Development
Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

Conservatives
Mr J Mooney (Chairman)
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

Liberal Democrats
Dr M Gray

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 27 April 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.

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

If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance

Large print version can be made available
Please familiarise yourself with this information if you are not in receipt of the agenda.

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

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

THEREFORE we will:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Minutes of the Meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 30 March 2016 (attached – page 10)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 22)
   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>2014/1524/CU</td>
<td>MORNINGTHORPE AND FRITTON</td>
<td>The Grove, Hempnall Road, Fritton, Norfolk, NR15 2LN</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2015/2748/RVC</td>
<td>FLORDON</td>
<td>Tas Valley Mushrooms, The Street, Flordon, Norfolk, NR15 1RN</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2015/2826/F</td>
<td>SEETHING</td>
<td>Land North of Harveys Lane Seething Norfolk</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2016/0389/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Land to the Rear of 35 Lynch Green Hethersett Norfolk</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2016/0495/O</td>
<td>TASBURGH</td>
<td>Land South East of Low Road, Tasburgh, Norfolk</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2016/0519/F</td>
<td>WOODTON</td>
<td>Frogs Farm, Springwood Lane, Woodton, Norfolk, NR35 2NF</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2016/0674/H</td>
<td>TASBURGH</td>
<td>31 Valley Road, Tasburgh, Norfolk, NR15 1NG</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2016/0682/F</td>
<td>CAISTOR ST EDMUND</td>
<td>Venta Icenorum (Roman Town), Stoke Road, Caistor St Edmund, Norfolk</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2016/0749/F</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Leisure Centre, Swan Lane, Long Stratton, Norfolk, NR15 2UY</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

7. Quarterly Enforcement Report (attached – page 80)
8. Planning Appeals (for information) (attached – page 84)

9. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wednesday 25 May 2016
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

Member consideration/decision.

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

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

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

3. FILMING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS: GUIDANCE

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

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

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?

OR

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

YES

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

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

NO

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

YES

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

NO

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

YES

Have I declared the interest as an other interest on my declaration of interest form? OR

Does it relate to a matter highlighted at B that impacts upon my family or a close associate? OR

Does it affect an organisation I am involved with or a member of? OR

Is it a matter I have been, or have lobbied on?

NO

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

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton, on Wednesday 30 March 2016 at 10.00 am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors L Neal (Vice-Chairman), Y Bendle, C Gould, C Kemp, M Gray, G Minshull, B Stone and A Thomas

Apologies: Councillors J Mooney, F Ellis and V Thomson

Substitute Members: Councillors C Easton (for V Thomson), N Legg (for J Mooney), and G Wheatley (for F Ellis)

(Cllr Legg left the meeting after consideration of Application 2)

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors), the Senior Planning Officers (C Curtis, T Lincoln and C Raine), and the Planning Officer (T Barker)

Also in Attendance: A Willard (Highways Agency)

(The press and 73 members of the public were also in attendance)

258. 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>2015/2082/O</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Cllr C Gould, Cllr C Kemp</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr G Wheatley</td>
<td>Other Interest – member lives in vicinity of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2463/RVC</td>
<td>HINGHAM</td>
<td>Cllr Y Bendle</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2496/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0165/O</td>
<td>SCOLE</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Supporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2435/F</td>
<td>GILLINGHAM</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr M Gray</td>
<td>Other Interest – Member of the Broads Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
259. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 2 March 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

260. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

The Committee considered the report (circulated) of the Director of Growth and Localism, which was presented by the officers. The following speakers addressed the meeting with regard to the applications listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/2082/O</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Mr D Goodman - Chairman Bawburgh Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. P Rackham - Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr M Haslam - Agent for the Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015/2463/RVC</td>
<td>HINGHAM</td>
<td>Mr G McQueen – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr T Carr – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr T Abel – On behalf of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr J Russell – On behalf of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2496/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Mr J Mason - Diss Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr N Woods – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miss S Waggett – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr T Palmer – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr K Kiddie – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0165/O</td>
<td>SCOLE</td>
<td>Mr G Moore – Chairman Scole Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr R Marsh Feiley – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr J Wilby – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2435/F</td>
<td>GILLINGHAM</td>
<td>Ms L Edge – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr R Bramley – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr K Mason Billig – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0331/F</td>
<td>TASBURGH</td>
<td>Mr M Thompson – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></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.
261. **ENFORCEMENT REPORTS**

(i) Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Diss (ref 2013/8339).

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

(ii) Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Roydon (2015/8207)

**Updates**

Cllr D Goldson
- I can see there may be a privacy issue, as the side of the window of the porch overlooks the front of the adjacent property
- However the bamboo fence has been erected on the boundary and so close that the owner is unable to fully open her window and the light is restricted
- A compromise could be reached by moving it away from the boundary by a metre
- I therefore object and believe enforcement action should follow if the simple compromise, as suggested above, cannot be reached

Letters from neighbour circulated to members for information

Roydon Parish Council
- Had a planning application been received, the Parish Council would have recommended it for refusal

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

262. **PLANNING APPEALS**

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting closed at 3.32 pm)

_____________________
Chairman
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

Major applications

1. Appl. No : 2015/2082/O
   Parish : BAWBURGH
   Applicants Name : Mr Julian Darling
   Site Address : Land South of Village Hall Stocks Hill Bawburgh Norfolk
   Proposal : Outline application for the residential development of 10 dwellings
   
   Decision : Members voted 7 – 4 for Approval
   
   Approved with conditions
   
   1. Outline Permission Time Limit
   2. In accord with submitted drawings
   3. Standard outline requiring Reserve Matters
   4. Single storey dwellings only
   5. External materials to be agreed
   6. Surface Water drainage to be agreed
   7. Foul drainage to main sewer
   8. Reporting of unexpected contamination
   9. Archaeological work to be agreed
   10. Water Efficiency
   11. Ecology Mitigation
   12. Hedge planting and pond work/maintenance to be agreed
   13. Slab level to be agreed
   14. Boundary treatment to be agreed
   15. Retention trees and hedges
   16. Provision of fire hydrant
   17. Details of roads, footways, foul and surface water drainage to be agreed
   18. Estate Road to accord with agreed details
   19. Road and footways to be constructed to binder course before first occupation
   20. Construction traffic management plan to be agreed
   21. Accord with Construction Traffic Management plan
   22. Highway Improvements - Offsite
   
   Subject to the completion of a S106 to cover affordable housing
Development Management Committee

30 March 2016

Appl. No: 2015/2463/RVC
Parish: HINGHAM

Applicants Name: Mr Paul Legrice
Site Address: Land South of Norwich Road Hingham Norfolk
Proposal: Variation of condition 10 to allow revised drainage strategy of planning permission 2015/1675 – Erection of 88 dwellings

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

Approved with conditions

1. Re-imposition of all conditions of 2015/1675
2. Condition 10 to be varied to require the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted (as amended) drainage scheme

Subject to final surface water queries being resolved with the Lead Local Flood Authority.

Updates

Hingham Society comments –

- Note LLFA now largely content with the strategy
- We remain concerned over maintenance of the pond.
- Concerned about the new pipe with which the developer proposes to replace the old one, to take water from the pond into the ditch on the north side of Seamere Road. We have seen no evidence of the precise outlet point of the old pipe, nor its route from pond to ditch.
- In the event there is a problem with the new pipe and it appears blocked, it could be difficult to determine who exactly is responsible for fixing it.

The LLFA advise that as the infiltration testing was not carried out in accordance with BRE365 standard and repeated in quick succession to the proposed depths of the soakaway that this would not conform with the recommendations in the SuDS manual and not therefore comply with Part a of Condition 10 of the planning permission.

The applicant has advised the following in relation to BRE365 testing:

- Three shallow soakaway tests were carried out at 1.100m depth, to BRE 365, as part of their FRA. A further full BRE 365 test was completed in May 2015. Therefore, we currently have 4No. BRE 365 tests completed on the site, three of which are at a depth appropriate to the permeable design in question (our under the driveway storage/soakaway design has base levels between 0.400m deep and 1.000m deep).
- We have other tests, (Non BRE 365) resulting in poorer infiltration rates, indicating the site to be variable.
- We have designed the driveway storage/soakaways based on the data from the nearest test. It is our understanding, this design basis is allowed within the CIRIA SuDS manual. We concede that not all tests that our design is based on have been conducted to BRE Digest, therefore we would suggest that as this is not acceptable to the checking Engineer, a conditional approval may be granted, based on the current design, but subject to confirmation by further tests conducted to BRE 365 and amendments to the design if appropriate.
- We are now attempting to undertake the additional testing to verify the non BRE365 testing asap and will hope to have the results in prior to the committee meeting.

Additional letters of objection received - new grounds: Concerns that surface water will affect the Sea Mere SSSI in terms of pollution.
In respect of this objection Officers consider that as the proposed drainage strategy employs a number of SuDs elements including the pond and ditch network before this would enter into the wider drainage system feeding into the SSSI that this would afford some treatment and as such the proposed strategy would not harm water quality and residential development is deemed low risk.

**Recommendation** remains as set out in report – delegated authority to approve subject to the infiltration rates for the permeable paving being agreed.

