submitted and has confirmed that the revised drainage strategy addresses the concerns raised in their previous responses. Subsequently a package of measures has been proposed that includes surface water runoff discharged to either infiltration and to the
4.31 Subject to conditions recommended by the LLFA, to provide confirmation of the location of the anticipated Anglian Water surface water sewer in the west of the development as well as detailed designs of a surface water drainage scheme incorporating a maintenance and management plan setting out who will adopt and maintain all the surface water drainage features for the lifetime of the development, the surface water strategy is considered acceptable and to accord with NPPF paragraph 103 and 109 and JCS Policy 1.

4.32 With regards to the protection of water mains and sewers crossing the site this will be assessed at reserved matters stage.

Other matters

Access and Highways

4.33 The submitted Transport Statement and Addendum seeks to demonstrate that safe access to and from the site can be provided by the realignment of Cemetery Lane, in order to improve visibility levels at its junction with Station Road. The proposed realignment will enable two new priority junctions to be provided that will form a link road through the site and will include two new entrances off Cemetery Lane and a further access to the west of Cemetery Lane.

4.34 In order to enable the realignment of Cemetery Lane and access into the site, an application will be made under Section 247 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the stopping up of the existing alignment. The Highway Authority has carried out an assessment of the proposed realignment of Cemetery Lane and the access arrangements and has confirmed that, in principle, these are acceptable, subject to detailed designs and a stage 1 safety audit being carried out. As such it is considered that the proposals accord with Policy DM3.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, subject to conditions.

4.35 With regards to the future layout of the site, this will be considered at the reserved matters stage and will allow for the assessment of the internal road layout and overall design of the site to be made, having regard to Policy WYM2.

4.36 With regards to pedestrian and cycle movement around the site, the proposals include potential for additional pedestrian and cycle access off Cemetery Lane, connecting the Railway Station and the future pedestrian subway. These additional access points will enhance connectivity, allowing existing and new residents to access the town centre and potential connections to Toll’s Meadow. A potential new footpath link is also proposed on Station Road along the northern edge of the development, providing a safe connection to the existing footpath on Station Road and Toll’s Meadow.

4.37 In terms of car parking, this will be considered at the reserved matters stage. However the applicant has confirmed that the level of parking on site will meet the Parking Standards for Norfolk 2007, which sets out maximum per unit parking standards and states that the accessibility of a site in terms of access to employment and services by walking, cycling and public transport will be used to determine the appropriate local parking provision.

Affordable Housing

4.38 In terms of the affordable housing provision, Policy 4 of the JCS requires 33% of the total number of units to be affordable, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not viable to do so. In this instance the scheme proposes that 33% of the units would be affordable with a
tenure mix of 85% social rented and 15% intermediate. The exact mix of affordable housing will be secured through the S106 Agreement. Therefore subject to the completion of the S106 agreement the scheme is considered acceptable in this respect.

School capacity

4.39 Norfolk County Council has confirmed that there is currently no spare capacity at the Ashleigh primary school and that additional spaces would likely be generated from this development. There is spare capacity in the Early Education sector but taking into consideration other permitted developments in the surrounding catchment area all other local education provision may be considered full. However, it has been confirmed that additional spaces could be met by providing additional class rooms, improving/re-modelling existing class space etc and that these works would be funded through CIL as this is covered on the District Council’s Regulation 123 list.

4.40 With regards to high school provision there is currently adequate capacity. There is also a Masterplan for Wymondham High Academy to increase its capacity to 2050 places (including 6th form). This number of school places has been calculated to be required to accommodate children from existing permissions and allocations in Wymondham, including this allocation, and its surrounding catchment area.

4.41 In summary, it is considered that the lack of available primary school places within Wymondham does not result in a scheme which does not fulfil the social role in the context of the NPPF and provides an attractive scheme for future residents. It is therefore considered that the scheme is consistent with the aims of the NPPF.

Contamination

4.42 Policy DM3.14 has regard to development and contamination. Previous site investigations have identified some areas of contamination that required remediation. The Environmental Protection Officer has carried out an assessment of the proposals and confirmed that they have no objections to this planning application, subject to conditions that require the submission of the additional site investigation work and an updated and consolidated remediation method strategy and final verification report. Subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions having regard to contamination, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and in accordance with policies DM3.14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Minerals and Waste

4.43 The proposal site is underlain by an identified mineral resource (sand and gravel) which is safeguarded as part of the adopted Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, and Core Strategy policy CS16 ‘Safeguarding’. Norfolk County Council in its capacity as the Mineral Planning Authority has carried out an assessment of the proposals and concludes that the evidence available indicates that an economically viable resource of a safeguarded mineral does not occur on this site. Therefore the proposals are considered to comply with adopted Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, and Core Strategy policy CS16.

Sustainable construction/renewable energy

4.44 Policy 1 and 3 of the JCS require the sustainable construction of buildings and water conservation in addition to requiring 10% of the predicted energy requirements to be delivered by on site decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy. Precise details and compliance with the policy will be secured by condition.
Other considerations

4.45 Under paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires Councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes. This can be a material planning where self-build has been identified as the method of delivering the site. As no indication of self-build has been given by the applicant it is considered that the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

Section 106 Agreement and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

4.46 The application is liable for CIL at reserved matters stage and a liability notice would be issued with any reserved matters consent granted. A draft S106 Agreement has been prepared and should consent be granted the S106 would need to be entered into to cover Affordable Housing and a financial contribution in lieu of older children/adult open space provision.

Financial Considerations

4.47 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The principle of the application, which seeks planning consent for residential development only and highways access, is acceptable on this site allocation and is considered to represent a sustainable form of development. The application demonstrates that there are no technical issues whereby permission should be restricted and that the highways access submitted for approval has been designed to accommodate the level of development allocated on the site by Policy WYM2 of the Wymondham Area Action Plan. On this basis the application is recommended for approval subject to the imposition of conditions and completion of a S106 agreement. All other matters are reserved for future consideration.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Watts 01508 533765 cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2016/2837/RVC  
**Parish**: BAWBURGH  

**Applicants Name**: Mr Ivor Wills  
**Site Address**: Land North Of Bawburgh Road Bawburgh Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Variation of Condition 6 - Working Hours - 0700 - 2100 November to June, 0800 - 1800 Sat and Sundays, 0600 - 2300 July to October including weekends, Bank holidays as required within the above limits and Condition 8: revised Lighting Plan for the proposed site of permission 2016/1303/F  

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1. In accordance with approved details and previous conditions  
2. Amended hours of use  
3. Amended lighting condition

**Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
**NPPF 01**: Building a strong competitive economy  
**NPPF 03**: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
**NPPF 12**: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
**Policy 1**: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
**Policy 5**: The Economy

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
**Development Management Policies**  
**DM2.1**: Employment and business development  
**DM3.13**: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
**DM4.10**: Heritage Assets

**Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas**:  

S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”

**Planning History**

2.1 **2016/1303**: Construction of a new field trials building with associated services yard and on-site parking and alterations to existing agricultural building  

Approved
3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council**

Object

- the extension of operating hours for the Field Trial Centre seems somewhat excessive compared to the original application (approved on lesser hours), despite it being inevitably linked agriculturally to farming factors.
- Residents would not welcome any working that late into the night, especially at weekends and Bank Holidays.

3.2 **District Members**

Cllr Wheatley

To Committee

- this revision of the hours of operation will substantially affect the amenity of the residents of the village closest to the site and the impact is such that it should be considered by the DMC as a material change to the original approval.

Cllr C Kemp

To be reported if appropriate

3.3 **NCC Highways**

No objections

3.4 **SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team**

Conditional support

3.5 **Representations**

1 letter of support

- with the fact that we have been used to living with farming life in the village and probably living at the nearest point to the land we have no objections
- just a concern regarding security lighting

4. **Assessment**

The application

4.1 Planning permission was granted in September 2016 for the construction of a new field trials building with associated services yard and on-site parking and alterations to an existing agricultural building (planning permission reference: 2016/1303). The planning permission contained a number of conditions including a condition restricting the hours of use and requiring that the external lighting complied with the details contained within the submitted lighting report. This application seeks to vary the consent to amend these two conditions.

Hours of use

4.2 Under the existing permission, the use of the development is only permitted between the hours of:

- 0730 and 2000 Monday to Friday
- 0800 and 1800 Saturday and Sunday
- No use shall take place on bank holidays or public holidays

4.3 The applicant has stated that the approved hours of working do not suit the nature of the field trials operation which is, much as a commercial farm, led by the weather and the harvest and drilling seasons and hours. The amended hours of use that have been applied for are to allow use within the following hours:
It would also allow use on public holidays as required, provided they are within the above limits.

Concerns have been raised by Bawburgh Parish Council and one of the District Members about the impact on nearby residents from use in the evenings. Supporting information submitted in response to comments by the Council's Community Protection Team states that "it is not proposed to carry out seed processing until late at night and any other activities in the barn would be quiet work, for example working at computers, lab activities, or weighing out small amounts of seed". The noise report submitted with the original application identified potential sources of noise pollution from vehicle movements and use of threshing machines, a grain drier, a grain cleaner, extract fans and condenser units. As these are not proposed to be used in the additional hours requested the Community Protection Team now advise that they do not have any significant noise concerns as long as a condition is in place to reflect this.

