Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

Conservatives  Liberal Democrats
Mr V Thomson  Dr M Gray
(Chairman)  
Mrs L Neal  
(Vice-Chairman)  
Mr P Broome  
Mrs F Ellis  
Mr C Gould  
Dr C Kemp  
Mr G Minshull  
Mr J Mooney  
Mr B Stone  
Mrs A Thomas

Pool of Substitutes
Mrs Y Bendle  Mrs V Bell
Mr L Dale  
Mr C Foulger  
Mr J Hornby  
Dr N Legg  
Mr G Wheatley

Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time
9.00 am  Cavell Room

Agenda

Date
Wednesday 12 October 2016

Time
10.00 am

Place
Council Chamber
South Norfolk House
Cygnet Court
Long Stratton, Norwich
NR15 2XE

Contact
Sue Elliott  tel (01508) 533669
South Norfolk House
Cygnet Court
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

Email: democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Website: www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

PLEASE NOTE that any submissions (including photos, correspondence, documents and any other lobbying material) should be received by the Council by noon the day before this meeting. We cannot guarantee that any information received after this time will be brought to the Committee's attention.

This meeting may be filmed, recorded or photographed by the public; however anyone who wishes to do so must inform the Chairman and ensure it is done in a non-disruptive and public manner. Please review the Council's guidance on filming and recording meetings available in the meeting room.

If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance
Large print version can be made available
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 7)

4. Minutes of the Meeting of the Development Management Committee held on
   14 September 2016
   (attached – page 9)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 15)
   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>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2016/0662/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Land At Thickthorn Roundabout Norwich</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hethersett Norfolk NR9 3AU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2016/1741/F</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Land North of Wild Rose Farm Ipswich</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Road Long Stratton Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2016/1824/A</td>
<td>CARLETON RODE</td>
<td>Church Of All Saints Church Road Carleton Rode</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NR16 1RN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2016/1870/O</td>
<td>EASTON</td>
<td>St Athanasius Coptic Church Marlingford Road</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Easton NR9 5AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2016/1871/F</td>
<td>COLNEY</td>
<td>Land North West of Old Watton Road Colney Norfolk</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2016/2207/CAN</td>
<td>WACTON</td>
<td>Yeoman Cottage Church Road Wacton</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NR15 2UG</td>
<td></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. Quarterly Enforcement Report
   (attached – page 80)

8. Planning Appeals (for information)
   (attached – page 84)

9. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wednesday 9 November 2016
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 |
| Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document |
| Development Management Policies Document |
| 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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.
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

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

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

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

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?

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

YES

NO
AGENDA ITEM 4

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 14 September 2016 at 10.00 am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: L Neal (Vice Chairman), P Broome, F Ellis, C Gould, M Gray, G Minshull and B Stone.


Officers in Attendance: The Director of Growth and Localism (T Horspole), the Planning Decisions Team Leader (C Trett) and the Senior Planning Officers (C Raine and T Lincoln)

(10 members of the public were in attendance)

287. 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>2016/0803/D</td>
<td>TROWSE WITH</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant and Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td>NEWTON</td>
<td>T Lewis</td>
<td>Related Pecuniary Interest Local Member’s property adjoins proposed site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M Gray</td>
<td>Other Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Member is a political colleague of Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0805/F</td>
<td>TROWSE WITH</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant and Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 2)</td>
<td>NEWTON</td>
<td>T Lewis</td>
<td>Related Pecuniary Interest Local Member’s property adjoins proposed site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M Gray</td>
<td>Other Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Member is a political colleague of Local Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
288. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 17 August 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

289. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/0803/D (Item 1)</td>
<td>TROWSE WITH NEWTON</td>
<td>Mr A Tomlinson – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr A Presslee – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr J Nichols – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr T Lewis – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0805/F (Item 2)</td>
<td>TROWSE WITH NEWTON</td>
<td>Mr A Tomlinson – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr A Presslee – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr J Nichols – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr T Lewis – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/1447/F (Item 5)</td>
<td>BRESSINGHAM</td>
<td>Mr M Lambert – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr R Sanderson – On behalf of Applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

290. ENFORCEMENT REPORTS

1. Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Ashwellthorpe and Fundenhall (ref: 2016/8047).

It was RESOLVED that:

Appropriate enforcement action be taken to remove the bund next to the boundary with the B1113 Norwich Road, and that no further action be taken with regard to the enlarged pond and other associated earthworks.
2. Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Hedenham (ref: 2012/2170).

It was RESOLVED that:

No further action be taken on the matter.

291. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting closed at 11.50 am)

_____________________
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.

1  Appl. No : 2016/0803/D
Parish : TROWSE WITH NEWTON
Applicants Name : Norfolk Homes
Site Address : Land North Of A146 And East Of White Horse Lane Trowse Norfolk
Proposal : Submission of Reserved Matters pursuant to outline planning permission ref 2013/0463/O - appearance, scale, landscaping and layout: 85 no. dwellings and associated works
Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval

Approved with conditions

1 - in accordance with plans
2 - comply with ecology scheme as submitted
3 - water efficiency
4 - landscaping as submitted
5 - boundary treatments as in plan
6 - flintwork panel to be agreed
7 - SHC09
8 - SHC24
9 - SHC40
10 - Materials management plan to be agreed

2  Appl. No : 2016/0805/F
Parish : TROWSE WITH NEWTON
Applicants Name : Norfolk Homes
Site Address : Land North Of A146 And East Of White Horse Lane Trowse Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of 13 affordable houses and associated works
Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval

Approved with conditions

1 - Time limit
2 - In accordance with plans
3 - External materials to be agreed
4 - Highways
5 - Landscaping
6 - Water efficiency
7 - Surface water drainage scheme to be agreed
8 - Foul to mains
9 - Boundary treatments as submitted
10 - Materials management plan to be agreed
11 – Deed of variation in relation affordable housing

Updates to officer report
Additional condition required for flint work sample panel to be provided.
3  **Appl. No**: 2014/0981  
**Parish**: TROWSE WITH NEWTON

**Applicants Name**: Trustees Of The Arminghall Settlement  
**Site Address**: Land South Of Devon Way And Hudson Avenue, Trowse  
**Proposal**: Outline planning permission for residential development, associated external works and amenity areas (with an area of land set aside for future primary school use).

**Decision**: This item was **deferred** to a future meeting of the Development Management Committee.

---

4  **Appl. No**: 2011/0505, 2012/0371 and 2015/2168  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

**Applicants Name**: Pelham Holdings Ltd  
**Site Address**: Land North of the A11, Park farm, Silfield Road  
**Proposal**: Residential led development of 1230 dwellings and other infrastructure

**Decision**: Members voted unanimously for **Approval** for Deed of variation to the S106 Agreement (main agreement and bridge agreement) to be secured, subject to further agreement of terms.

---

5  **Appl. No**: 2016/1447/F  
**Parish**: BRESSINGHAM

**Applicants Name**: Openfield  
**Site Address**: Harvest House  Low Road Bressingham IP22 2DB  
**Proposal**: Demolition of 5 buildings and construction of 17 storage silos, 10 intake silos, 1 dust box, 1 machinery building, 3 grain driers and 6 bulk out load hoppers. New permanent and temporary access for construction vehicles and upgrading of on-site roadways.

**Decision**: Members voted 9-1 for **Approval**

Approved with conditions

1. Full planning permission time limit
2. In accordance with submitted information
3. Visibility splays to each side of access
4. Access / on-site car and HGV parking, loading, unloading and turning areas
5. Detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works
6. On-site parking for construction workers
7. Vehicular access from the adjoining highway limited
8. Temporary construction access to be closed
9. Materials to be agreed
10. Surface water drainage scheme
11. Foul drainage assessment
12. Environmental conditions as required
**Updates to officer report**

NCC Ecologist comments:

No objection subject to conditions in respect of replacement planting being provided and working methods and mitigation as in submitted ecology report being followed.

SNC Env Protection comments:

Conditions required relating to external lighting scheme, contaminated land investigation, unknown contamination, air quality mitigation measures as submitted, noise mitigation measures to be agreed, construction management plan to be agreed, delivery time restrictions 07:00 until 20:00.

---

6  

**Appl. No** : 2016/1737/RVC  
**Parish** : ASLACTON  

Applicants Name : Mr Dobson  
Site Address : Waveney Pumps Newport Drive Station Road Aslacton Norfolk NR15 2DU  
Proposal : Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 2015/1663 (Demolition of existing industrial nissen hut and erection of seven new industrial units) - increase in size of units, change in position of doors and shutters on the units, change in positioning of car parking spaces.

Decision : Members voted unanimously for **Approval**

Approved with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amendments  
3. B1 and B8 only  
4. External materials  
5. No power tools outside building  
6. Limited Hours of Use  
7. No generators, air handling plant  
8. No access to the site from east  
9. Eastern boundary treatment including bollards  
10. Provision of parking, service  
11. In filling of hedge  
12. Details of southern boundary treatment  
13. Tree protection  
14. Retention trees and hedges  
15. Fire Hydrant  
16. Demolition by hand and if bats found work to cease  
17. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
18. External Lighting
Applications referred back to Committee

1. **Appl. No**: 2016/1447/F
   **Parish**: BRESSINGHAM

   **Applicants Name**: Openfield
   **Site Address**: Harvest House Low Road Bressingham IP22 2DB
   **Proposal**: Demolition of 5 buildings and construction of 17 storage silos, 10 intake silos, 1 dust box, 1 machinery building, 3 grain driers and 6 bulk out load hoppers. New permanent and temporary access for construction vehicles and upgrading of on-site roadways.

   **Recommendation**: Approval with conditions:

   1. Time limit
   2. In accordance with submitted information
   3. Visibility splays to be provided
   4. Access and on-site turning and parking to be provided
   5. Agree and implement off-site highway improvements
   6. On-site parking for construction workers
   7. Vehicular access only from approved access
   8. Temporary construction access to be closed
   9. External materials to be agreed
   10. Surface water drainage scheme to be agreed
   11. Foul water disposal via sealed system or private treatment plant
   12. External lighting to be agreed
   13. Contaminated land investigation to be agreed
   14. Implement any agreed remediation agreed in relation to contamination
   15. Unexpected contamination during construction
   16. Air quality mitigation to be agreed
   17. Noise attenuation to be agreed
   18. Construction environmental management plan to be agreed
   19. Restriction on delivery times
   20. Ecological mitigation to be agreed
   21. Implementation of landscaping scheme
   22. Landscape management arrangements to be agreed
   23. Protection of trees and hedgerows

1. **Assessment**

1.1 Having resolved to approve the application at the Development Management Committee on the 14th September 2016, prior to issuing its decision, the Council was subsequently made aware that the site notice posted adjacent to the site may not have been dated. To ensure compliance with the regulations a new site notice has been dated and posted adjacent to the site. This was done on the 21st September and consequently the 21 day period expires on the 12th of October. The original report and update is attached as Appendix 2.

1.2 Since the previous committee resolution, and in light of the new site notice being erected the following comments have been received:
1.3 Bressingham Parish Council – comments awaited following meeting on 3rd October and will be reported orally to committee.

1.4 A number of local representations have been received. A summary of these is as follows:

- unacceptable impact on amenity including noise concerns,
- heritage impact not fully considered,
- consultation has been inadequate,
- unacceptable level of tree removal, which has not been properly assessed,
- detrimental landscape and visual impact,
- ongoing demolition requires consent,
- economic benefits have been overplayed

1.5 In addition, one of the objectors has employed a noise consultant and stated:

“I understand from Chris that the matter has been heard at committee but a decision notice has not been issued and that conditions are currently being decided upon. What is not clear to me is how the committee could have come to a decision in the absence of any noise survey data to support the application: The Sharps Redmore Report (Document reference R1-1.9.16-Proposed Upgrade of Grain Store, Bressingham-1616275-DEB) did not appear to be before the committee when it sat and only became available on the planning portal three days ago. When we spoke this morning you said that you had not had time to read the Sharps Redmore report and therefore it is clear that you would not have been in a position to make any technical recommendations to members regarding this document.

I am concerned that in hearing the matter at committee without any noise information it would have been impossible to assess if the application meets the requirements of South Norfolk Local Plan Policy DM 3.13 (copy below for your reference). This I believe is an important procedural issue that needs to be resolved before any decision can be issued.

Furthermore the noise report, as submitted, does not include any survey of the existing background noise levels in the area, it does not provide specific information regarding the proposed plant type and model numbers, and it provides only the simplest of predictions of likely noise at some, though not all, noise sensitive receptor locations. These predictions use estimates and assumptions that are not qualified in the report.

The report concludes that plant noise could be 59dBA at some receptors at night. Referring to our own library data the background noise level at this location falls to circa 25dBA after midnight and therefore the predicted plant noise level is a 24dB above this background level. For reference a difference of +10dB would be an indication of significant adverse impact (British Standard 4142:2014). When external noise levels above 55 dB at night occur the situation is considered increasingly dangerous for public health. Adverse health effects occur frequently, a sizeable proportion of the population is highly annoyed and sleep-disturbed. There is evidence that the risk of cardiovascular disease increases (World Heath Organisation Night Noise Guidelines for Europe, 2009).

Even if the report had been available to members of the committee there is not sufficient information to make an accurate assessment of the impact of noise on residential amenity. The limited data that is provided in the report indicates there would be a significant impact to residential amenity in the local community.”