3  **Appl. No**: 2015/2496/F  
**Parish**: DISS

**Applicants Name**: Miss Sophie Waggett  
**Site Address**: Land North of Frenze Hall Lane Diss Norfolk  
**Proposal**: A residential development comprising 142no. dwelling houses with associated accesses, car parking, refuse and recycling provision and landscaping

**Decision**: Members voted 10 – 0 for **Refusal** (contrary to officer recommendation)

**Refused**

**Reasons for Overturning Officer Recommendation**

Members considered the development to be a poor design layout and did not meet the required design standards.

**Updates**

**6 further objections** have been received which largely re-iterate concerns expressed in the report such as traffic related and infrastructure concerns, specific points raised include Falcon Avenue access should be pedestrian only, traffic light should be provided adjacent to the railway bridge, loss of agricultural land when brownfield is available.

**Diss England** - no objection to the proposal.

**Diss Town Council** – object:
In spite of the amendments to the application, it is still considered to be an overdevelopment, will not enhance the town, will have a significant highways impact, will be detrimental residential amenity, and there should be no access to Falcon Avenue.

**Diss Residents Association** – object:
Inadequate and unsafe access for construction traffic, construction traffic management document lacks detail, Persimmon drainage strategy is inadequate, housing layout is too great, lack of contribution to town infrastructure, must ensure that things promised to be delivered are delivered i.e. traffic lights

**NCC Highways** - a few minor comments remain (see below), however, I am content these can be largely dealt with through the detailed design process, therefore would not wish to raise objection:

1. The western pedestrian crossing on Frenze Hall Lane should utilise the build out, instead of being next to it.
2. I welcome the changes to the rear parking court that have removed the tandem parking for plots 24 – 27. However, I remain a little concerned by the parking arrangements for plots
22 & 23 a garage and parking space meets the required parking standard. However, as garages are generally not used and residents do not like rear parking, there is likely to be uncontrolled on-street parking adjacent to these dwellings.

3. Most of the 1 bedroom dwellings still do not provide 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling, although I appreciate these dwellings are spread throughout the development and the potential impact from on-street parking is minimal.

4. The extent of adopted highway forming the turning head adjacent to plots 135 & 136 has not been extended to a total length measuring 27m.

5. I note the visibility splay from the junction adjacent to plot 80 is correctly shown. However, you should be aware that the land which the visibility splay passes over should be adopted highway, not landscaping.

6. As previously stated, for the avoidance of doubt, I will not adopt the type 6 road to the northern boundary.

7. Following changes to the north-west corner there are numerous parking spaces served directly from the adjacent carriageway, which should therefore be setback at least 0.5m. Additionally has adequate access to the adjacent ditch been retained, as I believe there is an Anglian Water connection from the adjacent development into it?

8. How do you get to the front door / rear access of the terrace housing from the adjacent highway, as in many cases there is no connecting path clear of the parking spaces in front of these dwellings.

In respect of the off-site highway improvements on the drawing, for the avoidance of doubt, the footpath to Sycamore Way will only be undertaken by NCC following payment of the outstanding £60K previously agreed from the development to the south, otherwise this development would need to fund it. Whilst the works to the east are being undertaken by NCC, they will be funded by this development and previous contributions by Persimmon and would be secured by condition and subject to a S278 Agreement.

SNC Landscape Officer has concerns and suggests scheme should not be approved as it stands; in particular they would wish to see the issues regarding the eastern landscape buffer, and siting of the drainage lagoon addressed:

1. The revised plan has more in the way of indicative planting and landscape design, but for a ‘full’ application of this scale it is still disappointing; it would be good to have a stronger concept at this stage. The large area of open space now has more of a definite function, but there is still much that could be done.

   Officer response: It is considered that it is appropriate to consider the precise details of the landscaping scheme for the site relating to the open space, northern landscape buffer, site perimeter planting to the southern and western boundary and pedestrian link in the north-western corner of the site can all be reasonably agreed via condition.

   The developer has re-affirmed their willingness to work fully with the Council’s landscape Officer as to what they think is most appropriate for the site.

2. The landscape buffer along the east side of the site does not conform to the requirement in policy DIS4 in that it is less than 10m wide. The addition of a path reduces scope for planting the strip also.

   Officer response: Paragraphs 4.23 to 4.24 of the committee report address this point.

   The agent observes that “the landscape buffer along the eastern boundary does not serve as important a function as that proposed to the northern boundary. The views into the site from the east are broken by the raised railway line while views into the site from the north are more open due to the fields and generally flat topography. Therefore while the northern landscape buffer seeks to provide visual softening of the proposed development from the north, the landscape buffer and POS on the eastern and southern parts of the site provide a pleasant and soft transitional edge to the built form of the development and the existing dwellings on Frenze Hall Lane situated beyond.” The developer has provided an alternative plan that shows for an improved area of planting along the eastern perimeter which is included in the committee
3. The arboricultural assessment has not been revised but I remain concerned about the best/most interesting existing tree - an old oak pollard (T2) at the south east corner of the site – as the proposed drainage lagoon still appears to encroach upon the identified root protection area for this tree (the scheme appears to have been designed prior to the arboricultural constraints being established). We also need to be sure that this tree will not be inadvertently compromised by any consequent highways works here.

Officer response: In terms of seeking to move the lagoon as suggested, given that this is the lowest part of the site moving it does not appear viable. The encroachment into the RPA for T2 is stated as (11%), the assessment observes that due to the ploughed nature of the field, the root system is likely to be deeper and suggests that the lagoons should be designed as not to excavate greater than 250mm in the RPA to minimise any likely harm to the tree roots. This would appear viable through having a low gradient profile to the outer edge of the lagoon.

The agent has added, that the precise size, shape and location of the lagoon will not be known until further on-site investigations are undertaken. The lagoon needs to be situated in the lowest part of the site in order to be able to carry out its function. Again the developer is more happy to fully involve the Landscape Officer in agreeing the design of the lagoon via the suggested condition.

In terms of any highway works, the developer has commented that these are noted on the planning layout for informative purposes only in order to show how the proposed development will relate to these works. The method of construction for the proposed footpath on the site which is shown to connect to the Walcot Green/Frenze Hall Lane junction improvement works can be secured via condition.

4. A hedgerow assessment has been provided and this concludes that the existing hedgerow along Frenze Hall Lane does qualify as ‘important’ as defined by the Hedgerows Regulations. The proposed road access to Frenze Hall Lane breaches this ‘important’ hedgerow; policy DM 4.8 presumes in favour of the retention of ‘important’ hedgerows so we need to have more information about this feature.

Officer response: Whilst the loss of a section of hedgerow is regrettable, it is evident that the allocation requires two accesses into the site, and the limitations of providing an access onto Walcott Green, (road widening would be required and there is a underground gas pipeline in the vicinity of the carriageway) mean that it is inevitable that an access onto Frenze Hall Lane would occur as a result of the allocation. The loss would be compensated by planting along the southern boundary of the site.

The developer has highlighted that in accordance within Policy DM4.8 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows it is considered that the overall benefit of delivering residential development on an allocated site, including the provision of a safe means of access, would clearly out weight the loss of a small proportion of hedgerow. In addition the Hedgerow Regulations state that certain exemptions apply with regards to carrying out works to hedgerows deemed as important. The main relevant exemption that applies to the proposed development is as follows:

Hedge removal in the course of carrying out development for which planning permission has been granted or has deemed to be granted can normally proceed without notification of removal.

The developer has also confirmed that they are are willing to provide replacement and supplementary planting to the hedgerow in order to bolster and maintain its ecological and visual contribution to the benefit of the surrounding environs. The details of the soft landscaping pursuant to the hedge can be secured by way of a suitably worded planning condition.
5. The required landscape buffer to the north (as required by DIS4 will have the potential to provide a visual softening of the development from Walcot Green, but we need to make sure that any planting does not become too overbearing for the dwellings that are adjacent to it.

These all currently have north-facing gardens, and the combination of aspect and maturing vegetation could make the plots unduly oppressive. It is disappointing that the northern landscape buffer does not connect more to the other green space on site – currently the ‘connectivity’ is limited.

Officer response: In terms of potentially creating oppressive gardens along the northern perimeter, the exact nature of the planting is to be agreed by condition, and it is envisaged that the landscape Officer will have significant input on what is agreed. It is not considered that the gardens created would provide unacceptable private amenity spaces whereby a refusal could be justified. The developer has suggested that they envisage small trees such as hawthorn, Hazel, Field Maple and mountain ash, which are native and small in their size, could be planted in the northern landscape buffer.

It is considered that the perimeter planting to the large area of open space which continues along the eastern boundary of the site to the landscape buffer to the north. The Council’s ecologist has not objected to the scheme.

In response to the Design Officer’s comment contained at para 3.4 (2) the developer has considered this, and in particular, the possibility of introducing a two light kitchen window as opposed to a single light unit. However, they do not want to amend the unit as suggested for the following reason:

“The introduction of a two light opening to the kitchen of the Morden housetype would adversely compromise this accommodation. The upright fridge/freezer sits adjacent to the sink and to introduce the two light opening would mean its relocation to another part of the kitchen. The kitchen, as currently shown, has been designed to fully utilise the space and also allow ease of circulation to the different appliances and work surfaces.”