As such, it is considered that with an appropriately worded revised condition covering hours of use the operational needs of the applicant can be met whilst not resulting in adverse impact on nearby residents and therefore complying with Policy DM3.13.

External Lighting

A lighting diagram has been provided for the proposed new lighting arrangement that indicates that it would not cause a statutory nuisance to residents of the area. The Council's Community Protection Team are therefore satisfied that the lighting proposals are acceptable and there will be no adverse impact in accordance with Policy DM3.13. Equally, it is not considered that the amended lighting details would result in visual pollution that would affect the nearby listed buildings and conservation area and therefore the proposal is considered to comply with Policy DM4.10 and to meet the Council's requirements under Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Other matters

Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

As no additional floor space is proposed, this application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Conclusion

The proposed variation of conditions 6 and 8 of planning permission 2016/1303 are acceptable subject to a slight amendment to ensure use late in the evenings does not involve machinery that would result in disturbance to the amenities of local residents.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:
Tim Barker 01508 533848
tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2016/2942/DC  
**Parish**: CRINGLEFORD

Applicants Name: Mr Andrew Taylor  
Site Address: Land South-west of Newfound Farm Colney Lane Cringleford Norfolk

Proposal: Discharge of condition 6 - design code report of permission 2013/1793 (outline planning permission for a development for up to 650 dwellings together with a small local centre, primary school with early years facility, two new vehicular accesses off Colney Lane, associated on-site highways, pedestrian and cycle routes, public recreational open space, allotments, landscape planting and community woodland)

Recommendation: Agree that the Design Code be approved pursuant to condition 6 of planning permission 2013/1793 subject to the resolution of outstanding matters of minor amendment and clarification

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 7: Supporting communities  
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.4: Environmental quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.10: Promotion of sustainable transport  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM3.15: Outdoor play facilities/recreational space  
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.3: Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste  
DM4.4: Natural environmental assets- designated and locally important open spaces  
DM4.8: Protection of Trees and Hedgerows  
DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design  
DM4.10: Heritage Assets

1.4 Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan  
GEN1: Ensuring a coordinated approach to deliver housing development and infrastructure  
GEN2: Protection of heritage assets
GEN3 : Protection of significant buildings and their settings outside conservation areas
GEN4 : Provision of infrastructure
ENV1 : Provision of landscaping
ENV3 : Provision of hedgerows
ENV5 : Provision of sustainable drainage
ENV 6 : Provision of open spaces and community woodland
HOU 2 : Design standards
HOU 3 : Density of development
HOU4 : Mix of property type
HOU6 : Minimising energy use in dwellings
HOU8 : Provision of garages
HOU9 : Provision of affordable housing
HOU10 : Protection of heritage assets
SCC1 : Provision of primary school
SCC3 : Provision of walking/cycling routes
SCC4 : Construction methods for community buildings
SCC5 : Provision of playing field and play areas
SCC8 : Provision of allotments and community orchard
TRA1 : Major estate roads
TRA3 : Provision of walking / cycling routes
TRA4 : Pedestrian and cycle needs

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas:

S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/1793 Outline planning permission for a development for up to 650 dwellings together with a small local centre, primary school with early years facility, two new vehicular accesses off Colney Lane, associated on-site highways, pedestrian and cycle routes, public recreational open space, allotments, landscape planting and community woodland. Approved

2.2 2016/2695 Discharge of condition 32 - phase 2 Geo-Environmental Assessment Report, Condition 33 - Verification report of remediation strategy, Condition 34 - Contamination monitoring and maintenance Approved
plan of permission 2013/1793 (Outline planning permission for a development of up to 650 dwellings together with a small local centre, primary school with early years facility, two new vehicular accesses off Colney Lane, associated on-site highways, pedestrian and cycle routes, public recreational open space, allotments, landscape planting and community woodland.)

3. Consultations

3.1 Cringleford Parish Council

Original comments:
Cringleford Parish Council welcomes the Design Code for Newfound Farm, Cringleford. It is particularly pleased about: integration of a large amount of open space into the development; retention of trees and hedgerows; retention and enhancement of the ‘greenway walk’; integration of cycle and pedestrian ways into the development and their clear separation from the road along the ‘primary street’.

However, the Parish Council does have concerns about some of the items in the Code:
Vehicles coming to the school could endanger seating placed at the centre of the layout of the ‘School Square’ and consideration should be given to locating it around the edges; access to the estate and traffic flow on Colney Lane remain a concern; potential on-street parking is a concern; the size of garages does not seem to be mentioned in the Design Code; surprised that no mention appears to be made to the scheduled allotments and community wood/orchard; concern if there will be demand for a village centre on this development in addition to that on Roundhouse Park.

Comments on the amended design code document:
To be reported

3.2 SNC Conservation And Design

Original comments:
The applicant should explore whether roof pitches should be included as a tool to provide uniformity and consistency where required (e.g. terraced streets) or variation on pitches and forms where detached properties are proposed. Slight inconsistencies with phrasing regarding use of varying boundary treatments that need correcting.

Comments on the amended design code
To be reported

3.3 NCC Highways

Comments:
- Strongly support a layout that provides a network of connected streets and avoids the use of cul-de-sac.
- Access by agricultural vehicles to the retained farm land should not be via the new residential streets.
- The main primary street must continue to the site boundary without ransom in order to allow for the creation of a future link with the Roundhouse Way roundabout.
Secondary Streets should have a carriageway width measuring 4.8m – 5.5m, dependent on location and the number of dwellings they serve.

Parking provision for all dwellings should where possible be contained within the plot, rear parking courts should be avoided wherever possible. On-street parking will be permitted to accommodate additional parking requirements, subject to it being in the form of roadside lay-bys, as suggested.

Street trees in the verge adjacent to the main spine road are acceptable in principle subject to them not being located within any required visibility splay or within 5.0m of a streetlight.

The cycleway should not be coloured.

Service margins adjacent to shared surface roads should be 1.0m wide, not 0.5m.

Given underuse of garages as parking spaces preference for all 2 & 3 bedroom dwellings to be provided with 2 parking spaces excluding the garage.

Where tactile paving is required is should be in a contrasting colour.

Any feature area around the school will need careful design.

Residents should be able to manoeuvre bins from where they are stored to their collection point without the need to move parked vehicles.

Consideration should be given to whether it would be better to provide the cyclepath on the same side of the primary street as the school.

3.4 SNC Landscape Architect

Original comments:

- Happy in principle with approach
- Need additional green/ecology links across the development
- Concern about building heights adjacent public space
- Suggestion that the notion of enhancement of existing hedgerows be more explicit
- Notes about street trees and minimum requirements/maximum spacings (the language is ambiguous)
- Suggestion that no rocks be imported for landscape features in public spaces and play areas (imagery should be changed)
- Some changes to the indicative designs for Key Spaces required - non-specific images to convey the mood would be better
- A statement about use of native species of trees and plants, and where non-native or cultivars will be used is required
- There appears to be an over-use of knee rails; hedging may be better in the long-term. The proposed mounding appears very uncharacteristic and should be used very sparingly and carefully, if indeed at all.
Development Management Committee 1 March 2017

- Community woodland and allotment – need for general description of intentions, management etc.

Comments on amended design code document:
The revised document is much better in so far as it addresses many of my previous comments. I still maintain that more could be made of the potential landscape linkages especially between the Central Green (now referenced as KS_6) and the drainage attenuation to the west. The language about the street tree spacing is still not ideal and needs slight amendment; I am happy to agree exact wording.

4 Assessment

Introduction

4.1 The purpose of the report is to provide an overview of the design code submitted to comply with condition 6 pursuant to outline planning permission 2013/1793 which requires a design code to be submitted and approved for the application site (land south west of Newfound Farm, Cringleford) with particular reference to land directly adjoining the adjacent development site to ensure a coordinated approach to design across the site and site boundaries with adjoining development.

4.2 The report will explain the purpose of the design code and its relevance to the assessment of all subsequent phases of the development (650 dwellings), as well as providing an understanding of the merits of its submission as a tool for ensuring a high quality development.

4.3 Members should note that Officers have been working with the developers prior to and after submission of the document to ensure that it complies with the condition. As a result the document has been amended to ensure that it adequately sets out the guiding principles and mandatory requirements for development based on the guiding principles of the outline consent. At the time of writing the report a number of further minor amendments are still required however these are considered to be minor in nature. Furthermore comments are outstanding from some consultees on the amended document. Members will be updated at committee as to final comments on these minor amendments to the document.

Site description

4.4 The application site relates to an area of agricultural land occupying approximately 28.67 Hectares to the west of Roundhouse Way and north of the A11 and to the east of the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital at Cringleford which has outline consent for 650 dwellings granted on 20\textsuperscript{th} July 2016 (ref 2013/1793).

