Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

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

Liberal Democrats
Dr M Gray
Mrs L Neal (Vice-Chairman)
Mrs Y Bendle
Mrs F Ellis
Mr C Gould
Dr C Kemp
Mr G Minshull
Mr B Stone
Mrs A Thomas
Mr V Thomson

Pool of Substitutes
Mr P Broome
Mr L Dale
Mr J Hornby
Dr N Legg
Mr B Riches
Mr G Wheatley
Mrs V Bell

Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time
9.00 am Blomefield Room

Agenda

Date
Wednesday 2 March 2016

Time
10.00 am

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

Contact
Owen Pugh tel (01508) 533685
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.

The order of the agenda may change at the discretion of the Chairman, so it is advisable to arrive at the commencement of the meeting if you are intending to speak on items 1 to 6, and arrive at 1:30pm if you intend to speak on items 7 – 21.

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

02/03/2016
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.

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 long you have left 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 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.

Please note: In accordance with the Council’s constitution no one may make photographs, film, video or other electronic recordings of the meeting without the Chairman's consent

HEALTH AND SAFETY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire alarm</th>
<th>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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phones</td>
<td>Please switch off your mobile phone or put it into silent mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td>The toilets can be found on your right and left of the lobby as you enter the Council Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>There will be a short comfort break after two hours if the meeting continues that long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td>A water dispenser is provided in the corner of the Council Chamber for your use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A G E N D A

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

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

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

4. Minutes of the Meeting of the Development Management Committee held
   3 February 2016
   (attached – page 10)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 20)
   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>2014/2495/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land Between London Road and Suton Lane, London Road Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2014/2222/F</td>
<td>THURLTON</td>
<td>Land North Of College Road Beccles Road Thurlton Norfolk</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2015/1428/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Thatchers Needle 33 Park Road Diss Norfolk IP22 4AS</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2015/2406/O</td>
<td>STOKE HOLY CROSS</td>
<td>Land West of Chandler Road Stoke Holy Cross Norfolk</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2015/2630/F</td>
<td>LITTLE MELTON</td>
<td>Land South East Of The Gardens Mill Road Little Melton Norfolk</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2015/2836/F</td>
<td>BERGH APTON</td>
<td>Land South of Cookes Road Bergh Apton Norfolk</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2015/0833/O</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Evangelical Free Church Carr Lane Poringland Norfolk NR14 7JZ</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2015/1735/H</td>
<td>PULHAM MARKET</td>
<td>Sixmill Green Colegate End Road Pulham Market Norfolk IP21 4XG</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2015/2078/F</td>
<td>BURSTON AND SHIMPLING</td>
<td>Land East of Green Lane Diss Road Burston Norfolk</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2015/2175/B</td>
<td>REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON</td>
<td>21 Broad Street Harleston Norfolk IP20 9AZ</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2015/2176/H</td>
<td>REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON</td>
<td>21 Broad Street Harleston Norfolk IP20 9AZ</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2015/2344/F</td>
<td>TIVETSHALL ST MARGARET</td>
<td>The Maltings Moulton Road Tivetshall St Margaret Norfolk NR15 2AJ</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2015/2362/RVC</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Ayton House Ayton Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0QJ</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2015/2856/F</td>
<td>BRESSINGHAM</td>
<td>Land North Of Waveney House Low Road Bressingham Norfolk IP22 2AG</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Planning Ref No.</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>Page No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2015/2874/H</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>38 Ruskin Road Costessey Norfolk NR5 0LL</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2015/2896/F</td>
<td>SHOTESHAM</td>
<td>Meadow View Brooke Road Shotsham Norfolk NR15 1XN</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2016/0158/O</td>
<td>CAISTOR ST EDMUND</td>
<td>Land South of High Ash Farm High Ash Lane Caistor St Edmund Norfolk</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2016/0174/H</td>
<td>SHOTESHAM</td>
<td>Highfield Hawes Green Shotsham Norfolk NR15 1UL</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2016/0019/F</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Cygnet House Swan Lane Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2XE</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2016/0043/RVC</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Land North Of Shotsham Road Poringland Norfolk</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2016/0216/RVC</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Wymondham Leisure Centre Norwich Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0NT</td>
<td>171</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. **Enforcement Reports** (attached – page 175)

8. **Planning Appeals (for information)** (attached – page 181)

9. **Date of next scheduled meeting** – Wednesday 30 March 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 your right and left 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 2003 |
| | Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document – Pre Submission |
| | Development Management Policies Document – Pre Submission |
| WAAP | Wymondham Area Action Plan – Pre Submission |
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A  Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?

OR

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

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

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

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

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 meeting

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

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

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?
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 3 February 2016 at 10.00 am.

Committee members Present: Councillors J Mooney (Chairman), F Ellis, M Gray, C Kemp, G Minshull, L Neal, B Stone and V Thomson

Apologies: Councillor Y Bendle and A Thomas

Substitute member: Councillor N Legg for Y Bendle

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

(1 member of the press and 40 members of the public were also in attendance)

247. 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>2014/2611</td>
<td>EASTON</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Member Code of Practice Lobbied by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1487/F</td>
<td>THURLTON</td>
<td>M Gray and V Thomson</td>
<td>'Other' interest – members of the Broads Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1921/F</td>
<td>CAISTOR ST EDMUND</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Member Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2655/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Member Code of Practice Lobbied by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/8180</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>C Gould</td>
<td>Local Member Code of Practice Lobbied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ENF 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

248. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meetings dated 6 January 2016 and 9 December 2015 (these were tabled at the meeting) were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
### 249. 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 application listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/2611 (Item 1)</td>
<td>EASTON</td>
<td>Mrs L Ford – Chairman Easton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr P Milliken – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr K Cooper – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr M Dewsbury – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2449/F (Item 2)</td>
<td>WRENINGHAM</td>
<td>Mr M Hill – Chairman Wreningham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr I Dobson – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr J Wells – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2536/F (Item 3)</td>
<td>GREAT MOULTON</td>
<td>Mr M Howe – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr M Wilby – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1485/F (Item 4)</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Mr J Barbuck – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1487/F (Item 5)</td>
<td>THURLTON</td>
<td>Mr P Bolton – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr K Garnham – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1663/F (Item 6)</td>
<td>ASLACTON</td>
<td>Mr P Webb – Vice-Chairman Aslacton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1921/F (Item 7)</td>
<td>CAISTOR ST EDMUND</td>
<td>Mrs G Buckley – Supporter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr T Lewis – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2147/A (Item 8)</td>
<td>TOFT MONKS</td>
<td>Ms L Harlon – Chairman Toft Monks Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs S Carver – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr D Dobma – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2276/H (Item 9)</td>
<td>TASBURGH</td>
<td>Mrs V Charles – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2522/F (Item 10)</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Mr T Bunn – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2655/O (Item 11)</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Ms B Birkett – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr J Parker – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2803/F (Item 12)</td>
<td>WICKLEWOOD</td>
<td>Mr A Cooke – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms D Bingham - 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.

250. ENFORCEMENT REPORTS

Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Stockton (ref:2012/8069)

It was RESOLVED that no further action be taken regarding the fence

Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Loddon (ref: 2014/8180)

It was RESOLVED that no further action be taken on the unauthorised works to the listed building.

251. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

252. ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS QUARTERLY REPORT

Members noted the quarterly enforcement report.

(The meeting closed at 4:04pm)

_____________________
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.

Major applications

1  Appl. No     :  2014/2611
Parish       :  EASTON

Applicants Name : Easton Landowners Consortium Joint Venture LLP
Site Address   :  Land north and south of Dereham Rd, Easton
Proposal      :  The erection of 890 dwellings; the creation of a village heart to feature an extended primary school, a new village hall, a retail store and areas of public open space; the relocation and increased capacity of the allotments; and associated infrastructure including public open space and highway works

Decision       :  Members voted unanimously for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Outline time limit
2. Reserved matters to be approved, including location and design of village hall
3. Amended plans
4. Off site highway works – Dereham Road right hand turn
5. Off site highway works – Marlingford Road/Hall Road new spine road
6. Off site highway works – Bawburgh Road new spine road
7. Off site highway works – footway/cycleway
8. Off site highway works – footway/cycleway phase T and road narrowing
9. Off site highway works – footway/cycleway and road narrowing phase Z
10. Off site highway works – footway/cycleway
11. Submit green infrastructure strategy – wider ecological corridors
12. Landscaping scheme to be agreed
13. Noise mitigation – earth bund as required
14. Submission ecological management plan
15. Contamination reports required
16. Reporting of unexpected contamination
17. Fire hydrants
18. Written scheme of investigation for archaeology
19. Surface water strategy
20. Foul water strategy
21. Minerals and waste safeguarding
22. Requirement for design code
23. Water efficiency
24. Renewable energy – submission of details
25. Standard highway specification – details
26. Future management and maintenance of estate roads
27. Construction worker parking
28. Wheel cleaning facilities
Updates

Letter received expressing concern at the ecological impacts of the scheme, with particular concern at the west of Marlingford Rd element which looks the same as previously indicated and suggest that SNC have not asked for the advice of Natural England. Natural England has been consulted, and they have responded accordingly. Furthermore, the Council also gains technical input on matters related to ecology via Norfolk County Council and they have no objection to the scheme as submitted subject to conditions and a S106 being entered into.

Further letters of objection expressing concern in two areas:

Firstly, paragraph 5.2 of the report insofar as the consultation process for the original submission did not include Sport England and therefore to revert to the original recommendation would mean that any decision issued on this basis would be flawed. Given that the scheme has been formally amended into its current state and Sport England has been consulted and their comments referred to and commented on in the present committee report it is considered that the current revised application can be progressed. In the event that the applicant wishes to revert back to the previous application (at this time there is no indication that this will happen) then the Council will re-consult on this basis in any event, including with Sport England, and take into account representations made before deciding how to progress the matter. Therefore in order to clarify the intention of paragraph 5.2, it is the officers intention to reflect upon the results of the re-consultation process at that time, if indeed it was to happen, and discuss with the relevant Ward Member the most appropriate course of action for further consideration of the application.

Secondly, In terms of the agent’s response to Sport England’s comments, whilst Easton FC has been well looked after in terms of its access to college facilities, there is concern at what facilities are available for the youth of the village and the use of facilities during the day at the college. It must not be forgotten that the college is a commercial venture in respect of making pitches and facilities available. The village has a right to its own sporting facilities, and these should be under the direct control of the village. It is evident that the scheme makes provision for policy compliant levels of open space, including a large village green and land for a new village hall and this can then be used to facilitate whatever facilities are considered to be appropriate, whether this is something to compliment those facilities available at Easton College or create whatever type of playing field or equivalent/alternative the Parish Council wishes to see.
6. Off-site highway works (TROD) footpath
7. Ecological mitigation
8. Retention of trees and hedgerows
9. Planting scheme to be agreed
10. Landscape management scheme to be agreed
11. Hedge heights
12. Tree and hedgerow protection
13. Contaminated land
14. Remediation scheme
15. Unexpected contamination
16. Air source heat pump specifications
17. Renewable energy
18. Water efficiency
19. Materials
20. Archaeological written scheme of investigation
21. Surface water drainage
22. Foul water strategy
23. Fire hydrants

Subject to the completion of a S106 to cover affordable housing

3 Appl. No : 2015/2536/F
Parish : GREAT MOULTON
Applicants Name : Mr T Heather
Site Address : Land north of High Green Great Moulton Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of 10 new dwellings and garages
Decision : Members voted unanimously for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Full planning permission time limit
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. New access construction over verge
4. Visibility splay dimension
5. Provision of parking, service
6. Landscaping scheme
7. Contaminated land – submit scheme
8. Implement of approved remediation
9. Reporting of unexpected contamination
10. Details of foul water disposal
11. Ecology mitigation
12. Boundary treatment and surface materials
13. Rainwater harvesting system

Subject to a S106 to secure affordable housing requirement

Update

Section 4.2 is meant to say 1x2 bedroom affordable housing dwelling so total now adds up to 10 dwellings instead of 11.

4 Appl. No : 2015/1485/F
Parish : WYMONDHAM
Applicants Name : Estate of Joan Alice Burton
Site Address : Land rear of 14 Norwich Common Wymondham Norfolk
Proposal : Proposed 1No. New Chalet bungalow

Decision : Members voted unanimously for REFUSAL

Refused

1. Contrary to policy
2. Out of character with the established development

5 Appl. No : 2015/1487/F
Parish : THURLTON

Applicants Name : Mr M Rushmer
Site Address : Home Farm Low Road Thurlton Norfolk NR14 6PZ
Proposal : Retrospective application for 2 No commercial dog kennels

Decision : Members voted unanimously to grant 2 year temporary consent (recommendation amended by members)

Approved with conditions

1. Approval is temporary for a time limit of 2 years
2. In accordance with submitted drawings
3. Limit the number of dogs
4. Flood safety
5. Disposal of waste
6. Details of surface water

Members also RESOLVED that enforcement action be taken to reduce the number of adult dogs on the site to 8.

Updates
Add condition surface water

6 Appl. No : 2015/1663/F
Parish : ASLACTON

Applicants Name : Waveney (Holdings) Ltd
Site Address : Waveney Pumps Newport Drive Station Road Aslacton Norfolk NR15 2DU
Proposal : Demolition of existing industrial Nissan hut and erection of seven new industrial units

Decision : Members voted 9 – 0 (with 1 abstention) for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Time limit
2. In accordance with plans
3. B1 and/or B8 only
4. External materials as in plans
5. Parking and turning laid out as in plans
6. No access to the site from the east
7. Fixed bollards provided as in plans
8. Infilling of hedging
9. Agreement of position and design of southern boundary treatment
10. Tree protection during construction
11. Hours of operation restriction
7. **Appl. No**: 2015/1921/F  
**Parish**: CAISTER ST EDMUND  
**Applicants Name**: Mrs Rebecca Gallagher  
**Site Address**: Land north of Tas House Norwich Road Caistor St Edmund Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Siting of one number log cabin style mobile home, one number log cabin style day room, one single bedroom unit and one touring caravan for residential use  
**Decision**: Members voted unanimously for **REFUSAL**  
Refused  
1. Planning definition of Gypsy/Traveller not met  
2. Outside development boundaries  
3. Harm the landscape setting  

8. **Appl. No**: 2015/2147/A  
**Parish**: TOFT MONKS  
**Applicants Name**: Mr Doeke Dobma  
**Site Address**: Junction of Pound Lane with Yarmouth Road (A143) and junction of Church Road with Pound Lane Toft Monks Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Two main directional signs on the corner of Yarmouth Road (A143) and Pound Lane plus one repeater sign adjacent St Margaret’s Church Toft Monks, opposite Church Road  
**Decision**: Members voted unanimously for **APPROVAL**  
Approved with conditions  
1-5. Standard advertisement conditions  
6. Non-reflective surface  
7. Existing signs to be removed  

**Updates**

Applicant has confirmed that the owner of the land the other side of the road near the church is not prepared to give permission for a sign on their land.  
Trailer sign on A146 has been removed  

9. **Appl. No**: 2015/2276/H  
**Parish**: TASBURGH  
**Applicants Name**: Mrs V Charles  
**Site Address**: Jasmine Cottage Low Road Tasburgh Norfolk NR15 1AR  
**Proposal**: 2 storey rear extension  
**Decision**: Members voted unanimously for **APPROVAL**  
Approved with conditions  
1. Full planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amendments
Parish Council
Supports the strong objections from the neighbouring property noting the application has been amended to mitigate the impact. Extension could be lowered; however this will end up very close to the ancient well, which could be structurally compromised by the development.

Officer
Site not in the development boundary

10  Appl. No : 2015/2522/F
Parish : COSTESSEY
Applicants Name : Mr Trevor Bunn
Site Address : Land north of Glenhurst Folgate Lane Costessey Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of 1 no. single storey dwelling to land north of Glenhurst
Decision : Members voted unanimously for APPROVAL
Approved with conditions
1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. Provision of parking, service
4. Tree protection
5. External materials to be agreed
6. Slab level to be agreed
7. Boundary treatment to be agreed
8. Construction access route and restoration
9. New water efficiency
10. PD removal for alterations to roof
11. Fence across north boundary to remain in place during construction

11  Appl. No : 2015/2655/O
Parish : WYMONDHAM
Applicants Name : Mr T Skitmore
Site Address : Land south east of 9 Spinks Lane Spinks Lane Wymondham Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of new dwelling and garage
Decision : Members voted unanimously for REFUSAL
Refused
1. Outside development limits
2. Erosion of strategic gap

12  Appl. No : 2015/2803/F
Parish : WICKLEWOOD
Applicants Name : Mr Kevin Musk
Site Address : Workshop Crownhorpe Road Crownhorpe Norfolk NR18 9EW
Proposal : Convert a garage at Crownhorpe Road to commercial offices and build a store for light use. Replace hedges and trees to landscape and make access to office and store
Decision : Members voted 6 – 3 (with 1 abstention) for **REFUSAL**

Refused

1. Unsustainable location
2. Contrary to policy
Major applications referred back to Committee

   Parish: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: Hallam Land Management
Site Address: Land Between London Road and Suton Lane, London Road
             Wymondham Norfolk
Proposal: 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

Recommendation: Authorise officers to confirm to the Planning Inspectorate that the Council
does not wish to contest the appeal subject to conditions and a S106
being agreed and to undertake further discussions with the applicant in
respect of viability

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to seek the views of the Development Management Committee in
respect of application number 2014/2495 for a residential development of 335 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 (outline application) at Land Between London
Road And Suton Lane, London Road, Wymondham which was refused on the 5th June 2015
following the recommendation made to the Development Management Committee on the 3rd June
2015. This decision was made upon the Council being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land
supply at that time. Given that the Council has recently confirmed that there is no longer has a 5
year supply within the Norwich Policy Area and has adopted its new Local Plan, it is necessary to
re-assess the proposal as it is now the subject of an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate.

1. Planning Policies

1.1 Since the determination of this application, the Council has a newly adopted local plan, and
therefore, the local plan policies contained within the previous committee report attached as
Appendix 2 have now been superseded. The following is a list of policies which are considered to
now be applicable to the proposal:

1.2 National Planning Policy Framework

NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport
NPPF 05: Supporting high quality communications infrastructure
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
1.3 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4: Housing delivery
Policy 6: Access and Transportation
Policy 7: Supporting Communities
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 13: Main Towns

1.4 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.2: Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety
DM3.15: Outdoor play facilities/recreational space
DM3.16: Improving level of community facilities
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.3: Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.5: Landscape character and river valleys
DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.10: Heritage Assets

1.5 Wymondham Area Action Plan
WYM 8: General green infrastructure requirements for new developments in the general AAP area
WYM 10: General green infrastructure requirements for new developments in the South of Wymondham
WYM 13: New recreation provision in Wymondham
WYM 15: Land for a new burial ground in Wymondham

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

1.7 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. Consultations

2.1 Notwithstanding that Given that the application is now the subject of an appeal, the consultation responses previously received are summarised in the previous committee report presented to the Development Management Committee on 3rd June 2015. This report is attached as Appendix 2.

2.2 It should also be noted that the appeal process in itself allows for representations to be made direct to the Planning Inspectorate. Officers are aware that such representation has been made.
3. **Assessment**

**Reasons for refusal**

3.1 Firstly, it is evident that there were 4 reasons for refusal within the decision notice, these being as follows:

1. The principle of residential development is not acceptable, by virtue of the site being outside existing and emerging development boundaries, there being a five-year land supply within the Norwich Policy Area and the development not therefore on balance being considered sustainable development. In the absence of an exception justification relating to affordable housing, agriculture, forestry or sustaining economic or social activity in the surrounding area the proposed development is not considered to be a sustainable form of development and is considered to be contrary to saved policies ENV8 and HOU4 of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan (2003), policy 10 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (adopted 2011, with amendments adopted 2014) and paragraphs 14 and 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

2. The development would lead to a detrimental impact to the setting of the Grade II listed building of Gonville Hall, and it's moats which are of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument by virtue of the loss of the open and rural character of the land surrounding the heritage asset and wider Tiffey Tributary Farmland Landscape character, through the proposed urban form to the north of Gonville Hall eroding the open, rural character of the surrounding area, and having regard to the requirements of Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 consideration has been given to the desirability of preserving the setting of the Listed Building identified. The proposed development is therefore considered to be contrary to Saved Policy IMP15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (adopted 2003), policy 2 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (adopted 2011, with amendments adopted 2014). Furthermore, it is considered that there is insufficient justification to permit the scheme in light of the harm through detrimental impact on the setting of a designated asset (Gonville Hall) when weighed against the public benefits of the proposed dwellings, affordable housing, neighbourhood centre and cemetery, as required by paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework and having regard to paragraph 134 of the National planning policy Framework.

3. The proposal has been assessed against the three dimensions of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012), in acknowledgement of paragraph 49 of the NPPF which requires the consideration of housing applications in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and paragraph 14 of the NPPF which confirms that the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be seen as a golden thread that runs through decision taking.

It is considered that the acknowledged benefits of the scheme namely the delivery of housing, including 33% affordable housing, a neighbourhood centre, open space and the provision of a cemetery are outweighed by the negative impacts of the lack of available secondary school places within Wymondham or suitable alternatives outside of Wymondham and the subsequent adverse impact on sustainable transport to schools and social cohesion of local communities this would cause, detrimental impact to the setting of the Grade II listed building of Gonville Hall, and its moats which are of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument by virtue of the loss of the open and rural character of the land surrounding the heritage asset and wider Tiffey Tributary Farmland Landscape character, through the proposed urban form to the north of Gonville Hall eroding the open, rural character of the surrounding area, and also having due regard to the existence of a five year
housing land supply within the Norwich Policy Area, and as such the scheme is not considered to represent sustainable development in the context of the NPPF when taken as a whole.

4. The proposed development represents a substantial development, which, if approved, would undermine the plan-making process in relation to the Wymondham Area Action Plan (Submission version 2013), which is presently at an advanced stage of preparation. The development, if approved at the present time, would potentially be pre-determining matters relating to the scale and location of new development in Wymondham. To grant consent for the application sites now would therefore be wholly premature and highly prejudicial to the outcome of the plan-making process in respect of the Wymondham Area Action Plan (2013) and not in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance entitled "Determining a Planning Application" Paragraph 014 Reference ID: 21b-014-20140306.

3.2 Having reviewed these reasons for refusal in light of the recent adoption of the South Norfolk Local Plan and the Council not being able to now demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply within the Norwich Policy Area, it is evident that this has the implications for the reasons for refusal:

3.3 In terms of reason 1 as set out in the decision notice is no longer directly relevant/suitably worded. At this time it is considered necessary to re-assess the scheme in light of the significant material change of no longer having a 5 year land supply and the adoption of the SNLP. This re-assessment is undertaken on the following assessment, paras 3.9 to 3.39.

3.4 In terms of reason 4 of the decision notice, this was based upon “prematurity”, whereby approving this scheme would have undermined the plan-making process in respect of the WAAP. Given that the WAAP has now been adopted, this reason for refusal is no longer applicable to the scheme.

Revised “planning balance” assessment

3.5 Given the Council cannot now demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, its housing supply related policies are considered to no longer be up to date in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 49 of the NPPF. Paragraph 49 also confirms that housing applications must be assessed in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. With this in mind it is necessary to establish whether the current scheme represents sustainable development. Sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. The NPPF goes on to stress in paragraph 8 that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.

3.6 The following is an assessment of whether the scheme can be considered to represent sustainable development. It should be noted that this approach was adopted in assessing the scheme previously with a copy of the committee report attached as Appendix 2.

Economic Role

3.7 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.”

3.8 The scheme would continue to result in some short term economic benefits as part of any construction work and in the longer term by local spending from the future occupants.
3.9 Likewise, given the range of potential uses which would be available within the neighbourhood centre, there would be an inevitable economic benefit from this part of the development. As set out above there would also be a short term benefit linked to the construction of the neighbourhood centre.

3.10 There would appear to be limited economic benefit associated with the cemetery proposal other than that linked to the construction work linked with it.

3.11 In summary it is considered that the scheme would bring forward a level of economic benefit.

Social Role

3.12 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.”

3.13 The previous committee report considered that given the Council could demonstrate an up to date 5 year housing land supply at the time of writing, this meant that this largely satisfied the requirements set out in respect of the social role in that it could provide sufficient housing in the context of the social role of the NPPF, and therefore the social benefits of this scheme were limited.

3.14 As confirmed above, the Council cannot now demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and therefore the social benefits are now considered to be greater than previously expressed.

3.15 Whilst Wymondham has a significant range of facilities, it is envisaged that there will be a lack of available secondary school places within Wymondham in the future when taking into account committed developments in the town and in neighbouring settlements which are within the catchment of Wymondham High Academy. Given the close proximity of the application site to Wymondham High Academy, in reality it is unlikely to be the children from this development which would be displaced if the school is over subscribed. Wymondham High Academy has an extensive catchment area and includes a number of outlying villages, such as Ashwellthorpe, Barford and Barnham Broom. After children with special educational needs and those in “public care”, the schools admissions criteria gives priority to those children who are due to transfer and live in the area served by the school but goes on to state that if all children cannot be offered a place the highest priority will be given to children living nearest to the school and that this will be measured on a straight line ‘crow flies’ basis using Ordnance Survey data.

3.16 This education related concern was expressed by Norfolk County Council in their response to the application. Having discussed the matter in detail, since this appeal was lodged, and also as part of the appeal related to the relocation of WRFC, it is apparent that Norfolk County Council, in their capacity as Local Education Authority, have found it is difficult to provide substantive evidence to demonstrate that a significant level of harm with any certainty would occur as a result of this development. On this point it is important to acknowledge the requirements of paragraph 14 of the NPPF which requires that where a policy is out of date (in this case the Council’s housing supply related conditions given the lack of a 5 year land supply) any adverse impacts must significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, and this then forms part of the planning balance.

3.17 Officer’s have also considered the potential implications of the undecided WRFC appeal which, if allowed, would add further pressure to secondary school provision on a cumulative basis. However, again, the evidence of displacement associated with the WRFC appeal was equally difficult to establish significant and demonstrable harm.
In terms of the cemetery proposal, Policy WYM10 of the WAAP makes provision for a new burial ground either inside or outside the development boundary for Wymondham provided that the following are met:

1) It is in keeping with the character of the surrounding area;
2) It does not have an adverse impact on the amenity of local residents;
3) It is appropriately located in relation to public transport;
4) It has adequate vehicular access including parking arrangements for disabled users;
5) There will be no significant impact on controlled waters (groundwater or surface water);
6) There will be no significant impact on the ecological value of the area
7) There will be no significant impact on nationally important heritage assets and any impact on lesser significant assets is significantly lessened

The scheme as submitted is considered to comply with these requirements, and on this basis the cemetery is considered to represent a benefit in the planning balance. The weight of the benefit of the cemetery is unchanged regardless of the change in land supply position.

In terms of the neighbourhood centre, this would assist with serving the future residents of the proposed housing as well as those already present within the locality. On this basis helping to meet the social role in so far as providing accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs.

In summary, the scheme presents a number of social benefits insofar as it would contribute additional housing, including a policy compliant level of affordable housing, and a cemetery for which there is an acknowledged need for both elements. In relation to affordable housing provision, the applicant has confirmed their intention, however, at present the Council is not in possession of any viability information to confirm this position. With this in mind the Council will seek the submission of the requisite information to support this. At present there is no evidence to suggest that this cannot be delivered. Furthermore, it should be stressed that there would be greater social benefits than previously expressed in the committee report from June 2015 in respect of the housing component of the scheme given the change in the housing land supply position.

On the negative side, it is considered that some education related harm would occur in relation to the displacement of those children in the outerlying villages within the catchment of Wymondham High Academy to other education establishments, however, in raising this point, it is necessary to have due regard to the difficulty NCC has in providing evidence of significant harm with any certainty at this time as to how this would manifest its self within the locality and the issues this would cause, and acknowledging that the lack of spaces at Wymondham High Academy is likely to be more of a long term rather than immediate concern.

In reaching a balance on the social implications of the scheme it is considered that there is no certainty of significant harm that could justify saying that the social role is failed in this instance.

Environmental Role

The NPPF confirms the environmental role as “contributes 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.”
3.26 As set out in the previous committee report, the site continues to be outside the existing or proposed development limit and is considered to represent an encroachment into the open countryside, which represents a level of harm in environmental terms. However, it must be acknowledged that solving a housing land supply shortfall will frequently result in the loss of areas of the countryside.

3.27 Given the close proximity of a listed building (Gonville Hall) Historic England has been involved as a consultee. It is evident that the scheme took account of the initial concerns expressed by Historic England and reduced the number of houses proposed from 375 to 335 and this has led to Historic England confirming in their most recent consultation response that:

“the development is now wholly contained north of the east-west farm track and the revised cemetery location would ensure that there would be no built forms to the west/northwest of Gonville Hall. This, combined with the cutting back of the housing on the east/northeast side of Gonville Hall that was incorporated earlier following the refusal of the previous application, would markedly reduce the harm that would result to Gonville Hall through development within its setting. The housing would now been contained in an arc to the north - northeast of Gonville Hall behind significant landscape buffering, and while a degree of harm remains, arising from the new housing continuing to suburbanise the setting of Gonville Hall in views from the north, the level of harm has now been reduced to the point where it would be difficult to envisage what further mitigation might be provided whilst still delivering a meaningful number of new dwellings. To remove this remaining harm would effectively require land to remain in agrarian use.

In determining this application it will be necessary for the Local Planning Authority to assess whether the residual harm that remains is now outweighed by the wider public benefits delivered by the proposal, in accordance with Paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

3.28 Paragraph 134 confirms that:

“Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designed heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing optimum viable use.”

3.29 As set out above the Council is satisfied that the provision of housing, including affordable housing would represent a significant benefit as would providing a much needed new cemetery site and as such these are considered to represent public benefits. In weighing the harm to the heritage asset against the public benefits it is considered that the scheme is not contrary to paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

3.30 In summary, there would be some environmental harm brought about by the scheme as it does represent a level of encroachment into the open countryside and level of harm to a listed building, but neither is considered to represent significant levels of harm.

Summary of sustainable development consideration

3.31 Having due regard to the above assessment made in the context of not having a demonstrable 5 year housing land supply, it is considered that the benefits of providing additional housing, including a policy compliant level of affordable housing, a cemetery that meets the aspirations of the WAAP are not outweighed by the acknowledged harm to a heritage asset (listed building), encroachment into the open countryside and potential education shortcomings related to future secondary school places in the Wymondham High Academy catchment area which is acknowledged within the adopted as being a key consideration when looking at housing within Wymondham (see paragraph 5.8 of the WAAP), but acknowledging and taking into account paragraph 105 of the Inspector’s final report for the Local Plan which noted that the harm would be likely to be later in the plan period and acknowledging the potential impacts from the as yet undetermined WRFC appeal.
Environmental Impact Assessment

3.32 The proposal was considered against the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2011. The environment, social and economic impacts have all been considered and are adequately addressed as detailed in the above report and the proposal was not considered to require an Environmental Statement and will not lead to any significant impacts other than those raised and adequately addressed in the above report.

3.33 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.

Other issues

3.34 The refusal did not include any reason relating to matters such as highway safety, residential amenity etc based upon the assessment of these points set out in the previous committee report attached as appendix 2. The change to the housing land supply position and the adoption of the Local Plan does not alter the officer’s views on these matters.

This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

4. Conclusion

4.1 The change in the council’s current position in respect of housing land supply from that at December 2014, when the decision was issued, whereby there is now no longer an adequate supply in the Norwich Policy Area, leads officers to the view that the scheme can now be considered to represent sustainable development in the context of the NPPF, having regard to the acknowledged harm in terms of a heritage asset (listed building) and potential education shortcomings related to future secondary school places in Wymondham.

4.2 In the context of the current appeal lodged with the Planning Inspectorate, the aforementioned position means that it is suggested that Members agree that the Council do not contest the current appeal and we confirm this position to the Planning Inspectorate.

4.3 If this position is agreed then it would be necessary to provide a copy of suggested conditions to the Planning Inspectorate to assist them in reaching their decision along with advancing discussions with the appellant in respect of S106 matters eg affordable housing, open space.

4.4 Officer’s would wish to stress that notwithstanding the above recommendation the appointed Planning Inspector may still come to a different planning balance in their decision.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Raine 01508 533841 craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

2. **Appl. No**: 2014/2222/F  
**Parish**: THURLTON

Applicants Name : Mr Geoff Collen  
Site Address : Land North Of College Road Beccles Road Thurlton Norfolk  
Proposal : Residential Development consisting of 27 dwelling houses

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions

1. Full permission time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted details  
3. Visibility splays to be provided  
4. Construction traffic management and worker parking  
5. Retention of trees and hedgerows  
6. Landscaping scheme and management plan, including provision and maintenance details of open space and play areas  
7. Tree and hedgerow protection  
8. Contaminated land  
9. Remediation scheme  
10. Unexpected contamination  
11. Renewable energy  
12. Water efficiency  
13. Materials to be agreed  
14. Surface water drainage  
15. Fire hydrant provision

Subject to the completion of a S106 to cover provision of affordable housing and green infrastructure contributions.