1.6 For the avoidance of doubt, as indicated above the site notice does not expire until the 12th of October and therefore it should be noted that the Council may still receive further representations after the publication of this report. In the event any received after publication these will be reported via the Development Management Committee update sheet.
1.7 With respect to the comments received to date, officers would wish to comment on the points raised in paragraphs 1.4 and 1.5 as follows:

Noise

1.8 Para 3.3 of the original committee report (appendix 2) highlights that SNC’s Community Protection Team’s comments would be reported to committee, the committee update sheet duly did this and advised that a number of suggested conditions had been recommended, including securing mitigation measures to be agreed.

1.9 It is evident that a noise assessment was received by the Council on the 6th September, however this was not uploaded to the Council’s website, upon being made aware of this it was duly added to the website. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that this undermines the recommendation insofar as the previous report acknowledges that noise is an issue which must be assessed, and consequently concludes, via the update sheet, that a condition would be required to secure measures to mitigate the impact of the development. It is considered that Members were aware of this when reaching their resolution.

1.10 In the context of Policy DM3.13 and noise it is evident that reference is made in part 1 criterion c 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 use as the site is already, and has been for some time in this use.

1.11 Part 2 of DM3.13, as above it is necessary to take into account the fact that the character and function of the area at present has this use in it.

1.12 Part 3 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 entirely reasonable to take into account the fact that the lawful use of the site generates noise at present, 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.

1.13 Since the committee resolution, further consideration of the content of this condition along with all other community protection based conditions and these are reflected in the list of conditions that accompany the recommendation in this report.

1.14 For the avoidance of doubt, taking into account the discussions that have taken place between the applicant’s noise consultant and the Council’s Community Protection Team they are satisfied that the methodology used in the report is appropriate and subject to appropriately worded conditions they have no objections.

Heritage

1.15 Paragraph 1.5 of the original committee report (Appendix 2) acknowledges its duties under S66(1) of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 and paragraph 3.8 of the committee report highlights that the Council’s Senior Conservation and Design Officer has within their assessment considered the impacts upon listed buildings and their setting. Paragraphs 4.21 and 4.22 of the committee report then assesses and conclude on the requirements of S66(1).

Consultation requirements

1.16 In terms of the consultation requirements associated with the application, upon the expiration of the site notice referred to above, the Council will have fulfilled all of its statutory requirements as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2015.
Tree removal

1.17 Paragraph 3.6 of the original committee report (Appendix 2) represents a summary of the Council's Landscape Architect's comments and confirms that "no significant existing trees will be lost". This is entirely consistent with their full response dated 18th August which clearly acknowledges the removal of trees (40 in total), but clearly articulates that the quality of those scheduled for removal as a consequence of them being “contemporary with, or more recent than, the existing site developments” are not considered to be “significant”. It should also be noted that the layout plan which formed part of the committee representation clearly highlighted the tree removal proposed.

Landscape impact

1.18 Concern has been expressed at how the landscape impact has been assessed. The original committee report at paragraphs 4.17 to 4.19 clearly acknowledges that there would be a negative impact on the landscape as a consequence of the proposal and subsequently the recommendation made reflects this. Furthermore, the visualisations used in the previous committee presentation showed the impact from four viewpoints by providing existing images and proposed images at both year 1 and year 15 of the development.

Enforcement/Demolition

1.19 It has been suggested that enforcement action against the demolition of buildings on-site be considered. In considering this, it is appropriate to acknowledge that the current proposal, if approved, would allow for the demolition, whilst this is still a “live” application it is not considered appropriate to pursue the demolition through its enforcement powers.

Economic benefit

1.20 It has been suggested that the proposal would actually result in loss jobs given the content of section 19 of the application form. It has been clarified that those jobs indicated to be “proposed employees” are additional to those indicated as “existing employees”. This is consistent with paragraph 1.6.1 of the Planning Statement which confirms that they are “new” employees.

Other matters

1.21 It is also appropriate to confirm that since the previous committee resolution, the Council has received confirmation via the Planning Inspectorate that 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 3.

1.22 In terms of the appeal decision, it is evident that 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.

1.23 Also, it is evident that 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.”

2 Conclusion

2.1 It is evident that the consideration of heritage, trees, landscape impact, noise and economic benefits were all considered within the previous committee report, and also having regard to the other matters highlighted above, it is the officer’s opinion that there are no material changes to the previous recommendation, in light of the additional comments made since the previous resolution. Therefore officers continue to recommend approval of the scheme based upon the previous assessment and as updated in this report.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:
Christopher Raine 01508 533841
Chris Watts 01508 533765
craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk and cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Appendix 2

Development Management Committee 14 September 2016

5.  Appl. No : 2016/1447/F
Parish : BRESSINGHAM
Applicants Name : Openfield
Site Address : Harvest House Low Road Bressingham IP22 2DB
Proposal : Demolition of 5 buildings and construction of 17 storage silos, 10 intake silos, 1 dust box, 1 machinery building, 3 grain driers and 6 bulk out load hoppers. New permanent and temporary access for construction vehicles and upgrading of on-site roadways.
Recommendation : Approve subject to the imposition of conditions

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 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 5 : The Economy
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation

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
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
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets
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1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD

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

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

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

2.4 1995/1461 Two grain silos Approved

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

2.6 1994/0530 Erection of 2no hopper grain silos and grain dryer (amendment to permission 07/98/0032F) Approved

2.7 1993/1022 Storage of 2000 tonnes of fertilizer Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Recommends approval.

3.2 District Member Requests that the application is determined by Development Management Committee.

3.3 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team Comments to be reported.

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 objection.
  • The application falls below our current threshold for providing detailed comment.
3.6 SNC Landscape Architect

- No significant existing trees will be lost. 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.
- 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 Helford 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.
- 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 comments received

3.8 SNC Conservation And Design

No objection.
- There are a number of heritage assets to the south of the site along Fen Street. 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.
- The design is appropriate for the context, but I would suggest resurfacing materials and details to ensure a quality to the final design.

3.9 NCC Ecologist

No objection.

3.10 NCC Highways

No objection.
- Subject to detail design, the proposals are considered acceptable. Recommend conditions relating to providing visibility splays, access / on-site and HGV parking, off-site highways improvement works.

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 Other Representations

2 letters of objection received and 1 letter of support. Comments as summarised:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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

Site description and proposals

4.1 The site relates to the Openfield Agricultura UK grain store located in the open countryside between Bressingham and South Lopham. 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. To the south of the site is a utilitarian brick office building associated with the site and there are properties located directly to the south east and south west of the application site.

4.2 Agricultural fields surround the application site with the A1066 forming the southern boundary of the site, which the site has direct access on to. There are a number of Public Rights of Way in the vicinity of the site and the site is located in the Waveney Rural River Valley Landscape Character Area. There are a number of listed buildings within the surrounding area. The site gently slopes down towards the river valley in a southerly direction.

4.3 The site has a number of existing silos, large grain store sheds and significant areas of concrete hardstanding, including car and lorry parking areas. A tree belt comprising mainly conifers is along the western boundary of the site and there is some mixed vegetation along the eastern boundary.

4.4 The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of 5 buildings and construction of 17 storage silos, 10 intake silos, 1 dust box, 1 machinery building, 3 grain driers and 5 bulk out load hoppers, and a new permanent and temporary access for construction vehicles and upgrading of on-site roads.
The amount of development proposed is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>FOOTPRINT M²</th>
<th>HEIGHT m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storage Silos</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3308m²</td>
<td>28m</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>24.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Driers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>152m²</td>
<td>16.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead bulk outloading hopper</td>
<td>2 x 3 bins</td>
<td>104m²</td>
<td>17.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyor / elevator for crop handling</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 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.

4.7 The new silos will be used to store grain. The proposed development will upgrade the existing outdated facility and the silos will enable grain to be stored more efficiently. The proposed development is in line with the existing built form of the grain store complex, and will not exceed the current site boundary.

4.8 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.

4.9 Additional landscape planting is also proposed along the eastern boundary to the site. This consists of a 425m² native shrub belt planting with hedgerow trees. In addition, additional trees are proposed to the west of the site.

4.10 The relevant policy considerations relating to the site are those contained in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and the South Norfolk Local Plan 2016 as well as national policy guidance.

4.11 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.

4.12 From an economic perspective, Openfield are one of Britain’s most successful co-operatives working with over 5000 arable farmers throughout the UK. Collaboration across the farmer member base is essential to create the required scale and the necessary investment in infrastructure to meet the needs of the farmer members at harvest time and the continuity of supply of grains to processor customers throughout the year.

4.13 The proposed investment in the Bressingham facility is £10 million spread over two years with £8 million in the first phase in readiness for harvest 2017 and the remainder in readiness for harvest 2018. The proposed upgrade will add significant added value contracts with local customers and produce approximately 6 full time equivalent new direct jobs (comprised of 3 full time employees and 6 part time employees) and many indirect jobs through the construction process, increased deliveries and maintenance of the site. The proposed upgrade will ensure that the grainstore remains profitable thus increasing the job security of the existing jobs (16 full time and 8 HGV drivers) the site provides. The proposed development will improve the efficiency of the site and make the grain store in
compliance with the EU food standard regulations, this will make the site more
economically sustainable. The application also suggests that the proposed grain store will
act as a catalyst for the local rural economy. Several maltsters within a ten mile radius of
the site have expressed interest in sourcing grain from the site.

4.14 With regards to the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2015, Policy DM1.3 supports this
approach and makes provision for development in the countryside outside of the defined
development boundaries or settlements providing the proposals demonstrate overriding
benefits in terms of its economic, social and environmental dimensions or where specific
development management policies allow for development outside of development
boundaries.

4.15 With the last point in mind, Policy DM2.1 of the Local Plan is applicable to Employment and
Business Development, and in particular part 6 which states that:
(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.

4.16 In considering the scheme against Policy DM2.1, firstly, it is clear that the scheme would
provide for new employment opportunities, significant inward investment and the adaptation
and expansion of an existing business and as such the scheme will be supported unless
significant adverse impact would occur, or other material considerations dictate otherwise.

As established in part 6 of Policy DM2.1 the key issues for consideration are:
- Landscape impact
- Impact upon the natural environment
- Amenities of neighbouring occupiers

Landscape impact (including the impact on heritage assets)

4.17 As well as part 6 of Policy DM2.1, policy DM4.5 requires that development proposals
should respect, conserve and where possible, enhance the landscape character of its
immediate and wider environment. It also states that development proposals that would
cause significant adverse impact on the distinctive landscape characteristics of an area will
be refused.

4.18 With regard to the overall visual impact, the Council’s Landscape Architect has assessed
the proposals and broadly agrees with the findings of the Landscape and Visual Impact
Assessment (LVIA) submitted with the application. However it is acknowledged that there is
a degree of judgement in the process and the Landscape Architect’s own assessment
concludes that some of the viewpoint locations with residential receptors (especially from
the river valley) would have major/moderate adverse and major adverse impacts
(viewpoints iii and iv). These impacts are notwithstanding the proposed mitigation
measures proposed (planting).

4.19 It is considered that given the impacts of the development from the majority of directions
would be moderate adverse, with more major adverse landscape impacts limited to only a
couple of viewpoints, on balance, whilst clearly it must be acknowledged that harm to the
landscape would be caused, in the context of part 6 of policy DM2.1 it would not be
considered to be significant adverse impact.

4.20 In terms of Public Rights of Way (PROW), there is a number of 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.
The Conservation and Design Officer has also undertaken a detailed appraisal of the proposal and its likely impact on the nearby designated heritage assets. It is noted that there are a number of listed buildings within the vicinity of the site, principally located to the south and east of the site. It is noted that 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, it is also noted that 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. The Conservation Officer concludes, and I concur, that the development is therefore acceptable from the point of view of its impact on the setting of the listed buildings.

In consideration of the Council’s duties under S86(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990, the Council has given special attention to the desirability of preserving the buildings or their settings. The proposal would not adversely affect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed buildings or the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

The Conservation and Design Officer 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.

The new structures of substantial size and height will feature prominently within the immediate site and wider landscape setting. However, notwithstanding this point the proposed silos and ancillary structures are well sited within the site being located between existing grain store sheds to the north and the existing (albeit smaller) silos to the south. Although the buildings will be large in scale and industrial in character, they are related to agricultural activity, and therefore not incongruous within a rural landscape context when seen within long distance landscape views. As such it is considered that the design and position of the silos and ancillary equipment within the site are appropriate for the context and accord with the principles of Policy DM3.8 and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD, subject to an appropriately worded condition seeking details of materials to ensure design quality.

Having regard to the above policies, it is acknowledged that there already is an existing development on the site, albeit significantly smaller than the proposed development, and whilst on balance it is acknowledged that there will be landscape harm arising from the development, most notably at the property known as the Wayside, the proposals are related to existing agricultural activity, and therefore not incongruous within a rural landscape context when seen within wider landscape views. As such whilst visual harm is acknowledged, it is not considered that this is considered to represent a significant adverse impact in terms to the rural landscape.

Impact upon the natural environment

The County Ecologist has assessed the Ecological Assessment submitted to the support the application and has concluded that it is fit for purpose. The report indicates that there is little evidence of bats on the site and a licence would not be required.

The Ecologist has requested that the mitigation measures referred in the report are conditioned and I consider this to be a reasonable requirement to mitigate any disturbance to those bats that are present on the site.
4.28 Having regard to part 6 of Policy DM2.1 it is considered that the proposal, including the proposed mitigation, would avoid causing significant adverse impacts in terms of the natural environment.

Amenities of neighbouring occupiers

4.29 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.