4.5 Adjacent to the site to the east and south is the parcel of land that was granted outline consent on appeal for 650 dwellings (Land fund ref 2013/1494). This approved development is that which the design code condition refers to when requiring the design code document to ‘reference land directly adjoining the adjacent development to ensure a coordinated approach to design across the site and site boundaries with adjoining development.’ An equivalent condition was imposed on that consent to require a design code to be submitted to ensure both sites have a coordinated approach. There is to date no submission of design code or reserved matters for the Land Fund consent as the site is not at as such an advanced stage as the application site.
Proposal

4.6 The application relates to the approval of the design code submission element that was required through condition 6 of the outline consent for 650 dwellings. The precise wording of the condition is as follows:

With the exception of site clearance works, site investigations and tree protection works, no development shall commence on site until a design code for the entire application site, with particular reference to land directly adjoining the adjacent development site as identified within the Housing Site Allocations Area within the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (2014) is submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority to ensure a coordinated approach to design across the site and at the site boundaries with adjoining development. The agreed scheme shall then be implemented as such through the approval of subsequent reserved matters.

Purpose of the design code

4.7 The design code is a technical document which sets out guiding principles and a range of design parameters to ensure a high quality development. It does not fix every detail, but is intended to allow designers a degree of flexibility as along as design quality is retained. Scope also remains for discussion with the Local Authority on detailed design matters which will be subject to a subsequent reserved matters application.

4.8 The design code is intended to be used by developers, their agents, South Norfolk Council and by consultees to help establish whether a scheme has met the design quality required and whether it will achieve an integrated development with a strong sense of place and identity.

Assessment

4.9 The main issue for consideration is whether the design code submission satisfies the requirements of the condition and provides an appropriate base to inform subsequent reserved matters.

4.10 The design code is set into four sections: an introduction; development structure; site wide coding; key spaces. Further detail of the content of the three main sections is set out below.

Development structure

4.11 A development structure is established based on the principles set in the masterplan at the outline stage, addressing existing key landscape features and developing a landscape framework, establishing the key pedestrian and cycle links and key vehicular routes and links.

4.12 Strong building frontages to public spaces are set out to be established with the use of key focal buildings and points to add interest to the street scene and promotes a clear structure of hierarchy and legibility through the development. The use of key spaces will deliver a series of interconnected public spaces and destinations through and across the development.

4.13 The building heights and density framework are refined from those on the outline consent and these adequately ensure that the proposals would not exceed the maximum density of 28dph gross across the housing site allocation area.
Site wide code

4.14 This section sets out those parts of the design code which apply across all areas of the site. These codes are then applied to the individual key spaces and all areas of the development.

4.15 The site wide code covers:
- Street hierarchy (structure and hierarchy of streets within the development and accesses to it)
- Car and cycle parking (ensuring appropriate parking in terms of number to comply with parking standards and design and location to ensure parking is integrated into the development and rear parking courts are avoided)
- Building typologies (architectural styles and building types to create character and mixed communities)
- Landscape, open space and public realm (hard and soft landscaping to create character in different street hierarchies and public spaces and appropriate street furniture)
- Materials (colours, textures and types of materials appropriate to the site and its context)
- Boundary treatments (types of boundary treatments appropriate by boundary type i.e. front boundary; rear/side boundary; and open space boundary)
- Waste and recycling (to ensure this is integrated in to the design)
- Security (to ensure security and privacy are incorporated in to design)

4.16 The content of the site wide principles at a broad level is acceptable. There are a few minor corrections and clarifications that need to be made to the document for Officers to be fully satisfied of the detail which include those set out by the Landscape Officer. The applicant is reviewing these further comment and members will be updated at committee.

Key spaces as character areas

4.17 This section describes each of the key spaces within the development and how each of the site wide codes are assigned and applied to particular key spaces. The Code includes information on the guiding characteristics of each key space to help establish character.

4.18 The design objective is to create spaces that tie the development together and deliver a coherent, high quality design across the scheme. The code also provides a degree of flexibility and choice within each of the spaces, delivered through the use of material and product palettes, allowing developers to express their own ideas around the design principles and themes for each key space.

4.19 Seven key spaces are defined and the characteristics of each area are:

Key space 1 – Entrance West
This space forms the primary entrance to the development from Colney Lane. The character of the space is in part defined by the existing rural character of Colney Lane but also by the requirement for a new roundabout. Development in this area will be set back behind private drives and a new area of green space on either side of the roundabout. It will be low density of mainly detached dwellings of 2 – 2.5 storeys fronting Colney Lane. Properties on either side of the entrance road would be dual aspect to address both open space and street frontage. Landscaping will have a semi-formal character.
Key space 2 – Entrance East
This space will have an informal softer landscape character, reflecting the rural edge created by the existing adjacent trees and hedgerows. It will be a low density space with development set behind existing trees with building heights up to 2 storeys. Dual aspect dwellings would address open space and primary street frontage. The open space would have informal meadow/wildflower planting.

Key space 3 – Community allotments and orchard
This will be a planted woodland area and allotments. Existing hedgerows and trees would be retained to create a mature and natural boundary to the space. The detailed design and planting of the space is envisaged to be agreed through consultation and engagement with the community which will include agreeing a proportional split between the allotments and orchard.

Key space 4 – School square
The school square will form the main area of hard landscaped public realm within the development, providing a flexible multi use space. It is specifically located adjacent to the proposed primary school site and the proposed commercial/retail space. The space would be a pedestrian priority area, will provide an important drop-off and collection area for the school and will utilise changes in materials, textures and colours to define the space. A marker/focal building would be located within the space which could be up to 3 storeys. Street trees would be used to soften the space.

Key space 5 – Pocket park
This space will comprise a semi-formal green space with children’s play area providing a visual marker and reference point within the scheme along the primary street between Entrance East, School Square and Central Green. Framing the space on one side will be a marker of focal building of up to 3 storeys which as well as framing the space will provide a visual marker along the primary street. There will be a strong active frontage with dwellings overlooking and framing the space.

Key space 6 – Central Green
This space will form a large area of green open space in the heart of the development. The space will be formal in character framed by dwellings on all sides of the space. The predominant building typology should be detached and semi-detached dwellings with on plot parking. Tree planting within the space. A combination of pinch-points, tree planting and changes in materials and colours is to be incorporated to assist in reducing vehicular speeds and articulate the space.

Key space 7 – Greenway Walk
The Greenway walk would be a natural and informal space with the emphasis on nature and wildlife with a strong rural character reference which respects the relationship with the adjoining outline consent. The existing network of trees and hedgerows would be retained, additional planting in the area would be proposed. Housing along the greenway walk will be low density with an informal and loose building line with gaps between properties, predominantly detached 2 – 2.5 storeys, set behind tertiary streets or private drives. The Code envisages, to which the Council supports that the adjacent development would need to adopt the same approach of a green corridor along the shared boundary.

Compliance with the Cringleford Neighbourhood development Plan

4.20 The Design Code has been amended to include reference, in the relevant sections, to the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (CNDP) to show how the scheme will continue to broadly comply with the CNDP in line with the consideration had to the CNDP in determining the outline consent.
4.21 Cringleford Parish Council were consulted on the application, comments are set out earlier in the report and have largely been addressed in the amended design code submitted.

4.22 At the time of writing the report comments from Cringleford Parish Council are awaited on the amended document and members will be updated at committee.

Design code compliance

4.23 Applications for reserved matters will be required to be submitted with a design code compliance statement to show that they have applied the codes to their detailed designs, or provided a higher standard of design. Applicants will also be expected to demonstrate how their proposals comply with the South Norfolk Place Making Guide design principles as well as explaining their approach to achieving this by carrying out a Building for Life 12 evaluation.

4.24 As stated above, the design code is a technical document which sets out guiding principles and a range of design parameters to ensure a high quality development. It does not fix every detail, but is intended to allow designers a degree of creative flexibility as long as design quality is retained.

4.25 All reserved matters applications for development within the code area shall be required to comply with the guiding principles and design parameters of the Design Code unless it can be demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, that individual site circumstances justify a minor departure from it.

4.26 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

4.27 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) since it is a discharge of condition application.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Following minor changes to the Design Code to address matters raised by the Council, Cringleford Town Council and NCC Highways, and subject to additional minor changes requested, Officers are satisfied with the document. The format and content of the Design Code is considered to be comprehensive, legible and user friendly as a stand-alone document. Critically it covers and addresses a suitable design solution to the adjacent development to the east and has created sufficient character within the development through the use of key spaces for its scale and context. Officers are satisfied that the document will provide clear design guidance on which to base subsequent reserved matters to ensure a high quality, integrated development with a strong sense of place and identity is secured.