---

4 Appl. No : 2016/0165/O
Parish : SCOLE

Applicants Name : Mr B Tunmore
Site Address : Land West of Norwich Road Scole Norfolk
Proposal : Construction of 18no. dwellings and access road, village hall and parking, open space recreation and wildlife areas [resubmission of application ref. 2015/0436]

Decision : Members voted 7 – 2 with 1 abstention for Approval (contrary to officer recommendation)

Approved with conditions

1. Conditions to be agreed with Planning Officer and S106 to secure land for village hall and £300K contribution.

Reasons for Overturning Officer Recommendation

Members considered that the benefits of the village hall and parking area outweighed any harm to the setting of the church and the fact that the scheme lies outside of the development boundary and the inadequate information sub submitted in relation to trees and flood risk.
### Other Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2014/2435/F</td>
<td>GILLINGHAM</td>
<td>Mr Robin Bramley</td>
<td>Land North of Hill Farm House Yarmouth Road Gillingham Norfolk</td>
<td>To supply and install 2 x 60kw wind turbines (20m tower)</td>
<td>Members voted 10 – 0 for <strong>Refusal</strong>&lt;br&gt;Refused&lt;br&gt;1. Unacceptable impact in the landscape&lt;br&gt;2. Harmful impact on Heritage Assets&lt;br&gt;3. Lack of community support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2016/0408/O</td>
<td>SAXLINGHAM</td>
<td>Mrs Nicola Dix</td>
<td>Land West of Sandpit Lane Saxlingham Nethergate Norfolk</td>
<td>Outline planning permission for a 3 bedroom property</td>
<td>This item has been <strong>withdrawn</strong> by the applicant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8  Appl. No  :  2016/0498/RVC  
Parish  :  PORINGLAND  
Applicants Name  :  Wilkinson Builders Ltd  
Site Address  :  Land South of 40 The Street Poringland Norfolk  
Proposal  :  Variation of condition 2 of planning consent 2013/0713 – to change the materials and provide additional details on tree protection, levels and boundary treatment and ecology  
Decision  :  Members voted 10 – 0 to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to Approve  
Approved with conditions  
1  Full Planning permission time limit  
2  In accord with submitted drawings  
3  External materials to be agreed  
4  Existing access widen and improved  
5  Provision of parking, service  
6  Emergency turning area to be provided  
7  No PD for Classes ABCDE & G  
8  Surface Water  
9  New Water Efficiency  
10  Implement tree protection  
11  Implement boundary treatment  
12  Reporting of unexpected contamination  
13  No further work until protected species licence granted  

Subject to no significant comments being received before the expiry of the consultation on 30th March 2016  

Updates  
NCC highways – no objections  

Applications on land where South Norfolk Council has an interest  

9  Appl. No  :  2015/2893/RVC  
Parish  :  PORINGLAND  
Applicants Name  :  Mr I Jackson  
Site Address  :  Land North of Shotesham Road Poringland Norfolk  
Proposal  :  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 or within nine months of the completion of the Anglian Water works.  
Decision  :  Members voted 9 – 0 for Approval  
Approved with conditions  
1  In accordance with reserved matters  
2  In accordance with approved details & previous conditions  
3  Off-site highway works (amended condition)
Updates

For the avoidance of doubt this application only seeks to vary condition 9 of the original planning application which is for the provision of a footpath and cycleway on The Street and works on Shotesham Road. Works to connect the spine road are covered by a separate condition, with its trigger point of 150 dwellings unaffected by this application.

If members resolve to approve the application, we will ensure the consent is worded so that the 9 months is from completion from the Anglian Water works specific to that section of the highway and not the wider Anglian Water scheme as a whole.
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

1. **Appl. No** : 2014/1524/CU
   **Parish** : MORNINGTHORPE AND FRITTON

   **Applicants Name** : Mr David Carr
   **Site Address** : The Grove Hempnall Road Fritton Norfolk NR15 2LN
   **Proposal** : Retrospective application for Change of use to a mixed use for vehicle storage and depollution facility, motorsport preparation and associated sales, storage, repairs and web based parts supply business.

   **Recommendation** : Approval with Conditions
   1. In accord with submitted drawings
   2. Specific Use
   3. Visibility splay to be provided
   4. Provision of parking, service areas
   5. Noise levels
   6. No power tools outside building
   7. No generators, air handling plant
   8. No stacking of vehicles or materials
   9. No waste disposal on site
   10. Limited Hours of Use
   11. Hedge planting to be provided
   12. Retention trees and hedges
   13. No PD for fences, walls etc.
   14. No external lighting without further consent
   15. No loudspeakers etc. outside building
   16. Activates to be carried out within the building
   17. The area indicated on the plan to be used for staff car parking only
   18. No general public visiting and retail sales direct from site

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   Development Management Policies
   DM1.3 : 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
Development Management Committee  27 April 2016

DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM3.14 : Pollution, health and safety
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design

2. Planning History

2.1 2011/0122  Retention of site access fencing  Approved

2.2 2009/2035  Change of use of existing fabric glass moulding and storage B2 use to vehicle storage and de-pollution facility. (Specific use condition applied)  Approved

2.3 2007/0889  Change of use of existing B2 (electro-plating business) to glass fibre moulding and erection of security fencing. (No restriction on use)  Approved

2.4 2001/0555  Change of use from B1 to B2 (specific use condition applied).  Approved

2.5 2000/0818  Change of use from redundant agricultural site to industrial B1. (Condition excluding B1 office use).  Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Morningthorpe and Fritton Parish Council
- To original
  - Approve

Hempnall Parish Council
- To original
  - Support application subject to our lighting clause, provided that the exterior appearance does not change again and would not support any further expansion

- To amended
  - No comments received

3.2 District Member
- To be determined by committee
  - To fully assess its impact on the surrounding countryside especially in relation to the use of land at the roadside which has been cleared and is now fully visible to passing traffic

3.3 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team
- To the original
  - Require a noise assessment

- To amended
  - No objections subject to conditions

3.4 NCC Highways
- No objections subject to conditions

3.5 Environment Agency
- No objections
3.6 Representations

To the amended scheme

5 letters of objection
- Concern land cleared and hedge and trees removed without consent
- Hedge needs to be high enough to hide both the proposed wire fence and extra collection of larger trucks now parked on site
- Needs to be dense/wide enough to obscure the site in winter
- Type of to provide effective sound barrier
- Further expansion onto agricultural land to east should be prohibited at all costs
- Road safety - now a children's nursery opposite the site which already adds to the traffic and possible hazards, without exacerbating the situation further, with a car showroom
- Already inappropriate large transporters clogging up Hempnall Road
- Inappropriate location for a businesses such as car sales and showroom
- Change of use by stealth
- Application to dump more scrap/junk on to our beautiful countryside
- Why cannot this company transfer its business to an industrial site
- Environmental team have measured the background noise and suggest a limit of additional 5dBA which is 3 times the noise level, suggest 3dBA.
- The site would require a noise meter
- Site to east must not be used for overflow storage
- Concern area where the trees and hedge been remove will be used for the sale of cars
- Cutting down large trees, removal of hedge, erection of unsightly canvas and area behind the fence is now packed with parked vans and vehicles

To the original scheme

3 letter of objection
- Highway safety, inappropriate for extra traffic, poor visibility
- Already 3 garages selling cars and a 4th will cause extra traffic and will detract from existing business
- What is the justification from the current use
- When ES Motorsport started they must have known it was a breach of the planning permission
- Concern re the time taken to make an application
- Car sales are an inappropriate use for the site houses in a rural setting
- Should move to an industrial estate
- Not acceptable in a peaceful residential environment
- Spoil the countryside
- Since application lodged started using very large lorries which are inappropriate for the road, these lorries trying to cross the main road (A140) junction with Hempnall Road cause severe congestion, their entrance and exit from the site is hazardous to other road users

2 letter of no comment

2 letter of support, 1 subject to
- Original business has operated without causing problems
- However now extra noise from revving of engines on the site
- Cars being periodically accelerated very hard along the road - presumably being road-tested
- Would want regulations to avoid causing extra noise
4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks retrospective planning permission for the change of use to a mixed use for vehicle storage and depollution facility, motorsport preparation and associated sales, storage, repair and web based parts supply business, at The grove, Hempnall Road, Fritton. To the south, east and west of the site is open countryside, to the north on the opposite side of the road is the newly built Jack in the Box (children’s nursery), Apple International (business use) and residential properties. The site is outside the development boundaries for the surrounding villages.

4.2 The site’s agricultural use has long since ceased with consents for changes of use in 2000, 2001, 2007 and 2009. This site has been used for an electro-plating business and glass fibre moulding which included the erection of the security fencing. The nature of the permitted uses, since the 2007 consent have included external storage of materials and vehicles which have been visible from the surrounding area.

4.3 The main issues in this case are the principle of the use, highway safety, impact on residential amenities and the impact on visual amenities.