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 3 : Energy and water  
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation  
Policy 7 : Supporting Communities  
Policy 8 : Culture, leisure and entertainment  
Policy 15 : Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.1 : Ensuring development management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.1 : Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
DM3.2 : Meeting rural housing needs
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM3.14 : Pollution, health and safety  
DM3.16 : Improving level of community facilities  
DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.3 : Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste  
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows  
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design  
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies  
THL 1 : Land north of Beccles Road, west of College Road

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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

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

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

2. Consultations summary

2.1 Parish Council  
Object

Summary of detailed comments:

- We feel that SNDC has prematurely adopted the Local Plan and the site specific allocation of this site. Determination of this planning application should not be made at this time as it would pre-empt the determination of the complaint by the Local Authority Ombudsman.
- The allocation throughout the consultation process of the Local Plan was for 10-20 houses. Recent permissions for new dwellings will have the effect of increasing new housing to 41 dwellings if 27.
- The development is out of character with the existing form of village. An estate development of this size will be incongruous in the landscape and destroy the rural character of the village. There is also a lack of understanding of the social context and integration into the village.
- For what reason would a new estate need a separate play area. The applicant makes references to this being the future responsibility of the local council. Who would be responsible for insurance and maintaining the facility, play equipment and landscaping around the site in public spaces.
- Statements about transport provision and access to services are incorrect. Roads are either single track or winding with no
clear visibility and no pavements. Children should not or would be allowed to cycle these routes to school. Vehicle usage is therefore essential. Serious concern over highway safety.

- The design of the housing is not in accordance with the New Housing Standards. Where Lifetime homes are proposed they should be supported by evidence.
- The infrastructure required for an estate of this size will mean serious disruption of the main route into and through the village to outlying villages. All traffic will be diverted to single track rural roads. The developer should provide a workable plan of how the site can be developed, and if necessary consider that the site can only be accessed by some of the construction machinery and delivery vehicles from the rear of the site via a temporary road emerging directly onto the B1136.
- Potential impact on the archaeological significance of the fields to the rear of the site and the proximity of the previous discovery of historic artefacts should be made before any Planning Permission is granted.
- Design is unsatisfactory, the development would be incongruous in this rural village, out of character with the existing street scene, separating rather than unifying the existing housing that surrounds it and would have the potential for an unacceptable level of increase in car use and therefore has the potential for being detrimental to the safety of new and existing residents using the roads in and around the village.
- We do not believe that the infrastructure of the village can cope with an increase in population. The primary school is near capacity and an extra potential of 40 or so more children will mean that some primary school children will not be able to attend the local school.
- The Parish Council considers that this application should be refused for the reasons as set out in the detailed responses.

2.2 District Member

Comments on amendments:

- This application should be determined by committee as it is a significant planning application that is at variance with the recently adopted local plan.
- There are also a number of planning considerations (design, highway access etc.) which need to be properly considered in a public forum.

Original comments

- I believe this application should only be determined by the Committee as it raises significant issues of planning policy in terms of the forthcoming local plan examination and the Council's proposed allocation of housing for Thurlton in the Local Plan period.
- This has also attracted a significant amount of interest and engagement with the residents of Thurlton and so determination at the Committee would allow greater engagement by them in the determination process.

2.3 SNC Landscape Officer

No objection

Comments on amendments:

- This is better, as the boundary treatment for plot A1 is changed. Happy for landscape design to be conditioned if planning permission granted.
Original comments:

- It would be preferable to have the boundary of plot A1 hedged in order to continue so to be consistent with the other plots along this boundary with the public footpath; a fence can still be provided, but if it were set back from the line of the path slightly, there would be space for planting too.
- A much better scheme than that indicated on the submitted ‘Landscaping’ plans is achievable and that it is reasonable to expect this. In particular, the open spaces would benefit from a more coherent design concept as the arrangement and choice of features reads as being slightly arbitrary. I am happy for this to be detailed by way of a condition.
- Other than the play equipment previously proposed for the areas alongside the Beccles Road frontage being omitted, very little has been changed on the revised plans in light of my previous comments other than some additional tree planting within rear garden.
- The only extant landscape feature that will be affected is the existing (but incomplete) hedgerow along the roadside verge. No assessment appears to have been undertaken of this against the Hedgerows Regulations, but from my experience I do not consider that it would qualify as ‘important’ if it were fully assessed. I base this conclusion on the fact it comprises only relatively-young hawthorn plants. In light of this I do not consider that emerging policy DM4.9 applies and that the proposed hedgerow removal is a barrier to development.
- In terms of the development itself, I have no significant comments. My only concerns are the suitability of encouraging play in the POS along the road frontage, and also that the overall landscape scheme could be much improved. The latter could be dealt with by condition if necessary.
- Elements to consider include; having the new hedge more continuous along western boundary with footpath to increase connectivity; proposed tree planting could be arranged with more ‘conviction’ to create stronger lines and emphasis; hedges (not necessarily native species) to all front gardens could help achieve a more rural character; additional tree planting on frontage (can have a reducing effect on traffic speeds) and trees within new hedgerows especially on northeast boundary;
- If the application is approved, we will need to apply conditions to address the detail landscape design and management, retention of existing vegetation/ tree protection.

2.4 NCC Planning Obligations Coordinator

No objection

Comments on amendments:

- The funding of infrastructure would need to be through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
- Taking into account the existing capacity of the schools, the County Council would need to seek funding for infant/junior/primary/high school provision. (Primary School- 5 children generated – 0 spare capacity = 5 additional spaces required, High School- 3 children generated – 65 spare capacity = 0 additional spaces required.
- It is expected that the funding for the above pupil places would be through CIL as this is covered on the District Council’s Regulation 123 list.
Norfolk Fire Services have indicated that the proposed development will require 1 hydrant.

Library stock is required to increase the capacity of Loddon library. The County Council would expect library infrastructure to be funded through CIL.

Green infrastructure (GI) should be included within the proposed site in line with local policy. Connections into the local GI network, including Public Rights of Way and ecological features, should be considered alongside the potential impacts of development, particularly on international sites. Maintenance/mitigation for new and existing GI features may require a contribution or commuted sum in order to allow the local GI network to facilitate the development without receiving negative impact and equally, allow the development to integrate and enhance the existing network.

Wherry Lines walk (No 5 - Haddiscoe) incorporates Thurlton FP3; desirability, recreation and health benefits could be gained should future residents be made aware of local access to the countryside and circular walks. Norfolk County Council Trails therefore seeks a contribution of £500 per dwelling for improved access to the circular walk to include, Fido bins with associated maintenance for first 10 years, signage, walk improvements and supporting literature for new residents and other potential users.

Original comments:
- The funding of this infrastructure would need to be through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
- No contributions will be claimed for Nursery, Primary or High School provision.
- Norfolk Fire Services have indicated that the proposed development will require 1 hydrant.
- Library stock is required to increase the capacity of Loddon library. The County Council would expect library infrastructure to be funded through CIL.
- In terms of other Green Infrastructure (GI) the hedgerow boundary treatment approach for the PROW and dwellings is generally supported as these features will enhance local GI and respond to local rural character.
- With regard to other GI within the development boundary, it may be better suited that the Informal Area of Play is located away from the Beccles Road, incorporated into the central green space, and the existing central green space and its features distributed throughout the development in order to provide natural connectivity and GI integration across the site as well as improved safety for children.

2.5 NCC Public Rights Of Way

No objection

Comments on amendments:
- Thurlton FP3 Public Right of Way (PROW) runs along the NW boundary of the site.
- Norfolk County Council Trails have confirmed that they no objection to the proposals but are seeking a contribution of £500 per dwelling for improved access to the Wherry Lines walk which incorporates Thurlton FP3.
Original comments:
- The site plan provided indicates two accesses onto this PROW for the proposed development; there are a number of options for the future maintenance of these routes, however the most appropriate in this case would be for either the District or the County Council to adopt by way of an alternative agreement to S106.

2.6 NCC Ecologist  
No objection

Comments on amendments:
- Having reviewed the amendments for this development I am of the opinion that our previous comments still apply.
- As such, due to the limited ecology present on site, if minded to approve this application there need be no ecological constraints.

Original comments:
- A protected species assessment has been provided with the application (Land off Beccles Road, Thurlton; A Protective Species Assessment; Finnemore Associates; October 2012).
- The assessment considers protected species in an appropriate manner. Two ponds are present within 500m of the application site but both were assessed as having poor to below average potential for great crested newts. As such I am of the opinion that there are no ecological constraints at this site.

2.7 Historic England  
No objection

Comments on amendments:
- Historic England has considered the information received and do not wish to offer any comments on this occasion.
- The application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance.

Original comments:
- No comments received.

2.8 SNC Play and Amenities Officer  
No objection

Comments on amendments:
- I have no objections as to the location of play areas.

Original comments:
- I have no initial concerns as to the lay out of the proposed areas, however, I would like to see the equipped play area localised centrally where the POS laid to grass and drainage swell currently is and not as shown on the current site plan DWG NO: 20 001 revision B.
- There would also be a requirement to provide a fully detailed scheme for the equipment/fencing/ancillary items.
- The POS areas fronting Beccles Road will require careful consideration as to the type of boundary to accommodate the necessary safety aspects of locating POS area along a busy road.
- Not quite understanding why there is a drainage swale in the middle of the POS when the land slopes away from this area.
2.9 Historic Environment Service

No objection

Comments on amendments:

- An archaeological trial trench evaluation has been carried out at the site and a report submitted. The report confirms that below ground archaeological features are present.
- The evaluation enabled appropriate identification and dating of the archaeological features and given their limited significance and potential for further information we are happy that no further work is necessary on the site.
- We will not be recommending any conditions for planning permission, if granted.

Original comments:

- There is potential that significant heritage assets with archaeological interests may be present and that their significance may be affected by the development.
- Any planning application for this development should be accompanied by the results of an archaeological evaluation. The results of an archaeological evaluation have not been submitted.
- We recommend that an archaeological evaluation be undertaken prior to the determination of the application to establish the significance of the site.

2.10 SNC Listed Buildings Officer

No objection

- There are no listed buildings located within the application site and the site is not within a Conservation Area.
- The listed buildings that are closest to the site are Hall Farmhouse and Hall Farm Barn (Grade II) to the southeast of the site and All Saints Church to the northeast.
- The proposed development would not have any adverse impact on these heritage assets.

2.11 Norfolk Police

No comments received

2.12 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team

No objection

Comments on amendments:

- We do not wish to object to this planning application and would reiterate our original comments.

Original comments:

- We do not wish to object to this planning application. We would recommend that any approval of this application include conditions for contaminated land during construction.

2.13 NCC Highways

No objection

Comments on final amendments:

- Suggests a number of conditions and informatives covering detailed plans of the roads, footways, visibility splays and a Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Original comments and amendments:

- No objection but offers comments which should be addressed prior to the determination of the application.
- Amendments required in respect of visibility splays, junctions, visitor parking, parking layout, turning heads, parking spaces, private drives, pedestrian links and garage sizes.

2.14 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Officer

No objection

Comments on amendments:
- The affordable housing package is acceptable.

Original comments:
- JCS Policy 4 requires 33% affordable housing, and this application complies by proposing 9 affordable homes.
- The mix of property types is acceptable and the layouts and internal floorspaces are acceptable.
- I have not seen a reference to tenure in the application. JCS Policy 4 seeks an approximate mix of 85% rent / 15% intermediate tenure.

2.15 SNC Water Management Officer

No objection

Comments on amendments:
- We have no adverse comments to make regarding the surface water drainage strategy and flood risk assessment.
- The FRA advises that roof water from dwellings will be contained in individual soakaways designed to accommodate up to the 1 in 100 year climate change storm event. Private driveways will be of permeable surfacing. The highways drainage will drain via a positive system to a soakaway designed to accommodate the 1 in 10 years storm with additional storage by means of a shallow ditch, both located in the open space fronting the site.

Original comments:
- We do not wish to object to this planning application. However we would recommend that any approval of this application include conditions and notes.
- Further infiltration tests are recommended to confirm ground conditions.
- It is unclear what is intended to drain to the swale or how the lower part of the site will utilise attenuation storage or where any features will be located.
- Whilst the FRA has indicated the approximate volume of flood storage it is unclear how this storage will be accommodated within the site or where any flow control features will be located.
- The FRA does not demonstrate that any flood storage features that may be required if infiltration drainage is not viable, can be accommodated within the site lay-out.
- Where new infiltration devices are proposed, percolation tests should be carried out and designed so that run-off is completely contained for the 1 in 30 year storm event and properties protected against flooding from the site drainage system for the 1 in 100 year storm event plus 30% for climate change.
- If infiltration is not suitable, consideration should be given to alternative sustainable options.
- Prior to the commencement of work on site, full details of the means of surface water drainage shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
2.16 Environment Agency
Comments on amendments:
- We have now stopped commenting on surface water even where we have previously commented.

Original comments:
- The FRA does not comply with the requirements of the NPPF.
- The FRA fails to provide sufficient information about the design of a surface water scheme to demonstrate that the development will not increase flood risk in a 1 in 100 year climate change event.

2.17 Anglian Water Services Ltd
No objection

Comments on amendments:
- Original comments stand. AW recommends a Surface Water condition for this planning application.

Original comments
- There are no assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within the development site boundary.
- The sewerage system at present has available capacity.
- The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SUDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option.
- AW recommends a planning condition that no drainage works shall commence until a surface water management strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

2.18 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority
- The application falls below our current threshold for providing detailed comment.
- You should satisfy yourself that the applicant has demonstrated compliance with NPPF, Written Ministerial Statement ensuring that Sustainable Drainage Systems for the management and accords with national standards and relevant guidance.

2.19 NHS England
No comments received

2.20 Representations
36 letters of objection and 1 petition consisting 133 signatures of objection on the following grounds, as summarised:

- Estate scale development is out of keeping with the village.
- Located on a prominent site in the landscape requiring the creation of a new access in close proximity to a dangerous stretch of Beccles Road.
- Insufficient information provided on surface water disposal arising from the development of the site leading to an Environment Agency objection.
- Does not meet current highways design standards.
- Is of a scale over and above the future development needs of the village as defined by the role of the village as a service village in the residential hierarchy.
- Is of a design that will cause detriment to neighbouring amenity and the locality as well as being out of keeping with the grain and character of the village.
Concerns about the amount of traffic leaving and entering the development onto Beccles road, which is already a busy road for a small village and narrow in places, particularly where the proposed entrance would be situated.

Potential to make the driving out of College Road even more hazardous.

Concerns that the wishes of the majority of the village are being ignored.

Feel that smaller plots would be more beneficial to the village and would not impact the landscape as much as an estate.

Farmland that is producing food should not be sold/used for such development.

Primary school not able to accommodate the amount of additional children that the village would gain. 27 new families could present a situation where village children would have to go outside their village to find schooling.

The village has limited amenities and does not have the facilities to cope with another 27 families.

Concerns that if the field is built on the water will run off causing flooding on the already dangerous road, or the existing properties on Beccles Road and Sandy Lane.

Very little public transport available to residents.

Location and size of this development is inappropriate for a small village.

Highway comments should be considered as an objection to the proposal as it currently stands.

Recent appeal on land to the rear of Norman Close, and those permitted plus recent additions mean that the number of dwellings for the village is twice the level expected for a village.

Numerous road traffic accidents identified on the road in front of the proposed site.

Infrastructure unable to cope with a further single large residential estate.

Development designed with expansion in mind in the future.

The majority of the dwellings on the proposed development are large homes.

Position of play area on Beccles Road adjacent to access is not a good idea.

Development will destroy rural views over farmland.

Limited broadband capacity and no signs of fibre optic.

Inaccuracies of reports prepared at consultation stage, relating to Arboricultural Impact Assessment.

Impact on the open countryside, particularly northern boundary.

Water supply has insufficient capacity.

No archaeological evaluation submitted despite recommendation and advice from Historic Environment Services.

Biodiversity document does not mention Hedgehogs, a protected species. Numerous Hedgehogs identified in local habitat and existing hedgerow proposed to be removed.

3 Assessment

Site description and proposal

3.1 The site comprises approximately 2.05 hectares of agricultural land located 10 miles to the northeast of Bungay and 5 miles north of Beccles.
3.2 The site is bounded to the southeast by existing residential development that comprises of single storey properties and two storey semi-detached dwellings. The northwest of the site is bounded by housing that fronts onto Beccles Road in the form of two storey semi-detached properties set back from the road frontage. A farmhouse is located opposite the site and to the northwest.

3.3 A public footpath runs alongside the northwest boundary of the site, beyond which is open farmland. The proposed northeast boundary is an arbitrary line within the existing agricultural field. There is a prominent slope at the front of the site, with land rising approximately 3m higher than the road level at Beccles Road.

3.4 There are no trees within the site, but there is a hedgerow and several trees located around the perimeter, notably along the southeast boundary. The southwest boundary, fronting Beccles Road is also delineated by a hedgerow.

The application

3.5 The application is a full application and proposes the erection of 27 dwellings. These consist of:

Open market housing
- Single storey
  - 1 x 1 bedroom
- Two storey
  - 9 x 3 bedroom
  - 8 x 4 bedroom

Affordable housing
- Single storey
  - 3 x 1 bedroom
- Two storey
  - 2 x 3 bedroom
  - 4 x 2 bedroom

3.6 A single point of access is proposed on to Beccles Road to serve the development. An adoptable standard of road is proposed with a footpath and turning head at the northern part of the site. The existing field access and public footpath that runs alongside the northeast boundary of the site is retained.

3.7 A linear area of open space is proposed running north-south along Beccles Road on the southwest boundary of the site, and extending to an area to the southeast of the entrance into the site. In addition an area of open space is proposed within the site, which also incorporates a drainage swale.

3.8 The application has been amended to address the Highway Authority's requirements largely relating to additional information and minor amendments being made to the road alignment, visibility splays, and parking arrangements. Furthermore amendments include improvements to the site layout, house types and landscaping, which have been negotiated throughout the course of the application.

3.9 The main issues for consideration are the principle of development; highway considerations; drainage; layout, scale and design; heritage assets; residential amenity; public open space and landscaping; ecology and affordable housing.
Principle of development

3.10 Policy 15 of the JCS identifies Thurlton as a Service Village in which land has been allocated to provide for approximately 10-20 dwellings between April 2008 and March 2026, subject to form, character and servicing constraints. A single site allocation has been adopted in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD to deliver this growth, Policy THL1: Land North of Beccles Road, west of College Road.

3.11 The application site comprises all of the land proposed for the residential allocation in policy THL1 of the Site Specific Allocations document. Policy THL1 sets out the requirements for development of the site and this is set out below:

3.12 Land amounting to around 2 hectares is allocated for housing and associated infrastructure. This allocation could accommodate approximately 20 dwellings. The policy requires the developer of the site to ensure the following:

- Estate development accessed from Beccles Road
- Appropriate boundary treatment on the site’s northern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the north
- Safe access
- Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 applies, as this site is underlain by safeguarded mineral resources.

3.13 The development proposes 27 no. houses on the site. Members should note that this is greater than the 10-20 houses in Service Villages identified in the Joint Core Strategy and greater than the approximate stated in Policy THL1. However in considering the resultant impact of this it is necessary to have regard to the following material considerations:

Part 1 of Policy DM1.3 of the Local Plan states that:

1) All new development should be located so that it positively contributes to the sustainable development of South Norfolk as led by the Local Plan. The Council will work with developers to promote and achieve proposals that are:

   (a) Located on Allocated Sites or within the development boundaries of Settlements defined on the Policies Map, comprising the Norwich Fringe, Main Towns, Key Service Centres, Service Villages and Other Villages; and
   (b) Of a scale proportionate to the level of growth planned in that location, and the role and function of the Settlement within which it is located, as defined in the Local Plan.

3.14 The scheme proposed meets the requirements of criterion a) as it is an allocated site and the 27 dwellings proposed is considered appropriate given the villages status as a service village subject to form, character and servicing constraints and therefore complies with the requirements of b).

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

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

3.16 In terms of para 58, providing 27 dwellings on the site whilst still having an average density of approximately 13dph ensuring the efficient use of land, which is reflective of the scale of the local area.

3.17 In summary, whilst the number of dwellings proposed is greater than the approximate figure contained within the allocation, it is considered, that in principle, providing 27 dwellings
within the village which is a service centre is, in principle, acceptable, subject to the scheme satisfying the stated criterion set out within the allocation and all relevant planning policies in respect of matters such as design, neighbour amenity, highway safety etc. An assessment of the scheme, against the above is as follows:

The first criterion within the allocation requires

• Estate development accessed from Beccles Road

3.18 The scheme has a single point of access from Beccles Road and the Highway Authority has confirmed that they have no objection to the precise position and specification (including visibility) proposed subject to conditions. For this reason the first criterion has been satisfied.

The second criterion requires

• Appropriate boundary treatment on the site’s northern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the north.

3.19 The scheme proposes a new native hedgerow to the northern boundary of the site, which is consistent with other established boundary treatments to the site and appropriate in this rural context. The Council’s landscape officer has confirmed that this is an acceptable approach in this locality. For this reason the second criterion has been satisfied.

The third criterion requires

• Safe access

3.20 As set out above, the Highway Authority is satisfied that its technical requirements in respect of the site access have been met.

The fourth criterion requires

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

3.21 NCC in their capacity as Waste and Minerals Authority has been consulted and their comments are awaited. These will be reported to the Development Management Committee accordingly. It is envisaged that no objection to the scheme will be received given that the use proposed is consistent with the adopted site allocation.

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

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

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

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

3.26 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."

3.27 The scheme would result in some short term economic benefits as part of any construction work and in the longer term by local spending from the future occupants, including at the village’s existing local facilities ie post office. In summary it is considered that the scheme would bring forward a level of economic benefit.

Social Role

3.28 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."

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

3.30 The social role highlights the need for housing to appropriate access to a range of accessible local services. Thurlton is identified as a Service Village and defined as having a good level of services and facilities. The site is well located in relation to the local post office, Thurlton Primary School and a regular bus service to Norwich.

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

3.32 It is evident that there is spare high school capacity provision and Thurlton is also a short distance to Beccles and Bungay Key Service centres which provide health care and a varied range of services.

3.33 In terms of the affordable housing provision, Policy 4 of the JCS requires 33% of the total number of units to be affordable, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not viable to do so. In this instance the scheme proposes that 9 of the 27 units would be affordable (33%) and is therefore considered acceptable.

Layout, appearance and scale

3.34 The environmental role also seeks to secure a high quality built environment. The site layout and house types have been subject to revisions during the application process following discussions with the applicant.
3.35 In considering the overall scale of development, regard should be given to the density and form of existing development fronting Beccles Road, which aims to reinforce the linear development along Beccles Road and which helps to establish and define the site. Regard should also be given to the density of development that reduces towards the rear of the site, in order to provide a transition from the built form on Beccles Road to the open farmland to the rear. With regard to the overall density of development, this averages out at 13 houses to the hectare, which is considered a comparable average density in a rural location such as Thurlton, ensuring the efficient use of land, yet is reflective of the scale of the local area.

3.36 Having assessed the overall scale and form of development it is considered that the proposed scheme would respect the existing character and arrangement of frontage development onto Beccles Road as well as providing an acceptable transition of development to the open farmland to the rear of the site, which displays a visual and physical connection to Thurlton.

3.37 House types have been considered in the context of the wider surroundings to help reinforce and enhance the local character of Thurlton. The house types use traditional forms and materials, yet have a distinctive appearance. House types fronting onto Beccles Road have been designed to reflect the simple style of the post war housing to the adjoining sites and pick up on the use of decorative trellis and brickwork seen in the nearby Taylor and Green bungalows. The height, scale and form of the proposed buildings is considered appropriate for the site and its context.

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

3.39 Overall, it is considered that the amended scheme has been well thought out and results in a development with a locally inspired character that relates positively to its surroundings and Thurlton. Information has also been submitted that demonstrates how the proposals comply with the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide design principles as well as explaining the approach to achieving this by carrying out a Building for Life 12 evaluation, which scores 10 greens out of 12.

3.40 It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS, section 7 of the NPPS and policy DM1.4, DM3.9 and DM4.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD have been met.

Public Open Space and Landscaping

3.41 In terms of landscape impact concern has been expressed about the impact of the development on the open countryside and the rural character of the site. It is evident that there is a need to ensure the development has a defined relationship to the open countryside, particularly to the northern boundary whilst respecting housing densities and the character of surrounding existing development. The northern boundary picks up on the existing line of the south-eastern housing to College Road and relates with the proposed housing, being more informal in its setting. The boundary itself is proposed as a new native hedgerow giving a clear and defined edge to the village in this location. The exiting hedge and tree line to the northeast also provides screening to the wider open countryside beyond. The hedge to the front of the site has been retained more continuous along western boundary.
3.42 In considering this the Landscape Officer has confirmed that he has no objections to the proposals and it is considered that the layout has strong visual links to the surrounding countryside to the north and southeast, which provides a positive transition from build form to the countryside.

3.43 With regards to the position of public open spaces, these provide a strong focus on the edges of the site as well as at the entrance to the development on Beccles Road and the centre of the site, which helps to provide attractive focal points overlooked by dwellings. The layout has good visual links to the surrounding countryside to the north, which provides a positive transition from build form to the countryside. It should be noted that the Council’s Landscape Officer has raised concerns regarding the detailed design of these open spaces and as such has suggested attaching a condition to agree a landscaping scheme and management for the site, as well as details of the proposed play areas.

3.44 In terms of removal of landscape features the only extant feature that will be affected is the existing (but incomplete) hedgerow along the roadside verge. Whilst no assessment has been undertaken of this against the Hedgerows Regulations, the Landscape Officer has made an assessment of the hedge and does not consider that it would qualify as ‘important’ if it were fully assessed, based on the fact that it comprises only relatively-young hawthorn plants. In light of this I do not consider that emerging policy DM4.9 applies and that the proposed hedgerow removal is a barrier to development.

3.45 With regard to the overall development the Landscape Officer has raised no significant comments. The only concerns relate to the suitability of encouraging play in the POS along the road frontage, which has now been omitted and also that the overall landscape scheme that could be much improved, which is proposed to be dealt with by condition.

3.46 In summary, whilst the concerns are acknowledged in respect of detailed landscape design and landscape character, it is considered that the current scheme does not lead to significant harm in terms of landscape impact. Therefore subject to a detailed landscaping scheme and management plan to be agreed by condition, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this respect and would accord with the aims of Policy THL1, DM4.8 and DM4.9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, JCS Policies 1 and 2 and section 11 of the NPPF.

3.47 In summary, Policy 15 of the JCS, Thurlton is identified as a Service Village and defined as having a good level of services and facilities. In considering the scale of development proposed, it is considered that the development will help to support the rural economy, delivering a wide choice of homes and promoting healthy communities in accordance with the provisions of the overall strategy and National Planning Policy Framework. It is considered that the lack of available primary school places within Thurlton does not result in a scheme which does not fulfils the social role in the context of the NPPF and provides an attractive scheme for future residents. Residential development will therefore help to support the rural economy, delivering a wide choice of homes and promoting healthy communities in accordance with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework. Environmental Role

3.48 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."

Ecology and Protected Species

3.49 The application is supported by a protected species assessment which is regarded as fit for purpose by Norfolk County Council Natural Environment Team. The assessment considers
protected species in an appropriate manner. Two ponds are present within 500m of the application site but both were assessed as having poor to below average potential for great crested newts. The County Ecologist considers that there need be no ecological constraints on the site.

3.50 It should also be noted that concerns have been raised by members of the public about the presence of hedgehogs. Whilst hedgehogs are not a protected species under European Legislation, they are listed under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Although this is not a material consideration in the determination of the planning application it is considered that the creation of green spaces through the development as well as the planting of native species of trees, shrubs and the retention and planting of hedgerows will facilitate adequate movement of hedgehogs where there is the potential for hedgehogs using the site. The County Ecologist considers that the above protected species assessment is acceptable.

Heritage assets

3.51 The Listed Buildings Officer has confirmed that there are no listed buildings located within the application site and that the site is not within a Conservation Area. The listed buildings that are closest to the site are Hall Farmhouse and Hall Farm Barn (Grade II) to the southeast of the site and All Saints Church to the northeast. These buildings are some distance from the application site and it is considered that the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on these heritage assets and is therefore considered acceptable in terms of policy DM4.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

3.52 In addition to the Development Plan policies, S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Furthermore S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

3.53 In consideration of the Council’s duties under those Acts it is considered, for the reasons set out in the paragraphs above, that the proposal would not adversely affect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building (Hall Farmhouse and Hall Farm Barn).

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

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

Other issues

Surface water drainage

3.56 The site lies within Flood Zone 1 which is low risk probability and as such the key issue for this site is the means of surface water drainage. The surface water from the development is proposed to be contained in individual soakaways designed to accommodate up to the 1 in 100 year climate change storm event. Private driveways will be of permeable surfacing and highways drainage will drain via a soakaway designed to accommodate the 1 in 10 year’s storm with additional storage by means of a shallow ditch, both located in the open space fronting the site.
3.57 The Environment Agency previously commented on this application with a holding objection stating that the previous Flood Risk Assessment did not comply with the requirements of the NPPF. The Environment Agency has since stopped providing comments on surface water where they have previously commented and advised that the Council satisfy themselves that the applicant has demonstrated compliance with the NPPF, Written Ministerial Statement on Sustainable Drainage Systems and other relevant national standards and guidance.

3.58 As this scheme falls below the current threshold for the Lead Local Flood Authority to provide comments, although it should be noted they are still the statutory consultee and should provide comments. The Council’s Water Management Officer has assessed the proposals and confirmed that the approach to surface water, as set out in the amended Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report prepared by Bingham Hall Associates, is acceptable and that it demonstrates compliance with the NPPF and other relevant national standards and guidance.

3.59 Anglian Water has also confirmed that the strategy is acceptable subject to a condition for a surface water scheme to be agreed prior to the commencement of development, which includes details of management and maintenance. It is therefore considered that subject to compliance with this condition that the impacts on surface water drainage are acceptable.

Foul water

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

Access and Highways

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

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

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

3.64 The development proposals recognise the need for car parking that will provide spaces in direct relationship to the property they serve, which will be screened by low level landscaping to help minimise the impact of parked cars on the street scene. Policy compliant levels of parking have been provided across the site, totalling 87 parking spaces. Garage sizes are 7m x 3m which are sized to ensure sufficient storage space in addition to parking that comply with the Parking Standards for Norfolk Guide (2007). There is some tandem parking within the development. To achieve viable developments some tandem parking is sometimes required and in this case it is considered that there is a sufficient mix of parking arrangements to ensure that the tandem parking would not lead to any significant concern.
With regard to public footpaths, the nearest footpath in the vicinity of this site is Thurlton FP3, which forms part of the Norfolk Trails Network. The footpath is located outside of the site boundary along an existing field access on the north west boundary of the site and forms part of the Wherry Links Walk (No. 5 Haddiscoe). Norfolk County Council Trails have confirmed that they no objection to the proposals but are seeking a contribution of £500 per dwelling for improved access to the Wherry Lines walk which incorporates Thurlton FP3. The walk is proposed to include Fido bins with associated maintenance for first 10 years, signage, walk improvements and supporting literature for new residents and other potential users. A draft S106 Agreement has been prepared that includes the contribution requested by Norfolk County Council Trails.

In terms of the footpath itself along the site boundary, it is considered that the existing field access track provides a generous footpath width, and space to allow the ongoing maintenance of the existing and proposed site boundaries, as well as ensuring that there is an acceptable level of natural surveillance. The Public Rights of Way Officer has confirmed that they have no objection to the application and that the footpath has been adequately accommodated.

In summary it is considered that the proposal is acceptable, subject to the imposition of conditions to provide safe access and ensure the free flow of traffic in accordance with policies DM3.11 and DM3.12 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Contamination

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

Sustainable construction/renewable energy

Policy 1 and 3 of the JCS require the sustainable construction of buildings and the compliance with Code Level 4 for water conservation in addition to requiring 10% of the predicted energy requirements to be delivered by on site decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy. Precise details and compliance with the policy will be secured by condition.

Archaeology

The applicant has undertaken trail trenching on the site as recommend by the Historic Environment Service (HES). This work concluded that there are archaeological features on the site which the Historic Environment Service advised have limited significance. The evaluation enabled appropriate identification and dating of the archaeological features and given their limited significance and potential for further information the HES has confirmed that no further work is necessary on the site and consequently no conditions are necessary.