5.2 Therefore subject to a number of additional minor amendments to the document which are matters raised by the Council’s Landscape Architect and matters of corrections, together with any further reasonable additional minor amendments as required by outstanding consultees, Officers recommend that Members agree that the Design Code be approved pursuant to condition 6 of planning permission 2013/1793.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tracy Lincoln 01508 533814 tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Development Management Committee 1 March 2017

Major Applications including some land owned by South Norfolk Council

8. **Appl. No** : 2016/0466/O  
   **Parish** : WOODTON

   **Applicants Name** : Mrs Juliet Read  
   **Site Address** : Land North West Of The Street Woodton Norfolk  
   **Proposal** : Outline planning application with some matters reserved for 21 new residential units (with secondary access from Suckling Place for emergency use and for pedestrian / cycle access)

   **Recommendation** : Approval with Conditions

   1. Outline Permission Time Limit  
   2. Standard outline requiring reserved matters  
   3. Ecological mitigation  
   4. Surface water drainage scheme  
   5. Water Efficiency  
   6. Provision of fire hydrant  
   7. Highway conditions  
   8. Tree Protection  
   9. Contamination  
   10. Details of air source heat pumps

   Subject to S106 agreement to secure affordable housing, open space and commuted sum for play equipment

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   NPPF 06 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes  
   NPPF 07 : Requiring good design  
   NPPF 10 : Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
   NPPF 11 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
   Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
   Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
   Policy 15 : Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   Development Management Policies  
   DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development  
   DM3.1 : Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
   DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development  
   DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
   DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking  
   DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life  
   DM3.14 Pollution, health and safety  
   DM3.15 : Outdoor play facilities/recreational space  
   DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management  
   DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows  
   DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design

1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies  
   WOO 1 : Land to rear of Georges House, The Street
2. Planning History

2.1 No recent planning history

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council

Comments on revised application

- Notes the changed layout of the site, reduced number of residential units which we consider to all be an improvement.
- Concerns with regard to the proposed changes to the road infrastructure
- Would recommend that a mini-roundabout is put in place at the junction of Hempnall Road and The Street
- Consider the traffic calming measures to be unacceptable and not necessary as a 20mph speed limit would address all our concerns
- Still have concerns about runoff

Comments on original application

Approve but with concerns over following points:

- Ability of current drainage of surface water via the beck to cope with increased run off
- Concerns with the splay and ability of vehicles approaching from north down The Street to safely enter the proposed site without causing disruption to traffic flow
- This site falls within the previously agreed Local Plan for Woodton, however the proposed density exceeds what we as a Parish Council consider suitable for this site, would prefer site to be developed with fewer dwellings, which are of a high quality than the number of dwellings which is proposed

3.2 District Member

To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd

Woodton Water Recycling Centre and sewerage system has available capacity, surface water management proposals do not affect Anglian Water assets

3.4 Environment Agency

No response received

3.5 NHS England

No response received

3.6 NCC Ecologist

No objection - unlikely to be protected species on site but further survey work and appropriate mitigation measures required through condition.

3.7 NCC Highways

Require provision of a new section of footway along The Street and a number of traffic calming measures.

Final comments on proposed secondary to be reported to committee.

3.8 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority

Conditional support
3.9 NCC Planning Obligations Coordinator
No contributions sought for education, contributions sought through CIL for library provision, and fire hydrant to be provided through condition

3.10 Norfolk And Waveney Local Medical Council
No response received

3.11 Norfolk Police
No response received

3.12 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team
No objection, recommend conditions relating to contaminated land and air source heat pumps, and informative notes on working hours and asbestos.

3.13 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager
No objection subject to securing affordable housing through S106

3.14 SNC Landscape Architect
Arboricultural concerns relating to the impact of the secondary access. Final comments to be reported to committee.

3.15 SNC Play and Amenities Technical Advisor
No comments at this stage, will need to see plans for the design of the play area at a later date

3.16 Representations
3 letters of objection to amended application
- remain concerned about volume of traffic that would be created
- the widening of the access does not alter that it is on a blind bend
- traffic calming measures will make road even narrower which will make access by large vehicles such as oil deliveries more difficult
- The Street is prone to flooding and this is happening more frequently
- photos submitted showing the Beck almost at capacity
- overlooking of neighbouring property to south

5 letters of support to original application
- there is no reason to suppose that Woodton could not comfortably absorb that degree of expansion
- on the contrary such development would have the potential to breathe new life and energy into the village, and would support local services
- infrastructure is already in place to support this development
- would allow me to be able to return to the village I was brought up in
- would provide additional housing without intruding into the countryside
- would remove the derelict nursery site which is an eyesore in the village
- very much look forward to the transformation of this site to a thoughtfully designed and landscaped source of additional housing
- I have not experienced any flooding in the 13 years of living on The Street
Development Management Committee

6 letters of objection to original application
• 26 homes will create an extra 52 cars travelling through The Street
• this section of The Street is very narrow where cars are already eroding the banks by trying to pass each other
• sections of The Street have no footpath
• blind bend on access
• 26 houses is a lot for a small village
• proposed numbers are too high for this site, an estate of this density would be out of character
• is this not a flood plain area?
• increased flood risk to neighbouring properties
• drainage channel across the site has been known to overflow
• water levels in the stream are already full when there has been steady rain full
• woodland area bordering the site which is a habitat for wild animals, birds, etc
• nursery site has been unused for many years and is likely to have been home to many animals, including bats

1 letter questioning access to rear of properties on Woodyard Square and maintenance of overhead electricity cables

4 Assessment

4.1 Site description and proposal

The site comprises of a former garden nursery with a range of sheds and greenhouses, most of which are now in a dilapidated condition. There is a notable change in levels across the site, with land rising from the south to the north. A small watercourse crosses the site from west to east in the southern portion of the site.

4.2 Adjoining the site to the east is Woodyard Square, a former local authority housing scheme designed by Taylor and Green. This takes the form of a two storey terrace that runs parallel with the site boundary. To the south-west of the site is an area of young woodland with open paddock land to the north-west of the site. To the south are residential properties along The Street and to the north open agricultural land.

4.3 Adjoining the site is land owned by South Norfolk Council. A secondary, emergency access is being proposed across the Council’s land and is the reason this report is being made to Development Management Committee.

The application

4.4 The application is an outline application for 21 dwellings, with all matters reserved other than access and scale. The application proposes affordable housing to be in line with Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy. Originally, the application proposed 26 dwellings on the site, but this was reduced to 21 dwellings to address concerns over the indicative layout as originally proposed and to provide open space.

4.5 Principle access to the site is proposed from The Street. In addition, the application has been amended to include a secondary access for pedestrians, cyclists and for emergency use from Suckling Place through the above mentioned young woodland to the south-west of the site.
4.6 The main issues for consideration are the principle of development on the site, the relationship of the development proposed within its context, adequate highway access, ensuring development of the site does not exacerbate the risk of flooding in the locality, impact on existing neighbouring properties, and the impact of the development on trees (particularly from the proposed second access) and the ecological impact of the development.

Principle of development

4.7 Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy identifies Woodton as a service village in which allocations of 10 to 20 dwellings have been provided for the period between 2008 and 2026.

4.8 Policy WOO1 allocates the site for approximately 20 dwellings. In addition, the policy contains the following requirements:

- development should take the form of a small estate development accessed adjacent to Georges House
- the access should be upgraded along with footway improvements to the requirements of the Highway Authority

4.9 The application comprises of 21 dwellings which can be considered broadly in compliance with the allocation of approximately 20 dwellings. This does exceed the 10-20 dwellings in Service Villages identified in the Joint Core Strategy. However in considering whether this resultant effect on total number of dwellings, other material considerations must also be taken into account.

4.10 Part 1 of Policy DM1.3 states that new development should be located so that it positively contributes to the sustainable development. The policy seeks development to be on allocated sites and of a scale proportionate to the level of growth planned in that location, and the role and function of the Settlement within which it is located. The scheme proposed meets the requirement of this policy.

4.11 The layout takes the form of a small estate as required by Policy WOO1. An upgrade of the access onto The Street is proposed as required by the policy. In addition, an emergency access is proposed from Suckling Place to the south-west.

4.12 Given the contents of paragraph 49 of the NPPF it is necessary to determine whether the scheme represents sustainable development having regard to the content of the NPPF.

4.13 Sustainable development has three dimensions: economic, social and environmental. The NPPF goes on to stress in paragraph 8 that these are not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of sustainable development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.

4.14 The assessment is undertaken having regard to the three roles expressed within the NPPF, and which have been reiterated in Policies DM1.1 and DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of each role also draws upon the relevant local plan policy where relevant.

Economic Role

4.15 The NPPF highlights the economic role as "contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure".
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4.16 The construction of 21 dwellings in a service village would help enhance the economic vitality of the village through local spending from future occupants of the dwellings.

4.17 In addition to the above, the scheme would also provide some short term economic benefits from construction of the dwellings.

Social Role

4.18 The NPPF confirms the social role as "supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being."

4.19 Given the site is allocated it is evident that this site is clearly part of the Council's strategy for meeting housing need within the district and as such would contribute to the stated social aim of the NPPF to provide the supply of housing to meet present and future need.

4.20 The social role highlights the need for housing to have appropriate access to a range of local services. Woodton is identified as a service village and has a good range of local services, including a primary school, village shop and public house, as well as a bus service to Norwich and Bungay. All can easily be reached on foot from the site.