Principle of the use

4.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 3: Supporting a prosperous rural economy supports growth and expansion of business and promotes development in the rural areas. The South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) and Joint Core Strategy (JCS) policies support employment subject to normal planning requirements. The proposal is for the continued use of the site for both its permitted use as a de-pollution, vehicle storage and dismantling facility with the diversification into motorsport preparation and associated internet sales, storage, repairs and web based parts supply business. The applicants supporting letter is attached for member’s information as Appendix 2. At the time of the original submission in 2014 the existing employees where 8 full-time and 2 part-time, this I understand has increase in number. The proposal to retain the diversification into motorsport for an existing well established business accords with the NPPF, JCS and SNLP as it supports sustainable growth through the expansion of existing business and sustains an economic and social activity in a rural community.

Highway Safety

4.5 Policy DM3.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would endanger highway safety or the satisfactory functioning of the highway network. The Highway officer has assessed the application and commented that the levels of additional traffic involved with the business are not unacceptable. In terms of visibility from the site entrance, this was acceptable from the easterly direction but is limited in the westerly direction. Subsequent to these comments being made, the hedge and tree have been removed from the site frontage. Following their removal additional information has been submitted showing re-planting of the hedge and its location taking into account the required visibility splay. In view of the above, the Highways Authority raises no objections to the development. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Polices DM3.11 and DM3.12. The concerns raised by the local residents as set out above are fully appreciated, however, as the Highway Officer has raised no objections to the proposal I do not consider the application can be refused on highway safety issues.

Residential amenity

4.6 Policy DM3.13 Residential Amenity directs that development should not be approved if it would have a significant adverse impact on nearby residents’ amenities.
4.7 Local residents have raised concerns regarding noise and disturbance from revving of vehicles and activities on the site. At the time of the original submission the Environmental Quality officer requested that a noise assessment was carried out on the site. Noise measurements have been undertaken by the Environmental Services Team (following the completion of the Jack in the Box child care facility) to ascertain current background noise levels in this location. The results have been analysed. In accordance with British Standard 4142:2014 the rating level of sound emitted from industrial activities on the site during the hours of operation should not exceed the background noise level (which has been determined to be 36 dB (LA90)) by more than 5 dB(A) at the nearest sound sensitive premises. As such they have calculated an acceptable level and this would be a condition of any planning approval. The Environmental Quality officer has now raised no objection and therefore I do not consider the application can be refused on the grounds raised. As such, the scheme would accord with the requirements of Policy DM3.13.

Impact on visual amenities

4.8 The application site is outside any development boundaries and therefore is considered to be in the open countryside. The site has been used for over 14 years as an employment site with external storage noticeable since the 2007 consent. Until last year there was a Horse Chestnut tree and hedging to the site frontage with the highway, which provided some screening of the site. Unfortunately the tree has been removed due to being dangerous (which I have no reason to dispute as it formed one of several Horse Chestnut trees along this part of the Hempnall Road, some of which have already come down) and the hedging, which has opened the existing site up for view. I consider that, on balance, whilst the loss of the existing vegetation is regrettable, the planting of a new hedge to the roadside, a condition limiting the area immediately adjacent to the highway for the parking of staff cars and taking into account the permitted use of the site, the visual intrusion created would not be so significantly detrimental as to warrant refusal of the application on visual amenity grounds.

Financial Matters

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 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

5. Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is considered acceptable as it does not adversely affect the visual amenities of the area to an unacceptable degree, will not have a significantly detrimental impact on the residential amenities of nearby neighbouring properties nor highway safety. The proposal will continue to provide employment. The scheme would therefore accord with sections 3 of the NPPF, DM2.1, DM3.11, DM3.12, DM3.13 DM4.9 of South Norfolk Local Plan and Policies 2 and 5 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Appendix 2

Supporting letter for planning application at the The Grove, NR15 2LN

The purpose of this supporting letter is to give an overview of business activities at The Grove since I moved into the premises in 2010 as a tenant. I recently purchased the property and aim to continue working with the local authorities and my neighbours.

I moved into the Grove in May 2010, at that time I was unaware of any historical planning issues that had caused problems locally. My business was to collect and store cars for a vehicle salvage auction company and was granted permission to do so before I moved in. All started well but the company I was working for was sold in November 2010 and my contract was terminated immediately. I was at the time employing 3 people so needed to diversify quickly to avoid closure.

I have always been interested in Motorsport and raced a Lotus car since 2009. I quickly became established in the Lotus race paddock when I began preparing and transporting other race drivers cars, offering an arrive and drive service which proved very popular. This quickly became a business in its own right which has expanded to today where we run a number of customer and rental cars. ES Motorsport now support and run more cars than any other Lotus team in Europe.

We race in the UK and European Lotus race series which is supported by Lotus cars. Out of the dozens of drivers we now support most are from overseas including Belgium, Switzerland, Luxembourg, Italy, Austria and Russia. We also support former Lotus F1 driver Martin Donnelly who lives in Attleborough and have a good working relationship with Lotus cars where we regularly assist them with their racing activities.

We also have a comprehensive parts department and supply parts worldwide to the Lotus and Land Rover market.

We have a number of trucks and vans that are used in conjunction with our activities which are stored outside on hard standing.

We have carried out a lot of screening work all around the perimeter and regularly have the hedges professionally pruned to help establish a permanent natural screen from the road. Our working hours have remained unchanged from the original application. All work is carried out inside the main building except for HGV and trailer work which has to be performed outside due to the size. Although most of the cars we work on are race cars they all have to conform to strict noise regulations in the series we run in, this is similar to road car decibels. All work is carried out within the EA guidelines. Our work is seasonal as you can imagine, spring to autumn we are away 14 long weekends which total about 50 days. Out of season (November to April) is spent rebuilding the cars with little vehicle movement.

Currently ES Motorsport employs 10 people who all live within close proximity of The Grove. 95% of the revenue generated comes from outside Norfolk so makes a good contribution to the local economy. Most of our suppliers are small Norfolk businesses, some of which we are their biggest customer.

We need to extend the current use to cover the preparation of the race cars, sale of parts, the occasional vehicle sale, storage and repair of trucks relating to our activities.

David Carr

22 JUL 2014
2. **Appl. No**: 2015/2748/RVC  
**Parish**: FLORDON

Applicants Name: Mr Tim Tumov  
Site Address: Tas Valley Mushrooms The Street Flordon Norfolk NR15 1RN  
Proposal: Variation of conditions 2, 4 and 11 of planning consent  
2013/1415/F (Condition 2 variation - enlarge the size of the previously approved staff building, larger boiler room building than originally approved and to build the deliveries/collection building, Condition 4 variation - closure of original site access and Condition 11 - hours of operation).

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

1. Temporary time limit for condition 11 (12 months)  
2. Amended plans (as varied under this consent)  
3. Phasing/ close existing access to commercial traffic (as varied under this consent)  
4. Foul drainage to main sewer  
5. Details of surface and wash-down water drainage  
6. New access  
7. Gates set back  
8. Visibility splays  
9. Any external lighting to be agreed  
10. Hours of working (as varied under this consent)  
11. Management Plan for drainage maintenance  
12. No new plant equipment  
13. Noise Management Plan  
14. Improved signage to discourage HGV right turn exits.

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 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 3 : Energy and water  
Policy 5 : The Economy  
Policy 17 : Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM2.1 : Employment and business development  
DM2.7 : Agricultural and forestry 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  
DM4.5 : Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
2. **Planning History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 2013/1415</td>
<td>Erection of eight plastic covered agricultural buildings. New entrance to site.</td>
<td>Approved with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 2015/2748</td>
<td>Variation of conditions 2, 4 and 11 of planning consent 2013/1415/F (Condition 2 variation - enlarge the size of the previously approved staff building, larger boiler room building than originally approved and to build the deliveries/collection building, Condition 4 variation - closure of original site access and Condition 11 - hours of operation).</td>
<td>Under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 2016/0728</td>
<td>Discharge of Conditions 6 and 12 of planning consent 2013/1415 (8 plastic covered ag. buildings &amp; new entrance) - Surface water and drainage management plan.</td>
<td>Under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 2015/1357</td>
<td>Discharge of conditions 3, 6 and 12 (part approve, part refuse)</td>
<td>Condition 3 approved only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 2010/1204</td>
<td>Proposed erection of two plastic covered agricultural building</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Consultations**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Parish Council</td>
<td>Original comments: PC objects to the proposal due to the breach of conditions and noise matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 District Member</td>
<td>Application should be determined by committee – noise and working hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 NCC Highways</td>
<td>• No objection to condition 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No objections to condition 4 subject to the works being completed as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No objection to condition 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Suggests procedure for out of hours deliveries and improved signage to discourage large vehicles passing through the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 NCC Ecologist</td>
<td>Comments on amendments: The amended proposal is not considered to conflict with the original advice provided by ecology. No further comments to be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Anglian Water Services Ltd</td>
<td>Original comments: Satisfied with the 1 year extension for the remaining works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6  SNC Water Management Officer

Comments of amendments:
Where there are proposed changes increase the discharge to the surface water drainage system, the foul drainage system and/or the dirty water system the applicant must ensure that sufficient capacity is available to accommodate the increased load in accordance with the design standard agreed as part of any former application.