4.30 The Environmental Protection Team has reviewed the proposal and has suggested a number of conditions that would apply to both the construction and operational phases of development. These conditions would seek to minimise the disruption caused to those residents closest to the site, particularly during the construction phase. An ‘hours of operation’ condition during construction will also further protect these residents from the impact of development although due to the scale of development and the proximity of these dwellings to the site it is recognised that some disruption is likely to be experienced. A noise assessment has also been submitted and will be assessed by the local planning authority prior to development taking place on site.

4.31 As noted above it is likely that there will be some disruption during the construction stage of development to the local residents however this is considered to be to an acceptable level. The conditions proposed above seek to ensure that the proposed development on this site will not result in the introduction of an incompatible land use in terms of noise, odour, vibration etc however it is also recognised that the application site is an established business that has been in operation for many years on this site.

4.32 As also noted above, the proposed sites are of significant scale and will be clearly visible to those residents closest to the application site, most notably the occupiers of Waveney House to the south west of the application site and Wayside to the east. Due to the existing units on this established business site, as well as the relationship between these properties and the silos, it is not considered that the standard of amenity associated with these properties will be significantly affected by development in terms loss of daylight, overshadowing or overbearing impact.

4.33 There will be a significant increase in traffic associated with the development however the proposed off-site highway improvements along with the improved site access arrangements seeks to address this in highways terms as set out above. Whilst the increased vehicle movements will have an impact on the properties closest to the site, the increase in traffic movements will occur over a relatively short period of time in the year and as such will not result in significant disruption to these occupiers to a degree which is considered to be detrimental. It should also be noted that at present large vehicles already visit the site on a regular basis for delivery and collection purposes and that the proposed off-site highways improvements along with the suggested conditions restricting hours of hours of operation, will further reduce the impacts associated with vehicle movements to and from the site.

4.34 With regards to external lighting, it is recommended that a condition is added that requires any changes or additional external lighting on site to be considered in terms of impact on nearby residential amenity and also on bats to ensure that any impacts are minimised.

4.35 On balance, whilst local residents concerns are acknowledged and it is recognised that there will be some increased disturbance to those residents closest to the site as a result of the development, it is not considered that this will be to a degree that results in conflict with planning policy DM3.14 and DM3.13. The existing use of the site, including the scale of operations on the site, is also a consideration in assessing the impact of the development.
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4.36 In summary the scheme is considered to comply with the requirements of Policy DM3.14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan that requires development to have regard to the impacts on residential amenity and DM3.13 that seeks to ensure that development proposals take into consideration the impact on the living and working conditions of existing and future occupiers surrounding the site, subject to appropriate conditions.

4.37 Having regard to part 6 of Policy DM2.1 it is considered that the proposal, including the proposed mitigation, would avoid causing significant adverse impacts in terms of the natural environment.

4.38 Overall, in the context of the requirements of Policy DM2.1, and in particular part 6, the scheme, whilst causing some visual harm to the landscape would not result in a significant adverse impact and therefore Policy DM2.1 has been fulfilled.

Other issues

4.39 Whilst no referred to in Policy DM2.1 it is evident that one of the key impacts of the scheme would be from traffic movements associated with the scheme.

4.40 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.

4.41 The nature of these movements will be by HGV or tractor 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.

4.42 This site at Bresingham 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.

4.43 The proposal includes for a right turn lane facility to improve the A1066 and provide safe refuge for vehicles right turning into the site. This would remove the current access track, which has a single with pinch point, and allow vehicles to turn into the site without holding traffic up on the A1066. The proposal also includes for a temporary site entrance for construction traffic, which would be permanently closed after construction is completed in agreement with the Highway Authority.

4.44 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.

4.45 The Highways Authority has carried out an assessment of the submitted information including the safety audit report and the highway scheme designer's comments and considers that the proposals are 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.
4.46 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 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.

4.47 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.

Financial considerations

4.48 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.

4.49 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5 Conclusion

5.1 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. 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, the level of harm is not considered to represent a significant adverse impact as recognised within policy DM2.1. 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), nor would there be any significant adverse impact in respect of any other matter is highway safety. Therefore, in balancing the above impacts, including a degree of negative impact, against the clear economic benefits of the scheme it is considered that the application is, on balance, acceptable. Therefore the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:  
Chris Watts 01508 533765  
cwatts@e-norfolk.gov.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Updates</th>
<th>Page No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2016/0803</td>
<td>No Updates</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2016/0805</td>
<td>Additional condition required for flint work sample panel to be provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2014/0981</td>
<td>Letter received from Norfolk Homes whilst pleased that the deferral has allowed a meeting to take place between key stakeholders, which was a positive exercise, they continue to have the following concerns.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Both the Highway Authority and South Norfolk Council say that 45 is unacceptable as a permanent solution, however, the temporary use is open-ended and therefore does not ensure the access for upto 45 is temporary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No explanation is provided as to why it is acceptable on a temporary basis and but not permanently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- If you are concluding that temporary use is acceptable when a permanent one is not, there must logically be a maximum period when it ceases to not be acceptable. In the absence of any analysis of this it is impossible to conclude that the amendment does not lead to unacceptable impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The S106 does not ensure that it is temporary. The later of the two dates means that upto 45 dwellings can use Hudson Avenue in perpetuity in the event that the NH site is not developed or the access road is delivered but not adopted. Whilst it is NH desire to deliver the scheme there is no guarantee the scheme will happen, or the speed it will be delivered, given the risk of unforeseen circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- On the grounds of the above the scheme could be open to legal challenge under the Wednesbury grounds of unreasonableness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Legal challenge could be minimised by clarifying that “availability” of the route across NHL land does not mean adopted to ensure improved clarity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Alternatively, for improved certainty, the agreement could simply fix the permanent arrangements only, which we conclude to be 20 dwellings from Hudson Avenue on the recommendation of our highway consultant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- If the figure of 20 dwellings permanently were used, it would allow for significant time for discussion between both parties as to the commercial arrangements for the access from the adjoining site, which as stated previously should have no bearing on the decision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer comments: The committee report makes it clear and acknowledges that there is no fixed date known at
this time as to when the link from the adjacent will be available. The report considers the respective positions of the two sites and considers that there is a reasonable prospect that the link will be made available, and in a reasonable time frame, given the differing stages that each party is at. Having regard to these, it is considered that the recommendation is a reasonable decision, having regard to the Wednesbury principle referred to in the letter. The following text is a summary of the Wednesbury principle:

A standard of unreasonableness used in assessing an application for judicial review of a public authority’s decision. A reasoning or decision is Wednesbury unreasonable (or irrational) if it is so unreasonable that no reasonable person acting reasonably could have made it (Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd v Wednesbury Corporation (1948) 1 KB 223). The test is a different (and stricter) test than merely showing that the decision was unreasonable.

Trowse Parish Council comments:

Following on from the agreements made at the stakeholder meeting, is there really a need to allow for the additional 30 houses to have temporary access down Hudson Avenue and The Street? Therefore we agree with the fixed 15 houses but wish for the additional 30 to be removed.

We were assured as a PC that because Norfolk Homes have to be on site, a year post gaining permission, they are so much further down the line than Trustees of Arminghall Settlement, so the road structure will be in place and would negate the need for any temporary access.

Our concerns are that the temporary access had no end date and we have not been assured as a PC how the 30 houses would be prevented from having permanent access, after the temporary period has ceased. This will also not be shown to us until after reserved matters applications are submitted, which will be submitted by the developer who buys the land. Which hasn't happened yet.

4 2011/0505, 2012/0374 and 2015/168  
No updates

5 2016/1447  
NCC Ecologist comments:

No objection subject to conditions in respect of replacement planting being provided and working methods and mitigation as in submitted ecology report being followed.

SNC Env Protection comments:

Conditions required relating to external lighting scheme, contaminated land investigation, unknown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 2016/1737</td>
<td>No updates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

contamination, air quality mitigation measures as submitted, noise mitigation measures to be agreed, construction management plan to be agreed, delivery time restrictions 07:00 until 20:00.
Appendix 3

The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2016

by Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge BA (Hons) MTP MRTP IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/W/16/3150975

Adjacent Waveney House, Low Road, Bressingham, Diss, Norfolk IP22 2AG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Paul Rackham Ltd against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
- The application Ref 2015/2856, dated 11 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2016.
- The development proposed is erection of industrial unit.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of an industrial unit at land adjacent to Waveney House, Low Road, Bressingham, Diss, Norfolk IP22 2AG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2015/2856, dated 11 December 2015, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 15178 8, 15178 100 and 15178 101.

   3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

   4) No development shall commence until details of the off-site highway improvement works for the provision of a ghost island right-hand turn lane on the A1066 Low Road at the site access have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied until the improvement works have been completed in accordance with the approved details.

   5) The development shall not be occupied until the proposed access, on-site parking, loading, unloading and turning areas have been laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plans and shall thereafter be retained for such use.

   6) The development shall not be occupied until details of external lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained as such.
7) No machinery or power tools shall be used on the site outside the 
building in connection with any industrial process or activity, except for 
the purpose of maintenance of the land and/or the building, unless 
approved in writing by the local planning authority.

8) No generator, compressor, chilling unit or cooling fan shall be installed on 
the site until details of the equipment have been submitted to and 
approved in writing by the local planning authority. The installation shall 
be carried out in accordance with the details as approved and shall 
thereafter be retained as such.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the safe and 
efficient operation of the highway network.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in the countryside on the A1066, a road identified as 
a principal route and ‘Corridor of Movement’ in the South Norfolk Local Plan 
Development Management Policies Document 2015 (DMP). While the amount of 
taxi was not high at the time of my early afternoon site visit, vehicles 
travelled at fast speeds past the appeal site around the national speed limit of 
60mph and frequently included heavy goods vehicles (HGVs).

4. The existing access off the A1066 into the appeal site is used by vehicles 
entering and exiting the adjoining business premises. This includes HGVs and 
tractors, which typically take longer to complete turning manoeuvres due to 
their size and speed. The visibility of the access is reasonable in both 
directions along the A1066, although more reduced for eastbound traffic due to 
a crest and bend in the road. Traffic using this section of the A1066 is 
therefore at risk of disruption through reduced speeds and potential collisions 
in the vicinity of the access. Data from the local highway authority indicates 
that a considerable number of vehicles use the A1066 each weekday and 
highlights a serious road accident in 2013 involving a vehicle using this access.

5. In terms of the first reason for refusal, no detailed information has been 
provided regarding the existing and potential numbers of vehicles using the 
access or the precise use of the proposed industrial unit. The local highway 
authority has estimated 90 vehicle movements per weekday which the 
appellant has not disputed. Notwithstanding the lack of detailed information, it 
is evident that the proposed unit would result in significantly more vehicles 
using the access than is currently the case, including HGVs. This would 
represent an intensification of movements onto and off the A1066. Based on 
the current highway conditions, this would increase the risk of traffic disruption 
and accidents.

6. The Council, based on advice from the local highway authority, has indicated 
that a ghost island right hand turn lane facility would mitigate the impact of the 
proposed development and overcome the first reason for refusal. The 
appellant is unwilling to provide such a facility. However, it would allow 
vehicles entering the site from the east more time to wait and manoeuvre, 
assist in terms of the flow of traffic along the A1066 and reduce the risk of 
collisions. While there is no evidence to suggest that the access has a capacity 
problem based on its existing or proposed use, there are safety issues arising 
from the nature of the A1066 in this location.
7. Therefore, I agree that a right hand turn lane facility would help to mitigate some of the negative effects the proposed development would have on the efficiency and safety of the highway network and could be secured by planning condition. I note the appellant’s concerns regarding the financial implications of providing such a facility on land outside of their control, but I consider that it would be necessary, relevant and reasonable given the proposed intensified use of the access.

8. In terms of the second reason for refusal, a tarmacked driveway leads from the A1066 to the appeal site which widens at the point where the industrial unit would be sited. Whilst wide enough for large vehicles to use, the proposed layout of the industrial unit and its car parking, along with existing buildings to the east on the adjoining business premises means that there would be insufficient space for HGVs accessing the appeal site to turn around without reversing.

9. It is apparent that the appellant only has access rights over a strip of land from the junction with the A1066 to the north-eastern corner of the appeal site that is narrower than the actual driveway. The appellant has sought to demonstrate how a HGV could reverse into the proposed unit within this strip of land and then enter the A1066 in a forward gear. The manoeuvre would be tight based on the existing and proposed layout of buildings, but not impossible. Furthermore, the strip of land is not marked on the ground and in planning terms there is nothing to prevent a HGV using the whole driveway if needed. Therefore, I am satisfied that the proposal incorporates adequate facilities to enable a HGV to turn and enter the highway in a forward gear in the interests of highway safety.

10. Concluding on the main issue, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the safe and efficient operation of the highway network based on the on-site turning facilities and the provision of an off-site ghost Island right hand turning lane facility which would be secured by means of a planning condition. Therefore, the proposal would accord with DMP Policy DM3.11 as an intensified use of a direct access onto a Corridor of Movement that would not prejudice the safe and free flow of traffic. It would also meet the aims of paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework as safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people and improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of development.

**Other Matters**

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.

12. The access into Waveney House is in front of the property via the driveway off the A1066. The proposed unit would be located to the rear of the property. Therefore, while there would be additional traffic movements arising from the development, it would be unlikely to affect or block the access into Waveney House.
Conditions

13. Conditions setting a time limit for the commencement of development and for it to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans are necessary for clarity and compliance. A condition concerning the materials to be used on the external surfaces of the building is necessary and relevant to ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory. However, a condition relating to the details of boundary treatments is not necessary as the plans show that existing boundary treatments will remain.