Section 12 of the NPPF has regard to the historic environment, including features of archaeological interest, and it is considered that the proposal can be considered in accordance with this.
Other considerations

3.72 Members should note that there is an outstanding complaint on the land proposed for the residential allocation in policy THL1 of the Site Specific Allocations document. However it should be noted that this is not a material consideration in the determination of this planning application and is not a reason to withhold determining the application.

Environmental Impact Assessment

3.73 An Environmental Impact Assessment screening has been undertaken as part of this application. This concluded that there would not be significant impacts to require a full Environmental Statement to accompany the application. All other matters raised are addressed in this report.

Section 106 Agreement and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

3.74 The application is liable for CIL and a liability notice would be issued with any consent granted. A draft S106 Agreement has been prepared and should consent be granted the S106 would need to be entered into to cover Affordable Housing and a contribution of £500 per dwelling for improved access to the Wherry Lines walk which incorporates Thurlton footpath FP3.

Financial Considerations

3.75 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. Conclusion

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

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Watts 01508 533765 cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3. **Appl. No**: 2015/1428/F  
**Parish**: DISS

**Applicants Name**: Marstons Estates Limited  
**Site Address**: Thatchers Needle 33 Park Road Diss Norfolk IP22 4AS  
**Proposal**: Erection of 4no non-food retail units (Use Class A1) comprising a total of 3948sqm with access from Park Road.

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions  
1. Time limit  
2. In accordance with amended plans  
3. External facing materials to be agreed  
4. Detailed landscaping scheme to be agreed  
5. Parking and servicing layout to be laid as in plan  
6. Construction workers parking area to be agreed  
7. Wheel washing facilities to be agreed  
8. Non-food retail only  
9. Tree protection  
10. Surface water drainage strategy to be agreed  
11. Foul water to mains only  
12. Fire hydrant to be agreed  
13. No generators, compressors etc installed without LPA consent  
14. Lighting scheme  
15. Hours restriction on deliveries and collections  
16. Restriction on refrigeration vehicles  
17. No loudspeakers outside of the building  
18. Contaminated land scheme to be submitted and agreed  
19. Agreed remediation strategy to be implemented  
20. Unknown contamination  
21. Renewable energy to be agreed

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 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Requiring high quality new homes  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 5: The Economy  
Policy 13: Main Towns

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.2: Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations  
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
DM2.1: Employment and business development  
DM2.4: Location of main town centre uses  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

1.4 South Norfolk Local Plan
Site Specific Allocations and Policies
DIS 6 : Former Hamlins Factory Site, Park Road

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

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

2. Planning History

2.1 2014/1570  T1 (T6 on TPO Schedule) - Lime Tree -
Prune side branches to clear chimney by 2m.
Remove epicormic growth from the centre mass in the crown in order to inspect for disease or defects.
T2 (T3 on TPO) - Lime Tree - Remove epicormic growth from the central mass in the crown in order to inspect for disease or defects.

2.2 2013/1728  Non material amendment to planning permission 2012/1493/D - Relocation of play area and hard/soft landscaping amendments

2.3 2012/1493  Erection of Public House/Restaurant, parking and associated works.

2.4 2011/0049  Erection of 60 bedroom hotel (Use Class C1), a restaurant/public house (Use Class A3/A4) and associated parking

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council  Object on the following grounds:
Detrimental highway and traffic impacts
Economic impacts, will conflict with the aspirations of the heritage Triangle
Contrary to planning policy NPPF and DIS6
Site in context
Should it be approved developer contributions in respect of the Heritage triangle project, enhancement of the bus station, landscaped path to the east of the site, widening of the path to the south of park Road

3.2 District Members  Cllr Palmer  Object. Detrimental to the retail businesses in Diss High Street and severely detract from its ambience and our support of the Heritage Triangle Project in which there is already a large committed investment.
Cllr Minshull  To be reported if appropriate
Cllr Kiddie  To be reported if appropriate

3.3 National Grid  No comments received
3.4 UK Power Networks  No comments received
3.5 Lower Waveney Internal Drainage Board  No comments received
3.6 Lower Yare Second Internal Drainage Board  No comments received
3.7 Waveney Valley Internal Drainage Board  No comments received
3.8 NCC Highways  No objection subject to conditions
3.9 Anglian Water Services Ltd  No objection subject to condition

3.10 SNC Conservation And Design  Comments on recently amended scheme to be updated to committee.
3.11 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority  No objection. Falls below their threshold for providing detailed comment (250 dwellings or 5ha site area and not within a surface water flow path as defined by Environment Agency mapping)
3.12 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team  No objection subject to conditions

3.13 NCC Ecologist  No objection provided the existing mature trees are not lost.
3.14 Mid Suffolk District Council  No comments received
3.15 Environment Agency  No objection
3.16 SNC Landscape Officer  Arboricultural assessment is required to fully assess the impact on the TPO trees, indicative landscaping should also be provided. Further comments will be reported to committee.
3.17 NCC Minerals And Waste Planning Officer  No objection
3.18 SNC Water Management Officer  No objection
3.19 Historic Environment Service  No objection.
3.20 NCC Planning Obligations Coordinator

No objection. One fire hydrant must be provided as part of the scheme.

3.21 Representations

Amended plans

6 objections received, a summary of the grounds are as follows:

- Does not substantially change address previous concerns raised in terms diverting people away from the town centre and traffic problems, access from Morrisons roundabout should be used
- Design of the building is a disappointing given that there are so many materials are available, these buildings are seen throughout the county
- Already have enough retail in Diss, use the land for something else.
- Does not comply with local plan guidelines
- Traffic problems would still occur
- Still no tenants despite saying there is demand
- Architecturally boring

Original scheme

20 objections received, a summary of the grounds are as follows:

- Other uses are needed more ie leisure, places to eat etc
- Poor design
- Wrong location for such a development
- Pull people away from the town centre
- Victoria Road will get busier when already too busy
- Increased traffic problems
- Detrimental to existing businesses
- There are empty shops now
- Does not fulfil the allocation or NPPF requirements
- Retail impact assessment should be required
- Does not include the required mix of uses in the allocation
- Entirely speculative, with no end users identified
- Does not fully explain why housing is inappropriate, no marketing for housing
- There is a need for a hotel in the town
- Heritage Triangle would be put at risk
- No consideration of whether self-build could be catered for
- Hotel would have been more beneficial
- Scheme does not take into account adjacent Conservation Area
- No road safety improvements
- Undo good work of market town initiative
- Does not deliver the approved hotel
- Signage concerns
- Layout is crude
- Unit 4 has its back to the bus station
- Leaving a decision on the totem sign to a later date is not acceptable

Diss Heritage Triangle Partnership

Object on the following grounds:

- Retail premises reduce the social and leisure benefits from those which would have been delivered by the consented hotel
• Will unbalance the existing town centre
• No effort has been made to link the development to the town centre or adjacent uses
• Lack of clarity on end users makes it difficult to fully assess impacts
• Traffic impacts will have a greater impact than the consented hotel
• Unit 4 has its back to the bus station to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area
• Units 1 to 3 are bland and ubiquitous and could be anywhere
• Leaving totem sign to a later decision is unacceptable
• No assessment of economic and social impacts
• Flawed marketing of site undertaken
• Hours free parking should be provided if approved
• Funding for landscaping, walkways etc
• Retail uses defined
• No coffee shops or similar
• Warehouse 4 deleted
• Poor design
• All signage included now
• Improved bus station secured

4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The site is extends to approximately 1.52 hectares in size and is presently vacant. To the north of the site is the Thatchers Needle public house/restaurant and associated car park, beyond which is the Park Road carriageway which provides access to the Thatchers Needle site and in turn would also provide access to the application site.

4.2 To the east of the application site are two supermarkets (Tesco and Morrisons), with no direct vehicular access between the site and these two stores. To west are commercial uses (Feather Mills Factory), to the north-east of the site is the existing bus station and to the south lies an electricity sub-station, beyond which is the River Waveney.

4.3 In terms of wider context, Diss town centre is situated to the north of Park Road and contains a significant range of shops, services and facilities.

4.4 There are a number of preserved trees within the vicinity of the site, including along the eastern boundary/corner of the site, and the Diss Conservation Area extends just into the Thatchers Needle site from the north (the majority of application site being outside of the Conservation Area with the exception of the site access).

4.5 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 4 non-food retail units, extending to 3948 sq metres gross floor space in total. The layout would provide for two buildings, the larger building incorporating 3316 sq metres floor space proving three units and the remainder in a single unit (632 sq metres).

4.6 Access is to be taken direct off Park Road, utilising the already approved and functioning access and egress points serving the Thatchers Needle public house/restaurant.

4.7 The scheme will mean that 189 car parking spaces are provided of which 12 are disabled spaces to serve the four proposed retail units and the existing Thatchers Needle Public House along with separate motorcycle parking and cycle parking also provided.

4.8 A service yard for units 1 to 3 is to be provided to the east of unit 3 and individual service yard for unit 4 lies to the east of unit 4.
4.9 The units would be constructed using a mix of external facing materials with brick and cladding to the walls, galvanised steel balustrading around the roof and large flat roof steel canopies around each of the large glazed entrance canopies.

Key planning issues

4.10 The site is covered by Policy DIS6 of the adopted Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document and as such it is appropriate to consider the scheme in the context of this allocation.

4.11 Policy DIS6 states that:

* Land amounting to some 1.76 hectares is allocated for retail (non-food goods), leisure, offices (class A2 only), and housing, with any housing only constituting a small (no more than 25% by area) proportion of the site. The developers of the site will be required to ensure:
  
  • Retail use is limited to non-food goods;
  • Residential use is an integral part of a commercial development (with offices limited to Class A2);
  • Provision of landscaping to screen the adjacent electricity sub-station;
  • Impacts on TPO trees on Park Road are taken into account;
  • Scheme design takes into account adjacent Conservation Area;
  • Potential for contamination on the site is assessed (and managed appropriately if any contamination found);
  • Contribution made towards green infrastructure provision at DIS 2 (including habitat creation along the river)
  • Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place;
  • Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 applies, as this site is underlain by safeguarded mineral resources.

4.12 In terms of criterion 1, it is evident that the site proposes non-food retail development which is consistent with one of the acceptable uses contained within DIS6.

4.13 By way of background to this criterion, officers would wish to draw attention to the Services and Community Facilities Section for Diss contained within the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document which forms part of the Local Plan recently adopted which confirms that:

“The JCS provides for the major expansion of town centre uses in or adjacent to the town centre and the strengthening of the town centre’s smaller scale non-food and leisure provisions. The 2007 Norwich Sub-Region Retail Study concluded a potential for new comparison goods shopping floor space of some 2600m2 net to 2016 and 4500m2 net to 2021, of which a small proportion has already been taken up. The study also identified a need for further eating and drinking establishments to support this retailing growth but precluded the need for further convenience goods stores due to recent expansion.”

4.14 It is considered that this clearly demonstrates that an evidence base has been used to establish that there is a need for non-food retail on edge of town centre locations such as on the application site, however, there is no need for further food retailers (supermarkets). The amount of non-food retail proposed here (3948sqm is within the figure anticipated upto 2021 set out in the previous paragraph(4500sqm).

4.15 The prevention of the sale of non-food goods would be controlled via a suitably worded planning condition. This would satisfy criterion 1 of the allocation.
4.16 Officers would also wish to highlight that the allocation DIS 6 applies to both the application site and the adjacent public house (Thatchers Needle) and as such when considered together in the context of DIS6 achieves a mix of uses on-site. It is evident that some of the uses considered to be acceptable within the allocation are not included within the confines of the land covered by DIS6, namely leisure, offices, and residential. However, the Policy does not require all of the above to be provided, as stated in the supporting text to DIS6 it states:

Its location adjacent to the town centre and Morrison's supermarket means that it could still be appropriate for a range of uses, including retail (comparison goods), leisure, offices (class A2) and a limited amount of housing.

4.17 In terms of the retail component proposed, concern has been expressed at the potential impact of the proposal upon Diss town centre.

4.18 On a national level, paragraph 24 of the National Planning Policy Framework indicates that a sequential test for planning applications for main town centre uses shall that are not within an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan. It is evident that the Council has a recently adopted Local Plan which allocates the site for non-food retail use (DIS6). This establishes that such a retail use is acceptable on the site and therefore it is considered unreasonable to ask for a sequential test to be undertaken in this instance. The absence of such a test would not merit a reason for refusal on this application.

4.19 It is an edge of centre site which can accommodate the projected need. The nature of Diss town centre does not allow this additional floor space to be located in the existing centre, therefore the Council has considered the sequential test and it is a brownfield site that is being regenerated.

4.20 Paragraph 26 of the NPPF highlights that applications for retail, outside of town centres, which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan require an impact assessment if above a specified sqm threshold. As set out above, given that the development is in accordance with the specified non-food retail component of the allocation DIS6 it is not necessary to undertake such an assessment. Again, the absence of such a test would not merit a reason for refusal on this application.

4.21 In terms of the Local Plan, Policy DM2.4 Part (2) indicates that "main town centre uses" shall be within primary shopping areas, town centres or on suitably allocated sites. In this instance the allocation DIS6 permits non-food retail as proposed here.

4.22 Concern has also been expressed at the impact of the scheme upon the Market Towns initiative and the Diss Heritage Triangle.

4.23 By way of background the Market Towns Initiative involves local Town Teams, Businesses, Local Councils and key stakeholders working together to help promote our Market Towns across South Norfolk. This involves community involvement events in the town centres, locally devised infrastructure improvements and a modern and technological approach to tourism across a wide range of platforms which will help sustain the vibrancy and intrinsic character of our historic Market Towns. The initiative seeks to improve the footfall in the towns which will in turn guarantee the economic future of the businesses who operate there and protect them for future generations of residents and visitors alike.

4.24 The Diss Heritage Triangle project is aimed at delivering a complete regeneration of the historic centre of Diss. At its heart is the restoration of the town’s grade II listed Corn Hall – thought to be the UK's last ‘working’ Corn Hall and now becoming one of Norfolk's premier arts and music destinations. In addition, the project will re-landscape the 'Heritage Triangle' shopping area of Diss; introduce a new boardwalk around part of the town’s Mere; create a new public garden; and interpret the history of Diss’ commercial centre for all to enjoy.
4.25 Officers are fully aware of the above projects and the important roles they play, and would not wish to support a scheme that compromises the successful delivery of these. The DIS6 allocation has also evolved in the full knowledge of these projects. In terms of DIS6, the supporting text amongst other things confirms its location adjacent to the town centre and consequently is seen as being suitable for a number of uses including non-food retail. It is considered that the close proximity of the site to the town centre, the easy access to the town centre from the site which has been improved as a consequence of the new pedestrian crossing secured under the approval for the public house, coupled with the units providing a type of unit not presently available in the locality should result in increased visitors to the town and the strong likelihood that people visiting the proposed retail units would make the short trip into the town centre as well.

4.26 Criterion 2 of the allocation highlights that "residential use is an integral part of a commercial development (with offices limited to Class A2)". It is considered that this should be interpreted to mean that in the event that residential accommodation forms part of a scheme it must be fully integrated and not marginalised or visually detached from the remainder of the scheme. The supporting text to the policy seeks to indicate that the scheme is suitable for a number of different uses given its close proximity to the town centre and the adjacent supermarkets and as such it is considered that the mixed scheme which would be provided on the allocation site (existing public house and proposed non-food retail), is acceptable and it is not necessary to have residential development or reasonable to refuse on the basis of no residential development coming forward.

4.27 There has been concern expressed at the failure to deliver the extant permission for the Hotel (2011/0049) which was considered a significant benefit to the town, and taken into account in reaching the previous decision on the public house and hotel together under 2011/0049.

4.28 It is evident that the permission (2011/0049) did not require the delivery of the hotel, in the event that the public house was delivered, and it is considered that if this had been sought via a restrictive condition attached to the permission it would have not been reasonable in planning terms to try and restrict the site in this way in any event.

4.29 Whilst acknowledging and appreciating the concerns of the Town Council and a number of local representations in respect of the failure to deliver the hotel, it was not a requirement of 2011/0049 or the current allocation (DIS6).

4.30 Notwithstanding that the hotel is not a requirement of the allocation, the applicant has provided evidence of its attempts to market the site. This ultimately did not bring forward any significant interest in delivering the hotel or a leisure use. The marketing exercise undertaken in relation to the hotel has raised concerns insofar as it was undertaken by a company based in Leeds and as such they would not have sufficient local knowledge or presence in the locality. In relation to this point, it is apparent that a sales board was erected on-site which would have allowed for any passing interest to be pursued further. In addition, it is considered appropriate to acknowledge that the amount of groups interested and/or capable of delivering a 60 bed hotel would be limited to those with the specialist skills/ability to deliver such a proposal and the agent used to market this site would seem to be an appropriate agent (CBRE) to market it to appropriate market. The submission indicates that CBRE sent out the marketing information for the site via e-mail to 9000 interested parties on their register. With three expressions of interest from retailers, separate interest from a developer for a supermarket was also received, however, there was no interest expressed in a leisure use. They also had discussions with both Premier Inn and Travel Lodge representatives, regrettably, neither party wanted to take the site forward.

4.31 Criterion 3 of the allocation acknowledges the need to screen the adjacent sub-station. The proposed layout has successfully screened the substation, albeit not via landscaping as envisaged by the allocation.
4.32 Criterion 4 of the allocation requires the TPO trees on Park Road to be fully taken into account within the scheme. Having regard to the proposed layout it is the implications of unit 4 that particular regard has to be paid. It would appear that sufficient separation between unit 4 and the trees, however, the detailed tree survey is awaited to verify this and to allow officer’s to establish which conditions are required to safeguard them during any construction period. This will be reported to committee.

4.33 Criterion 5 of the allocation requires the scheme to have due regard for the adjacent Conservation Area. The scheme has involved lengthy negotiations between council officers, including the Council’s Senior Conservation and Design Officer and the agent so as to not only have appropriate regard for the Conservation Area but also to maximise the scheme’s connectivity with the town centre given the retail nature of the scheme proposed.

4.34 It is considered that the layout provides a sense of connection with Park Road by having units 1 to 3 facing northwards towards Park Road, and unit 4 which lies closer to the Park Road carriageway helping to achieve a sense of linkage towards the town centre with its wraparound entrance elevation to the south and west elevations of the building. The units themselves have been amended from the original design and appearance to create something more contemporary in appearance including the use of materials to complement this.

4.35 It is therefore considered that the overall layout of the scheme contributes positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area, along with the overall scale and appearance of the buildings. The proposals are therefore considered to be in accordance with DM 4.10 and paragraphs 129 of the NPPF. The character and appearance of the conservation is also considered to be preserved as required by Section 72 of the Listed Buildings Act.

4.36 The layout has also been designed so as to not compromise the ability to maximise the connectivity between this site and the adjacent allocation (DIS7 Feather Mills site) which allocates 2.21 ha for a combination of any of the following, non-food retail, leisure, A2 offices and limited housing by not positioning buildings away from the western boundary of the site and including a landscaped edge which could afford access into the adjacent site.

4.37 Concern has been raised at the visual impacts of the scheme on views from the viewing platform to be created on the Mere. It is considered that the height, scale and mass of the buildings have been kept to a reasonable level so as to avoid any significant visual harm on the character and appearance of its surroundings. It should also be noted that the allocated nature of the site means that views from any viewing platform will in some way be affected by the development, indeed the consented 60 bed hotel would have likely been a more substantially larger building than proposed as part of this application.

4.38 Criterion 6 of the allocation relates to land contamination, the scheme has been assessed by the Council's community protection officer who has confirmed that they have no objection subject to conditions relating to an investigation and risk assessment of contamination on the site, the implementation of any agreed remediation scheme and to cease work if any unknown contamination is found during construction being attached to any subsequent permission.

4.39 Criterion 7 of the allocation relates to green infrastructure provision linked to allocation DIS2. It is evident that the CIL Regulation 123 list, which sets out items that are covered by CIL and those that are covered by other mechanisms eg S106 confirms that CIL should cover strategic green infrastructure unless it relates to the transfer of land to provide the necessary green infrastructure, the purchase of biodiversity credits, green infrastructure at a scale related to a particular development. It is not considered that the proposal would fall within one of three scenarios set out above and therefore the CIL payment associated with the development would satisfy this requirement.
4.40 Criterion 8 of the allocation requires that wastewater infrastructure capacity to be confirmed prior to development taking place. Anglian Water has been consulted and they have confirmed that sufficient capacity within the Diss Water Recycling centre and the sewerage system exists to meet the requirements of this development and they duly have no objection.

4.41 Criterion 9 of the allocation confirms that Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 applies, as this site is underlain by safeguarded mineral resources. Norfolk County Council (Minerals and Waste) has been consulted and they have not raised any objection to the proposal.

4.42 In summary, it is considered that the proposal satisfies the criterion set out within the DIS6 allocation.

Traffic implications

4.43 Concern has been raised in respect of the traffic implications of the scheme, the Highway Authority has been consulted (NCC) and they have confirmed that whilst there will be some impact on the highway network during the Friday evening peak and Saturday peak hours, this is likely to be minimal. The site is close to the town centre and other retail areas and so there will be an element of cross visitation and linked trips. Taking this into account they have no objection to the scheme, subject to conditions relating the laying out of the parking and service yards as shown on the plans, the agreement of a parking area for construction workers and wheel cleaning facilities be agreed. On the basis that the zebra crossing secured as part of the Thatchers Needle development has been completed no further off-site works are required.

Surface water

4.44 A condition is recommended to ensure an appropriate surface water management strategy is provided for this development, in line with local plan policies and the Planning Practice Guidance.

Renewable energy

4.45 Given the scale of the scheme a condition is recommended to ensure 10% of the developments' energy requirements can be met through renewable or low-carbon energy sources.

Other considerations

4.46 Reference has been made to a possible totem sign at the site entrance and that the details need to be considered now as it is an important part of the scheme. The submitted plans acknowledge that such a sign would require advertisement consent. On this basis the Council can consider the merits of any such signage when an advertisement application is submitted, having regard to relevant policies at the time, and be satisfied that a suitable sign is provided. It would not be reasonable in planning terms to insist upon an application being submitted now or withhold determining the application as submitted.

4.47 The consultation process has also raised a number of queries relating to matters that should be conditioned or secured in the event approval is granted, including free parking on-site for at least three hours, financial contributions for off-site landscaping and walkways, restriction on coffee shops etc within the units, bus station improvements.

4.48 It would not be reasonable in planning terms to specify the terms for parking on-site as this would be down to the site owner to establish operation practices on its own site.
4.49 A change of use application would be required to change any of the units to a coffee shop or similar in any event, therefore it is not necessary in planning terms to restrict this via a planning condition.

4.50 The allocation does not require off-site financial contributions for planting etc and as such there is no reasonable planning grounds to require it in this instance. Likewise, the allocation does not require any upgrades/improvements to the bus station either.

Environmental Impact Assessment

4.51 The proposal has been considered against the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2011. The environment, social and economic impacts have all been considered and are adequately addressed as detailed in the above report and the proposal is not considered to require an Environmental Statement and will not lead to any significant impacts other than those raised and adequately addressed in the above report.

4.52 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 It is considered that the scheme complies with the requirements of the Local Plan allocation DIS6 and other relevant local plan and national policies as referred to above notwithstanding the concerns raised above, including in respect of the potential harm to the existing town centre, the heritage triangle and market town initiatives, failure to deliver the consented hotel and highway safety.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Raine 01508 533841 craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No**: 2015/2406/O  
**Parish**: STOKE HOLY CROSS

Applicants Name: Mr D Bales & Miss D Leggett  
Site Address: Land West of Chandler Road Stoke Holy Cross Norfolk  
Proposal: Outline application for 12 dwellings with new associated accesses.

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. Outline Permission Time Limit  
2. Approval of reserved matters  
3. Single storey dwellings only  
4. Visibility splays to be provided  
5. Access road details to be agreed  
6. Highway details to be agreed  
7. Retention of hedge and trees on boundary  
8. Surface water drainage to be agreed  
9. Foul drainage to main sewer  
10. Archaeological work to be agreed  
11. Biodiversity Management Plan to be agreed  
12. Water conservation to be secured  
13. Renewable energy to be secured

Subject to receipt of information that satisfies the Council that the full affordable housing provision can be provided and subject to the completion of a S106 to provide affordable housing.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 14: Key Service Centres  
Policy 15: Service Villages  
Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.2: Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations  
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.10: Promotion of sustainable transport  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 1990/1906 Residential development Refused

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Refuse
- proposed site is outside the development boundary as confirmed by the Planning Inspector and since adopted in the Local Plan
- we are aware that for administrative reasons South Norfolk includes Upper Stoke on Poringland map for planning purposes, but this site is in Stoke Holy Cross for all other purposes
- we have reluctantly accepted 76 houses against a previously agreed allocation for up to 20 contained in the Joint Core Strategy, and there is a further allocation for about 50 houses making a total of 123. These numbers will undoubtedly put a strain on existing village facilities and it is not right that further housing should be permitted outside the development boundaries
- we have been advised that the applicant will use the lack of a 5 year land supply due to Broadland District Council's failure to achieve the required numbers but this should not be used to destroy areas in South Norfolk
- this is not a sustainable area for development being over a mile away from shops and other services
- concern about the rest of the field and whether there would be further creep
- the field is also a hunting ground for barn owls and there is concern that this development would damage their habitat

Parish Council comments remain unaltered by revised scheme for 12 dwellings

3.2 District Member To Committee
- outside development boundary, not consistent with Local Plan

3.3 SNC Water Management Officer Conditional support

3.4 Norfolk Police Recommends the dwellings are designed to meet the physical security requirements of Secured by Design

3.5 Historic Environment Service Conditional support

3.6 Anglian Water Services Ltd No comments received
| 3.7 | NCC Highways | Conditional support |
| 3.8 | SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team | To be reported if appropriate |
| 3.9 | SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager | No objection |
|     | | • subject to provision of 3 two bedroom four person houses to rent and 2 two bedroom four person houses for shared ownership or shared equity |
| 3.10 | SNC Landscape Officer | Conditional support, subject to development being excluded from the Root Protection Area of the Oak (T1) |
| 3.11 | NHS England | No comments received |
| 3.12 | Norfolk And Waveney Local Medical Council | No comments received |
| 3.13 | NCC Ecologist | Conditional support |
|     | | • a Biodiversity Management Plan should be conditioned which takes account of the ecological survey submitted |
| 3.14 | SNC Active Life And Play Officer | To be reported if appropriate |
| 3.15 | NCC Lead Local Flood Authority | Standing advice on surface water management good practice principles and standards |
| 3.16 | SNC Design Officer | Important to retain existing hedgerow, though having two accesses would be acceptable |
|     | | Important to preserve some gaps through to open countryside, the reduction from 15 to 12 units should help achieve this better |
|     | | Ideal that at the reserved matters stage, the unit on the corner of Poringland Road and Chandler Road faces the corner |
|     | | In terms of the design of the buildings, single or single and a half would be appropriate. It is also important that there is some variation in the design with a contemporary approach creating a general unit across the site |
| 3.17 | Representations | 4 letters objecting to amended plans |
|     | | • Revising scheme to 12 dwellings does not alter previous comments |

7 letters of support to original plans, including two from part owners of the site:
- the Government state there is not enough homes to meet the needs of our growing and ageing population and apart from the recent new builds under construction by Hopkins Homes there has been no development in Stoke Holy Cross unlike the neighbouring villages of Poringland and Framingham Earl
- it is time we did our bit to support the housing shortage in or local area
• the traffic using Chandler Road is commuter traffic rat-running from much further afield than just this village and neighbouring villages. To resolve this problem it would be better to restrict vehicular access at certain times of the day similar to the scheme put in place in White Horse Lane.

• proposal would fit in nicely with the dwellings on the east side; there is already ribbon development on three sides including Brickle Road

• more sympathetic than a huge development covering the whole field

1 letter of conditional support to original plans

• entrance should be off Chandler Road as it would be dangerous to access off the main road

• hedges should be maintained at their current height. This will maintain privacy and keep the countryside scenery.

22 letters of objection to original plans

• proposed homes are outside the recently agreed Local Plan in which the Planning Inspector stated "there is no clear justification for allocating additional housing land" in relation to Poringland and Framingham Earl, which includes Upper Stoke

• any development would risk urban creep in this attractive rural area and reduce the character of the neighbourhood and area

• precedent for further development of the rest of the land resulting in piecemeal development

• a precedent has been established with planning application 2014/1724 for two properties on Chandler Road which was refused as outside development boundaries

• as there limited amenities within walking distance of Chandler Road, motorised transport would be required. Therefore any development would increase frequency of transport up and down Chandler Road

• Chandler Road is a very narrow lane frequently used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders

• huge increase in traffic using it due to developments already underway

• increase in traffic resulting in damage to verges and frequent "close shaves"

• mains services are already stretched, water pressure very low at present

• loss of privacy to all properties that overlook the site which would affect the residential amenity

• noise and disturbance including from car lights shining in bedroom windows for properties directly opposite the two proposed access points

• proposal is over-bearing, out-of-scale and character

• understand that some of the trees are to be removed once again changing the character of the area

• this is the highest point for miles around and will affect the appearance of this rural area considerably

• proposed housing is very dense

• from the plans it looks like all the properties are to be of the same style which is not in keeping with the other properties on the road

• one parking space per dwelling is unrealistic. Second cars will be forced to park on the road with all the problems that would bring

• it does not fully fulfil the criteria for sustainable development

• doctors, dentists and schools are becoming overloaded

• the fields surrounding Chandler Road support diverse wildlife
4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The site comprises of a strip of agricultural land alongside the western side of Chandler Road and bounding Long Lane to the south. The site is approximately 0.96 hectares in size. It is outside the development boundary of any settlement, albeit adjacent to the development boundary for Upper Stoke, which forms part of the Poringland Key Service Centre.

4.2 The site is bounded by hedgerows on its highway boundaries with Chandler Road and Long Lane. The western boundary of the site is, however, an arbitrary line within an existing open field.

4.3 The eastern side of Chandler Road is characterised by existing residential properties in a linear form of development. The dwellings are primarily single storey, but with some first floor accommodation provided within the roof space of the dwellings. To the north of the site there are also some two storey properties. To the south of the junction of Chandler Road with Long Lane and Poringland Road, the pattern of linear development continues along Brickle Road but on both sides of the street.

The application

4.4 The application is an outline application for 12 dwellings, with all matters reserved other than access. The application was originally submitted for 15 dwellings but was amended to better reflect the pattern of development on the opposite side of Chandler Road. The application proposes affordable housing provision to be in line with the policy requirements of Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy. As the site is over 0.6 hectares the requirement is for 33% of dwellings to be affordable which works out at four affordable dwellings.

4.5 Two points of access are proposed on to Chandler Road that serve two private drives. This will require two breaks in the existing hedge to be created, although the width of the verge in front of the hedge means that there should be no need for substantial removal of the hedgerow to create visibility splays. A pedestrian link is also proposed directly from the Chandler Road / Long Lane / Poringland Road junction.

4.6 The main issue for consideration is the principle of development along with highway considerations, layout, residential amenity, the impact on the hedge and trees on the site, ecology and affordable housing.

Principle of development

4.7 The site falls outside of any development boundaries. Policy DM1.3 states that permission for development outside of development boundaries will only be granted where specific Development Management Policies allow for development outside of development boundaries or were development otherwise demonstrates overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environmental dimensions as set out in Policy DM1.1.

4.8 The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply within the Norwich Policy Area where this site is located. Consequently the land supply policies within the Local Plan are out-of-date. Criteria (d) of Policy DM1.1 applies in line with paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that new development should be permitted unless the development would result in adverse impacts that significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
Economic Role

4.9 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."

4.10 The construction of 12 dwellings in a location adjacent to a Key Service Centre would help enhance the economic viability of that service centre through local spending from future occupants of the dwellings.

4.11 In addition to the above, the scheme would also provide some short term economic benefits from construction of the dwellings.

Social Role

4.12 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."

4.13 The principle social benefit of the scheme is that it provides housing within a location where a 5-year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated. In addition and as noted above, the proposal includes the provision of affordable housing to the requirements of Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy. This will help meet an identified need within the district for affordable housing. This is a significant benefit when weighing the benefits against the harm of a proposal such as this and therefore before any approval is issued the Council would need to be satisfied that it is viable to provide the affordable housing on the site as part of the scheme. The Council has requested that this information is provided which to date has not been received. The Council has no reason to doubt that the affordable housing can be provided, however we would recommend that any resolution to approve is subject to the satisfactory provision of this information.

4.14 As mentioned above, the site is located adjacent to the development boundary of the Poringland Key Service Centre. This contains a wide range of services including primary and secondary education provision, healthcare, a small supermarket and other shops, and a range of community facilities. Whilst many of these services are not in close proximity to the site, they can be accessed by existing footways from the Chandler Road / Long Lane / Poringland Road junction. There is also public transport provision in close proximity to the site, with bus services running along Poringland Road / Long Lane. Some concerns have been raised over the capacity of local school and medical practices, however we have had no objection to the proposal from technical consultees on these grounds. In any event, 12 dwellings would not result in a substantial increase in demand on these services.