Original comments:
No comments

3.7  Natural England - EMAIL

Comments on amendments:
Further information is requested due to impacts to the nearby Norfolk Valley Fen (SAC) and Flordon Common (SSSI). Natural England have pointed out that condition 4 seeks to alter the permission to allow the new growing rooms to be brought into use prior to the surfacing and drainage works being completed and approved. Further information was requested from the agent.

Original Comments:
No objections

3.8  SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team

Comments received and attached to the committee report as an appendix.

3.9  Environment Agency

No comments received

3.10 Representations

Comments on amendments:
9 representations of objection
- Vehicle movements and potential location for traffic accidents
- Heavy traffic movements at old site entrance
- Noise
- Unsociable working hours that vehicles turn up to site
- Working out of hours
- More traffic coming through the village
- Breach of conditions

1 representation of support
- Support the proposed development. The location of the new business will be further away from the village.

Original comments:
19 representations of objection
- Noise
- Heavy traffic movements
- Traffic movements through the village
- Working long hours
- Regard should be had to residential amenity and traffic in accordance with local policy
- Proposed condition 4 is considered unambiguous, but some improvement has been made to move the operation of the site from the old entrance
- The extended hours of use are considered unacceptable due to impact on residential amenity
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• The reason for delay/not complying with conditions is unacceptable
• Breach of conditions

9 representation of support
• Should provide opportunities for UK business of this type. This farm is a good example of utilising technologies and helps to meet the strategic objectives.
• Compost infection is something difficult to identify.
• Most of the old site has been moved to the new site
• Resident lives near the site and has not experienced any problem

4 Assessment

Context

4.1 The site is located within Flordon, classified as an ‘other village’ in accordance with Policy 16 of the JCS (March 2011). The closest service villages to the settlement are Newton Flotman, Tasburgh and the linked service villages Mulbarton and Bracon Ash.

4.2 The site is situated south west of The Street. The new access and original access is accessed via The Street. There are some properties north, west and east of the site and they are situated in a sporadic way that follows the contours of The Street.

4.3 The farm (old site) has been in operation since the 1960’s. The use of the old site is unrestricted.

4.4 The previous application 2013/1415 granted permission for the erection of eight plastic covered agricultural buildings and new entrance to the site. That application included conditions, which this application (2015/2748) seeks to amend.

4.5 The site is situated within the constraints of the Tas River Valleys, Flood Zone 2 and 3, within the Norwich Policy Area, and situated within the countryside. The site is also adjacent to wider Environmental Sensitive Area constraints insofar as Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

The proposal

4.6 The proposed development relates to an existing Mushroom business at Tas Valley Mushrooms Ltd, The Street, Flordon, Norfolk NR15 1RN.

4.7 This application seeks a variation of the following compromised conditions of application 2013/1415:

• **Condition 2** – to increase the size of the proposed office and staff building, to build the deliveries and collections building in accordance with planning permission 2013/1415 and construct a larger equipment and boiler room.

• **Condition 4** – to delay the closure of the original site access until the 30th November 2016 to accommodate Mushroom collections, farm gate sale/customer service and parcel deliveries only.

• **Condition 11** – To extend permitted hours of operation to the following:

  Monday to Saturday 07:00 to 18:00
  Sundays 07:00 to 13:00 (production) and 07:00 – 17:00 (picking); and
  Bank Holidays 07:00 to 15:00 (production) and 07:00 – 18:00 (picking)
4.8 This application has been amended from the previous submission and a further 14 day consultation period was undertaken on the 16.03.2016 with all previous consultees.

4.9 The applicant has submitted a separate application 2016/0728 to discharge conditions 6 and 12, that relate to surface water and drainage management of application 2013/1415 which is under consultation until the 25th April 2016. This separate application will deal with matters raised in the consultation response from the Flood Defence Officer.

4.10 In order for the LPA to act in a proportionate, reasonable and pro-active way significant negotiations and discussions have taken place between the Case Officer, Environmental Protection Team, the agent and applicant of the application.

Principle

4.11 The principle of development has already been established and accepted through approved application 2013/1415, therefore, this element is not being reassessed as part of this application. This application is to consider the merits of the proposed variation of conditions and any harm of the breach of conditions.

4.12 The main reason why the original access has not been closed, as required by condition 4, is that the cold store has not yet been moved from the original part of the site to a new deliveries and collection building (as proposed), because this new building has not yet been built. It is important to note the old access is where deliveries have always taken place prior to the new development being approved under reference 2013/1415 although the new access has been created and is also in use.

4.13 Following discussions and negotiations I would make the following assessment of the proposed variations.

Condition 2 – to increase the size of the proposed office and staff building, to build the deliveries and collections building in accordance with planning permission 2013/1415 and construct a larger equipment and boiler room.

4.14 I see no harm in this proposed variation of condition 2 as the buildings in question (office/staff building, deliveries and collection and equipment/boiler) were approved under application reference 2013/1415. This variation would slightly increase the office building and boiler room. All buildings are away from the old site and further away from most residential properties.

4.15 There is great benefit in delivering these buildings to prevent operation on the old site. This will also allow collection vehicles to use the new entrance where the cold store will be located.

Condition 4 – to delay the closure of the original site access until the 30th November 2016 to accommodate Mushroom collections, farm gate sale/customer service and parcel deliveries only.

4.16 The old access has not been closed. This is because the cold store (which is still located on the old site) has not been relocated on the new site. The agent has informed this is because of financial matters and crop damage. It was also witnessed during my site visit that using the new entrance to serve the cold store on the old site is not practical for the short-term.

4.17 Moving forward, financial information has been provided, which helps to demonstrate there is a realistic prospect of the new collections and delivery building where the cold store will be located being built by the 30.11.16.
4.18 Although there may be some disturbance to residential amenity by the old access remaining open until November 2016 (an additional 7 months) I do not consider it significant enough to warrant enforcement action or refusal.

*Condition 11 – Increase the hours of operation to the following times:*

- Monday to Saturday 07:00 to 18:00
- Sundays 07:00 to 13:00 (production) and 07:00 – 17:00 (picking); and
- Bank Holidays 07:00 to 15:00 (production) and 07:00 – 18:00 (picking)

4.19 The applicant has informed the proposed hours are essential for the business to operate to meet future demand for the product to ensure the business remains viable. It is also noted some of the loading trays and deliveries have been re-located to the new site, which has reduced noise.

4.20 The proposed increase in hours would see the following increase:

- an addition 5.5 hours on a Saturday,
- an extra half an hour on a Sunday for production activity and additional 4.5 hours on Sunday for picking activity
- Bank Holiday would also increase an additional 2.5 hours for production activity and 5.5 hours for picking activity

4.21 The distinction between production and picking activity cannot be effectively enforced. I have some concern with this proposed increase in hours especially in respect of the previous breaches. Therefore, it is recommended in discussions with Environmental Protection colleagues that the proposed hours of use on the new site should be accepted only on a temporary basis subject to a noise mitigation scheme being submitted and agreed.

4.22 A temporary consent for a trial period will allow the applicant the chance to show if they can address the outstanding matters; operate without causing unacceptable disturbance; and achieve relocation of the cold store to the new site. The situation can be reviewed when deciding whether to make the variation of operating hours permanent.

### Residential Amenity

4.23 The third party objection representation raised matters in relation to traffic and noise. Having fully assessed the application I consider there is some noise coming from the operation of the old site by way of the old entrance being used and there may be some noise coming from the tray emptying area on the new site, but I do not consider there to be any significant or detrimental impact to the enjoyment of residential amenity. However, in view of the objections raised and comments received, I consider that it is reasonable to have a trial period for the extension of hours to assess the potential impact the extra hours of use may have.

4.24 Much of the concern from local people relates to the movement of vehicles and particularly HGVs passing through the village and arriving at anti-social hours. It was noted at the time of the previous application that the time of arrival and route of vehicles cannot be controlled through planning conditions. A condition is proposed to require improved signage at the exit to the site for HGVs to turn left away from the main part of the village. However, I do not consider that the changes to conditions proposed in this application will significantly change the likelihood of HGVs arriving at anti-social times.
Natural England response

4.25 Additional information has been sent through from the agent addressing the points raised by Natural England. I am currently awaiting a response from Natural England and will report further at the meeting.

Flood Defence Officer response

4.26 Information raised by the flood defence officer is for the benefit of the applicant to consider. Condition 6 and 12 will address this under submitted application 2016/0728.

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

5 Conclusion

5.1 There is a fine balance to be struck between supporting the economy by allowing the detail of the approved development to happen in the manner now requested in addition to safeguarding the amenities of the local community. It is considered in this case there is currently no benefit in taking enforcement action, which would significantly delay the matters breached. The site in principle is acceptable as established by application 2013/1415, the Mushroom business contributes to the local economy and there are alternative options and steps to rectify this breach of condition (which is in relation to detail/conditions of application 2013/1415) prior to the route of enforcement action. The Local Planning Authority has a duty to act proportionately in accordance with paragraph 207 of the NPPF (2012).