14. As stated above, a condition for the off-site provision of a ghost island right-hand turn lane facility is necessary, relevant and reasonable to make an otherwise unacceptable development acceptable. Requiring the access, parking, loading, unloading and turning areas to be provided before the development is occupied is also necessary to ensure that it is satisfactory and safe for all vehicles. However, a condition requiring details of on-site parking during the construction period is not necessary as adequate space exists within the appeal site and around the proposed industrial unit.

15. A condition requesting details of the proposed external lighting is necessary to ensure that the living conditions of occupiers of the adjoining property at Waveney House are not unduly harmed. For the same reason, a condition requiring details of a range of noise generating equipment is also necessary, along with a condition restricting the use of machinery and power tools outside the building in connection with any industrial process.

Conclusion

16. The proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the safe and efficient operation of the highway network based on the on-site turning facilities and the provision of an off-site ghost island right hand turning lane facility which would be secured by means of a planning condition. For this reason, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Tom Gilbert-Woolridge
INSPECTOR
Other Applications

2.  
   **Appl. No**: 2016/0662/F  
   **Parish**: HETHERSETT  
   **Applicants Name**: McDonalds Restaurants Ltd  
   **Site Address**: Land At Thickthorn Roundabout Norwich Hethersett Norfolk NR9 3AU  
   **Proposal**: Drive Thru Restaurant, Car parking, Landscaping, 2no Customer Order Displays with Associated Canopies, Remote Refuse Store, Covered Cycle Parking, Play Space, Patio Furniture and Fencing.

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1. Full time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Access Gradient  
4. Access Gates - Configuration  
5. Provision of parking, service  
6. Construction Traffic (Parking)  
7. Wheel Cleaning Facilities  
8. Surface Water  
9. Details of foul water disposal  
10. Archaeological work to be agreed  
11. Fire hydrant  
12. Biodiversity Management Plan  
13. In accordance with noise management scheme  
14. Contamination scheme to be submitted  
15. Implementation of approved remediation scheme  
16. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
17. Implementation of landscaping scheme  
18. Odour control  
19. External materials to be agreed  
20. Waste arrangements

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 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
   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  
   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 5: The Economy  
   Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
   Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
   Policy 12: The remainder of the Norwich Urban area, including the fringe parishes  
   Policy 19: The hierarchy of centres  
   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 and local distinctiveness
DM2.1 : Employment and business development
DM2.4 : Location of main town centre uses
DM2.6 : Food, drink and takeaways
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
DM4.3 : Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.6 : Landscape Setting of Norwich
DM4.7 : Strategic gaps between settlements within the Norwich Policy Area
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

2. Planning History

2.1 2016/0663 Installation of 6no. fascia signs, including illumination Under consideration

2.2 2016/0664 Installation of illuminated adverts including 1 no. Gateway, 9 no. Freestanding, 1 no. Side By Side Directional, 13 no. Dot Signs and 2 no. Banner Units. Under consideration

2.3 2016/0665 Installation of 1No. freestanding illuminated 8m totem sign Under consideration

2.4 2009/0568 Erection of security fencing on land adjoining the Thickthorn Interchange, off the B1172 Norwich Road Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Cringleford Parish Council Completely opposed to the proposal.
1) The site lies within the Southern Bypass Protection Zone and within the strategic gap between Hethersett and Cringleford - these designations have been much neglected but should be respected. It is inappropriate to expand the hub of commercial activity in this area.
2) It is inappropriate to have so much intrusive signage on the approach to Norwich.
3) Several commentators have drawn attention to the problem of litter.
4) Re. pedestrian and cycling access it is not simply a question of being able to enter and leave the site but also being able to proceed safely along the proposed entrance. It is already a hazardous route due to the volume of traffic and is the route NCC Education expects children to take between Cringleford and Hethersett.
5) The development will constrain the options for the improvements of the interchange.
6) The PC was surprised to see the reference to the major engineering works originally proposed by the HA - this is no longer a live option.

7) Inadequate account has been taken of actual vehicle movements in the vicinity of the site. A certain amount of confusion already exists over which road should be taken and this is likely to be compounded as a result of increased vehicle movements.

8) Not even a passing reference to the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Hethersett Parish Council

Recommend approval but raise the following concerns: the accuracy of the traffic assessment date; the impact of the development in restricting options for Thickthorn improvements and the pedestrian access from the Park & Ride; a restriction on the trading hours in line with other outlets in the area and consideration to be given to landscaping the development to the A47.

3.2 District Member

To Committee

- Bringing 'modernity' to the country-side of the A47 is potentially controversial
- Unimpressed by the lack of landscape screening to the B1172 side of the proposed facility
- Reassurances required about the effects on the occupiers of Thickthorn Cottages and their access potentially being blocked by patrons
- Need information about litter collection arrangements
- It does tidy up and unkempt area
- NCC Highways must either reinstall the centre land on the off-ramp from the east to the A11 to be A11 and Hethersett or clearly signpost where the right hand lane is designated

3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd

Conditional support:

- There are no assets owned by AW or subject to an adoption agreement within the development site boundary.
- Wastewater - Whittingham Trowse Water Recycling Centre will have available capacity for these flows.
- Foul Sewerage - Development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream however an impact assessment has been prepared in consultation with AW to determine a mitigation strategy. A condition requiring compliance with this strategy is required.
- Surface Water - The surface water strategy/ flood risk assessment is unacceptable and we would recommend that the applicant needs to consult with AW and the LLFA. We request a condition requiring a drainage strategy to cover the issues to be agreed.
- Trade Effluent - To discharge trade effluent to a public sewer requires AW consent. Details required to be added to the decision notice as a note.

3.4 Highways England

No objection

3.5 NCC Highways

Conditional support:

NCC Highways has received all the appropriate transport information and a revised layout plan including parking for staff. Having considered the information provided the local Highway Authority recommends 'no objection' subject to a number of planning conditions.
3.6 Historic Environment Service

Conditional support:

Cropmarks of undated field system ditches have been recorded extending into the site. Previous archaeological excavations at the Park & Ride revealed features of Bronze- and Iron Age date and artefacts spanning the prehistoric to medieval periods have been recorded in the surrounding areas. There is potential for heritage assets with archaeological interest to be present on the site and their significance will be adversely affected by the proposed development. A condition is required to secure a programme of archaeological mitigation work in accordance with the NPPF (para 141).

3.7 Norfolk Fire Service Station Master

An additional hydrant will be required to be installed

3.8 SNC Landscape Architect

On amended plans

Revised planting proposals and Landscape Management Plan are acceptable; we will need to condition implementation of the scheme A visualisation has been provided that illustrates that the building sits acceptably against the existing tree line

Original comments

The site is within the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone and the Hethersett / Cringleford Strategic Gap. Policies DM4.6 and DM4.7 apply but no specific assessment of the proposal to test it against these policies is provided. In the context of the existing road layout the rural character is arguably diminished by the highway infrastructure and associated features. Notwithstanding the "visual clutter" the view of the site from the B1172 is a scene devoid of buildings and adds to the sense of openness at this one point. The Design and Access Statement sets out that the materials palette has been chosen to suit the setting but it is difficult to test this without a visualisation. The structure will be set against the existing immature tree line and will introduce a definite hard element against a soft backdrop. View from the A47 are limited and glimpses are from vehicles travelling at speed. Provided that site features (e.g., signage) are restricted in height the perception is likely to remain as an undeveloped site.

Regarding long views from the city the existence of vegetation & banking associated with the A47/ A11 already limits these. Provided the new building does not breach the tree line I do not consider the policy to be compromised. The landscape design and management plans offer a scheme generally appropriate for the setting however I consider that more can be done. The fence to the north boundary is unduly austere and a hedgerow would be preferable, presenting a more rural edge in glimpses from the A47. A hedgerow to the west of the parking forecourt would lessen the visual impact of the car parking when viewed from the Hethersett approach. The Landscape Management Plan needs to be for a period longer than 5 years. Additional information and amendments are required.
3.9  SNC Water Management Officer

We do not wish to object to the application however we offer advisory comments and recommend that should the drainage aspect of this application not be agreed prior to approval of the application, the permission should include conditions relating to surface water disposal and foul water disposal.

3.10  NCC Ecologist

Conditional support:

If you are minded to approve this application, a condition should require a Biodiversity Management Plan which is informed by further reptile surveys.

3.11  SNC Community Protection

To be reported

3.12  Other Representations

Summarised comments:

1 Comment:
McDonalds should accept responsibility for clearing all resultant litter within a 1000m radius of the restaurant

9 Objections:

- Thickthorn roundabout and the surrounding area needs more litter!
- Concern about rubbish on the verges and gateways along the B1172 - you as an authority or McDonalds have a responsibility for this
- Already 3x food outlets at this junction
- Increase in traffic at very busy and dangerous junction and roundabout
- High levels of additional litter
- Noise pollution from a 24 hour fast food place in a rural area
- Light pollution from the illuminated signs and outside lighting in a rural area
- We already 'litter pick' at the car park and the nearby area at the top of Colney Lane - there is much dropped litter which we presume comes from the nearest take aways
- Much litter blows into the UEA grounds which is a designated conservation area
- Unless there is an agreement to monitor the litter produced, reduce packaging and encourage responsible waste disposal we object to this proposal
- No objection to development of the site but not with a business which will add to the traffic at an overcrowded junction which is prone to accidents due to the inappropriate siting of the petrol station.
- The position will be exacerbated by a fast food outlet and future expansion of the Park & Ride site
- Whilst applauding the local job creation I object to the application due to traffic congestion, noise and light pollution, litter and the impact on health and welfare
- These outlets are tacky and not in keeping with the local area which has already been scarred by the Park & Ride, a service station and the Thickthorn roundabout
- We do not need a further outlet - there are already a significant number along this route
• The litter problem will be exacerbated further if this development goes ahead
• You can place as many litter bins as you can afford in the vicinity but it will not stop people discarding their waste
• I suggest a levy is put on the rates McDonalds pay to ensure an on-site litter collector 7 days a week
• Unless we can be assured that the outlet will not generate more rubbish I object
• Increased traffic risk - the roundabout seems to struggle with safely directing the current traffic flow, never mind an increase
• We already have to clear rubbish from the bottom of our drive daily
• There is already a fast food outlet at Thickthorn services - other alternatives should be available

4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The site comprises approximately 0.6 hectare of scrubland located at the Thickthorn interchange, adjacent to the slip-road joining the westbound carriageway of the A47. The site lies immediately to the north of Thickthorn services and the Park & Ride facility, to the west of Cringleford and to the east of Hethersett.

4.2 The site is currently bounded to the east by vegetation which provides some screening from the A47. It is however in an elevated position relative to the existing service area and is therefore more visible. Although there is minimal vegetation across the application site it has naturally grassed over. Large electricity pylons extend across the site.

4.3 There is an existing chainlink boundary fence with concrete posts located to the north of the site along the boundary whilst the remaining boundaries remain free of a formal demarcation. However, the changes in ground levels between the application site and the surrounding land provide a natural boundary at this time.

4.4 Immediately to the west of the application site is a short terrace comprising three cottages. These properties are set along the B1172 but are set back from the road frontage, separated by garden areas, a pedestrian footpath and cycleway as well as an access drive and pathway.

The application

4.5 The application is a full application for a McDonalds restaurant and associated drive thru. The proposal also includes car parking, landscaping and other associated works. Linked applications seeking advertisement consent have also been submitted and are detailed below for clarification. These applications do not form part of the consideration of this application.

2016/0663/A  Installation of illuminated advertisements including 6 fascia signs
2016/0664/A  Installation of illuminated adverts including 1 no. Gateway, 9 no. Freestanding, 1 no. Side By Side Directional, 13 no. Dot Signs and 2 no. Banner Units.
2016/0665/A  Installation of 2 no freestanding 12m illuminated Totem Signs.

4.6 The restaurant is located centrally within the site allowing for the circulation of vehicles around its perimeter and access to the drive thru (which is located on the eastern side of the building). Parking is proposed to the west of the building and a small play area has been included to the south of the building. The area to the west of the parking provision is to be landscaped.
4.7 The gross internal floor area of the restaurant (including kitchens and associated service areas) is approximately 415 square metres, with the internal seating area measuring approximately 169 square metres and accommodating up to 140 diners at any one time.

4.8 Following discussions with officers the scheme has been amended to include additional parking provision on site with 6 dedicated staff spaces now clearly marked. The total parking provision on site would comprise 60 spaces, including 6 staff spaces and 2 disabled spaces. Cycle parking is also proposed.

4.9 The applicant is proposing 24 hour opening of the site.

Principle of the development and key issues

4.10 For the avoidance of doubt, the site lies adjacent to, but outside, of the area covered by Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan.

4.11 Drive-through restaurants are defined within the glossary of the NPPF as a main town centre use. Policy DM2.4 of the Local Plan states that main town centre uses will be encouraged at locations within defined town centres. Where such uses are proposed outside of defined town centres, sequential assessments and impact assessments will be required for development over defined thresholds. As noted above, the proposed McDonalds restaurant has a floor space of 415sqm which is below the threshold for an impact assessment but above the required threshold of 200sqm for the provision of a sequential assessment. This is used to assess the availability of sequentially preferable locations for potential alternative sites. In addition, Policy DM2.6 states that uses within Classes A3, A4 and A5 shall be permitted where the development does not give rise to unacceptable environmental impacts including noise, odour and general disturbance which would adversely affect the amenity of nearby occupiers and which could not be satisfactorily controlled by conditions, including restrictions on opening hours. The proposal is considered to be A3.