4.21 In terms of the affordable housing provision, Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy requires 33% of the total number of units to be affordable, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not viable to do so. In this instance the scheme proposes that 7 of the 21 units are affordable, which equates to 33% and therefore is acceptable.

4.22 As scale is a matter to be considered at this stage, the mix of housing proposed needs to be considered. The proposed mix consists of:

- 2 one bedroom houses for affordable rent
- 3 two bedroom houses for affordable rent
- 1 three bedroom house for affordable rent
- 1 three bedroom house for shared ownership / equity
- 7 three bedroom open market houses
- 7 four bedroom open market houses

4.23 It is considered that this is an appropriate mix of house sizes that meets the required mix in regard to affordable housing to the satisfaction of the Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer and provides a mix of open market housing, therefore complying with Policy 4 of the JCS and Policy DM3.1 of the Local Plan. The final layout and appearance would be considered at the reserved matters stage.

Environmental Role

4.24 The NPPF confirms the environmental role as "contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy."

4.25 As noted above, the application initially proposed a development of 26 dwellings. In addition to not providing adequate public open space, it was considered that the indicative layout provided did not show how this level of development, which was above the approximately 20 dwellings set out in Policy WOO1, could comfortably relate to its context.

4.26 Following negotiations, a revised indicative layout for a development of 21 dwellings has been submitted which is considered to have a sympathetic relationship with its context. In particular, the middle and upper sections of the site reflects the adjoining Taylor and Green housing at Woodyard Square with terraced housing fronting onto a public open space that
reflects the design of Woodyard Square, whilst the lower part of the site has a more irregular pattern of detached properties which are more reflective of the adjoining linear development along The Street to the south. The Senior Conservation and Design Officer is largely content with the layout and whilst some detailed design issues are still to be resolved these can be achieved at the reserved matters stage. In principle the development therefore complies with Policy 2 of the JCS and allows for a layout and design that can meet the requirements of Policy DM3.8 at the reserved matters stage.

4.27 A number of concerns have been raised about flood risk. In particular, concerns have been raised about flooding from the beck which runs along The Street, with the result that sections of The Street are within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3, and surface water flooding linked to the drainage channel that runs across the site. A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted and its findings considered by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA). In addition, a secondary access has been provided to ensure emergency access can be gained to the site even in a severe flooding event which prevents access from The Street.

4.28 The drainage strategy included in the Flood Risk Assessment suggests that the initial option for surface water disposal should be disposal via infiltration which is in line with the SuDS strategy. Should infiltration prove to be unfeasible in events up until the 1 in 100 year event including an allowance for climate change a second option of attenuation and discharge to the back is available to ensure that runoff from the proposed development at least matches if not less than the current runoff rates.

4.29 The runoff rate proposed is less than that which would be expected from a greenfield site, however the LLFA have accepted that this can be considered as a brownfield site and therefore the run-off rate has the potential to provide benefits to the downstream receiving environment (i.e. habitat benefitting from water). They therefore raise no objection subject to a condition requiring a detailed surface water drainage scheme that will ensure that the runoff rate will be no greater than that currently and to ensure there is no displaced surface water on to adjoining property. It is therefore considered that with this condition the proposal complies with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DM4.2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.30 Some concerns have also been raised about potential overlooking issues from dwellings shown on the indicative layout, particularly in relation to the property known as Beck View to the south. A dwelling is shown relatively close to this property, however it is shown at an angle which should allow for windows to be positioned where they do not result in unacceptable overlooking. Similarly, there are adequate separation distances between dwellings shown indicatively on the middle and upper parts of the site and the adjoining properties on Woodyard Square. It is therefore considered that the indicative layout allows for a development that would not result in an adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining properties in accordance with Policy DM3.13, although ultimately this will need to be ensured in the detailed design of the dwellings at reserved matters stage.

4.31 In relation to amenity it is noted air source heat pumps are proposed on the site. Whilst these would be detailed at the reserved matters stage a condition is recommended to ensure the noise from these does not adversely affect residential amenity, in line with policy DM3.13.

4.32 Development of the site allocation itself has relatively few arboricultural implications other than ensuring development does not have an adverse impact on the existing hedges on the site boundaries. However the creation of the second access does have a number of arboricultural implications as the land that it passes through to link to Suckling Place has been planted with trees to form an area of woodland. Further information is being submitted to establish the arboricultural implications of the access, and to ensure any impacts are minimised to ensure compliance with Policies DM4.8 and DM4.9. An update on this issue and the Landscape Architect’s comments will be provided at the meeting.
4.33 In regard to ecology, a Preliminary Ecological Assessment was submitted in response to comments from Norfolk County Council's Ecologist. This identifies that overall the site has low potential to support protected species. A full survey has not been undertaken of the land to be used for the second access. The applicant's Ecologist has noted that even if full surveys were taken out which resulted in a negative result for the presence of reptiles, the dense vegetation would be regarded as a constraint to an effective survey and therefore precautionary mitigation would be required. The applicant has therefore proposed a mitigation strategy including careful timing of any vegetation clearance, use of hand tools for such clearance under close ecological supervision and provision of alternative nesting opportunities. The County Council's Ecologist considers this approach appears reasonable and recommends a condition to this effect, worded to require approval before work commences.

4.34 As mentioned above, open space is to be provided in a square that reflects the adjoining Woodyard Square. The Council's guidance on open space provision requires that developments of between 14 and 21 dwellings provide 400sqm of open space. This will satisfactorily be provided in the indicative layout shown and therefore it is considered that the proposal complies with Policy DM3.15.

4.35 The development would not affect the setting of any designated heritage assets. The Tayler and Green housing adjoining the site at Woodyard Square can be considered as a non-designated heritage asset and is recognised as such by being subject to an Article 4 direction removing permitted development rights to retain their character. Consideration on the effect the application would have on the significance of this non-designated heritage asset is required under paragraph 135 of the NPPF. As mentioned above, the development has been designed to respect and reflect their character and therefore it is not considered that the development will have an adverse effect on their setting, and the proposals are considered to comply with paragraph 135 of the NPPF.

4.36 Given the former use of the land as a nursery it is appropriate to consider the potential for land to contain contamination. A suitable condition has been recommended to address this, and ensure the development complies with Policy DM3.14.

Highway Safety

4.37 A number of highway works have been proposed following comments from Norfolk County Council's Highways Officer. These include the provision of a new section of footway along The Street and a number of traffic calming measures. With these changes the Highways Officer does not raise any objection to the access from The Street into the site and the use of The Street as the primary means of accessing the site, thereby complying with Policy DM3.11. It is noted that the Parish Council do not consider the traffic calming measures necessary, however given the position of the highway authority it is considered that they do need to be provided. The provision of a mini-roundabout at the junction of The Street and Hempnall Road as requested by the Parish Council has not been proposed by the applicant and given it is not required by the Highway Authority it is not considered something we could insist upon the applicant providing.

4.38 The Highway Authority has questioned the need for the secondary access, which is not required in highway terms for a development of this site. However, as noted above, the primary purpose of this access is to provide an emergency access in the event of an exceptional flood event along The Street and not as an alternative access for general vehicular use.

4.39 The internal layout is indicative only and therefore to be determined at reserved matters stage. Nonetheless, it is important to establish that a layout can work with the scale of development proposed and with adequate parking to comply with Policy DM3.12 and 3.8. A few minor amendments are still to be provided at the request of the highway authority which were awaited at the time of writing the report, however there is no reason to consider
they cannot be delivered. An update will be provided as to whether the highway officer is satisfied with the internal layout provided when the amendments have been received. A fire hydrant is also required for this development, which can be required by condition.

Other issues

4.40 A condition is recommended to ensure the development complies with water efficiency standards in Policy 3 of the Joint Core Strategy.

4.41 Some comments have made reference to the overhead electricity cables that run across the site alongside the rear boundary of properties on Woodyard Square. These would need to be undergrounded with a layout such as that proposed given the proximity to the proposed dwellings and their impact on their private rear gardens. The applicant has confirmed that this is likely to be the case, but it is a detail that would be resolved at reserved matters stage. However, even in the event that the overhead cables were to be retained in their current position, access would need to be retained for maintenance.

4.42 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

4.43 The development will be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) at the reserved matters stage.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The principle of residential development, with the access and scale indicated within the application is acceptable given that the site is an allocation within the Local Plan and for the reasons outlined in this report accords with polices identified. Subject to the conditions listed above and S106 to secure affordable housing, open space and a commuted sum for play equipment the scheme is considered to represent a sustainable form of development as detailed in the above report.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker 01508 533848 tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Section 106’s relating to Major Applications

9. **Appl. No**: 2015/2463  
**Parish**: HINGHAM

Applicants Name: Paul Legrice – Abel Homes  
Site Address: Land south of Norwich Road, Hingham  
Proposal: Proposed Deed of Variation to the S106 for the consent for the proposal for the erection of 88 new homes plus associated roads and landscaping

Recommendation: Deed of Variation to Section 106 Agreement to be secured.