4.15 Many of the comments raise concerns about access to the site in terms of the suitability of the local highway network. Norfolk County Council's Highways Officer notes that whilst there clearly are inadequacies with Chandler Road heading towards Caistor St Edmund, residents of the proposed development would have the opportunity to use either Long Lane towards Stoke Holy Cross or Poringland Road and therefore does not consider that a highway objection can be sustained to this proposal on these grounds. Concern has also been raised about the level of parking provision. However, as this an outline application the highways officer has not considered the site layout. The size of the site is such that adequate parking should be able to be provided within the site.
Environmental Role

4.16 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."

4.17 The development would result in an infringement into open countryside. The level of harm needs to be assessed as to whether it is of such significance that it outweighs the benefits detailed above.

4.18 The site is currently well screened from the road by hedgerows on Chandler Road and Long Lane. As mentioned above, two access points will require breaks within the hedgerow on Chandler Road. As assessment against the criteria of the Hedgerow Regulations was carried out which has satisfied the Landscape Officer that the hedgerow does not qualify as "important" and therefore he does not object to the creation of the two new accesses. As noted above, the visibility splays can be provided within the existing verge in front of the hedge and as such the remainder of the hedge can be retained. With the dwellings set back behind the private drives and single storey to reflect the nature of the properties opposite they will therefore have limited visual impact onto Chandler Road.

4.19 Views of the site from other public points are limited. When approaching on Long Lane from the west, views are restricted by hedgerows, the relief of the land and St Georges Hall and its curtilage whilst the nearest public footpath to the west is some distance away with a number of intervening field boundaries.

4.20 Reference has been made in a number of the comments to the conclusions of the Inspector in the appeal decision on planning application 2014/1724. It should be noted, though, that this site is some 800 metres from the development boundary and on a section of Chandler Road that is notably different in character. The road is considerably narrower and with no footway between the site that was subject of that appeal and the current application site and therefore its location in terms of its access to services and the rural context vary considerably and indeed this was noted in the Inspector’s decision in which it was noted that the settlement pattern around the appeal site was very different to the linear development extending westwards out of Poringland and Framingham Earl to which the current proposal relates.

4.21 Concerns have also been raised about the impact on the amenities of existing residential properties on Chandler Road. Specifically concerns have been raised about overlooking from the new dwellings to the existing dwellings on the opposite side of the road and also in regard to noise and disturbance to occupants of the dwellings immediately opposite the access points, with one particular concern raised about car headlights. Overlooking issues would be considered in detail at the reserved matters stage, but in any event given the distance the new dwellings are likely to be set back given the private drives it is unlikely that demonstrable harm could be demonstrated from overlooking. It is accepted that that there may be a small increase in disturbance from turning traffic for properties opposite the access points but that the harm from this is likely to be very minor given the frequency and nature of these movements.

4.22 The impact on wildlife in the area from the development has also been raised. The ecological impact was considered both in an Ecological Survey submitted and in assessing the importance on the hedgerow against the criteria in the Hedgerow Regulations. Norfolk County Council’s Ecologist has commented that whilst the loss of hedgerow required for the new accesses is not ideal, it should not have a significant impact on local ecology. In regard to the wider ecological impact, the Ecologist has recommended that if the application were to be approved a Biodiversity Management Plan should be conditioned which should help identify actions to enhance the area in terms of biodiversity.
4.23 The site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 with no known flooding issue. A condition is recommended to ensure a sustainable urban drainage scheme is secured for the development. There are also no known contamination issues on the site.

Summary of sustainable development consideration

4.24 Having due regard to the above assessment made in the context of not being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, it is considered that the benefits of providing additional housing is sufficiently high that the concerns regard encroachment into the countryside are outweighed by the benefits as it is not considered that the visual impact would cause such harm as to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits as set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF. It is also evident that there are no other planning concerns (for example highway safety or neighbour amenity) that would result in such harm that it outweighs the benefits to the extent required in the NPPF.

4.25 Furthermore, it is also considered that the scheme does not conflict with any specific policies within the NPPF whereby permission should be restricted which must be established in considering a proposal in the context of paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

Energy and water resources

4.26 Policy 1 and 3 of the JCS require the sustainable construction of buildings and the compliance with Code Level 4 for water conservation in addition to requiring 10% of the predicted energy requirements to be delivered by on site decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy. Precise details and compliance with the policy will be secured by condition.

Financial matters

4.27 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. The development will be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) at the reserved matters stage.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The level of harm identified is not sufficient to present significant and demonstrable harm that outweighs the benefit of providing additional housing in a location where it is not possible to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. As such, the land supply policies are out of date and the development proposed considered sustainable development and recommended for approval, subject to demonstration that affordable housing can be provided to a level that accords with the Joint Core Strategy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker 01508 533848 tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No**: 2015/2630/F  
**Parish**: LITTLE MELTON  

Applicants Name: Abel Homes Ltd  
Site Address: Land South East Of The Gardens Mill Road Little Melton Norfolk  
Proposal: Residential Development for 8no. dwellings, car parking and amenity space including 2no. affordable dwellings which form part of planning reference 2015/0253

Recommendation: Delegated authority to Director of Growth and Localism to Approve with conditions  
1. Time limit  
2. In accordance with plans  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Boundary treatments to be agreed  
5. Surface water drainage system including maintenance and management details to be agreed  
6. Foul water into mains sewer  
7. Ecology mitigation to be followed  
8. Tree protection  

Subject to receipt of additional viability information to demonstrate affordable dwellings can be delivered and subject to completion of a Section 106.

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 15: Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
DM3.2: Meeting rural housing needs  
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  
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.3: Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
2. **Planning History**

The following list relates to the adjacent site being developed by this developer:

2.1 **2016/0172** Variation of condition 1 from planning permission 2015/0253 - Revised plans for plots 13 and 14 under consideration

2.2 **2015/1233** Variation of conditions 3 - Off-site works & revised surface water drainage, 5 - revised drainage strategy & 11 - Highway Authority agreed adopted roadway of planning permission 2013/0086/O Approved

2.3 **2015/0253** Reserved matters application for appearance, landscaping, layout & scale following approval under the outline application (2015/1233) for residential development including access. Approved

2.4 **2013/0086** Outline application including means of access for residential development and ancillary works Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council**

(16th December 2015)
Parish Council (PC) is pleased to note provision of 9 affordable homes and that there will be a bungalow on plot 23 to minimise the impact on the residents of Mill Road but the PC objects to this application on the following grounds:

- nearby roads are not suitable for the increased traffic. Traffic forecasts are not in line with local measurements with observed traffic about twice that predicted by the standard model. The PC are very unclear how proposed roundabout for Mill Road will work and has repeatedly asked for a traffic plan for the whole area.
- too many houses are being squeezed into the available space, plot sizes are very small and there is inadequate parking provision with 13 spaces for 8 houses. No communal provision for visitor parking.

(29th January 2016)
No further comments to make

3.2 **District Member**

To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 **SNC Water Management Officer**

Whilst we do not offer an objection it is disappointing the two sites were not progressed together where it may have been possible to provide a more sustainable surface water drainage strategy. Surface water from the proposed development is to discharge to the pumping station approved with phase 1 - adequate storage should be provided to accommodate from the proposed development. The discharge rate from the pumping station to the ditch is to remain as agreed at Phase 1. No information has been provided to advise of the management of the proposed swale and flow control device.

3.4 **Police Architectural Liaison Officer**

No objections but would advocate the dwellings meet the physical security requirements of Secured by Design
3.5 Norfolk Fire Service  A fire hydrant requested to serve this site (app: 2013/1836) has not yet been installed and would need to be in place prior to occupation of the dwellings on this adjacent site.

3.6 Anglian Water Services Ltd  Anglian Water does not comment on applications that are for under 10 dwellings.

3.7 SNC Design Officer  No objection.

3.8 NCC Ecologist  Originally requested a Phase 1 Habitat Survey and Protected Species Assessment which has now been provided. It recommends that should the development require works or removal of mature trees these should be checked for bats. The presence (or otherwise) of protected species and the extent to which these may be affected should be established before granting planning permission. The proposals include the removal of a number of trees so these need to be assessed as soon as possible. I also recommend that if the development is approved section 7 of the most recent report is conditioned as this should ensure that ecology is protected.

3.9 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team  To be reported if appropriate.

3.10 NCC Highways  Amended comments awaited, to be reported to committee.

(15th December 2015)

There is detailed history relating to neighbouring sites accessed off Mill Lane and each of these has a requirement to bring forward a scheme of off-site highway improvements along Mill Lane. Considering the scale of development already permitted, residual impacts of an additional 8 units are unlikely to be severe. As such having due regard to the NPPF it would not be possible to substantiate a highways objection to the application. Notwithstanding this comments are made in response to the proposed layout:

- The proposed 8 dwellings should be served via a shared private drive.
- In light of the above the two areas of open space should be linked (this site and previously approved scheme).
- Subject to the development not exacerbating existing surface water issues on Mill Lane the HA could not object on these grounds.

3.11 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager  No objection.

3.12 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority  No comments to make.

3.13 Historic Environment Service  The proposal does not have any implications for the historic environment. No recommendations for archaeological work.
3.14 SNC Landscape Officer (5th January 2016)

Arboricultural information has been provided. The main issue is the shading of the rear garden of plot 28 by oak tree T20. In my experience this will prove to be an issue for future residents. This is one of the best trees on the site and therefore the design needs to try and avoid future conflict. I would like to see if this situation can be improved.

Only plot 21 faces the public open space and therefore natural surveillance of this area is limited.

The cumulative effect of the adjacent POS is positive but the detail is important and we will need to ensure that the space is not overly divided by the pumping station access.

(16th February 2016)

My previous comments have not been addressed and I would still like to see if this could be improved.

3.15 SNC Play and Amenities Manager

To be reported if appropriate

3.16 Representations

5 letters of objection:

- Further houses are too many
- Roads are too narrow to cope with additional traffic
- There is a lack of infrastructure - no GP and Hethersett already overwhelmed, no frequent bus service and primary school full
- What about the wildlife pond on this land – Great Crested Newts, frogs and toads?
- Development is excessive with insufficient visitor parking, narrow roadways
- Loss of further open space in the village will be of great detriment to the local wildlife
- The true ecological importance of this site is its function as a transition zone linking the garden refuges with the countryside
- There is a lack of informal open space in the village and too few footpaths linking to the countryside
- Consideration should be given to making small changes in the development to try and remove barriers and promote wildlife routes (eg, gaps for hedgehogs, bat boxes)
- Property devaluation in the village
- Earlier objections to previous applications still apply plus over development of the site, failure of the whole site to meet the affordable housing policy, lack of detail regarding surface water run off and attention to the run-off rate, overall flood risk to the neighbouring area, increased traffic on unsuitable roads, damage to wildlife.

4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The application is located to the southern edge of the built up area of Little Melton and is linked to the earlier approved development on land to the south east of The Gardens, Mill Road (ref: 2013/0086/O and 2015/0253/RM). This proposal has been referred to as ‘Phase 2’ of the development by the applicant. The application site would be accessed via the previously approved road which in turn is accessed from the south side of Mill Road.
4.2 To the north-west of the application site is the approved development site and to the east and west are existing residential properties. To the south of the site is open land, beyond which is further residential development. There are also allotment gardens to the south-east of the site. The site is largely located outside the development boundary although a small section to the north-west of the parcel of land is within the development limits. The adjacent approved site also lies within the updated development limits and therefore some of the infrastructure proposed as part of this application and falling within that site also lies within the development boundary. The boundaries to the south and east of the site consist of vegetation of varying heights and forms.

4.3 The current application seeks approval for 8 dwellings, including associated car parking and amenity space, as well as 2 no. affordable housing units located on the 'Phase 1' site. These two units were previously approved as part of the earlier consented scheme but to ensure the appropriate affordable housing mix is achieved across the entire development, this application seeks to amend these units from private market dwellings to affordable housing units. The pumping station previously approved as part of the earlier scheme is also shown to fall within the site area of the current application.

4.4 The proposed units consist of:

Open market housing:-
2 x two-bedrooms
6 x three-bedrooms (including one single storey unit)

Affordable housing:-
2 x two-bedrooms (for clarification purposes both of these dwellings were granted as open market dwellings on a previously consented scheme).

4.5 The main issue for consideration is the principle of development along with highway considerations, layout, residential amenity, the impact on the hedge and trees on the site, ecology and affordable housing.

Principle of development

4.6 The site falls outside of any development boundaries. Policy DM1.3 of the Local Plan states that permission for development outside of development boundaries will only be granted where specific Development Management Policies allow for development outside of development boundaries or were development otherwise demonstrates overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environmental dimensions as set out in Policy DM1.1.

4.7 The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply within the Norwich Policy Area. Consequently Policy DM1.3 of the Local Plan is out-of-date insofar as it relates to applications for new housing when having regard to paragraph 49 of the NPPF which states that “relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to to date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable sites.”

4.8 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF also confirms that “housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.”

4.9 On this basis it is necessary to determine whether the scheme represents sustainable development having regards to the content of the NPPF.
4.10 Sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. The NPPF goes on to stress in paragraph 8 that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.

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

4.12 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF makes it clear that where a policy is out of date, development should be permitted unless the development would result in adverse impacts that significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

**Economic Role**

4.13 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."

4.14 The construction of further dwellings within Lt Melton (Service Village) would help enhance the economic viability of the village through local spending from future occupants of the dwellings. Furthermore, the scheme would also provide some short term economic benefits from construction of the dwellings.

**Social Role**

4.15 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."

4.16 The principle social benefit of the scheme is that it provides housing within a location where a 5-year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated. In addition and as noted above, the proposal includes the provision of policy compliant affordable housing taking into account the adjacent consented scheme (28 dwellings in total with 9 being affordable units).

4.17 This is a significant benefit when weighing the benefits against the harm of a proposal such as this.

4.18 In acknowledging the applicants indication to provide a policy compliant level of affordable housing, and officers affording this full weight in their planning balance, it is considered necessary to be satisfied that this can indeed be delivered. This need has also been heightened by recent attempts by other developers on other sites within the District to seek to amend the amount of affordable housing being delivered on their sites after gaining consent where it had been indicated that a policy compliant level of affordable housing would be delivered, such attempts being made under the provision of S106 BA.

4.19 With this in mind, officers have been seeking to gain appropriate information in respect of the viability of the proposed development from the applicant. The applicant has provided some information, however, it is considered that further information is still required to give greater certainty on the delivery of affordable housing. With this in mind, whilst accepting it can deliver the full provision of affordable housing for the purposes of this planning balance, it is proposed that prior to issuing any planning permission for this site, officers obtain further information so as to be satisfied on this point, and this information be verified by the Council's Property Consultant.
4.20 Officers would wish to stress that there are no apparent reasons which would appear to indicate that the full affordable housing provision could not be delivered here ie no extensive remediation works are required, there are no unusual/significant infrastructure costs etc and the developer in question has not sought to amend the affordable housing provision it has agreed to deliver on its other site within the District.

4.21 The social role, highlights the need to secure a high quality built environment. The proposed scheme continues with the arrangement agreed under the adjacent consented scheme which provides the access into this development. Likewise the scheme will continue with the some of the same house types as those agreed next door. In terms of the layout, reference has been made to ensuring that the enlarged open space brought about by this development must avoid the sense of being bisected by the access to the pumping station. The agent has confirmed that it is not their intention to for many boundary treatments adjacent to the driveway which would result in the areas being isolated from one another and are only proposing bollarding to allow for free flow between the areas. There has also been reference drawn to the limited natural surveillance of the additional area of open space, surveillance has been reconsidered by the developer, but the other adjacent plots (27 and 28) do not easily offer the ability to be changed to overlook this area without being contrived. On balance it is considered that the additional area of open space would have direct surveillance from plot 21 and this is sufficient to avoid any significant harm being caused in terms of crime or anti-social behaviour. It should be noted that Norfolk Constabulary has not objected on this ground.

Environmental Role

4.22 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."

4.23 The development would result in an infringement into the countryside by virtue of the land being outside of the development limit for the village, however, it is evident that the site would represent a continuation of an already consented scheme and would be contained within already established mature boundaries and as such does not represent a significantly harmful visual intrusion into the countryside.

Summary of sustainable development consideration

4.24 Having due regard to the above assessment made in the context of not being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, it is considered that the benefits of providing additional housing is sufficiently high that the concerns regard encroachment into the countryside are outweighed by the benefits as it is not considered that the visual impact would cause such harm as to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits as set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF. It is also evident that there are no other planning concerns (for example highway safety or neighbour amenity) that would result in such harm that it outweighs the benefits to the extent required in the NPPF.

4.25 Furthermore, it is also considered that the scheme does not conflict with any specific policies within the NPPF whereby permission should be restricted which must be established in considering a proposal in the context of paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

Other issues

4.26 The traffic impacts of the scheme have been assessed by the Highway Authority, and whilst there are no objections in principle to the scheme, their detailed comments on the recently revised scheme are awaited. These will be updated to members accordingly, however, it is assumed that no objection will be put forward subject to conditions.
4.27 The Landscape Officer has expressed concern at potential shading to the garden of plot 28 from an adjacent oak tree for future residents of the property. This concern has been put to the developer who has confirmed that the position of the tree in relation to the plot will mean that it will have early morning sun from the east and late afternoon sun from the west in the proposed position. Furthermore, the tree is outside of the control of the plot 28 as it is not within the garden. The developer believes that the tree is a suitable distance away. Given that the dwelling itself is sufficiently faraway not to be compromised as a consequence of the construction works itself, it is considered that the potential level of disturbance to future residents from overshadowing would not be a sufficiently strong reason to recommend refusal of the application.

4.28 Attention has been drawn to the need to agree details of the management and maintenance of the surface water drainage system. A suitably worded condition will be used to secure this.

4.29 The County ecologist has drawn reference to the need to inspect any trees scheduled for removal for nesting birds prior to their removal. This measure is included as part of the Habitat Survey and Protected Species Survey and as such adherence to the content of this report, including this protective measure, would be a condition of any approval.

4.30 Consideration has been given as to whether it is appropriate to inspect the trees now, however, on the basis that the development may not commence for some time, there is the possibility that trees currently being used by nesting birds now would not be in the future, and those not used now will be in the future, and as such there would appear to be limited value in undertaking further survey work at this time.

Financial matters

4.31 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 additional housing proposed, including affordable housing represents a significant benefit in the absence of a 5 year housing land supply within the Norwich Policy Area. The above assessment shows that the scheme can be considered to represent a sustainable development in the context of the NPPF when taken as a whole. The NPPF makes it clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Accordingly, the scheme is recommended for approval subject to officers being satisfied that the delivery of a policy compliant level of affordable housing is viable and entering into the requisite S106 to secure the delivery of these units as well as suitably worded conditions.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Chris Raine 01508 533841
and E-mail:  craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No:** 2015/2836/F  
**Parish:** BERGH APTON

**Applicants Name:** FW Properties on Behalf of Bergh Apton Development  
**Site Address:** Land South of Cookes Road Bergh Apton Norfolk  
**Proposal:** Erection of 11 dwellings plus associated roads, landscaping and drainage infrastructure

**Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Full details of drainage scheme  
4. Standard Estate Road  
5. Visibility splay to be provided  
6. Provision of parking area  
7. Highway Improvements - Offsite  
8. Drainage meadow landscaping scheme  
9. Ecological Management Plan to be agreed  
10. Water efficiency to be secured  
11. Renewable energy to be secured  
12. Boundary treatment and hedge planting to be agreed  
13. External materials to be agreed  
14. Details of doors and windows to be agreed

Subject to the completion of a s106 to cover affordable housing

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 15: Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.2: Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations  
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.10: Promotion of sustainable transport  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.3 : Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste  
DM4.5 : Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys  
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows  
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design

1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies  
BER 1 : Land south of Cookes Road & east of The Street

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 1980/2882  
Residential development  
Refused

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  
Accept the principle of development but have the following serious reservations regarding this development  
• the disparity between the original report by the Inspector that the site was suitable for approximately 7 dwellings and the 11 dwellings proposed  
• there should be at least 2 three bedroomed houses to improve the demographic of the village  
• hope that South Norfolk will confirm the drainage is adequate, particularly the foul drainage

3.2 District Member  
To Committee  
• there are concerns about the departure from the Inspector's "about 7". I am sure members will wish to balance the additional numbers against the provision of affordable housing  
• members may wish to balance the departure from the frontage development indicated by the Inspector against the developer's offer to retain the existing hedging  
• a number of objectors have made the point that drainage is generally poor in the area. I think it is expedient that members are able to form a view as to whether the technical FRA reports provide the level of comfort on drainage, whether this potentially solves a wider problem in the immediate local area and whether the additional expense justifies additional dwelling numbers on the grounds of viability

3.3 Police Architectural Liaison Officer  
Raise concerns about the rear boundary treatments

3.4 Anglian Water Services Ltd  
No comments on this application

3.5 SNC Design Officer  
Support with conditions

3.6 NCC Ecologist  
Support with conditions  
• an Ecological Management Plan should be condition taking into account any potential loss of biodiversity which will occur should any of the hedgerow be considered important
3.7 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team  
To be reported if appropriate

3.8 NCC Highways  
Conditional support  
- owing to the poor sustainability of the site we would prefer the 7 dwellings allocated rather than 11 proposed, however would not recommend refusal on those grounds  
- some concerns about the proposed main access but given the constraints it is accepted that the access has been located to provide the optimum visibility

3.9 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager  
No objection  
- the applicant has submitted financial evidence to justify the proposed tenure mix which has been reviewed by the Council's Property Consultant who is satisfied that the proposed tenure mix is justified

3.10 SNC Environmental Waste Strategy  
To be reported if appropriate

3.11 SNC Water Management Officer  
Lead Local Flood Authority will respond to the application and therefore we will not provide comment at this stage

3.12 NHS England  
No comments received

3.13 NHS Clinical Commission Group  
No comments received

3.14 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority  
Standing advice on surface water management good practice principles and standards  
Do not wish to provide detailed comments

3.15 SNC Landscape Officer  
- No definitive assessment against all the criteria of the Hedgerow Regulations has been submitted with the application  
- Concerned about relationship of dwelling at plot 11 to the oak trees on the boundary  
- Drainage solution creates a range of new earth forms which is a little disjointed in design  
- It would be preferable for the boundary with the retained access from The Street to be hedged too

3.16 Representations  
1 letter of support  
- few too many proposed properties

13 letters of objection  
- the site is allocated for 7 dwellings not 11  
- an increase of this proportion fails to meet the dictionary definition of approximate  
- if 7 dwellings cannot be viable due to the drainage scheme needed then the site is not financially viable  
- does not consist of frontage development as required by policy BER1
- there would be a significant adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area
- scale of dwellings do not take into account scale of Glebe Cottage, village hall and bungalows along Cookes Road
- front parking court for the affordable housing represents an overtly urban approach to parking in what is a rural setting
- affordable housing has already been provided on a nearby site, this site was not considered suitable when looking at sites for affordable housing
- no requirement to provide affordable housing if below 10 dwellings, site should be 7 dwellings
- additional access on to The Street is a potential safety hazard
- concerned that climate change and the decreased land available to soak up the water will result in flooding at some time in the future
- will result in loss of hedgerow that is in good condition and a very important habitat for wildlife. This will also be detrimental visually in a prominent site opposite the village hall
- detrimental impact upon the residential amenity of Glebe Cottage as the proposal will leave Glebe Cottage as an island between two roads
- consultation undertaken by developer excluded owner of Glebe Cottage
- insufficient consideration of ecology in the area
- photographs submitted showing barn owl flying over site

4 Assessment

Site description

4.1 The site comprises approximately 1.8 hectares of agricultural land located to the south of Cookes Road and to the east of The Street in Bergh Apton.

4.2 The site's highway boundaries consist of mature hedgerows with two existing field accesses, one onto Cookes Road and one onto The Street. On the northern side of the site is Glebe Cottage, an existing dwelling immediately adjacent to Cookes Road with an unusual curtilage in that its garden space is to either side of the property when viewed from the highway, with no curtilage to the rear.

4.3 The surrounding area consists of a mixture of residential properties and agricultural land, along with the village hall on the opposite side of Cookes Road to the north. A cluster of dwellings provide a more enclosed feel to The Street to the south-west of the site, whilst the pattern of development to the east of the site along Cookes Road consists of a series of bungalows in large plots. To the east of the dwellings on The Street to the south east and bounding the proposed drainage meadow are open fields.

4.4 Whilst there are no trees within the site, there are numerous trees on the boundary including some significant trees on the boundary with properties to the east of the site on Cookes Road.

The application

4.5 The application is a full application and proposes the erection of 11 dwellings which would include a mix of dwellings with three affordable dwellings in accordance with the policy requirements of Policy 4 in the JCS. The three affordable dwellings would consist of 1 x two bedroom detached house and 2 x one bedroom semi-detached houses, whilst the remaining eight open market dwellings would consist of 3 x four bedroom detached houses and 5 x five bedroom detached houses.
4.6 Two points of access are proposed to serve the development. One onto Cookes Road would serve a private drive that would access Plots 4 to 11 and one onto The Street which would serve the affordable dwellings on Plots 1, 2 and 3.

4.7 The main issues for consideration are the principle of development; drainage; layout; scale and design; highway considerations; the relationship of new dwellings with surrounding trees; the loss of hedgerow; residential amenity; ecology and affordable housing.

Principle of development

4.8 Policy 15 of the JCS identifies Bergh Apton as a Service Village in which land has been allocated for approximately 10-20 dwellings between April 2008 and March 2026, subject to form, character and servicing constraints. Two site allocations have been adopted in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Local Plan document to deliver this growth identified in Policy 15. One of those two allocations, BER1, allocates part of this site for approximately 7 dwellings. In addition Policy BER1 contains the following policy requirements:

1) Frontage development onto Cookes Road and The Street only
2) Appropriate boundary treatment on the southern boundary to minimise the impact on the open landscape to the south
3) Appropriate surface water drainage attenuation as required using the remainder of the existing field to the south and east of the land allocated for residential development.

The proposed 11 dwellings are within the land allocated for residential development, with the proposed drainage meadow on the remainder of the field as specified in the policy. The figure of 11 dwellings does, however, clearly exceed the approximately 7 dwellings specified in the allocation. The site was originally allocated for the very low figure of approximately 7 dwellings given the surface water drainage issues on the site. In developing the scheme, a drainage scheme has been developed to address surface water disposal and also incorporating foul water disposal. In order to ensure the scheme remains viable, and to continue to be able to comply with the affordable housing provision required in Policy 4, this has led a slightly higher number of dwellings have been proposed. It should be noted that given the size of the site and taking into account the surrounding pattern of development, 11 dwellings can easily be accommodated without overdeveloping the site or having an adverse impact on the form and character of existing development and therefore given the need to provide a comprehensive and functioning drainage scheme it is considered that a scheme of 11 dwellings is acceptable.

4.10 In terms of the increase in housing numbers above the approximate figure in the allocation, officer’s would also wish to draw attention to paragraph 58 of the NPPF which requires that planning decisions should aim to ensure that developments, amongst other things:

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

4.11 The scheme’s compliance with the other criteria in the policy are considered in the sections of the report below.

Access and highways

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

4.13 As noted above the development is to be accessed from two new accesses. One, onto Cookes Road, which will serve a parallel private drive serving the eight open market dwellings which are to the rear of the existing dwelling Glebe Cottage. The second access
off The Street serves the three affordable dwellings. The two existing field accesses are retained, with the field access off The Street serving the drainage meadow, whilst the field access will be available as additional access to the garden of Plot 11 for maintenance should occupiers of that property wish.

4.14 Bergh Apton is characterised by country lanes with no footways. It is however proposed to provide footways immediately adjoining the access onto Cookes Road to provide some pedestrian refuge and to allow a safe pedestrian crossing from the site to the village hall on the opposite side of Cookes Road. In order to offset the urbanising effect of this it is proposed that the footway surfacing should have a finish that reflects the rural character of the area.

4.15 Norfolk County Council’s highways officer has commented that whilst it is accepted that principle of development has established through the allocation of site in Policy BER1 of the Local Plan, they would prefer approximately 7 dwellings rather than the 11 proposed although they would not recommend refusal on those grounds. The reasoning for 11 dwellings is noted above and, as also noted above, 11 dwellings can clearly be accommodated on the site in terms of the scale of the site and the character of development in the area. Given that the principle of development for approximately 7 dwellings has been accepted it is not considered that refusal could be justified for 4 extra dwellings in terms of the sustainability of the location. It is therefore concluded that the proposal is acceptable in highway terms given its rural context, subject to the imposition of conditions to ensure adequate visibility on the accesses, the satisfactory construction of the access road and provision of the footways on the access.

Drainage

4.16 As noted above, one of the principle considerations for the satisfactory development of this site is drainage given the known surface water issues that affect the wider field of which the allocation forms part and this is identified within the policy considerations.

4.17 The application proposes a complex and comprehensive drainage scheme which accommodates both surface and foul water drainage from the development. This consists of sewage treatment units for each unit, from where waste water will be pumped into the proposed drainage meadow where the waste water will be filtered through a raised granular bank. Surface water from the new roofs and access roads will be directed by a system of French drains and shallow swales into an infiltration basin within the drainage meadow where deep bore soakaways are proposed to allow storm water to pass through the clay topsoil to the gravel bed which lies beneath it. Officers have sought the views of the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) on the proposed scheme, and they have confirmed that do not wish to offer any detailed comments on the proposal.

4.18 Notwithstanding the LLFA’s advice, officers have consulted with the Environment Agency (EA) in light of the proposed use of the deep bore soakaways. The EA has consequently advised that the use of deep bore soakaways may require a permit from them and the developer should make contact with the EA’s Groundwater and Contaminated Land Team to discuss the matter further. It should be stressed that this permit is a separate legislative requirement from planning. If for any reasons this permit is not granted, then an alternative approach will be needed and this will require an application to vary the planning permission should it be granted.

4.19 In terms of foul water, there is a requirement to provide a connection to the mains system unless it is not viable to do so. In this instance the nearest AW connection is a significant distance away and as such officers are satisfied that it would not be viable to make such a connection. This view being reached in acknowledgement of the number of dwellings proposed.
4.20 In summary, there is no objection in planning terms to the proposed foul and surface water drainage proposals, however, it is evident that a fully detailed scheme be agreed including management and maintenance regimes and details of the finished levels of the site given the raised banks and associated planting.

Layout, scale and appearance

4.21 Policy 2 of the JCS and section 7 of the NPPF requires all development to achieve good design, expanded further in Policy DM3.8 of the Development Management Policies and the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD.

4.22 The proposed development creates a low density development that is largely linear in character, other than where it passes behind Glebe Cottage and its curtilage. This proposed layout departs slightly from policy in terms of the requirement for frontage development to avoid estate-style development which would be out of character with the traditional pattern of development in Bergh Apton. When the policy was originally drawn up, it was on the basis that Glebe Cottage and its curtilage formed part of the allocated site. As originally envisaged the curtilage of Glebe Cottage would have been realigned so that its main garden area would be to the rear of the dwelling with its original curtilage developed to provide dwellings fronting onto Cookes Road. The landowner of the main part of the site and the owner of Glebe Cottage have been unable to reach an agreement to pursue this solution and therefore whilst frontage development onto The Street is still achieved, the development along Cookes Road is to be served by a private drive running parallel to Cookes Road to the rear of Glebe Cottage. Whilst it is regrettable that the original frontage development has not been realised, the pattern of development still largely reflects that along Cookes Road to the east with properties set back in large plots, albeit accessed from a parallel private drive rather than directly from the road itself. It is not therefore considered to be harmful to the character of the area that would warrant refusal and also has the benefit of allowing the full retention of trees and hedging along Cookes Road east of Glebe Cottage, thereby preserving its rural character.

4.23 In terms of scale, the proposed dwellings are two storeys high, with associated single storey garages. Individual house types vary in scale and massing which is typical of existing development in Bergh Apton which has grown organically and without any uniform style. Whilst it is noted that the properties immediately to the east on Cookes Road are single storey, they are nonetheless relatively large properties in large plots which the plots to the rear of Glebe Cottage reflect. The affordable housing provision in Plots 1 to 3 reflect the closer form of development immediately to the south of the site on The Street. It is therefore considered that the scale of the development proposed is acceptable.

4.24 Following a number of minor amendments to the layout, the Design Officer is satisfied with the detailed design of the scheme, and recommends conditions to cover materials and the fenestration. The materials for the affordable dwellings, including surfacing materials to driveways and boundary treatments, should the same as it is for the private dwellings, ensuring that the appearance and quality of these dwellings is similar to the private dwellings.