4.12 A sequential assessment has been provided. This identifies a number of retail premises within the southern and western area of Norwich and nearby settlements in South Norfolk such as Hethersett. The majority of these sites are unsuitable for a restaurant and all are unsuitable for the specific requirements of McDonalds in that none have the potential for a drive-thru facility. It has been held at appeal decisions that the required operational need for a drive-thru provision needs to be considered and sites that cannot accommodate this facility should be discounted. Given that the Council are also unaware of any suitable sites where such a drive-thru restaurant could be accommodated it is accepted that there are no sequentially preferable sites for the proposed development.

4.13 It is therefore considered that in the absence of any alternative sites in sequentially preferable locations the principle of a drive-thru restaurant in this location accords with Policy DM2.4.

4.14 Having established that the principle is acceptable under Policy DM2.4, the main considerations are therefore the environmental considerations set out in Policy DM2.6 as referred to above, and those other relevant DM policies included section 1 of this report. These cover landscaping and visual impact, design, traffic and parking matters, ecology, drainage and the archaeological impact of the development.

Landscape and visual impact

4.15 The site is located within the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone and the Hethersett/Cringleford Strategic Gap as set out within policies DM 4.6 and DM4.7 of the Development Management Policies Document. As such development in this location should not harm either the landscape setting of Norwich or the openness of the Strategic
Gap. These policies build upon the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS (Promoting Good Design) and the principles of the NPPF.

4.16 The applicant has not submitted a specific assessment of the proposals against the above policies however the Council's Landscape Architect has reviewed the proposal in detail and has provided substantive comments relating to the visual impact of the proposed development in this location. The application site is currently open and devoid of buildings when approached from the B1172. It is acknowledged that the proposal will result in a 'hard' edge to the setting, against the soft backdrop of the existing treeline. However, it would not be an incongruous addition to the overall setting when viewed in the wider context of the Thickthorn services site and the Park & Ride facility opposite.

4.17 Views from the A47 will be limited due to the movement of the vehicles along this route and the speed at which they travel. As such it is not considered that the proposed development in this location would result in an intrusive built form when viewed from this route. In addition, the existing landscaping along the boundary of the site will further reduce the glimpsed views into the site. On balance it is concluded that the development will not prejudice the principles of those policies set out above and is therefore acceptable in terms of its visual impact.

4.18 The proposed landscaping of the site has been subject to discussion with Officers and has been revised to reflect the Council's aspirations. A revised Landscape Management Plan has been received to secure the ongoing maintenance of the site. Due to the overall size constraints of the site the landscaping proposed by the applicant is largely to the west of the proposed building. This will improve the appearance of the site on the approach from the B1172. Following discussions with Officers the applicant has agreed to replace the proposed close boarded fence along the northern boundary with a hedgerow, providing a softer boundary treatment and improving the appearance of the site when viewed from the A47. The Council's Landscape Architect has advised that he is satisfied with the proposed landscaping and maintenance arrangements for the site.

Design

4.19 Planning policy promotes a high standard of design at all levels. In particular Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and DM3.8 of the Development Management Policies Document set out the design principles promoted by the Council. Good design is considered to be a key component of sustainable development and is therefore integral to successful development.

4.20 The layout of the site has been informed by its constraints, with the building and drive-thru route located towards the east of the site. A children's play area will be located to the south of the building and the parking area to its west. As set out above, signage associated with the development has been subject to separate consideration.

4.21 The proposed building is typical of this form of development, being relatively low level in height and finished in muted natural colours. A glazed customer area will provide a focal point for customers entering the site whilst the design details and mixed palette of materials proposed will provide an interesting finish to the building. The building will be modern in appearance, reflecting the corporate branding of the applicant, whilst also responding to the constraints of the site. Overall, the development is considered to be of good design and compatible with the requirements of those policies set out above.

Traffic and parking

4.22 Planning policy seeks to ensure that development does not prejudice the safe flow of existing highway networks or the future development of sustainable transport routes. The A47 is identified as a 'Corridor of Movement' in the Local Plan and therefore subject to the requirements of criteria (2) of Policy DM3.11 of the Development Management Policies
Document. Section 4 of the NPPF requires the protection of routes that would be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choices - these routes include defined Corridors of Movement. In addition, sufficient parking provision must be made to serve the needs of the proposed development. Vehicular and cycle parking should be made in accordance with the Council's standards (Policy DM3.12 of the Development Management Plan Document).

4.23 In accordance with the requirements of the NPPF the applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment to support the proposal. This has been updated with a Supplementary Transport Assessment during the course of the application following discussions between the applicant and Highways England regarding the impact of the development on the Thickthorn Interchange. As a result of discussions with the local Highway Authority the site plan has been updated to include designated staff parking spaces, addressing this on-site concern.

4.24 The statutory consultees - Highways England and the Highways Officer at Norfolk County Council - have both assessed the proposal and have concluded that they have no objection to the application, subject to a number of planning conditions that have been requested by the local Highways Authority. Whilst we are aware of the concerns that have been raised locally, including by the Parish Councils, on the basis of these technical responses it is therefore concluded that the development will not prejudice either the existing highway network or its future development. The submitted modelling concludes that the development will result in only a marginal increase in traffic movements on the main routes approaching the Thickthorn Interchange. The development is therefore considered to accord with the relevant parts of those policies set out above.

4.25 It is noted that concerns have been raised about the impact of the development on the existing pedestrian and cyclist network. Again no objections have been raised by the statutory consultees regarding this matter and the impact is therefore considered to be acceptable. Vehicular movements into the application site will be controlled by the existing small roundabout to the south west of the site and it is reasonable to assume that vehicular traffic will be entering and exiting the site at low speed, thus reducing the potential risks to pedestrians and cyclists crossing the site access and egress points.

Amenity issues (including odour, noise, hours etc)

4.26 There are a number of issues to be considered as part of this assessment, with particular reference to those residential properties located closest to the application site. These are considered in turn below. In accordance with the requirements of planning policy new development should avoid the introduction of incompatible land uses, including in terms of noise, odour and artificial light pollution. Furthermore, Policy DM3.13 of the Development Management Policies Document sets out the development should be refused where it would lead to "an excessive or unreasonable impact on neighbouring occupants and the amenity of the area". In determining the impact of development which may result in an increase in noise exposure the above policy also sets out that regard should be had to the existing background noise levels at different times of the day.

4.27 The development has the potential to adversely affect the amenities of nearby residential properties and the local vicinity generally from odour from cooking at the restaurant. Details have been submitted as to how odour will be controlled to ensure no adverse impact is caused. The Council’s Environmental Quality Team has considered the measures proposed and consider them acceptable. A condition is therefore proposed requiring the measures and implemented and the restaurant operated in accordance with them.

4.28 The applicant has confirmed that they are seeking 24-hour opening at this site and has advised that they do not consider there to be any associated amenity issues such as noise disturbance that should restrict the operation of the site. As noted above there are a
number of other facilities located on the opposite to the south of the application site, including existing fast food retail outlets and a petrol filling station. Having reviewed the planning histories for these developments it is clear that whilst both the Little Chef outlet and the Burger King restaurant operate restricted hours there is no planning requirement for them to do so. The petrol filling station currently advertises being in operation 24-hours a day. It is also noted that there is significant background noise within the immediate area due to the existing facilities as well as the road network.

4.29 Notwithstanding the above, the proposed unit and drive thru facility will be located in closer proximity to noise-sensitive residential development and it may be assumed that late in the evenings and early in the morning the background noise associated with road traffic is significantly reduced. The Noise Impact Assessment submitted however concludes that noise from the opening of the restaurant will not be above ambient background noise levels provided deliveries are prohibited between 10pm and 6am and measures such as the Customer Order Display unit speakers are switched to a night-time setting. The measures also include a strategy to deal with the potential for anti-social behaviour. A condition requiring compliance with these measures is proposed.

4.30 A lighting assessment has also been requested to ensure there is not an adverse impact from artificial light pollution. The full details of this have not been received at the time of writing this report, but if any issues are raised then an oral update will be provided to members at the meeting.

Litter

4.31 Many concerns have been raised about the litter that could result from the new development and citing existing litter problems from fast food outlets within the area and the Council recognises that this can be a problem. The applicant advised in the Planning Statement that a minimum of three daily litter patrols would be undertaken within the vicinity of the site. A later email confirmed that these are "typically within 100m of the site" (email dated 18th May 2016) although the applicant has not confirmed that this would be the case for this particular site. Provision will be made within the site boundaries for waste disposal and McDonald's policy is to encourage the recycling of rubbish. Although the above intent is noted, it is not considered appropriate to secure this by planning condition. Furthermore, the Licensing Team have advised that they would only become involved in matters such as this if a license was to be required for trading between the hours of 23.30 - 05.00.

Ecology

4.32 A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal was submitted at the Council's request to assess whether the proposal would have any adverse impact on protected species. Overall it found that there is limited potential for protected habitats and species on this site, although it did recommend that further surveys for reptiles be carried out. Reptiles are protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and as such are protected by law. However, if reptiles are found as a result of further surveys it is likely that mitigation will involve capture and translocation. Norfolk County Council's Ecologist has commented that this can be conditioned as part of any planning approval. Given the report also makes a number of other recommendations with regard to mitigation and enhancement for biodiversity but states that full recommendations cannot be made until the reptile surveys are completed, the Ecologist recommends that a Biodiversity Management Plan is conditioned. Subject to this the Ecologist has no objection and the proposal is considered acceptable in regard to its ecological impact.

Drainage

4.33 At this time the applicant has not supplied either a surface water drainage strategy or a foul water drainage strategy therefore both of these details will need to be secured by condition. Appropriately worded conditions have been agreed with both the Water Management
Officer and Anglian Water who have requested that the applicant contact them in advance of any submission should the intention be to connect to any Anglian Water assets. Anglian Water have advised that there are no surface water sewers in the vicinity of the site and the applicant is advised that any drainage strategy for the site must have regard to the SUDS drainage hierarchy, in accordance with planning policy.

Archaeology

4.34 In accordance with both national and local planning policy assessments must have regard to the impact on heritage assets, including sites of archaeological interest (section 12 of the NPPF). The Historic Environment Service has advised that their records indicate the potential for heritage assets with archaeological interest to be present on the site. Previous excavations at the nearby Park and Ride site included features of both Bronze Age and Iron Age, as well as artefacts spanning the prehistoric to medieval periods whilst cropmarks of undated field system ditches are known to extend into the site. Consequently a planning condition securing a programme of archaeological mitigation work has been requested and is considered to be critical to meet the requirements of planning policy that seeks to protect heritage assets.

Financial matters

4.35 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 liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

5. Conclusion

5.1 The proposed development is acceptable in principle as a sequential assessment has been provided that demonstrates that there are no available alternative sites in sequentially preferable locations in accordance with Policy DM2.4 and that environmental impacts including noise, odour and general disturbance can be satisfactorily controlled by conditions in accordance with Policy DM2.6. In addition, it is not considered that the development will have an adverse impact on the local landscape, nor on the safe and free flow of traffic.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker 01508 533848 tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3. **Appl. No**: 2016/1741/F  
**Parish**: LONG STRATTON

Applicants Name: Mr Matthew Davey  
Site Address: Land North of Wild Rose Farm Ipswich Road Long Stratton Norfolk  
Proposal: Erection of 2no 2 storey dwellings with attached garages

Recommendation: Refusal  
1. Contrary to policy DM2.11  
2. Poor design and harm to landscape  
3. Insufficient and lack of information (amenity)  
4. Harm outweighs benefits of development

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 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 6: Access and Transportation

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  
DM2.7: Agricultural and forestry development  
DM2.11: Agricultural and other occupational dwellings in the Countryside  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM4.10: Heritage Assets  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM4.4: Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space  
DM4.8: Protection of Trees and Hedgerows  
DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design  
DM4.10: Heritage Assets

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
Parking Standards for Norfolk  
Long Stratton Area Action Plan

**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 There is a range of planning history in relation to this site. I have detailed the most relevant to this case.

- **2016/1430** Proposed extension, conversion and associated alterations to annex. Approved
- **2015/0526** Retrospective change of use of holiday accommodation to residential annexe and erection of conservatory to extension. Approved
- **2010/0407** Proposed erection of single storey dwelling for poultry farm manager. Refused. Appeal Dismissed
- **1989/0650** Erection of Agricultural Dwelling. Refused

3. Consultations

3.1 Town / Parish Council
No objection. But would request an agricultural occupancy restriction be applied to the proposal

3.2 District Member
To be determined by committee.

3.3 SNC Water Management Officer
Recommend advisory comments regarding:
- Foul drainage
- Surface water drainage
- Land drainage

3.4 NCC Highways
No objection subject to parking and turning condition.

3.5 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team
Cannot support the proposal due to lack of information and the significant potential for the applicants of the proposed dwellings to be adversely affected by insects, odour and noise.

3.6 Historic Environment Service
Recommended conditions regarding:
- Written scheme of investigation
- In accordance with the written scheme of investigation and development not occupied until site investigation and post investigation is completed

3.7 NCC Ecologist
No objections subject to recommended conditions regarding:
- No piles of sand or materials
- Waste to be disposed of immediately
- No bonfires
- Covered trenches
- Development footprint to be maintained in current condition
3.8 **Other Representations**

Richard Bacon MP – supports the application main matters raised relate to:

- Outside the development boundary but within the Norwich Policy Area
- Response to emergencies/needs
- Animal welfare and business viability
- Paragraph 55

4 **Assessment**

4.1 The proposal seeks planning permission for two dwellings with attached garages to accommodate managers at Wild Rose Farm. The site is outside the development boundary within the Norwich Policy Area. The proposed properties would be isolated within an agricultural field (north of the farm) and accessed by vehicles via the main A140 highway route known as a corridor of movement.