1. **Planning Policies (relevant to Deed of Variation)**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
Policy 8: Culture and Leisure  
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 14: Key Service Centres  
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM 1.2: Requiring infrastructure through planning obligations  
DM 3.15: Outdoor play facilities and recreational space

1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies  
HIN 1: Land south of Norwich Road

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide  
Recreation Open Space Requirements for Residential Areas (Dec 1994)

2. **Relevant Planning History**

2.1 2014/2322  
Erection of 88 new homes plus associated roads and landscaping.  
Approved

2.2 2015/2463  
Variation of condition 10 to allow revised drainage strategy of planning permission 2015/1675 - Erection of 88 dwellings.  
Approved

3. **Assessment**

3.1 A deed of variation to the secured Section 106 Agreement is to be sought for this approved development in respect of the provision of equipment for adult/older children. Rather than provide this equipment on site, instead a commuted sum is to be agreed to enable equipment to be provided off-site, on the existing Hingham Playing fields.
3.2 The S106 agreement for the approved development at Hingham requires a provision for the following:

- On site provision of public open space
- On site provision of toddler/junior play area
- On site provision of equipment in the recreational space for adult/older children to be agreed

3.3 The approved development proposed open spaces on the eastern boundary in a linear form and pocket park. The linear open space formed the adult/older children recreation requirements of the Council's Open Space standards. Whilst the Council's standards do not require recreation spaces for adult/older children to be equipped, it was considered an opportunity to secure an outdoor gym/trim trail in the linear recreation space to widen possible uses of the space (which the Council's Play and Amenities Manager indicated would be a good use of the space). The applicant agreed to include this in the S106 to enable further negotiation on suitable equipment as an enhancement to the scheme.

3.4 As such whilst the need to equip the recreation space on site was not therefore a matter that the committee report placed any significant weight on in determining the acceptability of the application, given the applicant was willing to include this in the S106, as an enhancement above policy requirements, it was secured subject to precise equipment being negotiated.

3.5 Through discussions with Hingham Town Council, Hingham Playing Fields and Sports Hall Committee, the local member and the Council’s Play and Amenities Manager together with the developer it was proposed that the provision of the outdoor gym equipment would be of greater benefit to be provided off-site. As such a deed of variation is requested to enable a commuted sum to be agreed, to be paid to the Council, to work with the Hingham Sports and Playing Field association to deliver the equipment at the existing Hingham Playing Fields.

3.6 Officers consider that the siting of the equipment at Hingham Playing fields would still enable this to serve the approved development given the limited distance to the approved development and accessibility on foot. The enhanced benefits of the proposed equipment would therefore still be addressing the approved development, but by virtue of their more centralised location in the town, would be more accessible to existing residents.

3.7 The approved recreation space on the development site would still be provided but would not be equipped with the outdoor gym equipment. Officers consider that this would still serve as an appropriate space in terms of area and laying out as an informal space for recreation to accord with the policy requirements and to reasonably serve the occupiers of the approved development.

4 Conclusion

4.1 The proposed deed of variation seeks to provide recreational equipment off-site rather than on-site. For the reasons set out in the above section, it is considered that this is reasonable, would still serve the development approved, and would not have affected the outcome of the original decision in the grant of the full planning permission. Officers therefore seek member’s approval to secure the proposed deed of variation.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tracy Lincoln, 01508 533814 tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other Applications

10. **Appl. No**: 2016/2987/F  
    **Parish**: HETHERSETT

    **Applicants Name**: Saffron Housing Trust Ltd  
    **Site Address**: Land East of 10 and 12 Ketts Close Hethersett Norfolk  
    **Proposal**: Proposed 2no. semi-detached bungalows (affordable housing)

    **Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

    1. Full Planning permission time limit  
    2. In accordance with amendments  
    3. External materials to be agreed  
    4. Slab level to be agreed  
    5. New Water Efficiency  
    6. Surface Water to be agreed  
    7. Provision of parking  
    8. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
    9. Implementation of boundary treatment  
    10. Tree protection  
    11. PD rights removed for first floor openings and roof alteration/extension

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework

    NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
    NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
    NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
    NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy

    Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
    Policy 2: Promoting good design  
    Policy 3: Energy and water  
    Policy 4: Housing delivery  
    Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
    Policy 14: Key Service Centres

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan

    Development Management Policies

    DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
    DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
    DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
    DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
    DM3.5: Replacement dwellings and additional dwellings on sub-divided plots within Development Boundaries  
    DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
    DM3.10: Promotion of sustainable transport  
    DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
    DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
    DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document

    South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012
2. Planning History

2.1 2009/0453  Provision of one two bedroomed, four person dwelling with associated parking

2.2 2007/2344  Proposed 2no flats

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  To original submission
- Over development of the site
- Loss of amenity to local residents

To amended plans
- No material change to the original application
- Comments as previously stated

3.2 District Members
  Mr D Bills:  To the original submission
- Over development of a small patch of grassland and will impact on local amenity

To amended plans
- Still of the opinion that the application should be heard by Committee

Mr L Dale:  To original submission
- Currently see no reason why it should be determined by Committee, however might like to search out the previous application which was not proceeded with.

To amended plans
- To be reported if appropriate

3.3 SNC Water Management Officer  No objections subject to conditions

3.4 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team  No objection subject to conditions

3.5 NCC Highways  No objections subject to conditions

3.6 SNC Landscape Architect  No objections
- The tree's removal was proposed for the previous 2009/0453 application (withdrawn). I did not object at the time, but since then the Council has adopted policy DM4.8 which seeks retention of significant trees wherever possible.
- I do not have any information immediately available to suggest that this tree is particularly historic (either in its location or because of its variety) or a remnant of an orchard, but it is in relatively good condition with a useful life-expectancy and is suitable for its situation. Furthermore,
if palatable, I am sure that the fruits will be collected and used by those nearby who appreciate the opportunity to do so.

- If planning permission is granted, and the tree removed, then my hope would be for some replacement planting nearby. The applicant has much land in the vicinity, including an amenity space within Ketts Close, and it would be good to have new (or indeed further) apple trees there.

3.7 Representations

To original submission

1 letter of comment
- No objections to bungalows but hope something will be put in place to deal with any extra traffic, parking such as double yellow lines, to limit inconvenience to existing residents in an already restricted area of the close

7 letters of objection
- Planning permission for site been applied twice before. 2007 withdrawn following statement from SNDC that it was not a developable site and second withdrawn following recommendation to Committee for refusal
- Contrary to IMP1, as harmful to character and appearance of the street scene being cramped and intrusive form of development
- Over development
- Not in keeping with other properties
- Loss of green space
- Overbearing impact on neighbouring properties 11 and 12 Ketts Close significantly harming their amenity contrary to IMP9
- Loss of light, outlook and privacy
- Residents of 11/12 Ketts Close have been forced to concede sections of their garden as a condition of their tenancy agreements should this development take place

To amended plans

6 letters of objection
- See no difference and therefore continue to object
- Minor aesthetic changes but footprint is about the same
- Moved closer to our boundary
- If first proposal unacceptable then minor changes must be unacceptable
- Still over development
- Proposal is sited just 9m and 16m from the building lines of 10/12 Ketts Close and 6 Cann’s Lane respectively
- For 30 years had uninterrupted views across this small green space
- When I accepted the property understood that 5 metres would be taken from the bottom of the garden, it now appears more land will be taken leaving me with virtually no garden, no privacy and a very depressing gable end outlook
- Within 20m of 6 Cann's Lane building line
- Unacceptable level of intrusion
- Too close to junction
- Already have problems with parking and this will exacerbate
- Passers-by will enjoy fruit from the old apple tree
• Hethersett Environmental Action Team in recent times have spent time and money on tree and seasonal flower plants to augment the existing green space and wildlife habitat
• With general dramatic increase in housing in Hethersett vital to retain small pockets of rural habitat for wildlife and future generations to enjoy
• Pedestrian safety

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of two 1 bedroom bungalows with associated parking at land to east of 10 and 12 Ketts Close, Hethersett for Saffron Housing Trust. The application site forms part of the gardens of 10 and 12 Ketts Close together with a small piece of land, currently laid to grass and containing several trees. A terrace of small bungalows adjoins the site to the west, with a two-storey dwelling together with its garden located to the east and northeast. Semi-detached two storey ex-local authority dwellings are located to the south and southwest. The site is within the development limit for the village of Hethersett and in the Norwich Policy Area.

4.2 In 2009 an application for a two bedroomed, four persons dwelling with associated parking was recommended for refusal due to being a cramped and intrusive form of development, out of keeping with the existing built form of the area. However the application was withdrawn prior to being heard and formally determined, at the North West Area Planning Committee. Whilst an application is determined on its individual merits, due consideration in this instance has been given to the 2009 scheme. There are however, some distinct differences between the two applications, the application site was smaller as it did not include the gardens of 10 and 12 Ketts Close and it was for a two-storey dwelling.

4.3 The main issues in this case are the principle of development in this location; design and layout; highway safety; and residential amenity.

Principle of development

4.4 Policy 14 in the JCS allocates Hethersett as a Key Service Centre where further development is acceptable in principle under Policy DM1.3 subject to other planning considerations. This approach is supported by the NPPF.