4.25 It is noted that the Architectural Liaison and Crime Reduction Officer has commented about the nature of the rear boundary treatment to the various plots. They have recommended 2.4 metre close boarded fencing to secure the site. However, whilst future occupants of the dwellings have the option of erecting such boundary fencing if they feel it is necessary to secure their property, we do not feel that requiring this level of boundary treatment along the rear boundary of all 11 plots is desirable in terms of its visual impact and feel that the boundary treatment as proposed is appropriate.
Overall it is considered that the design of the scheme is appropriate to the existing pattern and character of development in this area of Bergh Apton, and also helps preserve the rural character of the area. It is therefore considered the proposal complies with Policy 2 of the JCS, section 7 of the NPPF and policies DM1.4, DM3.8 and the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide.

Landscape and Ecology

The landscape impact of the development is a critical part of the design of this scheme, given the rural character of the area with strong landscape features such as extensive hedgerows bounding the local highway network and many important trees and wooded areas. As a consequence this landscape also has the potential to support many species and therefore the ecological impact of the development also needs particular consideration.

The new accesses will require the removal of some sections of hedgerows. The Landscape Officer has raised a concern that the hedgerows are likely to qualify as "important" under the Hedgerow Regulations and therefore the removal of the hedgerows would conflict with Policy DM4.8. Whilst further information is required to fully understand whether the hedgerows qualify as important or not, development of the allocation will inevitably require the loss of some part of the hedgerow to adequately access the site. As noted above, the creation of a parallel access road to the rear of Glebe Cottage reduces the amount of access points into the site, and therefore maximises the amount of hedgerow to be retained. Therefore it is considered that this scheme results in the least impact on hedgerows whilst still delivering the allocation.

A specific concern of the Landscape Officer was the relationship with the dwelling in Plot 11 and the oak trees on the boundary with the dwelling to the east. As initially proposed, the building was to have been 13 metres from a tree over 20 metres in height which, although outside the tree's Root Protection Area, could have resulted in apprehension from residents given the height of the tree. Such circumstances should be avoided, as set out in BS5837. The applicant has amended the scheme by reducing the size of plot 10 to allow the building in plot 11 to be moved by around 4 metres further from the tree. Overall, it is considered that this is an acceptable balance between providing an acceptable relationship between the dwelling and the tree, and an appropriate layout of development on the site.

The landscape impact of the drainage scheme is of concern, particularly in relation to the granular bank. This is proposed to be 1.4 metres in height. Public views of the drainage meadow are limited but possible from The Street and from Dodgers Lane to the south east. Through planting and the precise details of the drainage scheme, which are to be controlled via planning condition, it should be possible to ensure that the scheme has no significant landscape impact and will represent an attractive open space to be used by the residents of the development.

The application is supported by an Ecology Survey. The survey concludes that the development is unlikely to have any impacts on Great Crested Newts as surveys of nearby ponds were shown to be negative for this species, but did find evidence of other species including bats. Norfolk County Council's Ecologist has advised that the report is broadly fit for purposes but recommends that an Ecological Management Plan which should take into account the findings of the report and also the potential loss of biodiversity which would occur should any of the hedgerow be considered important under the Hedgerow Regulations. This should be agreed in writing prior to any works commencing under clearance works.

Residential amenity

Policy DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan requires development to have regard to the impacts on residential amenity.
Potential impacts on residential amenity of existing properties are largely limited to the three immediately adjoining dwellings - Orchard View to the south-west, Cherry Tree to the east and, of particular concern, Glebe Cottage.

Orchard View is close to the semi-detached dwellings at Plots 1-2. However, the new dwellings are set forward from Orchard View and would not directly impact on any of the windows in this dwelling which face out onto the site and which largely look out onto the proposed drainage meadow. In addition, the field access to the drainage meadow would separate this property from Plot 1. In regard to Cherry Tree, there is extensive vegetation on the boundary with Plot 11 which includes the tall trees mentioned previously and has led to a large distance between the house proposed in Plot 11 and the neighbouring property. It is not therefore considered that there will be an unacceptable impact on either of these properties.

There would be more of an impact on Glebe Cottage due to the private road that runs near the rear boundary of the site. Careful consideration will be needed of the boundary treatment and surfacing in this location to ensure that any potential disturbance from use of the access is mitigated against. In regard to the relationship between Glebe Cottage and the new dwellings themselves, the two nearest dwellings (Plots 7 and 8) are set back with a garage block in front which should help screen against any overlooking of the house along with existing trees on the boundary with the garden area of Glebe Cottage. Overall, it is considered that the impact on Glebe Cottage would not be sufficiently unacceptable to warrant refusal of the application.

In regard to the relationship between proposed dwellings themselves, these are largely in a linear line, other than at the corner of The Street and Cookes Road and therefore do not result in direct overlooking of other proposed properties. They have also been positioned not to result in an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties, nor will they result in overshadowing of each other.

It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with Policy DM3.13.

Affordable housing

JCS Policy 4 requires 33% affordable housing with a mix of house types and tenure which meets local need. The application proposes three affordable dwellings with 1 one bedroom house for rent, 1 one bedroom house for shared equity and 1 two bedroom house for shared equity. Financial evidence has been submitted to justify the proposed tenure mix which has been reviewed by the Council's Property Consultant to his satisfaction. The Council's Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer has confirmed that the proposed mix and tenure is acceptable. Furthermore, this information could be used in the future in the event that a S106BA application be submitted.

Subject to a section 106 agreement to secure the affordable housing the proposal would accord with Policy 4 of the JCS and is therefore acceptable.

Heritage assets

There are no listed buildings within the application site and the site is not within a Conservation Area. The closest listed buildings to the site are White Willows around 140 metres to the south west and Washingford House over 200 metres to the east. There are a number of buildings in between the site and these listed buildings and as a consequence, it is not considered that the development would have any impact on any heritage asset.
Energy and water resources

4.41 Policy 1 and 3 of the JCS require the sustainable construction of buildings and the compliance with Code Level 4 for water conservation in addition to requiring 10% of the predicted energy requirements to be delivered by on site decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy. Precise details and compliance with the policy will be secured by condition.

Section 106 agreement and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

4.42 The applicant is liable for CIL and a liability notice would be issued with any consent granted. A draft section 106 agreement has been prepared and should consent be granted the section 106 would need to be entered into to cover affordable housing.

Financial Considerations

4.43 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).

Sustainable development

4.44 Paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that all housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For the reasons set out above, it is considered that the development is sustainable in terms of the economic, social and environmental roles and therefore is recommended for approval.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The principle of the application is acceptable given that the site is an allocation within the Local Plan. The scheme is considered to represent a sustainable form of development. It is accepted that in order for development of the site to be viable taking into account the requirement of the drainage scheme a slightly higher number of dwellings is justified than that set out in the allocation and it is evident that this additional level of development can be accommodated on the site whilst remaining in keeping with the pattern of development in the area and without adversely affecting the rural character of the area. It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policies 1, 2, 4 and 15 of the Joint Core Strategy, Policy BER1 of the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Local Plan document, and Policies DM1.4, DM3.1, DM3.8, DM3.11, DM3.13 and DM4.9 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan document have been met. All other matters are considered acceptable and subject to the imposition of conditions and a section 106 obligation the application is recommended for approval.
Other Applications

7. **Appl. No** : 2015/0833/O  
   **Parish** : PORINGLAND

   **Applicants Name** : Rev. R W Scorey  
   **Site Address** : Evangelical Free Church Carr Lane Poringland Norfolk NR14 7JZ  
   **Proposal** : Follow up to Outline Application 2014/2651 - Proposed demolition of church and erection of dwelling and garage.

   **Recommendation** : Approval with Conditions

   1. Outline planning permission time limit  
   2. Approval of reserved matters.  
   3. In accordance with approved plans  
   4. Parking/turning to be provided  
   5. Water efficiency to be provided  
   6. Any works to drainage pipe to be approved  
   7. Removal of permitted development rights - buildings/structures  
   8. Removal of permitted development rights - walls/fences  
   9. Boundary treatments to be agreed  
   10. Floor levels to be agreed  
   11. Details of attenuation tank to be agreed

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 11 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   - Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
   - Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
   - Policy 3 : Energy and water  
   - Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
   - Policy 14 : Key Service Centres

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   Development Management Policies
   - DM1.1 : Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
   - DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development  
   - DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
   - DM3.1 : Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
   - DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development  
   - DM3.11 : 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.  
   - DM4.3 : Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste  
   - DM4.4 : Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space  
   - DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
   South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012
2. Planning History

2.1 2014/2651 Proposed demolition of church and erection of dwelling and garage.

Withdrawn

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Recommend refusal as proposal does not address the issue of drainage in a known flood risk area [response made prior to flood issues being addressed].

3.2 District Members

Cllr Overton To be determined by committee if application is recommended for approval due to concerns of local community.

Cllr Neal Can be delegated as long as it meets all drainage concerns and concerns regarding the oak tree.

3.3 SNC Water Management Officer

No objections following assessment of Flood Risk Assessment and confirmation of connection of drainage pipe to adjacent pond.

3.4 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team

No objections.

3.5 NCC Highways

No objection, condition regarding parking and turning recommended.

3.6 SNC Landscape Officer

No objection subject to conditions.

3.7 NCC Ecologist

No objection.

There are two ponds very close to the site but these are surrounded by development and have little terrestrial habitat suitable for Great Crested Newts. Given the above, we conclude that there is a low likelihood of protected species being present on-site and therefore suggest that the application proceeds with no ecological constraints.

3.8 Representations

2 letters of support

• Current building is an eyesore. Consideration should be given to potential for overlooking.

• Pleased to see that the site is being developed for only one house.

19 letters of objection. Concerns regarding:

• Loss of building that has been used for community purposes

• Impact on protected oak tree and other trees on site.

• The church is needed as the population of Poringland grows

• Concern that site and surroundings are liable to flooding.
4 Assessment

Proposal

4.1 Permission is sought for a detached residential dwelling and garage on land currently occupied by the Evangelical Free Church at Carr Lane, Poringland, also known as the Wellspring Church, following the withdrawal of a similar application in 2015. The church building is a 20th century single storey structure which has little architectural merit and it would be demolished as part of the proposal. The site is surrounded by a mixture of residential development of various ages and styles, with planning permission also having been granted for a new dwelling on land directly to the west of the site (ref: 2011/1434). There are also a number of trees on the site boundaries, and in particular a large oak tree which is the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.

4.2 The application is in outline with access, layout and scale to be considered. The site is within the development boundary of Poringland as defined by the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (2015). There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development for all housing applications, as outlined in Policy DM1.1 of the Council’s Development Management Policies and paragraphs 14 and 49 of the NPPF. In the absence of a demonstrable five year land supply in the Norwich Policy Area, paragraph 14 of the NPPF is also relevant to consideration of this application, which states that developments that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. It also goes on to state where policies are out-of-date, such as housing supply policies in the absence of a sufficient land supply, development should be approved unless any harms significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposals. Whilst the principle of residential development in this location is not an issue given it is within development boundaries, the weight to give the housing provision in light of the housing shortfall needs to be balanced against the loss of a community facility.

4.3 The main considerations are therefore ensuring that the access, layout and scale of development is acceptable, ensuring the proposal would safeguard the protected tree, and ensuring the proposal would not materially increase flood risk at the site and surrounding area. Whether material harm would also be caused due to the loss of a community facility is also a matter to be considered.

Access, layout and scale of development

4.4 Whilst the plot is of a reasonable size, it is constrained by the presence of the protected tree and this largely dictates the position of the proposed dwelling, with it being sited over to the far western side of the plot, quite close to the road. It would be closer to the road than the adjacent properties, but on balance this is considered acceptable given the constraints of the site and due to there not being a particularly defined building line in this part of Carr Lane. The dwelling proposed would be 1.5 stories and would not be unduly prominent because of this. It is therefore considered there would be no material harm caused to the street scene and the scheme would also lead some visual benefit with the removal of the existing building which is of little architectural merit.

4.5 A separate garage building would be built on the site of the church building. There would be sufficient room for off-road parking and amenity space and there is no objection from the County Highway Officer on access or visibility grounds. Although the application is in outline, indicative plans have been submitted to demonstrate how a dwelling could be built without causing material harm through overlooking or loss of privacy to adjacent properties. The design indicated is very similar in scale and appearance to the dwelling approved on the adjacent site under application reference 2011/1434. The access, layout and scale is considered acceptable, in accordance with policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy, and policies DM 3.8, DM 3.11, DM 3.12 and DM 3.13 of the Development Management Policies document.
Impact on protected tree and other trees

4.6 The application was accompanied by an Arboricultural Implications Assessment which demonstrates that the proposal could be implemented without causing undue harm to the protected oak and the other significant trees on the site. In consultation with the Landscape Officer, the flood relief proposals, which include an attenuation tank and overflow into a pond via connection to an existing drainage pipe, can also be implemented without harming the tree. The existing drainage pipe runs through the root protection zone and therefore a condition is recommended requiring the approval of details for any future proposal to repair or replace the pipe. A further condition seeking the exact details and specification of the attenuation tank is also recommended. Conditions are also recommended removing permitted development rights to avoid any unwanted construction work within the root protection zone.

Impact on flood risk and foul drainage

4.7 As part of the application process, it was identified that the site is at a high risk from surface water flooding and therefore a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was requested. The FRA advises that pervious surfacing such as permeable paving will be used for driveways to provide a cleansing process prior to discharge to an attenuation tank located in the rear garden area. Roof water is to discharge direct to the attenuation tank sized to accommodate the 1 in 100 year climate change event. It is proposed that surface water from the development can discharge attenuated flows via an existing pipe to a pond on the adjacent land to the east of the site. The Council’s Water Management Officer has assessed this information and raises no objection to the proposal on the grounds of flood risk. The proposal complies with Joint Core Strategy Policy 1 and Development Management Policies policy DM4.2 in this regard.

4.8 Foul drainage would be disposed of to the main sewer to which no objections are raised by the Water Management Officer.

Community value of the building.

4.9 Letters of objection have been received from local residents who enjoyed visiting the building when it operated as a charity shop and it is clear that it was valued by a section of the community who are concerned at its potential loss.

4.10 In terms of the use of the building, according to the applicant, the building ceased to be used for formal religious services in 2007 when they were moved to Poringland Community Centre, although these services ceased in 2012. The building continued to be used for church teaching schools and other events, and in recent years was used as charity shop, until it closed on 21 April 2015.

4.11 The charity shop only opened on 3 days a week for 4 hours at a time and from 2014 this reduced to two days a week. It has now closed and there seems little prospect of it being used for church or charity shop purposes in the future. Consideration has been given to this limited use and the fact that there are far better facilities available at the Poringland Community Centre. It is therefore considered that the loss of the facility is not a justifiable reason to withhold planning permission, and there is no material conflict with policy 3.16 of the Development Management Policies document in this regard.

Other matters

4.12 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires housing applications to be considered in the context of sustainable development. The site lies within the Norwich Policy Area, where a 5-year supply of housing land cannot be demonstrated; therefore it is in an area of identified housing need. In addition the proposal is within...
development limits, where housing development is acceptable in principle. For the reasons described in the above sections, the proposal is considered to fulfil the economic, social and environmental role of sustainable development as described in the NPPF. The additional benefit that can be given to the delivery of housing in this shortfall also weighs against the harm identified of the loss of a community facility.

4.13 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.

4.14 The proposed development is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and this matter will be dealt with at the reserved matters stage.

5. **Conclusion**

5.1 The proposal for the demolition of a redundant church building and erection of a new residential dwelling within the development boundary accords with relevant national and local planning policies which seek to make the most efficient use of land and focus residential development in sustainable locations. The site is constrained by the presence of a protected oak tree and also due to it being at a high risk of surface water flooding. The applicant has worked with the planning authority to address these issues to the satisfaction of the Landscape Officer and Water Management Officer.

5.2 Although there is some local objection to the loss of the church facility it is no longer being used as a church and there are superior alternative community facilities available at Poringland Community Centre. As a result the role of the building as a community facility is limited and the loss of the building is not a reason to withhold planning permission in this instance. The benefit of an additional dwelling in the absence of a demonstrable five year land supply must also be weighed in favour of the proposed development. The proposal is acceptable in all other regards and it is recommended that outline planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Robert Webb 01508 533801 rwebb@s-norfolk.gov.uk

Chris Trett 01508 533794 ctrett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Parish : PULHAM MARKET  
Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs Crane  
Site Address : Sixmill Green Colegate End Road Pulham Market Norfolk IP21 4XG  
Proposal : Front 2 storey extension to existing property.  
Recommendation : Refusal  
1 Character and impact on existing dwelling and street scene  
2 Impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property.

1. Planning Policies  

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design  
NPPF 12 : Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM3.4 : Residential extensions and conversions within Settlements  
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

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

2. Planning History  

2.1 None

3. Consultations  

3.1 Parish Council  
The Parish Council has no objection to this application but feel it would not be appropriate to actively support it as the applicant is employed by them.

3.2 District Member  
Can be delegated if for approval -

To Committee if for refusal:  
Not convinced there is an overshadowing/loss of outlook which would be to the detriment of nearby residential properties.

Nor do I believe that any overlooking and loss of privacy to adjacent property or does this proposal have an effect on the conservation areas.
Finally the visual appearance and finishing materials are tasteful and in-keeping with the street scene.

3.3 SNC Conservation and Design Officer

Design of the extension is not of a suitable design standard to merit approval, and therefore does not conform with JCS policy 2 on achieving good design, DM3.8 or DM4.10, or Paragraph 3.82 of the South Norfolk Place Making Guide. I therefore consider that it is detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and results in a degree of harm to the conservation area as a designated heritage asset.

3.4 Representations

1 letter received raising no objection to the extension but raising concern on the provision of parking on site to ensure highway safety.

4 Assessment

4.1 The existing property is a modern red brick two storey dwelling with a steep gable front porch, with a detached garage located to the south of the main dwelling. The property forms one of a group of modern dwellings on the east side of Colgate End Lane. The existing dwelling is set forward of the immediate neighbouring property to the north. The style and materials of the properties along Colgate End Lane vary considerably and include two listed buildings further to the north (Briar Cottage and Cobwebs) and one to the south (Limetree House). The site is within the development boundaries of Pulham Market and within the Conservation Area.

4.2 The scheme proposed is for a two storey front extension. The proposal is assessed against policy DM3.4 for residential extensions, conversion within settlements. Which permits residential extensions within development boundaries provided they:

a) Incorporate a good quality design which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of the building, street scene and surroundings; and
b) Do not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers or adversely affect neighbouring commercial uses.
c) suitable amenity and utility space, and,
d) Adequate access and parking.

4.3 This building has been designed in a traditional ‘double fronted’ manner with a predominantly flush front elevation and a floor plan based around a small central porch extension. In this instance the building is part of a group of similar properties, all designed slightly differently and with a slightly varied building line. This building is the most forward of the group of four properties that are viewed together and most visible within street views.

4.4 The scale of the extension as proposed which extends the full width of the property (approximately 8.4 metres) will dramatically change the form and character of the building, and its contextual relationship to the neighbouring properties. At present all the properties close to the site are orientated with the ridge horizontal to the road with gable porches, this sets a strong established character within the street scene of which the existing property makes a positive contribution. The proposed extension will result in the design of the extension having a gable frontage and due to the span of the extension will have a gable which is out of character with the area. It is for this reason the scale and design of the proposed extension is considered to have an adverse impact on the character of the existing dwelling, and on the character of the existing established street scene.
4.5 As already stated the application site is located to the south and forward of the neighbouring property. If constructed the extension will be approximately 6 metres from the front wall of the neighbouring property, given the orientation of the extension (to the south of the neighbour) the proposed extension would have an adverse impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property and is considered unacceptable and is therefore in conflict with criteria b of policy DM3.4.

4.6 Consideration has been given to the scale and design of the extension and how it impacts on the Conservation Area. The Council’s Conservation Officer comments as follows:

“The proposal is to add a large gable front extension to the property that will dramatically change the form and character of the building, and its contextual relationship to the neighbouring properties. The new gabled extension will be the same width as the house with the entrance placed to the side – this is unusual for any building form as the frontage no longer has the appearance of a traditional principal front elevation of this type of plan – it is overly wide for a gable fronted property. If any extension is carried out to the front, the principal building line is usually retained, with a projecting forming either smaller or creating a new form such as an L shape plan with narrower forward extension designed to be in balance with the remainder of the elevation, which remains the dominant element. If the entrance is changed, it is normally changed in such a way that it is still very legible within a part of the front elevation. The character of this extension is dominant, but also relatively plain, and makes the front elevation appear more like a rear extension, particularly with the French windows at ground floor level. It is also less clear where the entrance is. Also, it will bring the building line quite far forward of the neighbouring houses to the north, which it forms a group with, making this elevation more visible and dominant within street views. Advice on achieving suitable traditional forms and articulation is given within paragraph 3.82 on p178-180 of the SNPG.

I therefore consider that design of the extension is not of a suitable design standard to merit approval, and therefore does not conform with JCS policy 2 on achieving good design, DM3.8 or DM4.10, or Paragraph 3.82 of the South Norfolk Place Making Guide. I therefore consider that it is detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and results in a degree of harm to the conservation area as a designated heritage asset.”

4.7 Accordingly the proposal is considered to conflict with Policy DM4.10 Heritage Assets, and fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area as required by S73 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990.

4.8 A site meeting has been held with the application to ascertain if there is an alternative to achieve the required additional space. The options to the rear of the site are limited due to the location of existing shared drains, and the considerable cost in any relocation of these drains to allow for the required level of extension to the rear of the site. In addition, any extension to the rear of the site is also considered to result in loss of amenities to the neighbouring property which has a very restricted rear garden.

4.9 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 CIL under the Regulations.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The scale and design of the extension has an adverse impact on the character of the existing property and by reason of its orientation will have an adverse impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property by reason of loss of light and dominance, which is in conflict with policy DM3.4 and DM3.8 of the SNLP 2015.
5.2 The resulting extension will have an adverse impact on the established street scene and the overall character of the Conservation Area and is considered to conflict with policies DM3.8 and DM4.10 of the SNLP 2015.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:  
Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837  
j.jackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No**: 2015/2078/F  
**Parish**: BURSTON AND SHIMPLING

Applicants Name : Mr Gary Collier  
Site Address : Land East of Green Lane Diss Road Burston Norfolk  
Proposal : Erection of building for the storage and processing of apples and for the processing of honey from the bee apiary

Recommendation : Approval with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Details of machinery  
4. Details of foul water disposal  
5. Details of trade waste  
6. Full details of external lighting  
7. Ecological enhancement  
8. Limited Hours of Use  
9. No retail sales of products on site or access by commercial vehicles other than the applicant

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 03 : Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 5 : The Economy  
Policy 17 : Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM2.7 : Agricultural and forestry development  
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM4.5 : Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No planning history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council : Have several concerns:  
- the size and impact of a two storey building in such a location  
- the supporting information, with this application is vague in a number of areas  
- there is no water or electricity supply to the site, nor is it clear how there will be sufficient water available on site to process the fruit that requires washing  
- no indication of size of cesspit and whether it will prevent the chemical run-off from entering the surrounding water courses
the application states there are no trees and hedges on the adjacent land - Green Lane has trees and hedges along the western boundary
issue raised over access over public footpath. Applicant has advised us that he has a right of access

3.2 District Member
To Committee
possible impact of a two storey building in such a location
damage which would occur to the popular grassy footpath, even though it can accommodate vehicles
the possible ecological damage caused by chemical runoff from the apple washing process
the likelihood that the operation could be unsustainable as a viable business given the number of hives proposed and therefore could only be regarded as a hobby rather than a rural business

3.3 The Ramblers
Green Lane is a footpath and not a bridleway. We would like assurance that, should the application be approved, these footpaths will not be damaged and will remain safely accessible for their intended use

3.4 NCC Ecologist
Conditional support following submission of Phase 1 Habitat Assessment

3.5 NCC Highways
No objections

3.6 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team
Conditional support

3.7 SNC Water Management Officer
Conditional support

3.8 Rights of Way officer
No objection on condition that:
The applicant is aware that they will be responsible for the upkeep of the lane and for the prompt repair of any damage caused by the exercise of their private rights
Assume as owner of the orchard that the applicant has a right to access along the lane but would expect them to demonstrate this otherwise the use in vehicles would be illegal

3.9 Representations
1 letter stating no objection providing environmental concerns are met
the apple trees as far as I know have been out of production for at least 15 years and from experience would take between 3-4 years to bring them back into production
I also note that sheep have been running under the trees - this runs the risk of bark stripping and e-coli contamination of the apples making them unsuitable for human consumption
access to the site is via a bridleway unsuitable for either regular vehicular use or any vehicles other than farm traffic accessing the fields.
next to the site is a meadow registered with Norfolk Wildlife and am concerned that all the necessary checks and surveys should be carried out
• concerned that any run-off from the apple processing plant will just run off into the watercourse which runs through the village
• currently there is no provision for electricity or mains water on this application site so how is this to be brought to the site as there is no direct road access

6 letters of objection to the application
• access to the site is via an unmade ancient byway which is a footpath and bridleway unsuitable for continuous use by motor vehicles
• it is a popular route for walkers
• it has no road surface as it is a throw back to an original country road, such work would need to be done to it for vehicles to use
• this lane has an average width of 4.3 metres with the width at the entrance to Diss Road being 6.3 metres and the narrowest point being 2.3 metres
• the applicants land is approximately 200 metres from the road
• traffic sight lines on junction with Diss Road are not good owing to overhanging trees and hedges
• about 50 metres downhill from the proposed site there is a meadow which is an important registered County Wildlife Site. The environmental impact of the run-off from the processing plant should be a major consideration
• how are water and electricity to be supplied to the site for the processing plant?
• land was marketed last year as amenity land
• the application should be for light industrial not storage
• design is a little fancy for a tool shed, is this a back door application for future residential accommodation

4 Assessment

4.1 The proposal is for the erection of a building on a relatively small portion of land in Burston that has historically been used as an orchard. The original description did not include the full extent of what the applicant wishes to use the building for and therefore an amended description was agreed. This description is that the building is to be used for storage and processing of apples in relation to the existing orchard, and also for the preparation of honey from a new bee apiary to be created on the site.

4.2 The site is located to the north of the main village of Burston, accessed from Green Lane which is a public footpath that runs northwards from Diss Road, parallel to Mill Road which is to the east of the site. A second public footpath runs along the southern boundary of the site and connects Green Lane with Mill Road. The building is proposed towards the south of the applicant’s land whilst the main part of the orchard is to the north although there are orchard trees located around the site of the proposed building and additional trees are also proposed. The bee apiary will also be located immediately to the north of the building. Policy DM2.7 allows for development required for agriculture and forestry. The storage of apples in connection with the orchard on the wider site and the keeping of bees and producing of honey is accepted as agricultural development and therefore the proposed development is acceptable in principle. The policy requires that development is appropriate to the location in terms of use, design and scale and is sensitively sited to protect the amenity of existing neighbouring uses, and does not have an adverse impact on the local landscape and environment.
4.3 The building has been designed as it is to minimise land take and to separate the apple storage use and honey processing on different floors. In addition, a two storey building will allow the provision of solar panels to operate effectively given the trees to the south. However, the building is still modest in scale and proportionate to the needs of the business being undertaken by the applicant on the site. It is similar in scale but less prominent than another two storey structure on land immediately to the east of the application site where a building has been permitted and erected for use in connection with a non-commercial vineyard (application ref: 2009/1454). It is considered that the trees along the boundary will result in the building have relatively little impact in the wider landscape and whilst there will be views of the building from the public footpath to the south during the winter when the vegetation has died back it is not considered that it will be particularly prominent. The building is proposed to be constructed using black weatherboarding and red pantiles which are appropriate materials to use in this location. There are no immediately adjoining residential neighbours and therefore the proposal is generally considered to accord with Policy DM2.7.

4.4 The building is to be accessed from a track known as Green Lane which is a public footpath. A number of people have disputed the right of the applicant to use this as a vehicular access and that it should be used as a public footpath only. The applicant already uses the access to the wider site and has asserted that this has been the longstanding (and only vehicular) access to the land and was sold to him on this basis, which appears to be the case from the information submitted. Whilst Norfolk County Council’s highways officer raises no objection to the proposal in terms of highway safety, it is considered that the access is not suitable for more intensive use. On the basis of the information provided from the applicant, there is no reason to believe that there will be a greater intensity of its use however in order to ensure this is the case a condition is recommended preventing use of the access by other commercial users or any retail of the applicant’s products on the site.

4.5 The storage and processing of apples will not involve any industrial processes on site and as such there will be no wastewater generated by this element of the use. In response to concerns about foul water disposal, the applicant has clarified that a treatment system is to be used.

4.6 A County Wildlife Site (CWS) exists within 100 metres to the south. An Ecological Report has been submitted and concluded that few ecological receptors had any potential risk associated with the proposal, and the planned habitat improvements which will occur alongside the new building will substantially enhance the site for biodiversity. The Council’s Ecologist is satisfied that the report is fit for purpose and that the development has the potential to have positive effects but notes given the proximity of the CWS and the fact that the report only assesses one of the nearby ponds for Great Crested Newt potential, that a precautionary approach is taken and a condition imposed with the recommendations from the report with the added detail of at least 1 bat and 1 bird box to be mounted in a suitable location on the site.

4.7 Some concerns have been raised about the provision of electricity and water to the site. It is not immediately planned to link the building to these services, with electricity provided by solar panels and water supply if needed through a borehole. However, ultimately if services are needed the provision of these along Green Lane is not in itself a planning issue.

4.8 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 building is required to support existing and proposed agricultural uses on the site. It is considered that it will not have a significant adverse impact on the local landscape and environment due to its relatively modest design and existing trees on the boundary and within the site and therefore is considered to accord with Policy DM2.7.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker 01508 533848 tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
10. **Appl. No**: 2015/2175/LB  
   **Parish**: REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON  
   **Applicants Name**: Mr & Mrs J Oberhoffer  
   **Site Address**: 21 Broad Street Harleston Norfolk IP20 9AZ  
   **Proposal**: Proposed first floor extension  
   **Recommendation**: Approval with conditions  
      1. Listed Building Time Limit  
      2. In accordance with submitted plans

11. **Appl. No**: 2015/2176/H  
   **Parish**: REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON  
   **Applicants Name**: Mr & Mrs J Oberhoffer  
   **Site Address**: 21 Broad Street Harleston Norfolk IP20 9AZ  
   **Proposal**: Proposed first floor extension  
   **Recommendation**: Approval with conditions  
      1. Full Planning Permission Time Limit  
      2. In accordance with submitted plans

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   NPPF07: Requiring Good Design  
   NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   Development Management Policies  
   DM3.4: Residential extensions and conversions within settlements  
   DM3.8: Design Principles  
   DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
   DM4.10: Heritage Assets

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

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

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

2.1 2013/2012 Replacement of 4 no windows. Approved

2.2 2014/2635 New PVC back door Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council Recommend refusal of the scheme originally submitted in having a detrimental impact on the neighbouring homes. Maintain objection to amended plan.

3.2 District Members

Cllr Savage To be determined by committee

• to discuss the impacts of the proposal on the neighbour at no. 23. He still feels the revised plan is very harmful and should be further reduced in size.

Cllr Riches To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Representations

1 letter of objection received The neighbour at number 23 has objected on the grounds that the proposal would be overbearing, would reduce the level of light to their kitchen and private patio area, would be overlooked by the two new windows, and that the scheme would be out of keeping in the context of this listed building and its neighbours.

4 Assessment

4.1 The house is a grade 2 listed building dating from the 17th or 18th century rendered with a steep pantiled roof with gable ends. It has a two storey frontage to Broad Street with later single storey extensions at the rear providing a kitchen and bathroom which face The Thoroughfare. The proposal is to add a gabled extension above the rear flat roofed kitchen to provide a bathroom and landing. The extension would be in matching pantiles and a rendered finish.

4.2 The two concerns are the impact of the extension on the neighbour in the light of DM policy 3.13 in terms of the impact on the amenities and privacy of the neighbour, and national and local policies relating to the impact of the heritage asset. This would cover both the impact on the listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Background

4.3 The original proposal was to provide a gabled extension which covered the entire width of the rear elevation above the kitchen, joining with the walls of both number 21 Broad Street and 34 The Thoroughfare. This would provide a bathroom and a slightly larger landing area accessed by a new door inserted at the top of the stairs in the house. The neighbour objected to this proposal on the grounds of its over bearing impact, loss of light, over shadowing and loss of privacy by virtue of the two proposed gable windows. The scheme also blocked an existing dressing room window in the side wall of the neighbour's house, and offered to replace it with a roof light. This did not meet with the neighbour's approval. The Town Council also recommended refusal.