5.2 In conclusion, the extended time until the 30.11.16 to close the old site access and build the cold store on the new site along with the office, staff and boiler/equipment room is considered adequate time to allow the applicant to get finances in place to realistically achieve this. The temporary extended hours will allow the council to establish whether the longer operational activity causes unacceptable amenity impact (currently there is no evidence to suggest it does). The negotiation of the proposed variation of conditions proposed can be controlled and monitored. The proposed variation of conditions is considered necessary in accordance with Local Plan Policy DM 2.7.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Elizabeth Thomas 01508 533793 ethomas@s-norfolk.gov.uk
I write on behalf of the Environmental Quality Team in reply to your consultation regarding the above planning application. Having reviewed the application documentation we would offer the following observations:

1. This proposal seeks to amend conditions relating to planning reference number 2013/1415/F.

2. The application is seeking to vary Condition 2 to enlarge the size of the previously approved staff room.

3. There do not appear to be any proposals to install any additional plant/equipment or machinery in connection with the increased size of the building.

4. The application is seeking to vary Condition 4 to retain the use of the old site entrance until the 30th November 2016.

5. The applicant has advised that this entrance will solely be used for mushroom collections/farm gate sales and customer service and parcel deliveries.

6. The application is to vary Condition 11 to permit additional hours of operation on the new site.

7. Currently the site may operate between the following hours, 07.00 - 18.00 Mon to Fri and 07.00 - 12.30 weekends and public holidays.
8. The proposed hours of use are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon – Sat</td>
<td>07.00 – 18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>07.00 – 13.00 (Production) 07.00 – 17.00 (Picking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Holidays</td>
<td>07.00 – 15.00 (Production) 07.00 – 18.00 (Picking)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We understand that these hours are required for emergency situations such as machine failure, transportation delays in the delivery of raw materials and during promotional periods, however normal working hours would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon- Fri</td>
<td>07.00 – 17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat and Sun</td>
<td>07.00 – 13.00 hours (Picking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Holidays</td>
<td>07.00 – 14.00 hours (Picking and Production)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The main activity of picking mushrooms occurs within the growing sheds and is a noticeably quiet activity. There are however activities associated with the picking process which have the potential to generate noise. Such activities include tray emptying, vehicle movements and the use of high pressure washers to clean equipment. The degree of noise generated will depend on how the activities are undertaken and managed on site.

10. This service has received two recent formal complaints of alleged noise nuisance arising from Tas Valley mushrooms neither of which are ongoing. We received very limited information however on the basis of the witness's evidence we have identified that the majority of the noise in question related to operations which are undertaken on the old site which is not regulated by any hours of use restrictions. On the basis of the evidence we received the noise was not considered to amount to a statutory nuisance.

Having regard to the above and the nature and location of the application site we would make the following recommendations;

**CONDITION 2 - VARIATION**

**ENLARGEMENT THE SIZE OF THE STAFF BUILDING, BOILER ROOM AND BUILD THE DELIVERY/COLLECTION BUILDING.**

Whilst this service does not wish to object to the variation of Condition 2 for the above purposes, in the event that the applicant is proposing to change any proposals for plant/equipment and or machinery located within these areas, we would wish to see the following condition attached to any permission granted as follows;

**RU/GN No generators/air handling plant without consent**

No new generator, compressor, chilling unit or cooling fan shall be installed on the site without precise details of the equipment being submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details as approved.

**CONDITION 4 – VARIATION**

**CLOSURE OF ORIGINAL SITE ACCESS**

Whilst we do not wish to object to the retention of the use of the old site entrance until 30/11/16, we would recommend the following advisory note be attached to any permission granted as follows;
ADVISORY NOTE

We would encourage the applicant to carefully monitor the use of the old site access, to ensure that it is only used for the purposes stated. In addition, as discussed with the applicant, we would encourage the use of careful travel plans used by the company to ensure that vehicles travelling to and from the site enter the new site access via The Street Flordon via Hethel utilising Wymondham road, rather than off the A140 through the village of Flordon itself.

We note that the applicant suggested that they would be able to restrict use of the old entrance so that there is no vehicular use associated with the business after 13:00hrs on weekends and bank holiday for the remainder of its use up to 30/11/16. We would encourage this approach.

CONDITION 11

EXTENSION TO HOURS OF OPERATION

Whilst we do not wish to object to the applicants proposed extension in hours, having regard to point 10 above, we would recommend that any permission is granted on a temporary basis and the following conditions be attached to any permission granted as follows;

CONDITIONS

NOISE

A condition which requires the submission of a noise management plan for the new site. This plan shall be carried out by a suitably qualified acoustic consultant, be in writing and shall be agreed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. The agreed plan shall be implemented in connection with the operation of the business and updated in line with new processes or machinery brought onto and used on site.

HOURS OF USE

A condition that any permission shall be granted on a temporary basis for a period of 12 months and then reviewed after this period

ADVISORY NOTE

We would expect a site specific noise management plan to identify any potentially noisy activities/processes undertaken on site and more specifically;

- A plan marked with the location of any fixed plant and machinery which has the potential to generate noise. The noise levels from each unit, measures to control noise from these sources and details of maintenance/service agreements for each unit.

- Consideration of any potentially noise generating activities undertaken in connection with the business such as tray emptying, pressure washing and emptying bins etc, and identification of measures to mitigate noise from these sources.

- Details of vehicle movements to include;

- Delivery/despatch times

- Types of vehicles used
- How noise is minimised from vehicles. The applicant may wish to consider travel plans and a memorandum of understanding for all delivery/despatch vehicles operated in connection with the business to ensure vehicles are not travelling through Flordon village, engines are not left running on vehicles, engines are not revved and horns are not sounded unnecessarily etc.

- How noise will be minimised vehicle safety reversing units. The applicant may wish to consider the use of multi frequency white sound units, the sound from which dissipates much quicker, is directional and localised. In addition the applicant should consider on site traffic flows to reduce the need for vehicles to reverse.

- How staff will be informed of the noise management plan, frequency of any updates and how this information will be communicated. There may be a need for this information to be made available in different languages.

- A process for dealing with and recording noise complaints from local residents

It is important to note that this list is not exhaustive and the applicant may have other measures which they may propose to manage noise in connection with the operation of the business.

Sue Lennard
Environmental Quality Team
Development Management Committee 27 April 2016

3. **Appl. No**: 2015/2826/F  
   **Parish**: SEETING

Applicants Name: Mr Jason Finch  
Site Address: Land North of Harveys Lane Seething Norfolk  
Proposal: New dwelling including separate carport, and a forge to be used for the owners farrier business

Recommendation: Refusal  
1. Insufficient justification for location of business  
2. New Dwelling outside development limit  
3. Not sustainable development  
4. Insufficient ecological information  
5. Design of cart lodge

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 5: The Economy  
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  
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM2.11: Agricultural and other occupational dwellings in the Countryside  
DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
DM3.2: Meeting rural housing needs  
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.5: Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys  
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

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No relevant planning history
3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
No comments received

3.2 District Member  
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways  
No comments received

3.4 NCC Ecologist  
**Object**
- Desktop assessment appears to have a small building on it near the southern boundary.
- There are 4 ponds within 250m of the site.
- There are also mature trees and shrubs on the south and western boundary of the site and although it is implied that these will remain, it is not explicitly stated.
- The building could have bat potential and the 4 ponds in the area could mean that the site is used by Great Crested Newts (GCN).
- Bats and Great Crested Newts are protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and Schedule 2 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) making all species of bat European Protected Species.
- The presence or absence of protected species, and the extent to which they could be affected by a proposed development, should be established before planning permission is granted, since otherwise all material considerations might not have been considered in making the decision (Circular 06/2005).
- Phase 1 Habitat Assessment is required so any potential impact of this development on ecology can be more fully understood.

3.5 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team  
No comments received

3.6 SNC Water Management Officer  
No comments received

3.7 Representations  
**One letter of support**
- Adds to site security and another business on the industrial site

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application relates to a field on the north side of Harvey Lane in Seething. FenderCare and Yarmans scrap yard are located to the east and Nene Valley Farm is located to the west. There is an existing stable block on the site. The site is outside any development boundary defined in the South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations.

4.2 It is proposed to erect a new building for the applicant’s farrier business and a new dwelling and cart lodge on the site. It is proposed to use the existing access onto the Harvey Lane.

4.3 There are two different components to the application the farrier business and the new dwelling. In terms of the business, the NPPF, JCS and policy DM2.1 in the Development Management Policies support new business, including in rural areas. Part 7 of policy DM2.1 requires:
4.4 Proposals for new sites in the Countryside will be assessed against the policies of the Local Plan, with positive consideration given to proposals that:
   a) Re-use redundant rural buildings and hard standings 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.

4.5 No information has been submitted with the application about the applicant’s existing business or the proposed development of this business on the site. No information has been submitted on the consideration of any sequentially preferable site and why they have been discounted.

4.6 The proposed development is remote from any rural towns or villages and insufficient information and justification have been put forward to justify a new business in this location contrary to policies DM1.1, DM1.3 and DM2.1 of the Development Management Policies.