4.5 The Council also is currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply within the Norwich Policy Area where this site is located, with a 4.7 year supply at March 2016. Consequently, the land supply policies within the Local Plan are out-of-date. Criteria (d) of Policy DM1.1 applies in line with paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that new development should be permitted unless the development would result in adverse impacts that significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

4.6 Policy DM3.5 of the Development Management Policies requires the sub-division of plots within the development limit to incorporate good quality design which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of existing buildings, street scene and surroundings and does not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties. Specially, proposals must provide and maintain: Adequate private amenity and utility space; adequate access and parking; and adequate levels of amenity with reasonable access to light and privacy, free from unacceptable noise or other pollutants. This policy is out of date in terms of land supply, however the more detailed design principles remain very much a material consideration in the determination of this application.
Design and layout

4.7 Both JCS Policy 2 and Section 7 of the NPPF require high quality design with importance being attached to the design of the built environment, with it seen as a key aspect of sustainable development.

4.8 Concerns were raised regarding the submitted detailed design and layout and of the submitted proposed dwellings. It was suggested that the width of the dwellings was reduced to mirror that of the single storey properties to the west and the properties moved towards the west to increase the space between the proposal and 10 and 12 Ketts Close. The revised scheme creates a better layout and the buildings reflect that of the existing single storey properties in terms of their scale, form and massing. The concerns set out above regarding over development; intrusive form of development and being out of keeping with the character of the area are fully appreciated. However the proposal is now considered acceptable in terms of its design, scale and relationship to the surrounding properties. The layout demonstrates that the site is of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed dwellings and curtilages. On this basis, it is considered that the scheme would accord with DM3.8 of SNLP, Policy 2 of the JCS and Section 7 of the NPPF.

Highways

4.9 Policy DM3.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would endanger highway safety or the satisfactory functioning of the highway network. The Highways Authority have assessed the proposal and raised no objections subject to the imposition of conditions. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with polices DM3.11 and DM3.12. The concerns raised by local residents are fully appreciated however, in the absence of a highway objection, I do not consider the application can be refused on highway safety grounds raised.

Residential Amenity

4.10 Policy DM3.13 on residential amenity directs that development should not be approved if it would have a significant adverse impact on nearby residents’ amenities. The proposal has been carefully designed as to protect the amenities of the existing neighbouring properties by not introducing any first floor windows; the roofs are hipped to reduce the bulk and massing on the boundary; and moved further away from the neighbours, increasing the distance between the new properties and the existing, and reducing the loss of gardens to 10 and 12 Ketts Close. In view of the above, it is considered that the development will not have any significantly detrimental impacts on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties in respect of privacy, light, noise and overbearing impact. As such, the scheme would accord with the requirements of policy DM3.13. Local residents have raised concerns as set out above and whilst these are fully appreciated, I do not consider the proposal can be refused on the grounds raised.

Trees

4.11 The Landscape Architect has raised no objections to the removal of the fruit tree as there is no justification for its protection via a Tree Preservation Order. Equally as the land owned by Saffron elsewhere does not form part of this application a condition requiring new planting cannot reasonably be imposed.

Other matters

4.12 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater
4.13 This development would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) because they are new dwellings, but exemption can be claimed as they are affordable dwellings.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The application is acceptable on this site and is considered to represent a sustainable form of development. The appearance and layout of the development is considered acceptable for its context and it will not adversely affect the amenities of the neighbouring properties. As such the proposal accords with the NPPF, JCS and SNLP

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788
and E-mail: ccurtis@norfolk.gov.uk
11. **Appl. No** : 2016/3012/F  
**Parish** : HETHERSETT  

Applicants Name : Mr Sam Watts  
Site Address : Land To The Rear Of 25 South Croft Hethersett Norfolk  
Proposal : Demolition of existing garages and erection of 4 No 1 bedroom bungalows  

Recommendation : Approval with conditions  

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amendments  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Slab level to be agreed  
5. New Water Efficiency  
6. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
7. Contaminated land - submit scheme  
8. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
9. Provision of parking, service  
10. Retention trees and hedges  
11. PD rights removed for first floor openings and roof alterations/extensions  

1. **Planning Policies**  

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 06 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design  
NPPF 10 : Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 3 : Energy and water  
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation  
Policy 14 : Key Service Centres  

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.1 : Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.1 : Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.10 : Promotion of sustainable transport  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life  

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012  

2. **Planning History**  

2.1 None directly relevant
3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Town / Parish Council**

To original scheme
Provision of needed 1 bedroom dwellings in the village

To amended plans
No additional comments

3.2 **District Member**

To be determined by DM Committee
Potential for removing amenities which are currently enjoyed by residents surrounding the site in terms of rear access and parking. There may be some who are freeholders under right to buy and may well have 7 years entitlement to claim a statutory right of continued access.

3.3 **SNC Water Management Officer**

No objections

3.4 **SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team**

No objections subject to conditions

3.5 **NCC Highways**

No objections subject to conditions

3.6 **Representations**

To the original submission
1 letter of support
- Would tidy up area - garages are in a bad state
- Provide housing
- Prevent anti-social behaviour

3 letters of objection
- Would not object to principle of development of the area, however have issue with the positioning of the proposed bungalows and the road way
- Development could be achieved with bungalow and road way to the rear of 9, 11, 13, 15 and 17 - maintaining good access to the rear of 69
- Narrow road to site with heavy lorries carrying building materials, parking of building workers cars
- Disturbance and possible damage to properties
- Weekly refuse collections
- Damage to ash tree
- Saffrons handling of the situation has been unfair
- Garages have asbestos

To amended plans
2 letters of objection
- Maintain objection
- Following being advised that a large amount of my rear garden will be built on with to raise concerns over parking issues which can already create problem and therefore request to lower kerb at front of my existing dwelling to parking congestion
4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of four 1 bedroom bungalows with associated parking at land to the rear of 25 South Croft, Hethersett for Saffron Housing Trust. The application site is currently an existing parking and garage area, with a mixture of boundary treatments with some pedestrian access gates from the surrounding properties. It is also proposed to use part of the top of the gardens servicing two existing properties. The properties surrounding the site are predominately single storey. It is proposed to use the existing access located to the northeast. The site is within the development limit for the village of Hethersett and in the Norwich Policy Area.

4.2 The main issues in this case are the principle of development in this location; design and layout; highway safety; and residential amenity.

Principle of development

4.3 Policy 14 in the JCS allocates Hethersett as a Key Service Centre where further development is acceptable in principle under Policy DM 1.3 subject to other planning considerations. This approach is supported by the NPPF.

4.4 The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply within the Norwich Policy Area where this site is located, with a 4.7 year supply at March 2016. Consequently, the land supply policies within the Local Plan are out-of-date. Criteria (d) of Policy DM1.1 applies in line with paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that new development should be permitted unless the development would result in adverse impacts that significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

4.5 The development is located on an existing piece of land used for parking, where there are a number of garages in a mixture of states of repair. The loss of this area as a parking facility for local residents is a material consideration of the application. The applicants have carried out a parking survey to show the existing parking spaces available to residents (equally when visiting the site I also noted the parking provisions that existed) and in this instance, it is considered that due to the provision of existing parking within the curtilages of a significant number of the existing residential properties, and the provision of 7 spaces for existing residents proposed as part of the scheme, that the principle of the development of the site is acceptable.

Design and layout

4.6 Both JCS Policy 2 and Section 7 of the NPPF require high quality design with importance being attached to the design of the built environment, with it seen as a key aspect of sustainable development.

4.7 Concerns were raised regarding the submitted detailed design and proximity to 69 South Croft and it was suggested that the roof was hipped to reduce the bulk and massing, equally the applicants have moved the bungalows away from the boundary. The revised scheme creates a better layout and the buildings reflect that of the existing single storey properties in terms of their scale, form and massing. The concerns set out above are fully appreciated however the proposal is now considered acceptable in terms of its design, scale and relationship to the surrounding properties. The layout demonstrates that the site is of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed dwellings and curtilages. On this basis, it is considered that the scheme would accord with DM3.8 of SNLP, Policy 2 of the JCS and Section 7 of the NPPF.
Highways

4.8 Policy DM3.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would endanger highway safety or the satisfactory functioning of the highway network. The proposed access is via the present access to the site and the Highways Authority have assessed the proposal and raised no objections subject to the imposition of conditions. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Polices DM3.11 and DM3.12.

Residential Amenity

4.9 Policy DM3.13 Residential amenity directs that development should not be approved if it would have a significant adverse impact on nearby resident's amenities. The proposal has been carefully designed as to protect the amenities of the existing neighbouring properties by not introducing any first floor windows and the roofs are hipped to reduce the bulk and massing on the boundary. The proposal is separated from the neighbouring properties by their gardens and is for single storey dwellings; therefore it is considered that the development will not have any significantly detrimental impacts on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties in respect of privacy, light, noise and overbearing impact. As such, the scheme would accord with the requirements of Policy DM3.13. Local residents have raised concerns as set out above, whilst these are fully appreciated, I do not consider the proposal can be refused on the grounds raised.