4.4 At the other end, the extension would require two existing air conditioning units to number 34 to be brought forward to a more prominent position in the street. The applicant was advised that this proposal was not acceptable and discussions were held to reduce the scale of the extension ideally to provide just for the bathroom, and limit the projection of the extension to line up with the neighbour's lean to.
A revised scheme was submitted which reduced the width of the extension and drew it away from the neighbour’s lean to, but would otherwise be the same height and projection length. The air conditioning unit, (one was found to be out of order,) would have to be moved and would be housed in a timber clad cover on the bathroom roof. The practicalities of the new roof did not allow this end of the extension to be drawn away from number 34.

The neighbours have maintained their objection, and the local member has accordingly asked for the application to be reported to the committee. The Town Council have also maintained their objection.

Impact on the heritage asset

In terms of the impact on the listed building, the house has no first floor WC or bathroom. It has two bedrooms accessed by a steep modern stair. The position of the access to the extension is dictated by the landing which serves the two bedrooms. This section of the wall has been altered and while it contains some timber framing, the loss of the fabric required to provide the doorway is not objectionable.

The form of the extension with matching materials is not uncharacteristic with a decently pitched tiled roof, with timber windows centrally placed. It is a modest scaled extension, visibly secondary to the main house. It would be screened by the projection of number 34, and in many ways would improve the present appearance of the flat roof. The enclosure of the air conditioning unit would reduce its impact.

The extension would sit comfortably in the townscape of the street which has a variety of gable and other roof forms. It would be a slightly larger version of the gabled wing to the rear of number 23.

As such it is considered that the proposal would preserve the building as one of special architectural or historic interest as required under section 66(1) of the 1990 Act and would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area as noted under section 72. It is felt that the proposal does not conflict with the significance of the building and as such complies with paragraph 129 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In the same way, the proposals do not adversely affect the significance of the asset and as such does not conflict with DM policy 4.10.

Neighbour Impact

The neighbour lies to the north of the proposed extension and as such it would marginally affect the level of light that is currently enjoyed by their kitchen, the door and window of which faces south, and opens out onto their private patio area. The original proposal, by building up to the boundary, would have had an over bearing impact, and was not supported. By reducing the width by a metre, this impact has been reduced, although as the only private amenity area available to the neighbours, their concerns can be appreciated.

The need for a first floor bathroom is a priority for the owners who cannot easily manage the stair and cannot provide the facility in an existing bedroom when both are used at present. The need for a landing of this size is less clear, and it does seem possible to reduce it and the extension further but this would require structural support. The revised proposal uses the existing kitchen foundations for support. The applicant is unwilling to make this further reduction.

It is acknowledged that the proposal will reduce the level of morning light to the rear garden of number 23 although this is already affected by number 34, The Thoroughfare, which is a taller building, however on balance given the buildings are within a tightly packed town centre, it is considered that the impact on the neighbour is not excessive or unreasonable as to result in any significant adverse impact on the amenities of that property and as such would not justify a refusal in this case.
4.14 The two windows proposed serve a landing and the bathroom and could be made obscure glazed, however Officers would not consider this overlooking would be so significant or overbearing given the oblique angle afforded to the neighbouring properties, the proposed tertiary accommodation proposed in the rooms they serve and also the close tight knit nature of the buildings in the area. As such Officers would not require by condition obscure glazing, although in practice it is likely that the bathroom would be obscured.

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.

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

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposal will reduce the level of morning light to the rear garden of number 23 although this is already affected by number 34 The Thoroughfare which is a taller building and the impacts are not significant or more adverse. It is acknowledged that there would be increased overlooking but this would not be significant or adverse. On balance given the buildings are within a tightly packed town centre, it is considered the impact on the neighbour is not excessive or unreasonable and would not justify a refusal in this case.

5.2 The proposals would preserve the character and appearance of both the listed building and Conservation Area.

5.3 Approval of both applications is recommended subject to the imposition of conditions, as per the detailed assessment above.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Steve Beckett 01508 533812 sbeckett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
12. **Appl. No**: 2015/2344/F  
**Parish**: TIVETSHALL ST MARGARET  

Applicants Name: Mr Don Smith  
Site Address: The Maltings Moulton Road Tivetshall St Margaret Norfolk NR15 2AJ  

Proposal: Conversion of old Maltings Building to New Site Office, Installation of New Steeping Silos, Installation of Germination Vessel, Installation of conveying system, Relocation of Engineering Workshop, Malt Dressing & outloading, Additional Malt storage, Water Treatment and Switch room demolition.  

Recommendation: Approval with conditions  

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amendments  
3. Materials  
4. Air quality Abatement  
5. Implementation of approved noise control measures  
6. External lights  
7. Contamination site investigation  
8. Verification of contamination mitigation  
9. Monitoring of remediation  
10. Unsuspected contamination

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 5: The Economy

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  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety  
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.6: Landscape Setting of Norwich

**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 2014/1274 The proposed development is for a Warehouse facility and car parking Approved

2.2 2003/0456 Erection of 2no storage silos and installation of an exhaust fume absorber Approved

2.3 2002/1147 Proposed erection of jackleg amenity unit Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Approve

- The Council has no problem with the majority of the application
- Concerned about height and location of engineering building
- Council accepts that the success of the Maltings could benefit the Parish
- Accepts there is a lack of useable space
- Recommend approval but recommend consideration given to the relocating or reducing height of engineering building

3.2 District Member Amended comments

To be determined by committee

- Because of concerns from local residents about detrimental impact to them and the surrounding area

Original comments
Can be delegated decision

3.3 NCC Highways No objection

3.4 Environment Agency Support with conditions

- Aquifers below the site and also bore holes as a result site is therefore highly environmentally sensitive
- No preliminary assessment but happy contamination can be dealt with via condition
- Abstraction and discharge permits may need to be varied

3.5 NCC Ecologist No objection

- No ecology report submitted but given the existing industrial nature of site do not considered that the proposed changes would have an impact on the Ecology of the area.

3.6 NETWORK RAIL South East Advisory comments on works near railway line

3.7 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team Support with conditions

- Air quality information submitted happy for abatement to be conditioned.
- The proposed workshop is close to residential properties and could be operated during unsociable hours when impact on residential properties would be greatest.
- Noise report indicates that the noise from most of the proposal can be readily addressed and can be conditioned. However

114
have concerns over the assumptions made in respect of the workshop and feel further assessment is required in order to fully appreciate the potential impact from noise and vibration

- Potential for outdoor lighting to be adversely impact on residents if not correctly designed, located and installed
- Support Environment Agency comments on contamination
- Suggest conditions on noise mitigation, contamination, external lighting and limiting hours of workshop if noise cannot be resolved.

3.8 Representations

Six letters of objection

- Concerned about height and closeness of the boundary of the engineering workshop
- Will block light and result in noise and fumes
- Already suffer from noise
- Will affect trees
- Rain water will flood my property
- Workshop should be moved to north
- There should be no further development on the site
- Already constant noise
- HGV park on road and damage it and verges
- Existing odour
- Why facility is allowed in rural area
- Sewers will be over loaded
- Will continue to pollute
- Concern about cumulative noise on the site conveyors will lead to a reduction but this is minimal
- Use of engineering building until 23:00 or through the night
- Will workshop be used for lorry maintenance
- Road from A140 to narrow for two lorries to pass easily causes congestion
- Lorries queue at access
- 5 jobs not enough for impact on community
- Constantly suffer noise, dust and odour and nothing done about it
- Increased traffic
- 3 additional silo will create the impression of a sprawling complex
- If engineering building more to north it will affect more people
- Existing elevator squeaks will this be replaced, is resolved when I complain but happens twice a week
- 30 mph speed limit required.

One letter of support

4 Assessment

4.1 The application relates to Simpsons Maltings at Tivetshall St Margaret. The site has historically been used for malting for a number of years. It is located to the west of the main Norwich to London train line. There are a number of residential properties to the north and south as well as a residential property to the north west of the site. There are agricultural fields to the east and west of the site either side of the railway line and road

4.2 The malting markets have changed in the last few years with increasing demand for roast and white malt products. It is proposed to increase the capacity to increase production by 10,000 tonnes of malt a year on the site. To facilitate this there is a need to increase the steeping and germination capacity, as well as increase storage on the site. This has also lead to the reorganisation of the site and a number of proposals which are:
• Conversion of old Maltings Building to New Site Office,
• Installation of New Steeping Silos,
• Installation of Germination Vessel,
• Installation of conveying system,
• Relocation of Engineering Workshop,
• Malt Dressing & out loading facility,
• Additional Malt storage,
• Water Treatment and
• Switch room demolition

4.3 The traditional malting buildings on the road frontage currently house existing processing machinery and it is proposed to convert them to office, laboratory and welfare accommodation which is currently housed in temporary portacabin buildings. Minimal changes are proposed to the buildings.

4.4 Due to changes in the market there is a move away from roasted malt and towards crystal malt. This process requires extended steeping and germination. It is proposed to install a new steeping silo this is a tall structure which will be located in the position of the existing engineering building.

4.5 A double decker germination tower is proposed adjacent to existing silos and roasting drum, this again is a tall structure.

4.6 A new dresser building is proposed to have a pantile effect roof and lap boarding walls. It is proposed to relocate it further into the site this will also allow the fitting of aspiration and dust control socks on the out loading bins which it is not possible to retrofit on the existing bins. It is also proposed to relocate the existing despatch silos.

4.7 Three addition malt storage silos are proposed to the north of the site which will give the opportunity to link it with the new warehouse building in the future. It is proposed to locate the silos adjacent to the existing storage silos.

4.8 The proposed high level conveyor system will allow materials to be moved around the site at high level, currently they movements are done by lorry, so this will result in a reduction internal movements which will help to improve circulation for lorries visiting the site.

4.9 Water treatment plant is proposed adjacent to the railway this will house filtration equipment which will allow more reuse of water and ensure that the existing abstraction and discharge consents are maintained.

4.10 The application also includes the replacement of the existing switch room building.

4.11 It is proposed to locate a new two storey engineering building directly to the west of the residential properties the cottage near the station and Bunny’s Burrow.

4.12 The NPPF and policy DM2.1 in the Development Management Policies supports the expansion of existing business unless there are significant adverse impacts.

Siting, design and landscape impact

4.13 The existing structures and buildings on the site are taller and are clearly seen within the wider landscape. It is considered that the proposed structures would sit within the context of the existing site and would not significantly adversely affect the local landscape.

4.14 It is proposed that some of the building including the engineering building and the have a pantile effect roof and ship lap boarding which there no objection to.
4.15 It is considered that the proposed design of the conversion of the original malting buildings into office, laboratory and welfare facilities is acceptable and respects the character of the building.

4.16 The Grange is a grade II listed building is located some distance to the north west in accordance with 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.”. The impact of the development has been considered on the setting of the listed building and given the building and nature of the development it is not considered that it would harm the setting of the listed building.

Residential amenity noise dust air quality lighting

4.17 A number of representations have been received by residents regarding dust and smoke currently produced from the site which is adversely affecting their amenity. An air quality report has been received which includes modelling of the existing and predicted air quality and the Environmental Quality Team are now happy with this, there is agreement from both parties that there is an existing air quality problem, and it is possible to fit abatement as part of the proposed development which will reduce the problem to a level acceptable air quality standard. The applicant has confirmed that they are happy to fit abatement measures. It is considered that the final details of this can be conditioned.

4.18 A noise report has been submitted with the application indicates that most of the noise from the proposal can be addressed with appropriate mitigation which can be conditioned.

4.19 The Environmental Quality Team are however, concerned that the new engineering workshop is located close to residential properties could potentially cause some noise and disturbance particularly if it is used at night, when the background noise levels are lower. Although generally noisy activities will not take place in the workshop building at night there may be instances because of breakdown when this needs to occur. The Environmental Quality Team have suggested an hours of use condition for the workshop unless further information can be provided to allay their concerns. The hours restriction does not fit within the requirements of the business. This is subject to ongoing discussions between the Environmental Quality Team and the applicant and will be updated at committee.

4.20 The proposed engineering workshop has two stories and is approximately 6.7 metres in height it is located approximately 4 metres away from the rear boundary of one of the residential properties in Moulton Road. The proposal would result in some dominance and over shadowing first thing in the morning at the far end of the garden. Given the length of the garden it is not considered that this impact is sufficient to recommend refusal.

4.21 The size of the building and location of the building have been discussed but given the tight nature of the site there is no clear alternative position and there is a need to improve and consolidate the facilities.

4.22 It is considered that external lighting can dealt with via condition

Highways

4.23 Concern has been raised about the increase of traffic especially HGV lorries coming to and from the site, and the congestion and damage this causes to the roads. There are currently approximately 6799 lorry movements to and from the site at year with the proposals this is predicted to increase to 7391, this represents an 8.9% increase in traffic movements which equates to an average of loads by 2.2 a day. Improved layout and circulation should result be a better turnaround of vehicles. Although the concerns regarding traffic are noted the
Highway Officer raises no objection to proposal, a result it is not considered that a highway reason for refusal could be raised to the development. It is considered that the proposal complies with policy DM3.11 of the Development Management Policies. A 30 mph limit could not be justified by this application.

Water treatment

4.24 The installation of a water treatment building will result in the recycling of approximately 50% of waste water which will reduce abstraction and discharge rates to and from the site. This approach is supported by policy 3 in the JCS.

Surface water

4.25 It is proposed the surface water will drain into the existing surface water system, the use of soakaways has been investigated for the workshop building but it has not been possible to achieve this because of the constraints of the site.

Contamination

4.26 There are below aquifers below the site and water is abstracted via bore holes therefore the site is highly environmentally sensitive. There is also a high risk of contamination on the site given the historical use of the site, as a result the Environment Agency have suggested a number of conditions to investigate this and deal with any contamination found. The Environmental Quality Team support this approach.

Ecology

4.27 The NCC Ecologist considers that given the existing industrial nature of site that the proposed changes would have an impact on the ecology of the area.

4.28 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 In conclusion the benefits of the development in terms of additional jobs and improved security of the existing jobs within the rural economy needs to be balanced in terms of the impact of residential properties, highway safety and visual impact. Subject to the resolution of the issue with regard to impact of the engineering building and the inclusion of condition on environmental quality on balance the development is acceptable with recommended conditions.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman 01508 533833
and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
13. **Appl. No**: 2015/2362/RVC  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: Hope Community Church Wymondham  
Site Address: Ayton House Ayton Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0QJ  
Proposal: Variation of condition 2 of permission 2015/1664/F - Further extended to the rear to facilitate a larger main Auditorium.

Recommendation: Refusal  
1. Unacceptable design  
2. Insufficient information – noise assessment

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
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 5: The Economy  
Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM2.1: Employment and business development  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM3.15: Outdoor play facilities/recreational space  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2014/2258  
Change of use of the existing portal framed unit to a community hub and place of worship with an extension to the rear of the site, with associated car parking and external works.  
Approved

2.2 2015/0285  
Discharge of Conditions 5 - Area conditioning, 7 - Boundary Treatment and 12 - Planting of permission 2014/2258/F  
Approved

2.3 2015/1664  
Variation of conditions 2, 3, and 12 of permission 2014/2258/F - to allow a change in main entrance to east elevation along with revised extension elevation to facilitate structure and revised cladding to extension  
Approved
3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council
To amended scheme
• Following receipt of amended plans now recommend approval

To original scheme
Refuse
• Overdevelopment of the site
• Loss of residential amenity – neighbouring properties

3.2 District Member
To be determined by committee
• Due to the concerns that the size of the extension would impact on residential amenity and concerns raised to me by neighbouring residents on Browick Road

3.3 Landscape Officer
No objections

3.4 NCC Ecologist
To be reported if appropriate

3.5 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team
Insufficient information and therefore cannot support

3.6 NCC Highways
No objections

3.7 SNC Senior Conservation and Design officer
Refuse
• Concerned at the quality of the design being achieved

3.8 Representations
2 letter of support to the amended scheme
• Pleased to see comments and objections from neighbours have been taken into account
• Elevations show a considerable lowering of height of the building

12 letters of support to the original scheme
• Much needed resource in community
• Additional space will offer a suitable venue for a growing church but also a unique community facility providing a 500seater auditorium and a larger room for community activities
• Will be better acoustically for local residents and provide state-of-art meeting, conference and concert venue for Wymondham
• Good design and layout
• Create a worthy building for Church and community at the same time maintaining the buildings industrial heritage
• Improve the look of the building
• Noise created will not be an issue as it will be very well insulated
• There is a lack of community facilities that are of a large scale
• Would encourage growth and employment
• Hope Church already supports the Town by providing care in the community
• Offers easy access to locals and A11
1 letter of objection to the amended scheme
A letter of objection from 5 properties in Browick Road
A petition with 32 signatures

- The development by reason of its size, depth, width, height and massing would have an unacceptable adverse impact via loss of privacy, noise, pollution and visually overbearing impact
- Insufficient parking for 397 seat concert hall/theatre – does not accord with Planning Portal Parking Standards
- Pollution and noise from parking area
- Inadequate details re ventilation or air conditioning
- No information re boundary treatment to reduce negative impacts
- Inadequate detail on noise from building
- No details re car parking design – lighting
- Contrary to policy

To the original scheme
4 letters of objection
A letter of objection from 5 properties in Browick Road

- Development too close and too high
- Overshadowing to gardens
- Do not object in principle just to the present form
- Loss of light
- No proper consultation with residents
- Did not object to original planning permission but this has gone too far

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks to vary the full planning permission for the change of use of the existing portal framed unit to a community hub and place of worship with an extension to the rear of the site, with associated car parking and external works, at Ayton Road, Wymondham. To the north are residential properties with gardens forming the boundary with the site. To the south and east are commercial premises. The site is within the development boundary for Wymondham.

4.2 This application seeks to increase the size of the approved extension and to revise the design and cladding.

4.3 The main issues in this case are: the use; the design; the impact on the character and appearance of the area; highway safety and residential amenity.

The proposed use

4.4 It is proposed to use the present warehouse/industrial building as a multi-functional community centre and centre of worship. The new centre will provide for example an auditorium/main hall, meeting rooms, outdoor play space and coffee area. The Hope Community Church spearheads the following projects: running of mother and toddler groups; employment of a full time children's worker; establishment of the Hub Charity; Pastoral Care for those in the community; and the Who Care initiative. The application site is within the development boundary and the use is assessed in relation to the NPPF, Policy 7, Policy 8 and Policy 5 of the Joint Core Strategy. In terms of its use the proposal accords with policy.
Design, layout and impact on the character of the area

4.5 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 NPPF states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

4.6 Following the submission of the application and concerns raised through the consultation process, the Church undertook a consultation with local residents to try to overcome their objections. Revised plans altered the design of the roof to reduce the impact of the proposal on the neighbouring properties.

4.7 At present, although the building is intended for community use, the design is fundamentally a utilitarian structure. The proposed variation introduces two distinctly different sections of the building which leads to a disjointed massing which lacks cohesion. The sloping roof of the extended section to the west sits very uneasily juxtaposed with the existing building, alongside the exposed, but unrelieved flank wall of the original structure. Although cladding has been introduced to the front section of the building, this terminates abruptly, particularly on the south elevation with a considerable change in form and materials and the sudden unrelieved bulk of the new extended section. It is considered therefore that the proposed extension and design changes are unacceptable and will have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the existing building and the visual amenities of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy 2 of the JCS and section 7 of the NPPF.

Highway safety

4.8 Policy DM3.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would endanger highway safety or the satisfactory functioning of the highway network.

4.9 Concerns have been raised by local residents as set out above regarding the amount of parking, however the Highways Authority has assessed the proposal and raise no objections to the development. In view of this I do not consider the application could be refused on the grounds raised. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Policies DM3.11 and DM3.12.

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.

4.11 Concern has been raised by adjacent residential properties regarding the detrimental impact the proposal would have on the amenities of the neighbouring properties. However, in respect of loss of light, loss of privacy and overbearing impact, due to the changes in the design following revisions, in particular the roof and there being no windows at first floor looking towards the neighbours, I do not consider the proposal would give rise to a situation so detriment as to warrant refusal on these grounds.

4.12 The Environmental Quality team has however raised the following comments:

"The size of the auditorium has increased significantly compared to the original application and there is currently no limit on the number or type of events that could take place. It is also noted that the proposal is likely to be exempt from the requirements of the Licensing Act 2003 and thus its controls on disturbance from any events at the premises. The proposal could have a significant adverse impact on local residents; and as such we would require a detailed noise impact assessment to be carried out in order to assess this impact. The information which has been submitted to date to is not sufficient for the Environmental
Quality Team to be able to be able to support the application” In view of this it is considered that insufficient information has been submitted contrary to DM3.13.

4.13 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 proposal is considered to conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies (SNLP) and in particular is considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS, Policy DM3.13 of SNLP and the section 7 of the NPPF.

5.2 It is considered that the proposed development would by virtue of its size, scale, massing and detailed design, in particular the two distinctly different sections of the building, lead to a disjointed massing which lacks cohesion and the sloping roof of the extended section to the west, creating a poor quality design, which is out of character with the existing building and is detrimental to the visual amenities of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework and also section 3.4.1 of the South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012 which requires new development to respect the character of the local area.

5.3 The application has failed to provide sufficient information to properly assess the noise impacts of the scheme and as such the scheme cannot be assessed against the requirements of Policies DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015).

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
14. **Appl. No**: 2015/2856/F  
**Parish**: BRESSIONHAM

Applicants Name : Paul Rackham Ltd  
Site Address : Land North Of Waveney House Low Road Bressingham Norfolk IP22 2AG  
Proposal : Erection of industrial unit  
Recommendation : Refusal  
1. Corridors of Movement  
2. Inadequate Turning Facilities

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01 : Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03 : Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design  
NPPF 11 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 5 : The Economy  
Policy 16 : Other Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.1 : Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM2.1 : Employment and business development  
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.5 : Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys  
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No relevant history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council : Recommend approval.  
3.2 District Member : Can be delegated  
3.3 NCC Highways : Refuse:  
- Site is directly served from the A1066, which has been designated as a Principal Route and Corridor of Movement within the Norfolk Route Hierarchy. It is subject to the national speed limit of 60mph.  
- There has been one serious personal injury accident here in 2013 involving a vehicle turning into the site
• Proposal would intensify the use of the existing access, leading to the deterioration in the efficiency of the through road.
• Drivers on corridors of movement do not normally expect to encounter slowing, stopping and turning movements outside of built up areas.
• An amended plan could be submitted showing a ghost island right hand turn lane to gain access to the site, which would mitigate these impacts and remove the highway objection. A road safety audit would need to accompany any amended plan.
• Site boundary does not show adequate space for heavy goods vehicles to turn and re-enter the highway in forward gear.
• Site is well outside development boundaries and is remote from the local services and transport connections that are available, it is therefore considered to be poorly located in terms of transport sustainability. Closest bus stop is approximately 1km away and there is no footpath serving the site. Approval would be likely to render the development reliant on the use of private vehicles. It would therefore conflict with the aims of sustainable development in the NPPF and local Policy 5 of Connecting Norfolk - the 3rd Local Transport Plan for Norfolk (LTP3) 2011-2026.

3.4 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team
Concerned regarding potential impact but suggests conditions if approved.

3.5 SNC Water Management Officer
No objection, with the addition of advisory notes relating to surface water drainage, foul drainage and package treatment plants.

3.6 Representations
1 representation received:
• Do not object to the principle of the application
• Development would share an access with Harvest House; an existing grain store business. Clarification is sought regarding the potential traffic movements; how vehicles would enter and leave the site and how they would be integrated with the grain store site.

4. Assessment
Proposal and site description

4.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of an industrial building. The building would measure 36.8m in length by 15.9m and would be 6.2m high to the ridge. Both the roof and walls would be finished in colour coated profiled sheeting, with the roof to be translucent. A small brick plinth would be built, which would be more prevalent on the southern elevation due to the change in site level. Fenestration would be to be aluminium. Further details of the materials have not been submitted.

4.2 The site is located north off the A1066 east of Bressingham village and is within designated Countryside. The site is currently empty and is sited north of a dwelling, known as Waveney House. To the east and north lies a relatively large grain store business which is comprised of several industrial buildings, silos and an office building (harvest House). Access to the site is gained via a right of way over the access to this business, which runs alongside Waveney House. Open fields border the site to the west.
The building represents a speculative development and approval for use as B1, B2 or/and B8 is sought, with a preference for B2 or B8. Internally a relatively small section is shown to be divided off to serve as an office, kitchen and toilets. An indication that the building could be split into two units is also shown.

Principle of development

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets a presumption in favour of sustainable development, identifying the three dimensions as economic, social and environmental. Section 1 advocates supporting sustainable economic growth, advising that significant weight should be placed upon the need to support economic growth through the planning system.

Policy 5 of the JCS states that the rural economy should be supported by promoting the development of appropriate new businesses, which provide either tourism or other local employment opportunities. Section 7 of DM 2.1 outlines when new sites in the Countryside would be acceptable, advising that positive consideration will be given to proposals that;

a) Re-use redundant rural buildings and hard standings (see Policy DM 2.10); and / or
b) Are located on sites well related to rural towns and villages and it is demonstrated that there are no sequentially preferable sites available; and / or
c) Create accessible jobs and business opportunities in the rural area.

The site is currently empty, with the whole area a mixture of bare earth and vegetation. The agent has stated that the site used to be part of the adjacent grain storage business and that dilapidated buildings previously stood here. Whilst no evidence has been submitted to prove this, previous applications at the site do indicate that this is correct. No independent use of the site appears to have been established previously; it has only ever been used as part of the existing grain storage business. The application is therefore considered to be for a new stand-alone development in the Countryside, albeit on brownfield land.

Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states that the effective use of brownfield land should be encouraged, provided that it is not of high environmental value. The site is not considered to be of high environmental value.

The agent has submitted no details regarding the estimated employee numbers. However the development is anticipated to have the potential to provide accessible jobs in the rural area.

In the preamble of DM 2.1 the policy makes it clear that preference is given to new sites located within development boundaries for employment and business developments, then to the expansion of existing businesses and finally to new small sites that are well related to a nearby rural settlements. Development in the Countryside which would be outside of the defined development boundaries will only be granted where there are overriding benefits.

The principle of the proposal therefore has to be considered in this policy context. The site is located well outside any development boundary and remote from local services; however it is served by the A1066, and whilst there are concerns regarding highway safety, which is discussed below, there is a good road network to the site.

Whilst the site is not allocated for Employment use or located within a development boundary the site is a brownfield site and is well served by the local road network. Furthermore the site is not considered to be of high environmental value. The economic benefits that would be gained from the development have to be balanced against any identified environmental or social harm, which are discussed below.
Landscape and Ecology

4.12 The site is within the South Norfolk and High Suffolk Claylands landscape character area, as defined within the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide. This area is characterised by slightly undulating topography and is predominantly arable land. The site and adjacent buildings are located on land which slopes gently to the north, making it relatively prominent within the wider area. However the site itself is largely screened from the wider area by the existing buildings. A short laurel hedge has been planted along the western boundary which, if allowed to grow, would partially screen the building too. At 6.2m the building would still be visible from the south, viewed over the top of Waveney House, but the impact upon the views from the north and east would be minimal. Furthermore when viewed from the south and west the building would be seen within the context of the group of buildings associated with the grain storage, some of which are significantly taller than the proposed. The visual impact upon the wider landscape would therefore be considered to be acceptable, and comply with DM 4.5.

4.13 The submitted Biodiversity Survey concluded that the site has no particular conservation merit and that the development would have no impact upon the viability or habitat of specialist conservation species that are present in the Waveney valley. As such DM 1.4 is considered to be complied with.

Amenity Impact

4.14 Waveney House is located directly south of the site. In addition a dwelling known as Four Winds is located to the east of the grain storage business. Both dwellings are currently impacted from the existing business, and as such any anticipated impact from the proposal has to be viewed against the existing relationship, with consideration given to whether the proposal would have a significant impact upon the existing residential amenity of the neighbours.

4.15 Environmental Quality Team have indicated that they do not object in principle. Relevant conditions can be added to any approval to control any potential impact, such as restricting the opening hours, the luminance of the flood lights and the installation of any extraction or ventilation equipment.

4.16 The impact upon the dwellings opposite is considered to be relatively minimal, and thus acceptable under DM 3.13.

Design

4.17 The design of the building is typical of an industrial unit of this scale, and similar to those at the grain storage site. Whilst no details have been submitted in terms of the colour of the walls or roof, these details can be conditioned.

Highway Safety

4.18 The A1066 is designated as a Principal Route within the Norfolk Route Hierarchy and is also a Corridor of Movement. These roads are designed to allow significant levels of traffic to move freely and safely between centres of populations at speed. There is an existing access, with the road near the site served with central ladder hatch marking to deter overtaking. There has been one serious personal injury accident here involving a vehicle turning right into the site. The intensification of the access would lead to the deterioration in the efficacy of the through road and would be detrimental to highway safety, conflicting with DM 3.11. The Highway Officer has suggested that the creation of a ghost island right hand turn lane would mitigate against these concerns and remove the Highway objection. However the agent has advised that the applicant is not willing to submit an amended plan showing these works.
The site plan fails to show space for any heavy goods vehicles to access the site and be able to turn before re-entering the highway. No further plans have been submitted to address this concern either. As such this part of the proposal is also considered to conflict with DM 3.11, and attracts an objection from the Highway Officer.

Parking is shown for 16 cars, with 14 standard spaces and 2 disabled. As the application is for B1, B2 or B8 use, there are differing requirements in the Parking Standards for Norfolk 2007 document dependent on which class use. If the development was used as B1 20 car parking spaces would be required, 12 for B2 or 4 for B8. The site does have space to accommodate more parking, and could conceivably include 20 spaces. An amended plan could be requested indicating this.

Local financial considerations

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

This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), however due to the recommendation of refusal no further action was taken.

Conclusion

Whilst the proposal represents a new business use within the Countryside, where new businesses should only be approved where there are overriding benefits, weight is given to the land being previously developed, and that it would result in the provision of accessible jobs within this rural area. The development would have clear economic benefits and the harm upon the environment is considered to be acceptable, as outlined above. As such the principle of the development is, on balance, considered to be acceptable.

However as outlined above there are overriding concerns regarding highway safety which have not been addressed. The application is therefore recommended for refusal due to failure to comply with DM 3.11.

Reasons for Refusal

The proposed development would intensify the use of an existing access on a stretch of classified highway where the principle use is that of carrying traffic freely and safely between centres of population. The existence of an access in this location is a matter of fact and therefore some degree of conflict and interference to the passage of through vehicles already occurs, but the intensification of that interference which this proposal would engender would lead to the deterioration in the efficiency of the through road as a traffic carrier and be detrimental to highway safety. Contrary to DM 3.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015).

The proposal does not incorporate adequate facilities to enable a vehicle to turn on the site and so enter the highway in a forward gear which is considered essential in the interests of road safety. Contrary to DM 3.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015).

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Katherine Brumpton 01508 533681 kbrumpton@s-norfolk.gov.uk
15. **Appl. No**: 2015/2874/H  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY

Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs J Flowerdew  
Site Address : 38 Ruskin Road Costessey Norfolk NR5 0LL  
Proposal : Extension & loft conversion including raising existing roof level.

Recommendation : Refusal  
1. Impact on character of street  
2. Impact on residential amenity

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
DM3.4 : Residential extensions and conversions within Settlements  
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life

2. **Planning History**

2.1 None.

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Town Council  
Recommend approval.

3.2 District Members:  
Cllr Bell  
To be determined by Committee  
• to assess the impact of the proposed development on the street scene.

Cllr Amis  
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Representations  
Two letters of support.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application site comprises of a detached bungalow in a residential cul de sac within the development boundary of Costessey. The ground level rises from north east to south west along Ruskin Road and falls away steeply to the north with properties in Kabin Road at a much lower level. This bungalow has a loft conversion with a small dormer window in the front roof slope. This application now seeks permission to alter and extend this dwelling as follows:

- Raise the eaves and increase overall roof height to provide additional first floor accommodation. The resulting roof would have an asymmetric pitch with gable ends and two dormer windows are proposed in the front roof slope.
- Extend the existing ground floor across part of the rear elevation including a glazed window at its northern end.
4.2 Policies in the JCS, local plan and the requirements of the NPPF seek to ensure that proposals are for an appropriate use, are of good design and do not adversely affect the character of the existing dwelling or the street scene to a material degree, or have an adverse impact on the privacy and amenities of neighbouring properties.

4.3 Ruskin Road is characterised by a mixture of bungalows, chalets and two storey dwellings with no uniformity of design. This dwelling is detached and is reasonably separated from neighbouring properties. As a result, there would be no objection to increasing the height of the main roof which would have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the street without appearing overbearing when viewed from neighbouring properties. However, it is considered that the addition of a two storey extension to the south west elevation would close down the space between the application property and 40 Ruskin Road and, as a result, would result in a cramped appearance which would be harmful to the character of the street. It is therefore contrary to policies DM 3.4 and DM 3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015. Officers recommended that this section be reduced to single storey but the applicant wishes it to be considered as submitted.