4.2 There is a range of planning history and appeal history in relation to this site that is relevant as a material consideration in this case. I detail the relevant planning history as follows, which also address some concerns raised in the consultation responses:

**Relevant Planning History**

4.3 **Application 2010/0407**

This application proposed the erection of single storey dwelling for poultry farm manager, which was refused as the site could already demonstrate that any functional need for a dwelling could be met by the existing dwelling. An occupancy condition/restriction would not be agreed, which means the existing property on the farm could be sold or let away from the poultry unit at any time.

4.4 This application was appealed and the appeal was dismissed. The Inspector concluded there would be an increased risk of sale of the farmhouse if the proposed development was approved due to the absence of an agricultural occupancy condition/restriction, and that such a condition/restriction is considered relevant and necessary to planning in this case.

4.5 **Application 2015/0526**

This application was approved retrospectively to change the use of holiday accommodation to a residential annex. This annex is situated on the site of Wild Rose Farm and accommodates the maintenance manager and his family on the farm currently. Application 2016/1430 allowed an extension to this property.

4.6 The main considerations in this case are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character of the area (including design and para 55)
- Highways
- Residential amenity
- Archaeological Importance
- Ecology
- Other matters
- Is the proposal sustainable development?

**Principle of development**

4.7 The principle of development is contrary to the South Norfolk Local Plan policy DM1.3 (sustainable location of development). This is because the site in question is outside the defined settlement boundary. An assessment must be made of any other material considerations, which may justify a departure from the development plan as the site is also situated within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) where a 5 year land supply cannot be demonstrated.
4.8 Policy DM1.3 (sustainable location of development) is directly interlinked with policy DM1.1 (ensuring sustainable development), planning legislation and paragraph 14, 47 and 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) all of which seeks to ensure new development is sustainable. This proposal will be assessed further in this report to establish whether the proposal is sustainable development in accordance with the social, economic and environmental dimensions as set out in policy DM1.1 and the NPPF.

4.9 The occupants of Wild Rose Farmhouse and associated annex include (retired farther), who lives in the listed farmhouse with two of his sons who are also known to have/are worked on the farm, and the another son (the applicant) lives in the associated annex on site with his wife and family.

4.10 The report prepared for Hook2Sisters by Brian Barrow (June 2016) informs the reason for the proposed dwellings is to house the unit manager and assistant manager to be on hand to react to any emergencies at the farm, such as mechanical equipment failure.

4.11 The design and access statement informs the Poultry facility at Wild Rose Farm has been in operation for more than 40 years, which I consider is a successfully sound operating business. And that the owners of the site PJ Davey and Co are landlords and occupants of Wild Rose Farm, but it states there is no direct day-to-day involvement with the running of the poultry farm, but they are responsible for providing buildings and associated facilities on the site. However, it has been confirmed that the applicant is a full time maintenance manager to the site, which involves dealing with any mechanical failure of equipment, this position is the essential need identified within the applicants report prepared by Brian Barrow (June 2016). The existing farmhouse and annex accommodation provides the necessary functional need of the farm in accordance with Local Plan Policies DM2.7 and DM2.11.

4.12 The dismissed inspectors appeal decision to application 2010/0407 informs PJ Davey and Co, as owners retains responsibility for site maintenance and provision of maintenance of the farm, which is not only in the interest of the viability of the farm business, but also importantly safeguards the animals welfare, both of which are concerns raised within the evidence to support the application and are/can be addressed.

4.13 The existing farmhouse and annex can satisfy the functional need for accommodation on the farm. Granting permission for two additional dwellings would increase the risk of sale of the farmhouse arising from the proposed development and could divide the agricultural farm use making it less sustainable than the existing situation.

4.14 It is evident the proposed development is not necessary in accordance with Policy DM2.7 there is no functional need in accordance with Policy DM2.11. Therefore, the proposal would be in conflict with both of these policies and as such the principle of development is unacceptable as the two existing residential properties on the farm serve the functional need.

Impact on the character of the area (including design)

4.15 The proposed dwellings would be isolated, and intrusive in the rural landscape. The design is bland, lacks local distinctiveness and would not make a positive contribution to the area. The proposed dwellings would not represent a high standard of design. The dwellings would have a poor relationship with the existing farm due to the separation distance, but also the proposal presents a pedestrian and bike access that would cut across an agricultural field with an approximate distance of 140metres from the proposed dwellings to Wild Rose Farm. This is not considered an efficient or effective use of land and would disrupt an existing agricultural field.
Paragraph 55 of the NPPF promotes sustainable development where development enhances or maintains the vitality of rural communities, but suggests isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided unless there are special circumstances. As previously set out in this report there are no special circumstances in this case that would justify the development which conflicts with the development plan.

In my opinion, the design would fail to maintain or enhance the landscape setting contrary to local plan policies DM3.8, DM4.8, DM4.9 and paragraph 55 of the NPPF.

Highways

The highways authority highlights that the proposed pedestrian walkway from the proposed dwellings to the poultry units, would help reduce vehicle movements between properties via the A140, which may well be the case if the future occupiers decided to walk or bike to Wild Rose Farm.

However, in visiting the site and surrounding area I am of the opinion the relationship of the proposed dwellings with the farm is not practically or suitably sited and on the balance of probabilities it is likely any future occupiers would travel by vehicle for work and private use, due to convenience, speed and comfort especially in winter months. This is not considered sustainable or suitable in accordance with policies DM1.1, DM1.3 and the NPPF.

The highways officer has no objection from a safety perspective subject to parking and turning condition. Therefore, the application is considered to comply with Local Plan Policies DM3.11, DM3.12 and Parking Standards for Norfolk (2007).

Residential amenity

The proposed site would be isolated within the corner of an agricultural field. Therefore, the plot and proposal would be significantly separated and spaced from other surrounding properties, which would not cause overlooking or overshadowing and in this respect I consider the proposal complies with Local Plan Policy DM3.13. However, I have concerns there is a muck pad adjacent to the application site (north), which could cause odour issues especially in the summer to future occupiers of the new dwellings. The Environmental Quality officer has confirm they cannot support the proposal due to lack of information regarding the impact to future occupiers through insects, odour and noise from the large adjacent muck pad, unsocial hours of noise from HGV’s that use the lay-by to the A140 and vehicles that use the corridor or movement along the A140. Therefore, in this respect I consider the proposal would be contrary to Local Plan Policy DM3.13.

Archaeological Importance

The site lies within the area of the Roman nucleated settlement on the Pye Road Roman road and numerous artefacts of Roman date have previously been recorded from the site and its immediate surroundings. There is a high potential that heritage assets with archaeological interests would be present at the site and would be adversely affect by the proposed development. Therefore, the Historic Environment Service has recommended three conditions, should the application be granted permission. In my opinion, the proposal complies with Local Plan Policy DM4.10.

Ecology

No ecology report has been submitted with the application. However, due to the existing ditch that is blocked, the lack of water bodies and the location of the site within close proximity to the A140 it is considered unlikely that it will have potential for protected species including Great Crested Newts. However, because these protected species are found in South Norfolk the Ecology Officer has recommended relevant conditions should the application be favoured. In my opinion, the proposal complies with Local Plan Policies DM4.4.
Other matters

4.24 The parish council have raised concerns regarding the request for an agricultural occupancy restriction to be applied. This issue has been addressed in the relevant planning history section and principle of development section of this report.

4.25 The MP supports the proposal and has raised a number of planning matters within his response. I have addressed these matters and policies within this report.

Sustainable Development

Social

4.26 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."

4.27 The social benefit of the scheme is that it would provide two dwellings within a location where a 5 year land supply cannot be demonstrated. Therefore, the dwelling would be contributing to the housing shortfall. However, the design of the proposal would not be high quality and would not be in a suitable or sustainable location.

Economic

4.28 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."

4.29 The proposal is for a dwelling, in a location within the countryside outside the defined settlement boundary. The only limited short-term benefit of this proposal would be it would help enhance the local economy through local spending from future occupants of the dwelling. In addition, the scheme would also provide some short-term economic benefits from construction of the dwellings.

Environmental

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."

4.31 The proposal would significantly impact on the character and landscape setting of the area as two isolated dwelling would be at odds within the dominant rural landscape setting. The poor siting and relationship of the proposal would be of significant environment harm and is considered to outweigh the limited economic and social benefits identified above and so the proposal cannot be regarded as sustainable development.

Other considerations

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 would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) if it was supported.
Conclusion and reasons for refusal

In conclusion, the harm of this proposal outweighs any benefits for the reasons set out in this report. Fundamentally, the development is not necessary and is not sustainable and the conflict with local and national policy is not outweighed by any other material consideration.

Reasons for refusal:

5.2 Insufficient and inadequate information has been provided to demonstrate that there is a necessary functional need for further residential accommodation. It is clear through material consideration the farm already contains an existing main farm-house of substantial size and residential annex that accommodate for the functional needs of the farm. The existing dwelling is not the subject of any occupancy condition/restriction and, as such, could be sold or let away from the poultry unit at any time. The application is contrary to Local Plan Policy DM2.7 and DM2.11.

5.3 The design would fail to maintain or enhance the landscape character and setting. The proposed dwellings would be isolated and bland, which would not represent a high standard of design and would be at odds within the dominant rural landscape setting. The dwellings would have a poor relationship with the existing farm due to the separation distance. The proposal would be contrary to local plan policy DM3.8, DM4.8, DM4.9 and paragraph 55 of the NPPF.

5.4 Insufficient information has been provided regarding the impact of the adjacent muck pad in relation to insects, odour, noise and vehicle movement along the A140 corridor of movement and lay-by in relation to noise to future occupants. The proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policy DM3.13.

5.5 The adverse impact on the undeveloped rural character of the site and its setting would constitute significant and demonstrable harm that outweighs the benefits of the proposed development, notwithstanding the lack of a 5 year housing land supply in the Norwich Policy Area.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Elizabeth Thomas 01508 533793 ethomas@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No**: 2016/1824/A  
**Parish**: CARLETON RODE

**Applicants Name**: Mrs Joan Hocking  
**Site Address**: Church Of All Saints Church Road Carleton Rode NR16 1RN  
**Proposal**: Church and Community Notice Board

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

1-5 Standard conditions  
6 In accordance with submitted drawings

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  
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development  
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:

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 history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Town / Parish Council  
Recommend approval

3.2 District Member  
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 SNC Conservation and Design  
Original plans

The design, size and materials of the sign would detract from the views of this setting and therefore result in a degree of harm.

The proposed position is neither disabled nor elderly friendly, being located on a quite a rough grass verge – and it is not that practical to get close to the board to read notices.
Would suggest keeping the two locations – the larger parish board adjacent to the parking bay – although a timber board would be preferred in this location, there would be less of an objection to this being the Diocese blue and aluminium if desired, as its impact in this location on the setting of the church will be far less.

Revised plans
No objection

3.4 Historic England
Original plans

The proposed board would be larger and more prominently positioned outside the churchyard wall. The change of location is not problematic but when combined with the brightly coloured aluminium which it is constructed could make the sign distractingly discordant in its setting.

Do not object to the replacement of the notice board in this location but would recommend the Council seeks amended plans for a more traditional timber board.

Revised plans
To be reported

3.5 NCC Highways
No objection.

It is recommended that the sign be sited as close as possible to the church wall.

3.6 Other Representations
1 letter of support

4 Assessment

4.1 The application site is a Grade I listed church, outside of any development limits, within the settlement of Carleton Rode. It is set in a prominent position in the village, and is surrounded by a churchyard and brick wall. The site lies opposite residential properties and a primary school.

4.2 The application proposes the erection of a noticeboard on the south boundary of the site. The sign would be large in scale and aluminium and blue, as promoted by the Diocese.

4.3 The church has a car park and access to the north and a pedestrian access to the south. The church is surrounded by a churchyard and short brick wall which is grade II listed in its own right.

4.4 The original proposal sited the sign in front of the wall on the south boundary, however following negotiation, revised plans were submitted to re-position the sign further east to an adjacent parking bay.

4.5 Policy DM3.9 directs that advertisements and signs will only be permitted where they are well designed and sympathetic to the character and appearance of their location, and would not be detrimental to highway safety or amenities of the area.
Design and character of the area

4.6 Following consultation on the original application, Historic England raised concern regarding the colour and material of the sign. It was considered that the brightly coloured aluminium would make the sign distractingly discordant in its setting, and would have a harmful impact on the significance of the church. They would instead recommend a timber board.

4.7 The Conservation and Design officer also raised concerns with the original plans, in regard to the location, size and design of the sign. It was considered that the picturesque composition of the wall, the churchyard and the south elevation of the church contributes to the significance of heritage assets, and that the sign would detract from this view and result in a degree of harm.

4.8 Although the amended plans do not alter the size, material or colour of the sign, the siting of the sign in front of trees and away from the principle view of the church, and in front of the aluminium sign for the primary school, helps to mitigate any impact of the design. In this context, I would not consider that the design would have an adverse impact on the church or surrounding area.

Setting of the listed building

4.9 The setting of listed buildings requires consideration under the development management policies and S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990, which 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. The site lies within the setting of a grade I listed building and the application has been assessed by the Senior Conservation and Design Officer who, although would favour more traditional materials, would not object to the amended plans on the grounds that it would not have such a harmful impact on the principle views and setting of the Listed Building and wall, to justify refusal of the application.