4.7 In terms of the dwelling, it would be a new dwelling within the open countryside. Although it has not specifically been put forward as an occupational dwelling required for the Farrier business an assessment has been made on that basis.

4.8 Paragraph 55 of the NPPF and Policy DM2.11 of the Development Management Policies do permit agricultural or other occupational dwellings in the Countryside; but they need to comply with the following criteria:

   a) There is a demonstrated functional need for one or more fulltime workers to be readily available at all times for the enterprise; and

   b) The functional need could not be met by another existing dwelling in the area that is available and suitable.

4.9 Neither of these points has been demonstrated as part of the application. Although it would appear that the applicant has an established business it is not on this site, as such it has been assessed as a new enterprise. Policy DM2.11 makes it clear that permanent accommodation could not be justified for a new enterprise.

4.10 As the proposed development does not meet the criteria in policy DM2.11 an assessment has been made of the proposed dwelling in term of it location outside the development limit. Policies DM1.1 and DM1.3 require all new development to be within sustainable locations unless otherwise specifically justified by development management policies or is considered to be sustainable development.

4.11 The site is within the Rural Policy Area where the Council currently has a five year land supply of 16.9 years on 1st April 2015. Despite the Council having a five year land supply for purposes of clarity an assessment has been made under paragraph 49 of the NPPF which requires that housing applications are considered in the context of the presumption on favour of sustainable development.

4.12 In terms of the presumption in favour of sustainable development under paragraph 49 of the NPPF, this confirms that sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. It goes on to stress that these are not to be taken 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.
Economic role

4.14 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.”

4.15 It is apparent that the Council can demonstrate that it has an up to date five year land supply of deliverable sites. Therefore in the context of the economic role and the need to provide sufficient land of the right type, it is considered that the Council has met this requirement in respect of residential development. The provision of an additional dwelling in this location would contribute economically to the existing shops in the village from additional spend from new residents and in the short term provide construction jobs. Little information is given about the scale of the proposed forge but it is considered that the economic benefit from this would be modest and would be outweighed by the objections to the unsustainable location and the associated dwelling.

Social role

4.16 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.”

4.17 The Council can demonstrate a five year housing land supply in this area so has largely filled the social role. The site is remote from existing development boundaries and there are no dedicated pedestrian links to local services; any potential residents would be dependent on the private car to access services and facilities as a result it is considered that the proposed development fails to provide a development which is accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being. In addition some elements of the proposed design result in the dwelling which does not fulfil the social requirement of creating a high quality built environment.

Environmental role

4.18 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.”

4.19 The site is within the open countryside; and the erection of a new dwelling would erode the character of the open countryside. In addition, in the absence of an ecology report the environmental requirement of protecting the biodiversity of the area would not be met and as a result not comply with the environmental role.

4.20 The proposed development would have limited economic benefits which would be outweighed by the social and environmental harm of the provision of a new dwelling, remote from local services which would erode the character of the open countryside.

4.21 The NPPF, policy 2 of the JCS and policy DM3.8 in the Development Management Policies and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide require new dwellings to be of a high standard of design. The size of the dormer windows on the cart lodge buildings are too large and are out of scale with the building and form an incongruous element contrary The NPPF, policy 2 of the JCS and policy DM3.8 in the Development Management Policies and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide

4.22 At the time of writing the report comments from the Highway Officer had not been received on this application, these will be reported to Members at Committee.
4.23 An ecology report has not been submitted with the application. The NCC ecologist has identified that there are four ponds within 250 metres of the site so there is potential for Great Crested Newts on the site, there are a number of mature trees and shrubs and she has also identified the fact there is an existing building on the site which may be suitable for bats; this is an existing stable building, which it is not proposed to move, this is probably not as suitable for bats as the Ecologist has thought from her initial desk top assessment. There is however, still potential for Great Crested Newts on site. Great Crested Newts are protected species The presence or absence of protected species, and the extent to which they could be affected by a proposed development, should be established before planning permission is granted, since otherwise all material considerations might not have been considered in making the decision (Circular 06/2005). As such the Ecologist recommends that an ecological assessment such as a Phase 1 Habitat Assessment is undertaken so any potential impact of this development on ecology can be more fully understood. As it stands there is insufficient information to fully assess the impact of the development on protected species.

4.24 It is stated on the application form that foul drainage will be dealt with via main sewer or septic tank; there is no mains sewer in Harvey Lane. Where this is the case, in line with the advice in the PPG, foul drainage should be dealt with via package treatment plant unless specifically justified. This could be resolved by the imposition of a condition on foul drainage.

4.25 It is proposed to deal with surface water via mains sewer or soakaway. There is not a mains sewer in Harvey Lane, but none the less disposal of surface water by that means would be contrary to the advice in the PPG. A soakaway could be a suitable means of disposal; the final details of surface water drainage could be dealt with via condition.

4.26 Paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires Councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes. This can be a material planning consideration for this application as self-build has been identified as the method of delivering the site. Whilst an indication of self-build has been given by the applicant it should also be noted that at this stage it cannot be certain that the method of delivering this site will be self-build. In the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

4.27 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.

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

5 Conclusion and reasons for refusal

5.1 In conclusion, insufficient justification for locating the farrier business in the proposed location outside the development limit has been provided. The proposed dwelling outside the development limit has not been justified as requiring a countryside location and does not form sustainable development in terms of the NPPF. The proposed drawings floor, roof and elevation plans are inconsistent with each other and the proposed cart-lodge does not represent a good standard of design. Insufficient ecology information has been submitted with the application to assess the impact on protected species.

5.2 Insufficient justification or evidence of a sequential assessment of alternative sites has been put forward to justify the proposed location of the farrier business remote from towns or villages, contrary to policies DM1.1, DM1.3 and DM2.1 in the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document 2015.
5.3 The proposed dwelling is outside any development limit allocated in the South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific Allocation Document 2015 and insufficient justification has been put forward for its location in the open countryside contrary to paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2011 and policies DM1.1, DM1.3 and DM2.11 in the South Norfolk Development Management Policies Documents 2015.

5.4 The social and economic harm of the proposed development outweighs the modest economic benefits of the proposed dwelling, particularly as the Council can demonstrate a 16.9 year land supply as of 1st April 2015.

5.5 Insufficient ecological information has been submitted with the application to be able to assess the impact of the proposed development of protected species contrary to the advice in circular 06/2005.

5.6 The proposed dormer windows of the cart lodge block are out of scale with the proposed building and would form an incongruous element of the building design contrary to section 7 in the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland Norwich and South Norfolk 2011, policy DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document 2015 and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman 01508 533833
and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4.  

**Appl. No**: 2016/0389/F  
**Parish**: HETHERSETT  

- **Applicants Name**: Mr & Mrs A & L Culling  
- **Site Address**: Land to the Rear of 35 Lynch Green Hethersett Norfolk  
- **Proposal**: Proposed new dwelling  

**Recommendation**: Refusal  
1. Scale of dwelling excessive for plot  
2. Impact on residential amenities of existing dwelling from first floor windows and balconies.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
- NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
- NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
- NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
- NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
- Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
- Policy 2: Promoting good design  
- Policy 3: Energy and water  
- Policy 4: Housing delivery  
- Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
- Policy 14: Key Service Centres

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
- Development Management Policies  
  - DM3.5: Replacement dwellings and additional dwellings on sub-divided plots within Development Boundaries  
  - 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  
  - DM4.10: 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.”

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No recent history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Refuse: not in keeping with the street scene/environment of adjacent listed building. Access concerns together with potential of on-site construction traffic on an adjacent listed building during construction.
3.2 District Members:

Cllr Dale

To committee if for approval:

- A grossly over-bearing proposal vis a vis the size of Grove Road properties and the listed cottage and the latter's historic form and its juxtaposition close to a contemporary building containing "acres" of glass.
- Totally out of the local vernacular character compared to the rest of Hethersett; there is nothing of its like known to me west of the B1172 in Hethersett Parish. There can be no precedent to hang it on and it fails to comply with the Local Design Guide.
- Impact on the listed cottage in terms of noise/parking on an assumed gravel drive a few feet from the listed cottage, let us bear in mind here that it's the density of substance which attenuates noise; wattle and daub is not in the same league of attenuation as metallic lead.

Cllr Bills

To Committee

- The positioning of the garage is not imposing on the neighbouring property as there is already a structure there and this has not been a concern.
- The lack of privacy overlooking the current property's garden. The construction has been developed bringing this to a minimum and when considered against other developments is well within being acceptable.
- The plot size can certainly accommodate a development of this type without being considered excessive.

3.3 NCC Highways

Comments on scheme as submitted: Turning space required for emergency vehicles, revised plans required to demonstrate the turning area.

Comments on revised plans: The turning space is a little small, but taking into account the likely frequency of use by larger emergency vehicles, this should be sufficient. Now support subject to condition for the provision of parking and on site turning space prior to occupation.

3.4 SNC Conservation
And Design

Accept the principle of sub-division but overall size, scale and footprint is excessive for the size of the plot, resulting in too high a density - and the need to position extensive garaging away from the plot between existing buildings could be unnecessary with a more modest dwelling.