4.4 The proposed ground floor rear extension is designed with a flat roof and would not appear unduly prominent in views along the street or from neighbouring properties. It is designed with a curved corner window which would increase the outlook from this part of the property. However, the private amenity area of 36 Ruskin Road to the north east is effectively screened by its own brick-built garage and so this window would not result in any unacceptable overlooking which would be harmful to neighbouring amenity. Similarly, it would not introduce any new overlooking of properties further away and at a lower ground level in Kabin Road to the north. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed rear extension is an acceptable form of development. There is also no objection to the proposed front dormer windows.

4.5 This application also proposes a rear roof terrace over part of the flat roof of the extended kitchen/diner. The proposed terrace would allow unrestricted movement which would result in overlooking at a high level and, as a result, loss of privacy to neighbouring properties to the detriment of their residential amenity. This element of the proposal is therefore contrary to policy 3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015. Officers recommended that this part of the proposal be reduced to a ‘juliet’ balcony only but the applicant wishes it to be considered as submitted.

4.6 Existing parking provision within this site would be unaffected by these proposal.

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

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

5 Conclusion and reasons for refusal

5.1 This application proposes substantial extension to this dwelling and it is considered that the proposals to increase the height of the roof, insert two dormer windows and construct a ground floor rear extension are acceptable in terms of design and impact on residential amenity. However, the proposed two storey side extension would appear cramped within this site and so would constitute a poor form of design that would harm the character of this dwelling and of the wider street, contrary to policies DM 3.4 and DM 3.8 of the SNLP 2015.
5.2 While it is acknowledged that no objections have been received following neighbour notification, it is considered that the proposed rear roof terrace would introduce unrestricted overlooking at a high level which would be harmful to residential amenity and contrary to policy DM 3.13 of the SNLP 2015

Contact Officer, Telephone Number: Blanaid Skipper 01508 533985
and E-mail: bskipper@s-norfolk.gov.uk
16. **Appl. No**: 2015/2896/F  
**Parish**: SHOTESHAM

Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs K Heazle  
Site Address: Meadow View Brooke Road Shotesham Norfolk NR15 1XN  
Proposal: Replacement of a mobile home with a new three bedroom bungalow

Recommendation: Approval with conditions  
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amended plans  
3. Mobile home to be removed within one month  
4. Slab level to be agreed  
5. External materials to be agreed  
6. Window details to be agreed  
7. Specific details to be agreed  
8. Hedge planting to be agreed  
9. Retention trees and hedges  
10. No permitted development rights for Classes ABCDE & G  
11. No permitted development rights for fences, walls  
12. Domestic Microgeneration Equipment  
13. Water Efficiency to be agreed  
14. Provision of parking, service  
15. Ecology mitigation to be agreed  
16. Surface water to be agreed  
17. Foul drainage to be agreed

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.6: House extensions and replacement dwellings in the Countryside  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.5: Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys  
DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design  
DM4.10: Heritage Assets

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012
Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas:

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

2. Planning History

2.1 2015/2376 Use of Mobile Home for residential use Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Refuse
- The site has permission for a caravan this is not a like for like replacement and is much larger
- Sited wholly off the footprint of the caravan
- Extends into agricultural field and would require the removal of an established hedge which would make it more intrusive in the landscape than the caravan
- Bungalow would not be in keeping with the agricultural buildings
- Design and Access Statement says that it is suitable for two people but is three bedroom
- The site would be visible across the valley and increase elevation /roof/colour windows and brickwork of the building would be intrusive in the landscape
- If approved materials needs to be carefully monitored.

3.2 District Member Can be delegated
- There is already permission for a mobile home here so I feel a bungalow using bricks and tiles similar to other properties in close proximity should be a condition so in keeping with streetscene.

3.3 NCC Highways No Objection
- Concludes that although any occupiers would be largely dependent on the private car for transport it is not considered that the proposal would not conflict with the sustainability objectives of the NPPF.
- Highway terms the proposal would not generate significantly more traffic than the existing mobile home.

3.4 SNC Water Management Officer Support with conditions
- Advisory comments on surface water drainage
- Justification required for use of septic tank

3.5 NCC Ecologist Support with conditions
- Agree with ecology report that there will be little impact on protected species
- Recommend mitigation is conditioned and enhancements encouraged
- Include informative on nesting birds
3.6 SNC Conservation
And Design
Amended proposal
Support with conditions
- The plans are an improvement and will relate more positively to the existing range of historic farm building

Original scheme
- Existing grouping of farm buildings is fairly loosely planned, although the buildings are arranged around yards towards a core farmyard grouping
- Existing mobile home can be considered to be an incongruous feature in views, which is detrimental to the setting of the group of farm buildings.
- An additional building in a style which replicates traditional farm buildings would be acceptable.
- Concerned landscape treatment would result in a dwelling which was divorced from the general grouping of farm building, however, beneficial new hedge will be hawthorn rather than laurel.
- Could be overcome by removing the hedge boundary or having an estate railing and repositioning building to that it encloses the space so that it would appear more as a corner building and less isolated and peripheral from the other farm buildings.

3.7 Representations
Four letters from three households either do not wish to object or support the application but raise concerns
- New build is over double the footprint of the mobile house and considerably larger
- New dwelling does not step down the gradient of the site
- Have views from our property been considered
- Proposed new dwelling encroaches onto agricultural land, can it be assumed that all the land around can be considered for residential development
- Views of Conservation Officer required
- Civil matter raised regarding utility provision, telephone lines
- Construction traffic should use farm tack so not be damage existing private road
- Request that 30 mph limit for the road
- No provision in place to upgrade the tarmac entrance onto Brooke Road and the gravel drive
- Needs to be more in keeping with existing buildings.

4 Assessment

4.1 The sites relates to piece of land to the south west of a complex converted barns and Upgate Green Farm House, which is a grade II building. Permission was granted last year for a Certificate of Lawfulness for the siting of a mobile home for a residential use (application number 2015/2376). The site is outside any development limits defined by the Site Specific Allocations Document.

4.2 This application is for a replacement single storey dwelling, the site which extends into the agricultural land to the south west.

4.3 Policy DM1.1 seeks to ensure all development contributes to sustainable development. Policy DM1.3 goes on to ensure development is sustainably located. In this instance as the dwelling is a replacement dwelling in the countryside Policy DM3.6 in the Development Management Policies applies. This policy permits the replacement of dwellings in the open countryside as long as the original dwelling has a lawful
permanent use and is capable of residential occupation without major or complete reconstruction. The certificate of lawfulness granted last year confirms the lawful residential use of the site.

4.4 Polices DM3.5 and DM3.6 requires replacement dwellings to incorporate a good quality design which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of the streetscene, surroundings and landscape setting and does not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

4.5 The property has been designed to reflect the character of the existing barns on the site and the Conservation Officer raises no objection to this approach. As long as the proposed dwelling respects the character and appearance of the surrounding development and the local landscape there is no restriction on the building being larger in size. The Conservation Officer raised concerns that the proposed hedging around the dwelling which divorces it from the group of barns and suggested that it would be beneficial to rotate the building and remove the hedge so that it has a better relationship with the group. The proposal has been negotiated and proposed dwelling has been repositioned. It is also proposed to remove the hedge so that the development sits better within the group of buildings. The applicant was unwilling to rotate the dwelling for a number of reasons relating to orientation and need to live in the mobile home during construction. On balance however it is considered the amended proposal is now acceptable and the dwelling would not be divorced from the group of farm buildings. It is also now proposed to use clay pantiles and timber windows rather than the originally proposed concrete tiles and upvc windows.

4.6 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.” The Conservation Officer now considers that the development would result in the removal of the mobile home which is an incongruous element within the setting of the listed building and the new dwelling would enhance the setting of the listed building in accordance with S66 of the Act, the NPPF and policy 4.10 in the Development Management Policies.

4.7 The Parish Council has raised concern regarding the encroachment of the dwelling onto agricultural land and the impact of the dwelling on the local landscape. The proposed dwelling would be seen part of a group of converted farm buildings and would not appear significantly taller than the existing mobile home, it is therefore considered that the proposal would not significantly harm the local landscape or result in any significant loss of good quality farm land. It is proposed to replace the existing conifer hedge with a native species hedge would also be beneficial in landscape and ecological terms.

4.8 The development has been designed so that it would not adversely affect the amenity of the neighbouring properties through overlooking and given its position and scale would not result in a loss of outlook, daylight or sunlight as required by policy DM3.13 of the Development Management Policies.

4.9 The Highway Officer raises no objection to the application. Concern has been raised about the need to upgrade the existing private track to the dwellings. The development will not result in an increase in the number of dwellings being accessed via the track, the need for repairs to the track is a civil matter between the owner of the track and residents. The route of construction traffic could not be controlled for a development of this size by planning condition. This development could not justify the provision of a 30mph speed limit on Brooke Road.
4.10 An ecology report has been submitted with the application and identifies the development would result in a low risk to protected species, It is proposed to considering ecological mitigation and biodiversity enhancements.

4.11 It is proposed to deal with surface water drainage via soakaway which is in accordance with the advice in the NPPF and PPG. The PPG gives preference to the use of package treatment plants where there is no main drainage, the means of foul drainage is being clarified and will be updated to Committee.

4.12 In terms of other matters raised in representations in planning there is no right to a view and so cannot merit a reason for refusal on an application.

4.13 Also the provision and separation of utilities is a civil matter to be agreed between the parties.

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.

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

5 Conclusion

5.1 In conclusion the proposed development would result in the removal of the mobile home which is an incongruous element and provide a new dwelling which has been design to respect the character and appearance of the group of buildings, the local landscape and the setting of the listed building and will not adversely affecting highway safety, residential amenity, drainage or ecology.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman 01508 533833
and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
17. **Appl. No** : 2016/0158/O  
**Parish** : CAISTOR ST EDMUND

Applicants Name : Mr Daniel Skinner  
Site Address : Land South of High Ash Farm High Ash Lane Caistor St Edmund Norfolk

Proposal : Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved) for one detached, four bedroom self-build dwelling, double garage and gardens.

Recommendation : Refusal  
1. No functional need Contrary to DM2.11  
2. Development in the open countryside

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 04 : Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 06 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design  
NPPF 11 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 3 : Energy and water  
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation  
Policy 9 : Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 15 : Service Villages  
Policy 17 : Small rural communities and the countryside

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  
DM2.11 : Agricultural and other occupational dwellings in the Countryside  
DM3.1 : Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
DM3.2 : Meeting rural housing needs  
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2014/2414  
Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved) for one detached, two storey, four bedroom, self-build dwelling and single storey double garage.  
Refused

Appeal History

2.2 15/00008/AGREFU  
Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved) for one detached, two storey, four bedroom, self-build dwelling and single storey double garage.  
Dismissed
Development Management Committee  2 March 2016

3.  Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  Approve
The farm is a unique local amenity which provides many miles of permissive footpaths giving excellent walking and unspoilt views. It is used extensively by residents from this village and surrounding villages, but by visitors from Norwich and further afield in Norfolk. The proposed self build will enable the applicant to maintain his business to the benefit of the wider community, and to enjoy a reasonable family life. In light of recent decisions to allow development despite strong local opposition and with no obvious benefits to the local community, if there is any natural justice in the planning process, this application should be approved.

3.2 District Member  Can be delegated if for approval,

To Committee if for refusal to consider particular circumstances of the application, with reference to sustainability, employment and the retention and enhancement of a major South Norfolk asset.

3.3 SNC Water Management Officer  To be reported if appropriate

3.4 Historic Environment Service  No comments received

3.5 Representations  Over 100 letters of support at the time of the report being written
- Caring for the natural environment by farming in a sustainable way and providing access to the public should be able to live on site.
- No available accommodation on the site, this is the only available option.
- No negative impact on the surrounding area and would only help to enhance the facility that High Ash Farm has to offer.
- Haven for wildlife
- Allows people to enjoy the open countryside and promote healthy living.
- Recreational access for walking and horse riding.
- A single dwelling in this location would have huge benefits and should not be refused.
- Permissive walking access funding is being cut, this facility will be lost of permission for the dwelling is not granted.
- A benefit to local tourism being close to Caistor Roman Town and other walks.
- This is an amazing free facility and should be supported.
- Friendships formed with other walkers and appreciate the sense of community which draws people from the local area and beyond. Accessed by car, but also available to access via bus.
- This facility has contributed significantly to my well-being and recovery.
- Gain benefit from the daily exercise and enormous pleasure at seeing such a wealth of plant and wildlife.
- Mr Skinner is prepared to work hard and maintain these permissive paths at his own cost after the funding for them ceases in October 2016. To do this he needs to live on the site. He is a young man with a family how wishes to make his life in the village and he should be allowed to build a property on the farm.
I have been privileged on a number of occasions to access the walks around High Ash Farm with various ornithology groups, some through Adult Education, some that are informal arrangements with groups of fellow-enthusiasts.

The permissive walking that is available at High Ash Farm is excellent and such an important part of the local community as well as a wonderful place for Norwich residents to come and relax with their children and dogs. It would be such a loss if it was no longer available. If we didn’t have the permissive walking (or running in my case!) then we’d have to drive a lot further to find that many miles of safe and beautiful tracks to use. It is so important to our health and well-being to have such a facility.

4 Assessment

4.1 The proposal seeks permission for the construction of one dwelling to enable the applicant to live on site and continue to maintain access to the permissive paths on the farm and to enable the existing livery business to expand and widen the range of facilities provided. The site is located on High Ash Lane and is part of High Ash Farm which is run as one entity which is outside the development limits and therefore set within the open countryside.

4.2 High Ash Farm as a whole includes 1 single storey dwelling which is the subject of an agricultural occupancy condition granted under reference 2002/1682 (owned and occupied by the applicant’s father) and two cottages that are part of the tenanted farm.

4.3 The applicant owns some of the land and has a lifetime tenancy on additional land providing 204 hectares of agricultural land in total, High Ash Farm operates as one whole enterprise, and the applicant currently resides at one of the cottages as a tenant but wishes to have his own house whilst remaining on the farm.

4.4 The current application seeks to demonstrate the need for the dwelling in the open countryside to accord with the requirements of Section 6 paragraph 55 of the NPPF, and policy DM2.11 of the Development Management Policies 2015.

Background

4.5 A previous planning application for a self-build dwelling on this site was submitted, refused and dismissed on appeal, the reason: “the appeal proposal would result in a new isolated home in the countryside contrary to paragraph 55 of the NPPF and with resulting significant harm to the social and environmental dimensions of sustainability.”

“The NPPF at paragraphs 6-9 states that to achieve sustainable development economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. Because the appeal proposal would not secure this balanced approach it therefore follows that it would not represent sustainable housing development for which there is a presumption in favour of at paragraphs 12 and 49 of the Framework.”

4.6 The proposal is assessed against policy DM2.11: Agricultural and other occupational dwellings in the Countryside: Proposals for development in the Countryside to meet the housing needs of full-time workers in agriculture, forestry and other essential workers connected with that land will be permitted only where they comply with the following criteria.

4.7 In the case of established enterprises:
   a) There is a demonstrated functional need for one or more full time workers to be readily available at all times for the enterprise;
   b) The functional need could not be met by another existing dwelling in the area that is available and suitable;
c) The enterprise has been established for at least 3 years and is likely to remain financially viable for the foreseeable future;  
d) The proposal does not represent a replacement of another dwelling on the site (or the former holding of which the site formed a part) that has been sold on the open market in the last 5 years; and  
e) The proposed dwelling is no larger than that required to meet the functional needs of the enterprise and is affordable from a viable income derived from the enterprise in the long term.

4.8 As set out above the applicant only owns part of the site which operates as High Ash Farm. The three existing dwellings are located on the holding which is not within the ownership of the applicant, including the one which is occupied by the applicant, and one which is within the ownership and occupation of the applicant’s father.

4.9 The applicant has a holding of 204 hectares between ownership and the life tenancy. The holding which is within the applicant’s ownership, and on which the applicant justifies a new dwelling, is limited in size and is not functionally separated from the main farm. No financial information has been submitted to demonstrate the income from the applicants holding alone would be viable to support a dwelling in its own right.

4.10 In terms of functional requirement, it is accepted that the livery needs a person on site to deal with animal welfare issues however this functional requirement is already met by existing dwellings on the site. Furthermore it is accepted that there is a degree of security required for the permissive paths around the site, however this does not demonstrate a functional need i.e. someone living on site 24/7. It is acknowledged the applicants wish to expand the livery and provide riding school facilities. It is appreciated that if the existing livery business were to expand and include additional facilities additional staff would be required.

4.11 The additional staff suggested however would be required to provide a yard manager and riding lessons. While the yard manager may need to live on site, there would be no functional need to accommodate other staff associated with the riding school to be provided with accommodation on the site. The need for security and animal welfare requirements can be achieved through the existing level of accommodation already associated with High Ash Farm.

4.12 Taken as a whole High Ash Farm already benefits from 3 dwellings providing accommodation for the existing enterprise at all times including the livery business. From the information submitted and while it is appreciated that there is the potential for further expansion, the nature and scale of the enterprise does not demonstrate there is a functional need for a 4th dwelling on High Ash Farm, furthermore there is no financial evidence to suggest the small holding with this site could support a dwelling in the long term. For this reason and from the evidence submitted Officers are not persuaded that the scheme as proposed accords with the criteria of policy DM2.11 and therefore cannot be supported.

4.13 As the application falls within the Norwich Policy Area where the Council cannot now demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply in the Norwich Policy Area, its housing supply related policies are considered to be no longer up to date in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 49 of the NPPF. Paragraph 49 also confirms that housing applications must be assessed in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. With this in mind it is necessary to establish whether the current scheme represents a sustainable development. Sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. It goes on to stress that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.
4.14 The following is an assessment of whether the scheme can be considered to represent sustainable development. The three elements are set out to include the applicant’s case on how he considers the application accords with the criteria followed in each section by my assessment.

Economic Role

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

4.16 The Supporting Planning Statement states that: High Ash Farm has two main business operations. The first is an arable farm which is currently enrolled in environmental schemes. Because of the predominant land types in this area it is difficult to increase the economic return of this holding unless the farm moves to rearing outdoor pigs like the neighbouring holding; however this is not the route the Applicant (nor the local community) wants the farm to take.

The other main business is a popular equine livery yard. It has expanded several times but has now reached a size that cannot be exceeded without employing a full time livery manager/service provider. The farm would like to expand the livery business; however, it is considered standard practice to provide accommodation for this type of role due to the working hours and the necessity to monitor the animals at unsociable hours. The farm would also like to start a riding school which would enable people to visit the farm for individual and group riding lessons. This would be run by the full time yard manager, but would also require additional staff to be employed to give the lessons.

If the applicant is successful in achieving planning consent for a self-build dwelling at High Ash Farm, then his existing agricultural restricted rented cottage will be freed to meet the accommodation needs of the expanded livery staff. The application will therefore provide additional employment in the village which would also not require travel to and from work. Building a new house for the applicant to live on site would therefore create the following jobs in the village:

1) 1 full time yard manager (to line in the applicant’s previous accommodation)
2) 1 part time livery service provider
3) 2 part time riding school employees

Furthermore, the permissive access supports and enhances the local hotel (Caistor Hall) and the local restaurants (Wilderbeest Arms and Stoke Mill) by bringing in new visitors to the area who would not normally visit. Schools from the local villages and from Norwich visit and use the permissive access for outdoor education and project work.

Finally, given the Applicant’s commitment to farming for wildlife, it follows that the farm produces an abundance of wild flowers. To that end, the Applicant is also very keen to further expand the farm business to include a wild flower florist, which will also bring about economic benefits.

The proposed new dwelling would help to support the existing business, and help to fulfil the applicants wish to expand the existing equine business, and to divers

4.17 The farm as it currently operates, and looking forward to how the applicant proposes to change and diversify is acknowledged, however, much of the land used for the livery business and the permissive paths is outside of the applicant’s ownership. I accept that as it currently operates it no doubt makes a positive contribution to the local economy, and could be considered as a tourist attraction which is an asset to the locality. I also accept that visitors to the site may visit other facilities and services within the local area.
In conclusion, I consider that in terms of the economic aspect the facilities currently offered at High Ash Farm do have economic benefits both in terms of business operating from the site, and the contribution made to other business premises in the local area.

Social Role

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."

The Supporting Planning Statement states that:

High Ash Farm plays an important social role in the local community and is currently participating in a large scale Countryside Stewardship Scheme (Higher Level Scheme) which is funded by Natural England. One of the elements of this scheme is providing permissive access to the land for the public. At High Ash Farm this includes over 5 miles of off road, mowed grass track that people can use all year. The walking at High Ash Farm is very popular with local users and with visiting tourists and rated in the top 50 tourist attractions in Norfolk on Trip Advisor in 2015 and the 2nd highest rated hiking trail in Norfolk after the Norfolk Coastal Path.

The access to safe well maintained walking provides a health benefit to the many people that use it, in particularly travelling out from Norwich where there are few options to have free exercise (including free car parking). It supports and enhances the local hotel (Caistor Hall) and the local Restaurants (Wildebeest Arms and Stoke Mill) by bringing in new visitors to the area who would not normally visit. Schools from the local villages and from Norwich visit and use the permissive access for outdoor education and project work.

However, the current Higher Level Scheme comes to an end in October 2016 and the funding from Natural England is no longer available. This means that the cost of continuing the permissive access through High Ash Farm will have to be borne by the Applicant at a rate of approximately £4,500 per annum from loss of productive land, labour to maintain tracks and machinery costs for track mowing.

If the development fails to achieve consent, the applicant and his family will be forced to seek housing out elsewhere at a significant higher cost. Given that the applicant has finite time and financial resources, it is possible that this cost of having to seek housing elsewhere may need to be met by cutbacks to the social and environmental programmes currently carried out at High Ash Farm.

Additionally, the management of the permissive access requires a significant amount of time and on-site work, the applicant currently lives on site and so they are available to monitor the large number of people who visit to use the permissive access. The largest volume of visitors is outside of normal working hours, during the weekends and evenings.

If the applicant has to move further afield and spend time commuting to the farm each day then when the current scheme expires in October 2016 he will no longer be able to offer permissive access.

The facilities offered from the permissive paths around the site are acknowledged as making a positive contribution to the social, health and wellbeing and the associated benefits to the local and wider community, including local schools, this is demonstrated by the volume of support letters received many of which are from the wider area who regularly use the permissive paths. However, this has to be weighed against other issues relating to development in the open countryside and the associated policies.
Environmental Role

4.22 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."

4.23 The Supporting Planning Statement states that:

The environmental role encompasses contributing to and protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently and minimise waste and pollution. High Ash Farm is committed to its continuing practice of ecological farming and is an exemplar both in the local community and throughout the country for its ecological enhancement practices and programmes.

High Ash Farm is currently in large scale Countryside Stewardship Scheme (Higher Level Scheme) which is funded by Natural England. This involves changing the way the farm is managed by taking large areas out of intensive arable farming and managing the land to give the greatest environmental and biodiversity benefits.

The applicant is deeply committed to improving biodiversity within his agricultural holdings. High Ash Farm’s main consideration in everything they do is the impact on the wildlife that lives there and how they improve the environment to encourage greater diversity. Much of the conservation work at High Ash Farm is focused on encouraging farmland bird species. They have been particularly successful with little owls and now have at least 10 nesting pairs. In 2009 turtle doves returned to the farm. The farm focuses on both the larger scale habitats like its wild bird cover and pollen and nectar mix and also the smaller details such as holes in walls for mason bees or bird boxes in the farmyard buildings for sparrows. The farm boasts 100 acres of pollen and nectar mix plants to help attract endangered bee, moth and butterflies. Foxes, badgers, rabbits and squirrels are well welcome and encouraged at High Ash Farm, where healthy populations of roe deer and hares can also be found.

However, farming and biodiversity comes at a price. It requires the applicant to carry out additional work to ensure the protection and enhancement of the above species, thus requiring more of his time on site. If he is unable to build a dwelling on site for himself and his family, some of these enhancements practices may need to be reviewed, as he will have to move off site and likely commute to the farm on a daily basis, which will cut into his productive time at the farm. Farming for biodiversity can also lead to reduced yields, which in turn can affect profits. Allowing the applicant to build within his existing landholding would save him a significant amount of money that can be reinvested back into the farm and its sustainable agricultural practices. Granting consent for the proposal will also reduce carbon dioxide and other pollution emissions from travel. If permission is not granted, the applicant will be forced to seek out accommodation elsewhere as he wished to own his own home instead of continuing renting. Given the extremely high property prices in the immediate local area, it is likely that he will have to look further afield for housing, which will require him to drive to the farm for work every day, an unsustainable and polluting practice which is contrary to several provisions of the NPPF. If allowed to build within his landholding at High Ash Farm, commuting by car will be unnecessary, thus reducing the need to travel and the adverse environmental effects associated with this daily commute.

Furthermore, the applicant intends to build a highly efficient and sustainable house using many materials from the farm such as timber from the woodland and some straw thatch panelling harvested from the land - similar to the Enterprise Centre at the UEA - thus reducing transport movements for getting materials to the site for construction.

In addition to this, the house will have hot water and heating provided by the latest biomass boilers. These boilers can be run using dry matter such as straw or dried grass material. Currently on the farm there is over 100 acres of pollen and nectar plantations which get cut and removed each year. This material gets transported to various locations around the
country to be burnt in power stations which generate electricity. Using this waste matter on site for sustainable energy generation will not only reduce carbon dioxide emissions from energy production but reduce emissions that arise from transporting these materials to other energy facilities.

4.24 It is recognised that High Ash Farm is committed to its continuing practice of ecological farming and is an exemplar both in the local community and throughout the country for its ecological enhancement practices and programmes. The application suggests that the dwelling would be energy efficient using materials from the farm to fuel a biomass boiler; (however, as the application is outline no details have been submitted to assess the design).

4.25 The information submitted does demonstrate the benefits the farm offers to the environment which accord with this element of the NPPF.

4.26 While there are clearly benefits in terms of economic, social and environmental elements of the facilities offered at High Ash Farm, there is no functional need for an additional dwelling on the site. The site remains in an isolated location as previously demonstrated through the previous planning and appeal decision. For this reason the proposal is not considered to be sustainable in the context of the NPPF, however, it is still appropriate to have regard to paragraph 14 of the NPPF in respect of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision making this means:

“where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless:
• Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole; or
• Specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted.”

4.27 The Planning Statement submitted notes that – “The previous planning application which was refused was dismissed on appeal for just one reason, that of being isolated. The proposed development is not lonely or on its own, it is next to a small group of other dwellings,” and that it would help maintain the viability of rural services, (Stoke Holy Cross and Poringland the two adjacent settlements).

4.28 The point of location has already been tested through the previous application and appeal decision. However, it is necessary to consider the application on the basis it is now submitted which is that of functional need for the continued operations of High Ash Farm, the retention of the permissive footpaths and the potential expansion of the livery and possible introduction of a riding school.

4.29 It is understood the existing level of accommodation on High Ash Farm as a whole appears adequate to provide the level of accommodation required for the business and it is noted that the applicant already lives on the site albeit in rented accommodation. The level of land within the applicant’s ownership is limited and does not justify a 4th dwelling on the site.

4.30 I appreciate the work required to maintain the permissive paths, but the need to live on the site appears to be adequately provided for by the level of accommodation on the site at present. I also acknowledge that later this year the funding will finish and if the permissive paths remain open the cost will rest with High Ash Farm. However, this alone is not a justifiable reason to permit a new dwelling in the open countryside and more importantly the land on which many of these permissive paths are located is outside the ownership of the applicant and therefore could not be conditioned to remain open for the benefit of the wider community.
In terms of the potential expansion of the existing livery and the provision of a riding school, while the business at High Ash currently includes livery, any further expansion may be the subject to separate planning application and would be assessed against the necessary policies at that time. A large portion of High Ash Farm is outside the sole ownership of the applicant, consequently the future operations of the site should the application be permitted, could not be secured by way of condition to ensure they are retained for the benefit of the wider public benefits.

In conclusion, the functional need of High Ash Farm can be met by the existing dwellings already on site. Therefore the scheme as proposed is considered to conflict with Section 6 para 55 of the NPPF and DM Policy 2.11 of the SNLP 2015. In respect of paragraph 14 of the NPPF the benefits of the scheme are limited, and the social and environmental harm are not outweighed by those benefits.

Planning consideration for this application as self-build has been identified as the method of delivering the site. In the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

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).

Conclusion

High Ash Farm as a whole benefits from existing residential accommodation on site which is considered adequate to meet the functional requirements of the holding as a whole. Insufficient evidence is submitted to demonstrate there is a functional need for a 4th dwelling on the site. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy DM2.11 of the SNLP 2015 and para 55 of the NPPF.

The development of this plot would erode the open countryside and its predominant rural character which outweighs the benefits of the provision of an additional dwelling on this site. The site is not considered to be in a sustainable location as already determined by the appeal decision.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837 jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
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18. **Appl. No**: 2016/0174/H  
**Parish**: SHOTESHAM

Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs J Parnell  
Site Address: Highfield  Hawes Green Shotesham Norfolk NR15 1UL  
Proposal: Proposed extension and improvement of existing dwelling

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM3.6: House extensions and replacement dwellings in the Countryside  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM4.10: Heritage Assets

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

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

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2015/2332: Proposed extension and improvement of existing dwelling  
Withdrawn

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: Refuse  
- Highfield is currently a small cottage style bungalow in keeping with its surroundings.  
- Understands the wish of the applicant to improve the present bungalow into a modern family home.  
- There have been a number of modifications to the previously submitted application but they are minor when considered with the whole proposal.  
- Hawes Green is in the conservation area thus tree-felling and any building development are subject to more rigorous planning expectations.
• The Council and neighbours remain concerned on the impact of the present proposal on the street scene as the proposed property is much greater in size, height and scale and being close to the road will therefore be very prominent.

• Hawes Green is the original site of the cottage hospital which was re-sited in Norwich and became the original Norfolk and Norwich Hospital. It therefore is a Site of Outstanding Historical Importance to the village and Norfolk.

• Any extension should be to the side and at the existing roof line.

3.2 District Member  To be determined by committee

• Local concerns about the height of the proposed building and the effect on the Conservation Area

3.3 NCC Highways  Support with conditions

3.4 Representations  Three letters of objection:

• Will result in privacy issues
• Extension must be sympathetic to the character of Hawes Green
• Accommodation could be accommodated within the roof without the need to raise it
• To raise the height of the roof would cause it to protrude and look out of proportion with other properties
• Trees and shrubs removed from the site would have helped to screen the property
• Issue with foul water drains on the site
• Hawes Green is a historic hamlet and it would be nice to keep it that way
• Prominent location in Conservation Area
• Scale and size similar to those on the withdrawn application
• Introduction of gables is regrettable
• Although existing building has no historic relevance to surrounding properties most properties are one and half stories red brick and clay pan tiles
• Archers House is the only two storey building and was the main hospital building.
• Group of building although not statutorily listed are of historic interest
• Our outlook and views would be obscured and there is a gable facing us albeit with obscure glass
• All other properties have extended within existing rooflines
• The proposed dwelling on an elevated site and will impact on surrounding properties
• Addresses some of the concerns with the removal of gothic front door, porch and balcony
• The gable end is less proposed but the roofline remains at the increased height and the roof hipped removed it still represents a prominent and incongruous building.
• Fails to address Conservation Officer’s previous comments

4  Assessment

4.1 The application relates to an existing hipped bungalow which is located within the hamlet of Hawes Green in Shotesham. The site is outside any development limit defined by the Site Specific Allocation Document and is within the Conservation Area. The bungalow forms part of a small group of dwellings. An earlier application 2015/2332 was withdrawn.
The application is for a substantial extension to the bungalow to make it into a family home including the raising the height of the roof to create a one and a half storey dwelling and rendering the property.

Policies DM3.5 and DM3.6 require extensions to dwellings in the open countryside to be compatible with the character and appearance of the area and respect the landscape setting as well as ensuring the amenity of surrounding properties is not compromised.

In addition because the site is within a Conservation Area there is a statutory duty under S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990: “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. Policy DM4.10 also gives considerable weight to any harm caused by the development to heritage assets in the planning balance.