4.10 Although I acknowledge concern raised regarding the choice of materials, in view of the siting away from the front view of the church, I would consider that the appearance is acceptable. The sign would additionally have a public benefit as suggested in paragraph 134 of the NPPF. As such, on balance, it is considered that the proposal would accord with section 12 of the NPPF, Policy DM4.10 of the SNLP.

Residential amenity

4.11 Policy DM3.13 Residential amenity directs that development should not be approved if it would have a significant adverse impact on nearby residential amenities.

4.12 The sign would not be illuminated, and is sited in a sympathetic location away from residential properties. Therefore I would consider that the proposal accords with this policy.

Highway safety

4.13 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.

4.14 Following consultation, the Highways Authority has raised no concerns with the proposal, however would recommend that the notice board is located as close to the wall as possible. In view of the proposed siting, I would consider that the development accords with the principle of this policy.
4.15 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 The appearance of the sign is acceptable in the proposed location, and there will not be a significant impact on heritage assets, visual amenities and highway safety. As such, the application has been assessed against the policies of the Local Plan as set out above, and I would consider that the proposal accords to the principles of these.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Lucy Smith 01508 533821 lsmith@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **App. No:** 2016/1870/O  
**Parish:** EASTON

**Applicants Name:** Father Shishoy  
**Site Address:** St Athanasius Coptic Church Marlingford Road Easton NR9 5AD  
**Proposal:** Outline application to extend existing church facilities to provide entrance, altar, baptistery, kitchen, toilets & hall/dining area

**Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

1. Outline Planning permission time limit
2. Reserved Matters to be agreed
3. In accord with submitted drawings
4. External materials to be agreed
5. Reporting of unexpected contamination
6. Surface water drainage to accord with submitted details
7. Details of foul water disposal
8. Retention trees and hedges
9. Tree surveys and tree protection to be submitted
10. Specific Use – Church only no other uses within D1
11. Parking and turning area to be provided
12. Scheme of sound installation to be agreed

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

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 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 7: Supporting Communities

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
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  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.8: Protection of Trees and Hedgerows  
DM3.16: Improving level of community facilities

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2015/0494</td>
<td>Outline application to extend existing church facilities to provide entrance, altar, baptismry, children's area, kitchen, toilets, hall/dining area.</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2012/2076</td>
<td>New boundary fence and entrance gates</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2012/1524</td>
<td>New boundary fence and entrance gates (retrospective)</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2009/1935</td>
<td>Retention of wooden cross and gold lettering</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2008/2249</td>
<td>Erection of a single storey detached club house for bowls team players and removal of condition 5 from application 2008/0384/CU</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2008/1911</td>
<td>Single storey detached club house for bowls team players</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2008/0384</td>
<td>Change of use of existing sports club building to church, incorporating single dwelling and continued use of sports field</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2007/2659</td>
<td>Change of use of social club to church with priest residence</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2007/2228</td>
<td>Change of use to caravan site and associated works (hardstanding, septic tank, day room) for stationing of 2 caravans for residential use by Gypsy family and associated use of land for the keeping of horses</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2005/0375</td>
<td>Proposed change of use to form 12no additional car park spaces</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2003/1490</td>
<td>Erection of live-in accommodation for caretaker</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2001/0665</td>
<td>Internal alterations and extension comprising changing rooms and disabled toilets</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1999/0031</td>
<td>Erection of extensions to existing clubhouse</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Consultations

3.1 Easton Parish Council: No views or comments to make

Marlingford and Colton Parish Council: No views or comments to make
3.2 District Member  To be determined by committee
   - To enable full consideration to be given to the potential community benefit to the Church versus the impact of extra traffic on very narrow country lanes leading to the site and the impact that this site might have on the village of Marlingford should its usage continue to increase

3.3 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team  No objections subject to conditions

3.4 SNC Water Management Officer  No objection subject to conditions

3.5 NCC Highways  No objections subject to conditions

3.6 Other Representations  1 letter of support from Richard Bacon MP and Lord Bishop of Norwich
   - Coptic Orthodox Church serves approximately 20,000 worshippers across the UK
   - The location of St Athanasius' Coptic Orthodox Church in Marlingford is at a good central point for Coptic worshippers in the East of England, who travel as far afield as Boston and Ipswich
   - The congregation is made of 35 families, comprising 121 adults and children in total
   - Proposal will renew and expand a much needed place of worship for a growing faith community
   - Present Church building is already much too small to serve the existing community
   - Whilst it is anticipated that a small number of additional worshippers may attend once extended, the extension is urgently required to accommodate the congregation as it stands
   - The extension would neither prejudice road safety nor jeopardise the free flow of traffic
   - This application is a considerable reduction on the previous proposal
   - Some of this reduction has been achieved by the deletion of the live-in residence of Father Shishoy and he will need to seek other accommodation in the area, we are saddened that Father Shishoy feels he must sacrifice his home
   - The Coptic Orthodox faith does not permit the sale or exchange of consecrated (i.e. Holy) land, which applies to the application site and therefore the concerns of the Council that it would not be able to prevent future owners of the site intensifying their use of this D1 building as unfounded
   - Should the congregation continue to grow, the Coptic Diocese would eventually give consideration to establishing another Church in the region
   - The three reasons for refusal have been addressed
   - Would be grateful if planning permission to extend the Church is given most favourable consideration with a view to granting consent

4 Assessment

4.1 This outline application seeks consent for an extension to St Athanasius Coptic Church, Marlingford Road, Easton to provide entrance, church hall, kitchen, toilets. The site is located outside the village of Easton and its development boundary, within the open countryside. The site is accessed from a rural road without footways. This application seeks
to overcome the reason for refusal of the previous scheme which looked to add a substantial extension increasing the size of the Church to 1000m².

The previous application was refused for the following reasons:

4.2 “The proposed development is outside existing and emerging development boundaries and therefore is located in open countryside. Notwithstanding that the application is an outline, it proposes a substantial increase in floor space. It is therefore considered that by virtue of the size of the extension, the nature of the existing building which has a low pitched roof and the location of the site in the open countryside the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character of the area and would not protect and enhance the locality.

4.3 The proposal is remote from local service centre provision conflicting with the aims of sustainable development, the need to minimise travel, and the ability to encourage walking, cycling, use of public transport and reduce the reliance on the private car as represented in national and local policy.

4.4 In view of the above, whilst the proposal would have benefits as set out in paragraph 7 of the NPPF, these are outweighed by the harm which would be caused to the character of the area and its unsustainable location therefore contrary to saved policy LEI 2 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan (2003), policies 6 and 7 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2011, amended in 2014), emerging policies 1.3, 3.11 and 3.17 of the Development Management Policies Document (Submission document November 2013), the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy 5 of Norfolk’s 3rd Local Transport Plan -Connecting Norfolk.

4.5 The main issues in this case are: the principle of the development; the impact on the character and appearance of the area; and drainage.

Principle of development

4.6 On the site presently sits the existing church and residence for Father Shishoy and prior to 2008 was a Sport and Social club. The current church is 290m² (previous application Design and Access statement stated 300m²) and the proposed development increases this to 590m² to meet the needs of the current congregation of 38 families plus new members. The "Coptic" Orthodox Christian Church at Easton serves the East Anglia region with its congregation from Norwich, Ipswich, Boston, Kings Lynn, Bury St Edmunds, Dereham, Sheringham and Great Yarmouth. Church services occur on Sundays; during the 40 days before Christmas and bible class on Wednesdays. The revised proposal also involves the loss of Father Shishoy’s live-in residence. The application site is outside a development boundary and therefore the proposal is assessed in relation to the NPPF, policy DM3.16 of the South Norfolk local Plan, Policy 6 and Policy 7 of the Joint Core Strategy.

4.7 The NPPF 3 dimensions to sustainable development; economic, social and environmental, look to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s need and support its health, social and cultural well-being and protecting our natural, built and historic environment. The NPPF and local policies support the provision of new and extended community facilities and services provided they are in a sustainable location, preferably within development boundaries and with good accessibility to the community to be served by foot, by cycle and public transport.

4.8 The site is not located within a development boundary nor is it close to one. The Church is well established at the site and the ground has been consecrated. The revised proposal represents a significant decrease in the size of the proposed extension, taking the overall proposed floor space from 1000m² to 590m², however the site is in an unsustainable
location for a Church who's congregation comes from locations all over East Anglia and therefore would not be on foot, cycling and would have difficulty accessing local public transport. The Highway officer previously objected to the proposal due to the size of the proposal and its unsustainable location. Due to the significant reduction in the size of the extension, however, the Highway officer, now considers that the proposal is of a more favourable scale and on balance, provided that the use is restricted to a Church only and not any other uses within Use Class D1, that he can support the application subject to conditions. The proposal does have a social role as defined by the NPPF and would have benefits, supporting the social and cultural well-being of the established Church community and also supporting the continued use of the existing Church. On balance, it is considered that, notwithstanding the location of the Church, the proposal for an extension to an existing use and of a size that is now considered acceptable, has benefits which outweigh the harm created by its location.

Layout and impact on the character of the area

4.9 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. The application is an outline therefore no specific details are given regarding elevation and material choice which would be subject of a reserved matters application. The reduction in size of the extension would enable the design of the extension to be more sensitive to the character and appearance of the area and will be read with the existing building. On this basis, it is considered that the reduction in size overcomes the previous reason for refusal and would accord with Policy 2 of the JCS and Section 7 of the NPPF.

Residential amenity

4.10 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 site is has one immediate neighbour located to the north/northeast of the site. Provided that the reserved matters scheme incorporated measure in terms of sound installation and careful consideration is given to the design, given the existing use and previous use of the site, I do not consider the proposal would give rise to a situation so detrimental to their amenities as to warrant refusal on this ground.

4.11 Consideration must also be given to the impact the increased size in the Church may have on the villages of Marlingford and Easton via increased traffic. It is considered that however, given the existing Church use and the previous use of the site, whilst there will be a potential increase in traffic movements as the congregation grows, this would not give rise to a situation so detrimental to the amenities of the residents of the villages of Marlingford and Easton to warrant refusal on this ground. I am also mindful of the proximity of Easton College and the recent outline residential application which has been given authorisation for approval. As such, the scheme would accord with the requirements of Policy DM3.13.

Highway Safety

4.12 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 a condition requiring parking and turning to be provided. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Polices DM3.11 and DM3.12
Drainage

4.13 The proposed building will extend into an area of high risk from surface water flooding, therefore the Water Management Officer required the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment under the previous application. This has been amended to reflect the reduced extension and the Flood Defence Officer has raised no objections subject to any consent being conditioned to accord with the recommendations of the Flood Risk Assessment produced by Plandescil and details of the foul water disposal to be submitted.

Other Matters

4.14 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.

4.15 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

5 Conclusion

5.1 The principle of the use of the site as a Church has already been accepted and approved. The level of harm identified is not sufficient to present significant and demonstrable harm that outweighs the benefits and support to the social and cultural well-being of the community. The development will not adversely affect the character of the area; will not have a significantly detrimental impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring property or highway safety. As such the proposed development accords with the NPPF, JCS and SNLP.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2016/1871/F  
**Parish**: COLNEY  

Applicants Name: Mr Les Burr  
Site Address: Land North West of Old Watton Road Colney Norfolk  
Proposal: Erection of 2 detached barn style houses  

Recommendation: Approval with conditions  
1. Full planning permission time limit  
2. Levels to accord with submitted details  
3. Materials and details to be agreed  
4. Landscaping scheme to be agreed  
5. Ecological mitigation to accord with submitted report  
6. Contamination – precautionary advice  
7. Foul drainage details to be agreed  
8. Boundary treatments to be agreed  
9. Archaeological investigation  
10. Water efficiency requirements  
11. Access and vision splays  
12. Parking and turning areas  

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  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 12: The remainder of the Norwich Urban area, including the fringe parishes  

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.3: Sustainable location of development  
DM1.4: Environmental quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.8: Design principles  
DM3.11: Road safety and free flow of traffic  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise and quality of life  
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.5: Landscape character areas and river valleys  
DM4.10: Heritage assets  

1.4 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Site Specific Allocations and Policies  

Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place-Making Guide
2. Planning History

2.1 2016/1871  Erection of 2 detached barn style houses under consideration

3. Consultations

3.1 Town / Parish Council  Support  • Self-build which fits with landscape, causes no nuisance to neighbours and reinforces Colney community.

3.2 District Member  To be reported if appropriate

3.3 SNC Conservation and Design Officer  • Happy with the design approach and architectural references to agricultural buildings.  • Will not appear too prominent or incongruous in views from the Yare Valley.  • Good quality materials and detailing will be important.

3.4 SNC Water Management Officer  Note no mains foul drainage available. Recommend condition to agree foul drainage details and advisory note regarding design of surface water drainage.

3.5 NCC Highways  No objection in principle, but require vision splays of 2.4m X 25m and plan to show this is possible.

3.6 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team  No objections  • Precautionary contamination condition recommended.  • Advisory note regarding construction times.

3.7 Historic Environment Service  Potential for heritage assets with archaeological interest to be affected. Request condition requiring archaeological investigation.

3.8 Anglian Water Services Ltd  No comments to make on the general proposal as it is under 10 dwellings.

3.9 NCC Ecologist  Support subject to condition requiring mitigation as set out in sections 5.3 and 5.4 of the Ecology report.