Other matters

4.10 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

This development would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) because they are new dwellings, but exemption can be claimed as they are affordable dwellings.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The application is acceptable on this site and is considered to represent a sustainable form of development. The appearance and layout of the development is considered acceptable for its context and it will not adversely affect the amenities of the neighbouring properties. As such the proposal accords with the NPPF, JCS and SNLP.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
12. **Appl. No**: 2017/0252/H  
**Parish**: CHEDGRAVE  

Applicants Name: Mrs Claire Day  
Site Address: 18 Langley Road Chedgrave Norfolk NR14 6HD  
Proposal: Rear single storey extension  

Recommendation: Approval with Conditions  

1. **Planning Policies**  

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment  

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  

1.3 Development Management Policies  
DM3.4: Residential extensions and conversions within Settlements  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM4.10: Heritage Assets  

1.4 **Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas:**  
S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”  

2. **Planning History**  
2.1 No relevant history  

3. **Consultations**  
3.1 Town / Parish Council: No comments on application  
3.2 District Member: To be reported if appropriate  
3.3 Representations: To be reported if appropriate  

4. **Assessment**  
4.1 The applicant is a member of staff so the application falls to be determined by the Development Management Committee.  

4.2 The application site is a terraced cottage located within the development limits of Chedgrave, and within the Conservation Area. The street scene consists of a row of varied red brick early 20th century cottages, with small green space and a print works opposite.
4.3 This application proposes an extension to the rear of the property, extending an existing flat roof extension to the boundary.

4.4 The alteration of the existing dwelling is acceptable in principle. As such the main considerations are design, impact on the Conservation Area, and impact upon residential amenity.

Design

4.5 Policy DM3.4 directs that proposals for extensions to dwellings within settlements will be permitted provided that they incorporate good quality design which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of the building, street scene and surroundings.

4.6 With reference to design; the proposal is small in scale, with a form which acts as a continuation of the existing flat roof extension. Many of the properties along this row have been previously altered to provide a mix of extensions to the rear elevations.

4.7 The materials proposed are to match the existing dwelling; however a condition has been imposed to ensure that the bricks match as closely as possible.

4.8 Overall, the proposal is considered appropriate and in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and due to the position at the rear of the property, would have no impact on the street scene.

Impact on the Conservation area

4.9 The impact on Conservation Areas requires consideration under the development management policies and S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. The application has been assessed on whether there would be significant harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and in view of the scale and nature of the proposal, and that it would not be visible from the highway, it is considered that the scheme is acceptable. As such, it is considered that the proposal would accord with section 12 of the NPPF and Policy DM4.10 of the SNLP.

Impact on residential amenity

4.10 With regards to impact upon residential amenity, the proposal will extend to the boundary wall with the neighbouring property, where the wall is slightly directed away from the neighbour. The application site sits slightly higher and more forward than the neighbour to the south, which has an existing rear lean to. However, due to the scale of the alteration, which would slightly slant away from the neighbour, there is not considered to be a significantly adverse impact through overshadowing or through being overbearing. There are no windows proposed on the side elevations which would cause a loss of privacy.

4.11 In regards to highway safety, there is not considered to be an adverse impact due to the nature of the proposal.

4.12 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
5. **Conclusion**

5.1 It is considered that the design is in keeping with the property and that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the amenity of either the immediate neighbours or the wider area, or the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such the proposal accords with the criteria set out within policies DM3.4, DM3.13 and DM4.10 of the local plan and policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Lucy Smith 01508 533821 lsmith@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applications on land owned and submitted by South Norfolk Council
Applications on land owned and submitted by South Norfolk Council

13. **Appl. No**: 2017/0046/A  
**Parish**: DISS

- **Applicants Name**: Mr Daniel Infanti  
- **Site Address**: Diss Leisure Centre Victoria Road Diss Norfolk IP22 4JG  
- **Proposal**: Proposed banner on front fascia with changeable content

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions  
1-5 Standard advert conditions  
6 In accord with submitted drawings  
7 Advert details as submitted

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design  
NPPF 12 : Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM3.9 : Advertisements and signs  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

1.4 Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas:  
S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: "In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area."

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2015/0703 Replacement of existing facia and roadside signs. **Approved**

2.2 2010/0699 Erection of external signage **Approved**

2.3 2000/0727 Erection of extension to existing changing rooms and new front entrance canopy **Approved**

2.4 1993/1597 Erection of spectator area and foyer with covered entrance **Approved**

2.5 2008/0416 Replace existing fence and wall around front garden with a new wall **Approved**

2.6 2008/0415 Installation of sign **Refused**

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Town Council Proposal appears acceptable
Development Management Committee

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways No objections

3.4 SNC Conservation No comments - no significant impact on character of conservation area
And Design

3.5 Representations None

4 Assessment

4.1 Diss Leisure Centre is located on the southern side of Victoria Road and is sited within the
development boundary and the conservation area. This application proposes a non-
iluminated advertisement in the form of a banner to be erected along the fascia of the
existing flat roofed canopy on the front elevation of the centre. The banner would have
overall dimensions of 11 metres x 1 metre and would be blue in colour with white text. It
would advertise leisure centre services throughout the year, such as swimming lessons,
and so the text would vary. This application is reported to Committee because it is
submitted by South Norfolk Council Leisure Services.

4.2 This proposal is assessed against policy DM3.9 of the SNLP where advertisements will
only be permitted if they are well designed and sympathetic to the character and location of
their location and the building on which they are installed. This part of Victoria Road is
characterised by a mixed street scene of residential and commercial frontages. The
proposed banner would be of an appropriate size and finished in colours to match the
existing signage within the site. While the content of the banner may vary during the year,
the colours used and size of any text would remain consistent so would not alter the
character of the sign. Therefore, it is considered that this proposal would have an
acceptable appearance which would reflect the existing character of this site.

4.3 The leisure centre is set well back from the road with parking to the front. As a result, the
proposed banner would not appear unduly prominent in views along Victoria Road and
would have an acceptable impact on wider visual amenity.

4.4 The Highways Authority has assessed the proposal and raised no objections as the
proposed banner would have no adverse impact on road safety or the free flow of traffic.

4.5 The proposed banner would not be illuminated and would be well separated from the
nearest residential properties. Therefore, it would have no adverse impact on existing
residential amenity.

4.6 The impact on Conservation Areas requires consideration under the development
management policies and S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 requires special attention to be
paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of
Conservation Areas. The application has been assessed by the Senior Conservation and
Design Officer who has raised no objection to the scheme on the grounds that it would not
have any harmful impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area. As
such, it is considered that the proposal would accord with section 12 of the NPPF and
policy DM4.10 of the SNLP. Equally in consideration of the Council's duties under the Act it
is considered that for the reasons set out above that the proposal would not adversely
affect the conservation area.

4.7 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on
local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application
the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

4.8 CIL Liability - This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure levy (CIL).
5 Conclusion

5.1 It is considered that the design is in keeping with the character of the site and that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the amenity of either the immediate neighbours or the wider area. As such the proposal accords with the criteria set out within policies DM3.9, DM3.11, DM3.13 and DM4.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Blanaid Skipper 01508 533985
and E-mail: bskipper@s-norfolk.gov.uk
### Planning Appeals

#### Appeals received from 24 January 2017 to 16 February 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/1236</td>
<td>Wicklewood Land Adj To The Cherry Tree Inn Hackford Road Wicklewood Norfolk</td>
<td>Ms Julie Savory and Mr Roger Abrahams</td>
<td>Outline planning application for the erection of a four bedroom two-storey dwelling with attached garage to include means of access only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2165</td>
<td>Loddon Land At Beccles Road Beccles Road Loddon Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Reg Holmes</td>
<td>Outline application for the erection of 4 self-build dwellings with all matters bar access reserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2287</td>
<td>Bracon Ash And Hethel Land East of Long Lane Bracon Ash Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Wickers</td>
<td>New dwelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals

#### Appeals decisions from 24 January 2017 to 16 February 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Decision Maker</th>
<th>Final Decision</th>
<th>Appeal Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/0631</td>
<td>Surlingham Builders Store Beerlicks Loke Surlingham</td>
<td>Mr S Hall</td>
<td>Existing use as Builders Store (B8) and Manufacture of Play Equipment (B1)</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Approval with Conditions</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Parish / Site</td>
<td>Appellant</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Decision Maker</td>
<td>Final Decision</td>
<td>Appeal Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1312</td>
<td>Thurton Subdivision Of Garden Of Jaemeen House Norwich Road Thurton Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Adrian Barnes</td>
<td>2 No new dwellings and associated garaging</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/1558</td>
<td>Gissing Crown Bungalow Lower Street Gissing Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr K Greenacre</td>
<td>Removal of condition 6 following planning permission 2003/1418 (detached annexe) - to allow the sale of the annexe</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/1693</td>
<td>Costessey 26 West End Avenue Costessey Norfolk NR8 5BA</td>
<td>Mr And Mrs J Green</td>
<td>Proposed conservatory to front</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>