The site is within the Conservation Area and the dwelling forms part of a group of building which included a cottage hospital, the buildings have historic value but not are listed and have been altered. The bungalow subject to this application dates from the early to mid-twentieth century, and because of the pattern of development and retention of high hedges the lane passing through the settlement retains a very rural feel with landscaping rather than buildings dominating approach views. The existing bungalow sits discretely in its context with only the pantile roof visible. The Conservation Officer considers in principle the building could be replaced or substantially altered and can be considered as neutral in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The previous withdrawn scheme had design features which made it prominent in views along the lane, although there are similarities in the design between the present proposal and the previous design, the projecting gable now only projects slightly forward of the building line of the principle part of the building It is also much simpler in design with a more traditional rather than overtly modern style with the balcony feature and the ‘gothic’ porch omitted. The main part of the building resembles existing traditional housing in its design with low eaves, and the side bay is very similar to traditional side extensions to such houses. In terms of design, the Conservation Officer considers the proposal is acceptable.

With regard to the impact on the conservation area, the scale, bulk and height of the building (omitting the projecting side element) remains the same, and will have significantly greater impact on views along the lane in the conservation area than the existing bungalow. However, if designed with careful selection of traditional brick and tiles and colour of render, then the building will not appear incongruous as a building when viewed in the wider context as similar houses exist within the countryside settings within the wider area. The changes to the projecting bay element of the design in particularly will make the building appear more recessive than the previous proposal which had a side bay projecting more forward and had a very prominent first floor balcony design feature.

The Conservation Officer considers that although the proposal will result in a degree of harm to the conservation area from an increased in scale, height and bulk of the building over the existing building, the appearance of the building will not appear incongruous, and therefore on balance the proposal is considered to be acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

In term of concern of loss of privacy the proposed windows would face towards the garage car parking area of the property on the opposite side of the road and towards the side wall of the dwelling to the rear. It is considered given the position the dwelling would not result in a significant loss of amenity to the surrounding properties in accordance with policy DM3.13 in the Development Management Policies.
4.10 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

4.11 This application is liable for CIL under the Regulations, however, Cabinet resolved on 7/12/2015 to no longer apply CIL to domestic extensions.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The proposal will result in a degree of harm to the conservation area from an increased in scale, height and bulk of the building over the existing building, the appearance of the building will not however appear incongruous, and therefore on balance the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would not result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Helen Bowman 01508 533833 hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applications submitted by South Norfolk Council

19. Appl. No : 2016/0019/F
   Parish : LONG STRATTON
   Applicants Name : Mr Trevor Haystead
   Site Address : Cygnet House Swan Lane Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2XE
   Proposal : Construction of a temporary access to show homes.

Recommendation : Approval with conditions
1  In accord with submitted drawings
2  Temporary access
3  Access as shown on plan
4  Access is to serve block 25 only (no through road)
5  Visibility splay provision
6  Construction hours
7  Reporting of unexpected contamination

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   NPPF 01 : Building a strong competitive economy
   NPPF 03 : Supporting a prosperous rural economy
   NPPF 06 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
   NPPF 07 : Requiring good design
   NPPF 10 : Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
   Policy 2 : Promoting good design
   Policy 3 : Energy and water
   Policy 4 : Housing delivery
   Policy 5 : The Economy
   Policy 6 : Access and Transportation
   Policy 14 : Key Service Centres

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   Development Management Policies
   DM1.1 : Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
   DM1.2 : Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations
   DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development
   DM2.1 : Employment and business development
   DM3.1 : Meeting Housing requirements and needs
   DM3.10 : Promotion of sustainable transport
   DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
   DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking
   DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
   DM3.14 : Pollution, health and safety
   DM3.15 : Outdoor play facilities/recreational space
   DM3.16 : Improving level of community facilities
   DM3.2 : Meeting rural housing needs
   DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
   DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management
   DM4.3 : Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
   DM4.4 : Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space
   DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
Development Management Committee  2 March 2016

DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/0265 Outline application for the demolition of Cygnet House and development of up to 50 residential units (class C3) and up to 800 square metres (class B1) floor space, together with associated highway works Approved

2.2 2014/2278 Variation of conditions 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 28, 30, 31 of planning permission 2013/0265/O to enable demolition prior to commencement of development and variation of condition 29 to vary red line for alterations to access Approved

2.3 2015/0385 Reserved Matters Application of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 50 dwellings (Class C3), 800sq.m. of Office (Class B1(a)), together with the discharge of conditions 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, and 30 relating to outline consent 2014/2278 under consideration

2.4 2015/1089 Proposed advertising hoarding boards. Approved

2.5 2015/2858 Variation of condition 8 of planning permission 2014/2278/RVC - Amended from a pre-commencement to a pre-occupation condition to allow the commencement of the development on site under consideration

2.6 2012/0562 Screening opinion for residential development

2.7 1999/0872 Erection of standby generator in acoustic enclosure and fuel tank Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Concerns in relation to the impact the additional entrance will have on pedestrians accessing the school and leisure centre. Pedestrian crossing is necessary.

3.2 District Member Can be a delegated decision

3.3 NCC Highways No objection, recommended conditions and Informative regarding:
- Access detail
- Access is to serve block 25 only no through access
- Visibility splays
- Informative - works to public highway
3.4 SNC Landscape Officer  No Objection

3.5 SNC Community Services - Landscape Officer  No objection. There is an existing requirement to undertake soil remediation on the site as covered by a condition on the outline consent. A note in regards to construction hours is requested.

3.6 Representations  No comments received at the time of writing this report

4 Assessment

4.1 The site is located within Long Stratton a designated key service centre in accordance with the Joint Core Strategy settlement hierarchy. The site is situated north of Swan Lane adjacent to the South Norfolk District Offices (west) and residential housing (east), which is accessed via St Michaels Road.

4.2 The site is situated within the development boundary and Norwich Policy Area.

4.3 This proposal is in connection with wider planning history in connection with this site as seen in the planning history section of the report.

4.4 This proposal seeks permission for the temporary vehicular access to show homes. The new temporary access would front onto Swan Lane and serve block 25. The proposed new access positioning would be within close proximity with Manor Road 'T' junction, the distance would be 10.7 metres east (from Manor Road opening to the new proposed opening). The measurement from the middle of both Manor Road junction and the proposed new access junction would be 25 metres.

4.5 There will be good visibility out of the proposed new access when looking both left and right and when entering in and out of the new proposed 'T' junction.

4.6 The proposed access opening will accommodate four parking spaces to the show homes.

4.7 The development will mainly comprise of block paving as indicated on proposed plan 116_Rev C.

4.8 Public consultation is still ongoing at the time of writing this report. Members will be updated of any comments received at Committee.

Background context

4.9 Outline planning permission was approved with conditions in 2013 under reference 2013/0265 for the demolition of Cygnet House and development of up to 50 residential units, together with associated highway works. It was only the principle, number and access were for consideration at the time with all other matters reserved. A variation of condition application has been approved under reference 2015/2278 to enable demolition prior to the commencement of the development and also make a minor amendment to the application red line boundary.

4.10 Application 2015/2858 variation of condition application sought to vary 2015/2278, which has recently been approved with conditions at January 2016 committee. Reserved matters application 2015/0385 was approved with conditions. Members considered the reserved matters application (2015/0385) at the June 2015 meeting where authority to delegate approval of the application was given to the Director of Growth and Localism to allow the final details regarding the conditions to be resolved prior to determination. There were outstanding condition matters regarding highways and contamination in regard to 2015/0385. Application 2015/2858 varies the contamination condition.
Principle

4.11 The principle of development has already been established through previous approved applications as seen within the planning history section of this report. This application is part of the subsequent detail needs for the site to be completed.

4.12 This proposal is to address the access needed for the show homes that are to be erected towards the front of the site known in this application as block 25, which will be for two semi-detached properties known as dwelling 49 and 50.

Contaminated Land

4.13 The contamination on the site relates to a former above ground tank, which contained oil for the central heating for the former care home on the site in addition to red diesel for vehicles associated with SNC. The contamination is in the form of floating oil (free product) and dissolved phase hydrocarbons and these are present under and around the former care home.

4.14 The main associated risk from this contamination is risk to ground water in addition to human health and property.

4.15 The Planning and Contamination Briefing Note submitted with this application states contamination is present in the southern part of the site where the temporary access will in part be located. The contamination issue is being addressed as part of the applications associated with the wider redevelopment proposals.

4.16 Members will note that the Environment Agency and Environmental Services have previously advised under application 2015/2858, which was reported to committee in January 2016, that the development can commence and any outstanding contamination matters (as required by condition) can be addressed prior to occupation of the dwellings/office development.

4.17 This application is therefore acceptable in terms of contamination.

Highway impact

4.18 The Parish Council have raised concerns regarding the impact the additional entrance will have on pedestrians accessing the school and leisure centre.

4.19 I do not consider the temporary access to have any adverse impact on pedestrians crossing. The proposed temporary access will be on the opposite side of the road from the school and positioned some distance (approx. over 100 metres) from the school. The proposed new temporary access would be constructed from paving and the area where the new access meets the existing public footpath will be reinstated as existing. Therefore, I do not consider the proposed new temporary access to cause any significant difference to what already happens during busy traffic periods when pedestrians and vehicles are moving about. Furthermore, the Highways Authority has not raised any objections to the proposed development. Based on my assessment above I am of the opinion a pedestrian crossing is not necessary or directly relevant to the impacts of this proposal for a temporary construction access as Swan Lane already contains speed bumps and the road is limited to 20mph, which is appropriate and proportionate for pedestrian crossing and vehicle movements. This matter was given due consideration through the consideration of the original permission to develop the site for dwellings.

4.20 The proposed temporary access is acceptable in highway terms having no adverse impact on highway safety or the safe and free flow of traffic.
4.21 The proposal would not affect the integrity of any internationally protected site (Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation) individually or in accumulation with other permitted development and extant consents in the surrounding areas and therefore, in accordance with Regulation 61 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, it is considered that the development would not have a significant impact on any protected habitats and accordingly no Appropriate Assessment of the development is required.

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

4.22 The original outline application was screened under the EIA Regulations 2011, this concluded that the Development was not EIA development and did not require an Environmental Statement. Consideration has been had to the proposal being sought and the EIA regulations. It is considered this proposal does not require EIA as previous. The proposed access would not give rise to significant impacts and the matters in relation to contamination are being dealt with under previous applications as mentioned earlier in this report.

Other considerations

4.23 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.

4.24 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as no new building floorspace is created.

5 Conclusion

5.1 Subject to no objection from the Environmental Services Team, no substantive objection being received from local residents, and the imposition of conditions in respect of construction of re-instatement of the access, it is considered that the proposal to temporarily construct an access to the show homes is acceptable and accords with the Development Plan and approval is therefore recommended.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Elizabeth Thomas ethomas@s-norfolk.gov.uk
20. **Appl. No**: 2016/0043/RVC  
**Parish**: Poringland

**Applicants Name**: Big Sky Developments Ltd  
**Site Address**: Land North Of Shotesham Road Poringland Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Variation of Condition 2 of permission 2014/0393/D - Revisions to plot house types, parking and materials

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

1. Conditions on previous permission  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
3. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
4. Ecological management plan  
5. Provision of Bat and Bird boxes (discharged under 2014/1772)  
6. Tree protection  
7. No dig in root protection (discharged under 2014/1772)  
8. Implement landscaping scheme  
9. Retention trees and hedges  
10. New Water Efficiency  
11. Slab levels to accord (discharged under 2014/1772)  
12. Restrict office use to B1 use only

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   - NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
   - NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
   - NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
   - NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   - Policy 2: Promoting good design  
   - Policy 3: Energy and water  
   - Policy 4: Housing delivery  
   - Policy 5: The Economy  
   - Policy 14: Key Service Centres  
   - Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   - Development Management Policies  
   - DM4.4: Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space  
   - DM4.5: Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys  
   - DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
   - DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
   - DM1.2: Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations  
   - DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
   - DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
   - DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
   - DM3.2: Meeting rural housing needs  
   - DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
   - DM3.10: Promotion of sustainable transport  
   - DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
   - DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
   - DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
   - DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety  
   - DM3.15: Outdoor play facilities/recreational space
DM4.1 : Renewable Energy  
DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.3 : Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste  
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design

1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies  
POR 6 : Land north of Shotesham Road and east of Carr Lane

2. Planning History

2.1 2011/0661 Construction of Spine Road (Carr Lane to Shotesham Road), surface water lagoon and associated works Approved

2.2 2011/0476 Residential & Commercial (office) Development Approved

2.3 2014/0319 Residential layout including all house details and landscaping for next phase following planning permission 2011/0476/O Approved

2.4 2014/0393 Reserved Matters application for 57 dwellings and 3539m2 (GIA) office accommodation, associated parking and green spaces Approved

2.5 2014/0498 Variation of conditions 2 and 3 of planning permission 2011/0661/F- (Construction of Spine Road (Carr Lane to Shotesham Road), surface water lagoon and associated works) - construction in accordance with submitted drawings and construction of drainage lagoon Approved

2.6 2014/0714 Discharge of conditions 9 and 10 of planning permission 2011/0476/O- detailed schemes for speed limits, foot/cycleway and works to Carr Lane Approved

2.7 2014/0991 Discharge of condition 12 of planning permission 2011/0476- Speed limit Approved

2.8 2014/1107 Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 7, 8, 13, 15, 16 & 17 of planning permission 2011/0476/O - Drainage, Highways, traffic management, wheel cleaning, foul and surface water, landscaping, tree protection and boundary treatment Approved

2.9 2014/1772 Discharge of conditions 5, 7 & 11 of planning permission 2014/0393/D - Provision of bat and bird boxes, root protection areas and existing ground/proposed floor levels & boundary treatments Approved

2.10 2014/1856 Discharge of condition 3 of planning permission 2014/0319/D - Hard and soft landscaping details Approved
2.11 2014/1967 Non material amendment to planning permission 2014/0393/D - Reposition of the electricity substation, amendments to commercial units 3 & 4 elevations with the introduction of plant room extractor grilles and amendments to the residential facing bricks schedule. Approved

2.12 2014/2011 Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 of Norfolk Homes and Badger Building phases of planning permission 2011/0476 Approved

2.13 2014/2150 Discharge of condition 11 of planning permission 2011/0476/O - Travel Plan Approved

2.14 2014/2470 Revision to plot no1 - Facing bricks and roof tiles. Approved

2.15 2014/2568 Non material amendment to planning permission 2014/0393/D - Revisions to plots 11 and 16, external finishes. Approved

2.16 2015/0631 Variation of Condition 2 following planning application 2014/0393/D - Material change to windows and doors for the residential units and external changes to the materials for the commercial units Approved

2.17 2015/0973 Display of advertisements to include main development board, entrance direction boards, show home external sign, visitors car parking, external sales office sign, flag poles Approved

2.18 2015/2893 Variation of Condition 9 of planning permission 2011/0476 - Amend condition to require off-site highway works to be completed prior to occupation of 100th dwelling instead of 50th dwelling. under consideration

2.19 2016/0043 Variation of Condition 2 of permission 2014/0393/D - Revisions to plot house types, parking and materials under consideration

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council No view or comments

3.2 District Member Can be a delegated decision

3.3 NCC Highways No comments received

3.4 SNC Landscape Officer To be reported.

3.5 NCC Ecologist Providing the commitments made to ecology in application 2014/1772 remain the same ecology have no further comments to make.
3.6 **SNC Play and Amenities Manager**  To be reported if appropriate

3.7 **Anglian Water Services Ltd**  No comments

3.8 **SNC Conservation And Design**  Minor changes proposed modifications to be determined by the case officer.

3.9 **Environment Agency**  No comments received

3.10 **SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager**  No Objections

3.11 **NCC Planning Obligations Co Ordinator**  No comments received

3.12 **Police Architectural Liaison Officer**  No comments received

3.13 **SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team**  Wish to ensure the developer has considered any increase in the overall impermeable area and that there is available capacity within the proposed surface water drainage system to accommodate any increase in volumes discharging to this system.

3.14 **Norfolk Wildlife Trust**  No comments received

3.15 **Natural England**  No comment

3.16 **Health And Safety Executive**  No comments received

3.17 **Representations**  None

**4. Assessment**

4.1 The site is situated within the development boundary of Poringland a designated Key Service Centre south of Norwich City along the B1332 highway route.

4.2 The site in question is part of a strategically allocated housing allocation referenced as POR 6 in the adopted Site Specific Allocations & Policies Document (Oct 2015).

4.3 This application is in relation to 2014/0393, which was a reserved matters application for Area D (South Norfolk's part of the site). Both this application (2016/0043) and the reserved matters application (2014/0393) are subsequent to the outline application 2011/0476.

4.4 The site and wider context of the allocation contains some planning history, which includes some other variations of conditions to the same site.

4.5 Application 2015/0631 varied condition 2 of application 2014/0393 to amend materials to windows and doors for the residential units and external changes to the materials for the commercial units.
4.6 Application 2014/1772 discharged conditions 5, 7 and 11 of application 2014/0393.

4.7 The application seeks permission to vary condition 2 of permission 2014/0393/D - for the revisions to plot house types, parking and materials.

4.8 The proposal development would vary the following details:

4.9 Plot 17 - increase floor area 31ft²
   Previous House Type 4/1450
   Proposed House Type J 4 bed /1481
   Attached garage

4.10 Plot 19 - Change to the house type; increase in floor area 86ft²
   Previous House Type 4/1481
   Proposed House Type H 4 bed /1567
   Attached garage

4.11 Plot 21 - increase in floor area by 13 ft²
   Previous House Type 4/1450 ft²
   Proposed House Type J 4 bed /1481
   Attached garage

4.12 Plot 24 - reduction of 4 ft²
   Previous House Type 2/897
   Proposed House Type D 2 bed / 893

4.13 Plot 25 - reduction of 4 ft²
   Previous House Type 2/897
   Proposed House Type D 2 bed / 893

4.14 Plot 27 - increase 26.9 ft² in floor area
   Previous House Type 4/1356
   Proposed House Type G 4 bed / 1356
   Rear bay window added - 26.9ft²
   Proposed garage to rear garden

4.15 Plot 29 - increase 26.9 ft² in floor area
   Previous House Type 4/1356
   Proposed House Type G 4 bed / 1356
   Rear bay window added - 26.9ft²
   Proposed garage to rear garden

4.16 Plot 30 - increase 26.9 ft² in floor area
   Previous House Type 4/1356
   Proposed House Type G 4 bed / 1356
   Rear bay window added - 26.9 ft²
   Proposed garage to rear garden

4.17 Plot 38 - increase 106 ft² in floor area - change to house type
   Previous House Type 2/1069
   Proposed House Type K 3 bed / 1175 2.5 storey

4.18 Plot 39 - increase 129 ft² in floor area - change in house type
   Previous House Type 3/1046
   Proposed House Type K 3 bed / 1175 2.5 storey
4.19 Plot 46 - reduction of 258 ft² - change to House Type
Previous House Type 2/ 764
Proposed House Type L 1 bed / 506 apartment
Single cart lodge space

4.20 Plot 47 - reduction of 374 ft² - change to House Type
Previous House Type 2/ 880 apartment
Proposed House Type L 1 bed / 506 apartment
Single cart lodge space

4.21 Plot 48 - reduction of 1 ft²
Previous House Type 3/ 1045
Proposed House Type C 3 bed / 1044
Single cart lodge space

4.22 Plot 49 - reduction of 281 ft² - change to House Type
Previous House Type 3/ 1045
Proposed House Type F 2 bed / 764

4.23 Plot 50 - increase 280 ft² - change of House Type
Previous House Type 2/ 764
Proposed House Type C 3 bed / 1044

4.24 Plot 57 - increase 2 ft²
Previous House Type 2/ 919
Proposed House Type N 2 bed / 921 wheel chair bungalow

4.25 Parking:

Plots 17-21 attached double garages
Plot 22 double garage
Plot 23 single attached garage
Plot 26 garage added to rear garden
Plots 27+28 garage added to rear garden
Plots 29, 30+31 garage added to rear garden
Plot 32 attached
Plots 33-36 as before - cart lodge
Plot 37 attached garage
Plots 38+39 as before
Plots 40-43 garage + car parking revised
Plots 44-48 all open frontage parking cart lodge style under plots
Plots 49-52 parking spaces
Plots 53 - 56 as before
Plot 57 2 2 no spaces

4.26 In comparing the proposed variation of condition 2 with the previous proposal under application reference 2014/0393 it is apparent the variations to the above plots would be modest changes that would see the majority of changes amending floor areas by way of increasing or decreasing floor areas and house types, which would still comply with design policy and criteria. The main changes affect the above named plots. The main consideration is the impact of the changes on the overall design and concept. In my opinion, I consider the changes acceptable. The units represent good design in accordance with the NPPF and Policy 2 of JCS.

4.27 The housing officer has no objections with the changes in floor areas to the affordable property types and believes the mix is appropriate to meet needs.
4.28 The Environmental Quality Team comments regard the overall impermeable area, which I have addressed below.

4.29 The Ecology Officer provided the following comments: providing the commitments made to ecology in application 2014/1772 remains the same ecology have no further comments to make.

4.30 Application 2014/1772 was for the Discharge of Conditions 5, 7 and 11 (bat and bird boxes, root protection areas and existing ground/proposed floor levels & boundary treatments) of planning permission 2014/0393. This application regards condition two, specifically in relation to the increasing and decreasing of floor space. Therefore, in my opinion, I do not consider this application to affect the previous ecology comments, which specifically regarded species enhancements and urban wildlife and street lights.

4.31 Furthermore, the agent of this current application has confirmed in an email dated 16/02/2016 this proposed variation of condition will not affect street lighting as there are no changes proposed to the road/footpath layouts, which is also the same for the bird and bat boxes. There is also no increase to the impermeable area around the site some of the lengths of the drives have been reduced to increase rear gardens such as plots 17 - 21. In my opinion, this addresses the comments made by the Environmental Quality Team.

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 is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5 Conclusion

5.1 Overall I do not consider the proposed variation of condition 2 to cause any significant impact or harm or to affect significantly the previous outline approval 2014/0393. The variations are considered minor and modest for the size of the approved scheme.

5.2 No significant objections have been raised to the proposed variation of condition 2 and any matters raised have been addressed in this report.

5.3 The proposed changes will not adversely affect the amenities of the neighbouring residential properties neither highway safety.

5.4 I recommend this application is approved with conditions.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
21. **Appl. No**: 2016/0216/RVC  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: South Norfolk District Council  
Site Address: Wymondham Leisure Centre Norwich Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0NT  
Proposal: Variation of condition 2 of permission 2015/0581 - Fire escape stairs has been added and the fire escape door has been moved into the new cladding panel.

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. **Conditions on previous permission**  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Materials to accord with agreed  
4. Hours of use

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities

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 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment  
Policy 13: Main Towns

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM2.1: Employment and business development  
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety  
DM3.16: Improving level of community facilities

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2015/0581: External - Extension to reception creating new cafe and larger reception area, extension to sports hall to create a new two storey fitness area. Internal - General refurbishment to all areas, new spa, separation to swimming pool & new soft play.  

2.2 2015/2066: Discharge of condition 3 of planning permission 2015/0581 - materials

2.3 2015/2127: Non-material amendment to planning permission 2015/2581 - Windows shown to entrance curtain walling, new plant shown to link building, and proposed windows removed from pool.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Application Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2015/2244</td>
<td>Removal of condition 2 following planning application 2015/0581/F - The surround to the external escape stairs which is not a general circulation stairs is to be removed due to no requirement under building regulations this will create a less intrusive visual elevation from neighbouring properties. By drawing re-submittal</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2016/0216</td>
<td>Variation of condition 2 of permission 2015/0581- Fire escape stairs has been added and the fire escape door has been moved into the new cladding panel.</td>
<td>under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2010/0700</td>
<td>Erection of external signage</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Town Council** Approve

3.2 **District Member** To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 **NCC Highways** To be reported to committee.

3.4 **Representations** No comments received

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The site is Wymondham Leisure Centre, a facility on Norwich Road in Wymondham, which is owned and operated by South Norfolk Council. The Leisure Centre is within the development boundary of the town, with Wymondham High School to the north-west and north-east, and residential development to the south-west and south-east.

4.2 This application seeks permission to vary condition 2 of permission 2015/0581- To reconfigure fire escape stairs to be added and for the fire escape door to be moved into the new cladding panel in the south west elevation.

4.3 This is a subsequent application to 2015/2244/RVC, which was for the removal/variation of condition 2 to planning application 2015/0581/F, which specifically obtained planning permission to remove the external surround to the external escape stairs.

4.4 The application is being reported to Development Management Committee because the applicant is South Norfolk Council. The main issues to be considered are the principle of development, design and visual impact, impact on neighbouring occupiers, and highway impact.

4.5 The site lies within the development boundary of Wymondham and is for a leisure and community use. The principle of development is, therefore, in accordance with policies 8 and 13 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (JCS).
Design and Visual Impact

4.6 This application seeks to move the fire escape door into the new cladding panel, which is located to the south west elevation and reconfigure the fire escape stairs. It is considered that the reconfigured fire escape door and stairs would not adversely impact on the design of the approved scheme, which significantly enhances the main frontage of the building, modernising its appearance and creating a more active frontage, and are key part of the redevelopment proposals. The design accords with policy 2 of the JCS and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Impact on Neighbouring Occupiers

4.7 There are a number of residential properties on Norwich Road and Orchard Way, which are in close proximity to the site and the location of the escape stairs. The rear gardens of these properties back on to the application site. Given that the stairs will not be used for general circulation, whilst it would enable overlooking into the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties, I do not consider that they would give rise to a situation so detrimental to amenities of the neighbouring residential properties to warrant refusal. At the time of writing the consultation period has not expired and any neighbouring representation will be reported to committee. The proposal complies with Policy DM 3.13 in that it will safeguard residential amenity.

Highways Impact

4.8 In my opinion, given the previous removal/variation of condition 2 to application reference 2015/2244 it is unlikely the Highways Authority would object to this subsequent variation as there is not a significant difference in the two variation applications.

4.9 At the time of writing the consultation period has not expired and any statutory consultee representation will be reported to committee.

4.10 This revised application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the floor area is not increased.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The scheme to redevelop Wymondham Leisure Centre would greatly improve the sporting and leisure facilities available to the local community, with associated benefits to health and quality of life. The proposed variation to reconfigure the fire escape stairs and door will still allow for good design of the scheme and I consider should not adversely impact on the amenities of the surrounding residential area to a material degree or adversely affect the highway network.

5.2 The proposal complies with all relevant planning policies and guidance listed in this report, and is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Enforcement Report

1. **Enforcement Ref**: 2015/8008  
   **Parish**: SURLINGHAM

   **Site Address**: Builders Store, Beerlicks Loke, Surlingham, Norfolk, NR14 7AJ
   **Development**: Unauthorised fence
   **Developer**: Mr T Guyton & Mr S Hall

1. **Background**

1.1 Members will recall this matter was heard at the 9th December 2015 Development Management Committee where it was resolved that authority be given to require the fence to be painted a dark recessive green or brown colour. This report is attached as Appendix 2. Since then the fence has been reduced in height to 2 metres.

2. **Planning Policies**

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   Policy 7 – Requiring Good Design

2.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 2 – Promoting Good Design

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
   Development Management Policies  
   Policy 3.8 Design Principles

3. **Relevant Planning History**

3.1 2011/0631 Certificate of Lawfulness – Existing use as Builders yard/store and Manufacture of Play Equipment pursuant to and in accordance with planning permission 1995/0647

   **Status**: Approved

3.2 2009/0914 Proposed additional storage building and replacement building

   **Status**: Withdrawn

3.3 1995/0647 Renewal of permission 93/0235/F to continue to allow manufacture of playground equipment

   **Status**: Approved

4. **Assessment**

4.1 Whilst the unauthorised fence and gates have been reduced to 2 metres in height they are still unauthorised. However, the owners could erect a new fence of 2 metres in height without requiring planning permission and this fence could be constructed of any materials and be any colour. In view of this I no longer consider it expedient to take the enforcement action authorised at the Development Management Committee on the 9th December 2015 and consider that no further action should be taken on the matter.
5 Recommendation

5.1 That no further action be taken on the matter.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Andy Baines, 01508 533840 abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk
## Appendix 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th><strong>Enforcement Ref</strong></th>
<th>: 2015/8008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parish</strong></td>
<td>: SURLINGHAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Site Address</strong></td>
<td>: Builders Store, Beerlicks Loke, Surlingham, Norfolk, NR14 7AJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td>: Unauthorised fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Developer</strong></td>
<td>: Mr T Guyton &amp; Mr S Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Background**

1.1 It was brought to the Council’s attention that a new fence and entrance gates had been erected at the above site. Following a visit to the site it was apparent the fence and gates exceed the permitted height of 2metres. The owners of the site were invited to submit an application to regularise the fence but unfortunately no application has been submitted and the fence remains in situ.

1.2 The fence and gates are constructed of white metal corrugated sheeting and have wooden telegraph pole support posts. The fence and gates are approximately 2.2metres in height and the posts are up to 3.2metres in height.

2. **Planning Policies**

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   - Policy 7 – Requiring Good Design

2.2 Joint Core Strategy
   - Policy 2 – Promoting Good Design

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   - Development Management Policies
     - Policy 3.8 - Design Principles

3. **Relevant Planning History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Year</th>
<th>Approval Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/0631</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawfulness - Existing use as Builders yard/store and Manufacture of Play Equipment pursuant to and in accordance with planning permission 1995/0647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/0914</td>
<td>Proposed additional storage building and replacement building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/0647</td>
<td>Renewal of permission 93/0235/F to continue to allow manufacture of playground equipment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Consultations**

4.1 Parish Council
   - No comments received

4.2 District Member
   - To be reported if appropriate

4.3 Local Residents
   - 6 letters received raising a number of concerns
     - Not in keeping with surroundings
     - More appropriate fencing could be erected whilst still providing the security required
     - Looks like high security/prison fencing, warehouses etc
Assessment

5.1 The site is located down a small private loke in a rural area just off The Street. There are residential properties to the west and south and the Broads to the east.

5.2 A number of concerns have been received from the nearby residents relating to the appearance of the fence and gates and their impact on the surroundings. Further concerns have been received relating to the relocation of the access gates closer to the loke and the adjacent property and relating to its structural integrity.

5.3 The concerns relating to the location of the fence and gates closer to the loke are noted but I do not consider their location marginally closer to the loke has a material impact on the visual amenity of the locality. Again their location marginally closer to the adjacent properties rear boundary will not materially affect their residential amenity.

5.4 The concerns relating to the structural integrity of the development and that they have not been assessed by a building inspector are noted. However, there are no requirements for a building inspector to check boundary fences and the solid construction of the development suggests it is structurally sound.

5.5 The fence and gates by virtue of the materials used, colour and location are considered to have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the locality. The appearance of the development could be improved by painting it a recessive dark green or brown colour. This would soften its impact and help it integrate into its surroundings.

5.6 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.

5.7 This case is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Recommendation

6.1 That enforcement action be authorised requiring the fence be painted a dark recessive green or brown colour with a compliance period of One Month.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:

Andy Baines, 01508 533840 abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk
## Planning Appeals
### Appeals received from 22 January 2016 to 22 February 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/1141</td>
<td>Tharston And Hapton Wheelers Barn Hall Lane Tharston Norfolk NR15 2YF</td>
<td>Mr Alan Pittaway</td>
<td>Continuing use of land for residential garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2247</td>
<td>Ditchingham 50 Norwich Road Ditchingham Norfolk NR35 2JL</td>
<td>Mr S Seaman</td>
<td>Two storey side extension / Single storey rear extension to existing cottage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2550</td>
<td>Great Moulton Hope Valley Low Common Road Great Moulton Norfolk NR16 1LP</td>
<td>Mr Adam Price</td>
<td>Change of use to a mix of single Gypsy and Traveller residential pitch, garden and vehicle parking area, and paddock for the keeping and breeding of horses (revised application)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Planning Appeals
### Appeals decisions from 22 January 2016 to 22 February 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>2014/1642</td>
<td>Swardeston Land Off Bobbins Way Swardeston Norwich NR14 8DT</td>
<td>Jenkinson Properties Ltd</td>
<td>Outline application with all matters reserved except for access for demolition of existing buildings, residential redevelopment and ancillary works</td>
<td>Development Management Committee Note: Referred back to DMC – agreed not to defend the appeal</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Parish / Site</td>
<td>Appellant</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Decision Maker</td>
<td>Final Decision</td>
<td>Appeal Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/0187</td>
<td>Bunwell The Pightle Wymondham Road Bunwell Norfolk NR16 1NB</td>
<td>Mr B Banham</td>
<td>Conversion of existing outbuilding to provide annexe to bungalow</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/0529</td>
<td>Pulham St Mary Tubbys Barn North Green Pulham St Mary Norfolk IP21 4XX</td>
<td>Mr D Clutten</td>
<td>Application for prior approval determination under Class Q (a) (formerly Class MB (a)) of a proposed change of use of agricultural building to 3 dwellings</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Approval of details - Refused</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/0539</td>
<td>Easton The Ash Trees Bawburgh Road Easton Norfolk NR9 5ED</td>
<td>Mr Richard Draper</td>
<td>Replacement of existing mobile home with bungalow</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>