3.10 Other Representations  Local resident objects:  • Overlooking and overbearing impact on number 11.  • Need confirmation of no overlooking windows or doors.  • Increased highway danger from additional traffic including during construction.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application site is located between existing residential property and an Anglian Water operational site on the old Watton Road in Colney, which is now by-passed by the new Watton Road. The site has a narrow frontage, but widens to the rear. The ground level also drops substantially away from the road forming part of the edge of the Yare river valley. The site is currently overgrown and appears not to have been in active use for some time.

4.2 The application can usefully be assessed with reference to: the principle of development; landscape impact; design; residential amenity; highways; ecology; and archaeology.
Principle of development.

4.3 The front part of the site falls within the Colney Development Boundary as defined in the SNLP where the principle of residential development would be acceptable. However, in order to accommodate two dwellings, the layout places the houses and their rear gardens beyond the Development Boundary, built into the slope of the valley side. In the absence of any special agricultural or other need the proposal is contrary to the Development Plan in this respect.

4.4 The site falls within the Norwich Policy Area where the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. As a consequence housing supply policies, including the Development Boundary, cannot be regarded as being up-to-date (para. 49 NPPF). In these circumstances paragraph 14 of the NPPF requires that sustainable development should be approved unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development.

4.5 In the light of the above, the proposal should be assessed in detail to establish if it represents sustainable development and whether there is any harm that would be caused to weigh against the benefits of the development.

Landscape Impact.

4.6 The rear of the application site falls within the area designated as river valley, where SNLP policy DM4.5 requires that all development should respect, conserve and where possible, enhance the landscape character of the environment. Developments causing significant adverse impact should be refused.

4.7 This area is designated as Rural River Valley landscape type in the South Norfolk Landscape Assessment referred to in policy DM4.5. The area is also referred to in the South Norfolk Place Making Guide. Although the application site is within the edge of the river valley, it is not easily visible in longer views being screened by vegetation along the valley side. This is an example of one of the key characteristics noted in the Landscape Assessment —“Semi-enclosed landscape with long views within the valley but restricted views from the valley, creating occasional areas of intimate character”. The Place making Guide sets out key design principles for the Yare river valley including most relevantly: maintenance of the existing development pattern; respect for small scale of settlements; openness of the valley floor; protection of long range views; respect for vernacular character and rural character of the area.

4.8 The design of the proposal is dealt with later in this report, but I consider that the development would accord with the landscape protection principles. It relates well to the existing development pattern spread along the valley edge at this point and does not threaten the openness of the valley floor. It does not harm any long range views and the addition of two dwellings is consistent with the small scale of the settlement. Although the development of this undeveloped, overgrown site could be seen as harming the character of the site itself, I consider that the wider landscape would not be significantly harmed and the proposal accords with policy DM4.5 and the Place Making Guide.

Design

4.9 The design of the development has been the subject of negotiation and amendment during the pre-application stage. The scheme involves regrading of the sloping site to accommodate the proposed dwellings and create a level area to their rear to serve as curtilage. The dwellings are two storey plus some accommodation in the roof-space. They are set into the ground so that they appear as single storey buildings from the front at the higher ground level.
The design of the buildings respects the valley side land form, although significant earth moving will still be required to accommodate the buildings and their curtilage. As noted above, this will not have a harmful effect on the wider area.

The design of the buildings themselves, although clearly domestic and contemporary, reflects traditional themes in elevation treatment and materials. The Conservation and Design Officer is satisfied with the proposal and I conclude the design is acceptable and accords with relevant design policies mentioned above and the Place Making Guide.

Residential Amenity

Concerns have been raised regarding the impact of the development on the adjacent residential property with particular reference to privacy, outlook and overbearing effect. Dwelling B is set further back in the site than the adjacent terraced properties and is considerably larger in its built form. However, there is a substantial change in ground levels so that the proposed dwelling will sit much lower than the existing terrace. So much so, that the new dwelling would appear no more than single storey from the higher level. I also note that the adjacent property has fencing and outbuildings along the mutual boundary which already constrain its outlook. Although there are windows in the side of the new dwelling these will be at a level where they are screened by the boundary fence and outbuildings. A condition is recommended to clarify boundary treatments and landscaping and adherence to the levels shown on the submitted plans.

I conclude that the proposed development will not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of other residential properties and accords with SNLP policy DM3.13.

Highways

Concerns have been raised about the impact of traffic from and during the development. Traffic speeds on this section of the old road are comparatively low and free from through traffic. The highway officer has raised no objection, subject to the provision of vision splays at the access which are being clarified at the time of writing.

Subject to agreement on vision splays, I consider an objection on traffic or highway safety grounds could not be sustained and the proposal accords with policy DM3.11.

Ecology

The application is supported by an Ecological Survey prepared by Norfolk Wildlife Services. This concludes that the ecological impact of the development would be low but makes recommendations for mitigation and enhancement to benefit biodiversity. This mainly relates to the avoidance of disturbance to any nesting birds and the provision of new/replacement planting and nest boxes. These recommendations can be secured by planning condition.

Archaeology

The Historic Environment Service have indicated that there may be evidence of medieval features in this location. They have not objected to the development, but have requested that an archaeological investigation is carried out before development proceeds. This can be secured by planning condition.
Sustainability

4.18 From the above assessment it can be seen that the proposal is not expected to cause significant harm. Two dwellings will provide some economic benefit at the construction stage and from the spending from future residents. There will also be social benefit to the occupants and through reinforcement of the local community as expressed by the Parish. Environmental harm will be limited to disruption of the site itself which can be mitigated. The site is also close to Norwich and on a major radial route served by public transport. I conclude that the proposal would represent sustainable development.

4.19 The applicant has indicated that at least one and possibly both of the plots would be implemented as self-build schemes. 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 consideration. Whilst an indication of self-build has been given by the applicant it should also be noted that at this stage it cannot be certain that the method of delivering this site will be self-build. In the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

4.20 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). 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 development is sustainable and no significant or demonstrable harm would result that would outweigh the benefits of the development. The development would also be consistent with the policies and guidance referred to above. In these circumstances the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions summarised at the head of the report.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Trett 01508 533794
crett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applications for Works to Trees

7. **Appl. No**: 2016/2207/CAN
   **Parish**: WACTON

   Applicants Name: Mrs Philippa Agent
   Site Address: Yeoman Cottage  Church Road Wacton NR15 2UG
   Proposal: Removal of five field poplar trees.

   Recommendation: Approval with Conditions
   1. Standard time limit
   2. In accordance with BS.3998
   3. In accordance with Countryside Acts

1. **Planning Policies**

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM4.8 Protection of trees and hedgerows

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 2004/1350 Proposed ground & first floor extensions with internal alterations and alterations to flat roof at rear of dwelling Approved

2.2 2004/1349 Proposed ground & first floor extension with associated internal alterations and alterations to flat roof at rear of dwelling Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 No comments received

4. **Assessment**

4.1 This application is for the removal of five popular trees from a hedgerow bordering a listed building which is located within a Conservation Area. The application is before the committee as the applicant is a member of staff.

4.2 It is considered in this instance that the species of tree in this location are not suitable for a tree preservation order. All five trees are semi-early mature with high growth potential. The nature of these trees is that they grow very quickly and have a short safe
useful life expectancy. Although it is recognised that the trees are clearly visible, the presence of other trees and hedgerows within the vicinity mean that removal of the poplars will not have an adverse impact on the landscape within the conservation area. If left to reach maturity the trees will become hazardous due to their brittle nature and proximity to the road, dwelling and garden.

4.3 The trees are a considerable distance from the Cottage and well outside the Conservation Area. Therefore, in the context of Section 66 the tree removal would preserve the Listed Building and its setting and, in the context of Section 72, the removal of the trees will not adversely impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is in accordance with the ‘guidance on Tree Works Applications’ and it is recommended that works are approved with conditions:
1) Works are undertaken in accordance with BS3998 Recommendations for Tree Work.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Robin Taylor 01508 533753
and E-mail: rtsnorfolk.gov.uk
The report schedules progress on outstanding enforcement cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ALLEGED BREACH</th>
<th>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORTWELL Station Farm High Road 2004/0254</td>
<td>Standing and occupation of a residential caravan</td>
<td>20.06.06</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance period extended by Committee to 25.05.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICKLEBURGH Beeches Farm Norwich Road 2007/8036</td>
<td>Material change of use - Breach of a condition - Operational development</td>
<td>24.04.07</td>
<td>Enforcement Notices served and initially complied with. Ongoing negotiation to secure future of the listed building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMPNALL Pevensey House The Street 2009/8010</td>
<td>Unauthorised works to a listed building</td>
<td>12.04.10</td>
<td>Listed Building Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 27.01.12 Application submitted for revised scheme and awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of lean to structure</td>
<td>12.04.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 27.01.12 Application submitted for revised scheme and awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CARLETON RODE       | Change of use of land                                          | 21.07.10                    | Enforcement Notice served  
Compliance date 29.12.11  
Consultants employed to secure mitigation scheme                                                                                          |
|                     | Standing and Occupation of Residential Caravan               | 04.03.15                    | Further Enforcement Notice served re caravan  
Compliance date within 3 months of first occupation of the permitted dwelling house                                                                                                                              |
| CROWNTHORPE         | Formation of Access                                            | 16.11.11                    | Enforcement Notice served  
Compliance date 27.10.13  
Owner previously unable to comply due to personal circumstances but further action now underway                                                                               |
| SAXLINGHAM THORPE   | Storage of a caravan                                          | 27.02.13                    | Complied with NFA                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| WYMONDHAM           | Standing of residential mobile home                           | 22.07.15                    | Enforcement Notice served  
Compliance date 4 months after the mobile home is no longer occupied by specified occupier                                                                                                         |
| GREAT MOULTON       | Change of use of land for travellers site                      | 16.09.15                    | Enforcement Notice served  
Appeal hearing 25/10/16                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ALLEGED BREACH</th>
<th>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the standing of a residential caravan</td>
<td>14.10.15</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashgate House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 01/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketteringham Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KETTERINGHAM</td>
<td>Change of use of land for travellers site</td>
<td>14.10.15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land North of High Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTON</td>
<td>Change of use of dwelling To create a second independent dwelling</td>
<td>20/07/16</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Old Post Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 19/09/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Marlingford Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the storage of materials used in connection with</td>
<td>20/07/16</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land on the South Side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 17/01/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Cemetery Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the storage of items not associated with agricultural/horticultural use of the land</td>
<td>20/07/16</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice to be served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to the North West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Silver Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHWELLTHORPE</td>
<td>Formation of earth bank (engineering operation)</td>
<td>14/09/16</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice to be served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithy Corner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wymondham Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Enforcement Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No of complaints</th>
<th>Enforcement Notices Issued</th>
<th>Breach of Condition Notices Issued</th>
<th>Section 215 Notices Issued</th>
<th>Temporary stop notices issued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**As of 27.09.16**
### Planning Appeals

#### Appeals received from 06 September 2016 to 30 September 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1428</td>
<td>Diss Thatchers Needle 33 Park Road Diss Norfolk IP22 4AS</td>
<td>Marstons Estates Limited</td>
<td>Erection of 4no non-food retail units (Use Class A1) comprising a total of 3948sqm with access from Park Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2803</td>
<td>Wicklewood Workshop Crowntorhe Road Crownthorpe Norfolk NR18 9EW</td>
<td>Mr Kevin Musk</td>
<td>Convert a garage at Crowntorhe Road to Commercial Offices and build a store for light use. Replace hedges and trees to landscape and make access to office and store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0864</td>
<td>Wymondham 80 - 82 London Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 9BP</td>
<td>Mr Steven Shorten</td>
<td>2 detached dwellings &amp; double garages and 2 single garages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals

#### Appeals decisions from 06 September 2016 to 30 September 2016

<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>2014/0799</td>
<td>Wymondham Wymondham Rugby Club And Land West Of Elm Farm Norwich Common Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td>WRFC ,Landstock Estates Ltd And Landowners Group Ltd</td>
<td>Outline application for up to 90 dwellings at Tuttles Lane, including the demolition of existing Wymondham Rugby Club buildings and sports pitches and closure of existing</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
access; up to 300 residential dwellings at Norwich Common with multiple access points, including the demolition of 63 Norwich Common; a replacement rugby club (use class D1) with sports pitches including an artificial pitch, floodlighting, clubhouse, car parking and accesses including an emergency only access from Melton Road; and associated works including open space, sustainable urban drainage systems, landscaping, infrastructure and earthworks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/2495</td>
<td>Wymondham Land Between London Road And Suton Lane London Road Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td>Miss S Adlen</td>
<td>Outline application for up to 375 dwellings and associated infrastructure, new cemetery and 1.2 ha of land for neighbourhood centre comprising A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, and/or B1 and/or D1 uses</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal (Note: Members resolved to not contest the appeal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2616</td>
<td>Carleton Rode Meadowley 10 Bunwell Street Carleton Rode Norfolk NR16 1NA</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs R Hudson</td>
<td>Conversion of outbuilding to form annex to dwelling</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Parish / Site</td>
<td>Appellant</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Decision Maker</td>
<td>Final Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2847</td>
<td>Dickleburgh And Rushall Land North Of 7 Merlewood Dickleburgh Norfolk</td>
<td>Mrs Mary Roe</td>
<td>Single Storey 1-2 Bedroom Dwelling.</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2856</td>
<td>Bressingham Land North Of Waveney House Low Road Bressingham Norfolk IP22 2AG</td>
<td>Mr Paul Rackham</td>
<td>Erection of industrial unit</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0691</td>
<td>Saxlingham Nethergate The Nook Norwich Road Saxlingham Nethergate Norfolk NR15 1TP</td>
<td>Mrs Betty Benton</td>
<td>Demolish existing bungalow and replace with 2 no bungalows</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>