3.5 SNC Water
Management Officer

No comments received

3.6 Representations

6 letters of objection:
- Character of the proposed dwelling not in keeping with the immediate surrounding properties.
- Close proximity of proposed gravel drive which is to run parallel to the whole of my garden and cottage.
- Impact on the listed building from construction traffic, the listed building is timber frame and single glazed.
- Objections raised at the time the previous application submitted for the garages relating to the height and closeness to the boundary.
• Will sit in the back garden and look at a brick wall, any trees planted will not hide the building and other properties will also be in our view.
• Out of keeping with other properties in the area including the 1960’s bungalows or the 19th century cottages and the design not in keeping.
• ‘Garden Grabbing’. Should prevent infill of domestic gardens dubiously classified as Brownfield development.
• Whilst it is appreciated that my garden would not be overlooked, I would have to look at the back of the property, a bland and unappealing sight which would totally dominate my skyline and 360 visual outlook, as would any construction built at the same location of more than ground floor.
• No objection to a more traditional single storey dwelling, the north elevation is not unlike an industrial building not helped by the proposed 1.8 metre fence.
• Removal of Conifer hedge on the North boundary will not give additional South light into the gardens in Grove Road as the sheer face of the north facing wall will be similar in height and in the same position as the hedge.
• The proposed natural hedge between the North facing wall and the new fence has little chance of success as the distance provided, as seen on the East facing elevation will preclude both light and ground water as it will be planted on the top of the foundations of the wall.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application seeks to sub-divide 35 Lynch Green Hethersett to provide a plot for one, two storey dwelling. The scheme includes the demolition and replacement of existing garaging for the existing dwelling, demolition of a pool building to facilitate the construction of garaging for the proposed dwelling, and the infilling of the existing swimming pool.

Principle

4.2 The site falls within the development boundary for Hethersett and is identified in Policy 14 of the JCS as being within a Key Service Centre and as such there is a presumption in favour of residential development. The proposal is considered to accord with Policy 14 of the JCS.

4.3 The site is located to the rear of No 35 and is separated from the remaining garden area of No 35 by an existing Beech hedge. The north boundary of the site at present comprises a complete row of Conifer hedging approximately 20feet in height which is to be removed as part of the scheme and replaced with a 1.8 close board fence. Hedging forms the boundary to the east, however this is sparse in places. Further Beech hedging is on the west boundary which is also to be retained.

4.4 Subdivision and redevelopment is a feature in this particular area of Hethersett with new dwelling infilling plots in and around more historic properties. Due to the development of the area the overall character and grain of the settlement has changed and further appropriate and sensitive infilling would not necessarily be harmful to the character of the area. Having regard to the recent development of the surrounding sites and that the site falls within the development limits of Hethersett, the principle for the development of this plot is acceptable and would be considered to accord with policy.
Design

4.5 The scheme as proposed is modern in design providing a flat roof two storey dwelling. The design includes a mono pitch roof section on the west elevation and has been designed to break the overall dwelling into sections which significantly reduces the bulk of the building. Consideration has been given to the potential impact on the neighbours from overlooking, which has resulted in the scheme being design with no windows in the rear elevation. The West elevation has one first floor window which serves a bathroom, and the East elevation has one first floor window which serves an en-suite. The south elevation contains a high level of glazing to maximise the amount of natural light into the building, and includes balconies for all three bedrooms.

4.6 As already mentioned the sub-division of this plot is acceptable, the Council’s Conservation and Design Officer has commented as follows.

“I do consider that there are aspects of the design which help to break up its massing and create visual interest – the contemporary scheme also allows the massing to be arranged in such a way that creates a more sustainable building and mitigate impact on neighbouring properties. However, I do consider that the overall size, scale and footprint is excessive for the size of the plot, resulting in too high a density – and the need to position extensive garaging away from the plot between existing buildings could be unnecessary with a more modest dwelling.”

In summary, in terms of scale and design it is considered the overall size, and footprint is excessive for the plot resulting in too high a density and is therefore considered to conflict with policy NPPF7 and DM3.8.

Residential amenity

4.7 Concern has been raised by neighbours about the loss of amenities. The general design of the building is such that the amenities of the neighbours on the north and west of the site and to a degree to the east will have minimal loss of privacy. However, the first floor benefits from full glazing and balconies to all bedrooms. I accept that, due to the design of No 35, there will be no loss of privacy or amenity into the existing dwelling, however, these south facing bedrooms and associated balconies will overlook the only remaining garden of No 35. While at present the applicants occupy this dwelling, consideration has to be given to the future occupants and their right to an acceptable level of privacy and amenities. I accept that there is already a 2 metre hedge which forms the boundary between the proposed dwelling and the garden of No 35. While at present the applicants occupy this dwelling, consideration has to be given to the future occupants and their right to an acceptable level of privacy and amenities. I accept that there is already a 2 metre hedge which forms the boundary between the proposed dwelling and the garden of No 35. While at present the applicants occupy this dwelling, consideration has to be given to the future occupants and their right to an acceptable level of privacy and amenities.

4.8 One issue which is of concern to the nearest neighbour is that of the proposed gravel drive and the potential of noise. I accept that this can be an issue but surfacing could be conditioned to prevent unacceptable levels of noise. I do not consider this issue alone is reason for refusal.

4.9 Concern has also been raised regarding the garaging for the new dwelling. However, as this is in a location of an existing pool building, I do not consider the construction of a new garage would be detrimental to the residential amenities of either the existing dwelling or the neighbouring property.

Access

4.10 The scheme as originally submitted shows the shared access to continue to the east of No35, removing the pool building to provide garaging and vehicle access to the plot. However, concern was raised by the Highways Authority to the lack of turning space for
emergency vehicles given the distance from the road to the application site. An amended plan has been submitted which shows a small but adequate turning space. The Highways Authority is now satisfied the proposal accords with policy DM3.11 and DM3.12.

Impact on listed building

4.11 The scheme has also been considered in terms of its impact on the adjacent listed building (No 43 Lynch Green). No 43 is a modest thatched cottage with low eaves with a north–south plan. No windows above ground floor level look west except for a small eaves level dormer. There is a fence between which separates the curtilages and a further hedgerow planting is submitted on the site plan. I consider that the development of the plot to the rear with a suitable development would not necessarily have a harmful impact on the listed building. The main issue is the scale of the proposed garaging and its proximity to the listed building. Although I am concerned at the size and scale of the garaging/car port between the two existing historic buildings, in general terms the development of this plot as proposed would not harm the setting of the listed building to a material degree and therefore the scheme accords with policy 12 of the NPPF and Policy DM4.10 of the SNLP 2015 and is considered to accord with S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990.

4.12 Paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires Councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes. This can be a material planning consideration for this application as self-build has been identified as the method of delivering the site. Whilst an indication of self-build has been given by the applicant it should also be noted that at this stage it cannot be certain that the method of delivering this site will be self-build. In the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance. The potential benefits of a single self-build plot are not considered sufficient to outweigh the objections noted above.

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 liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

5 Conclusion

5.1 The scale of the proposed dwelling on the plot is considered to be excessive and would result in a cramped form of development which is contrary to the requirements of policy NPPF 7, JCS2 and DM3.8.

5.2 The first floor south facing windows and balconies result in the loss of amenities to the existing garden of No35, and to a lesser degree the neighbouring property No43 bringing the proposal into conflict with policy DM3.13.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837 jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No**: 2016/0495/O  
**Parish**: TASBURGH

Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs Gerald & Sarah Barnes  
Site Address: Land South East of Low Road Tasburgh Norfolk  
Proposal: Outline permission (with all matters reserved) for six houses with parking and gardens.

Recommendation: Approval with conditions
1. Outline Permission Time Limit  
2. Standard outline requiring RM  
3. In accord with submitted drawings  
4. Slab level to be agreed  
5. Archaeological monitoring  
6. External materials to be agreed  
7. Surface Water  
8. Foul drainage to main sewer  
9. New Water Efficiency  
10. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
11. Ecological mitigation  
12. Implement boundary treatment  
13. Highway conditions

Subject to securing affordable housing

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 15: Service Villages  
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  
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
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  
DM4.10: Heritage Assets

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

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

2. Planning History

2.1 No relevant planning history

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council
Refuse
- Site was previously rejected when considered as part of the Local Development Framework agreement remain valid
- A development of this nature would impact on the streetscene which is made up of individual properties with gaps along the road.
- The impact on the highways a concern, with a blind sweeping curve in the road and T junction almost immediately opposite.
- Set a precedent for further development

3.2 District Member
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways
Additional comments
- Existing flood on Low Road is a result of a blocked pipe the repair of which is currently being organised.
- Current pipe is not particular suitable for increased capacity from the development.

Object
- The site is located outside development boundary for Tasburgh
- Site is remote from Tasburgh Village, where there are local services and the catchment primary school exists
- Village primary school and village are located approximately 1.5 km from the site and nearest doctors is in Long Stratton
- No pedestrian footpath to link from the site to village hall where there is already a footpath.
- Walking along northern section of Grove Road is not attractive route for pedestrians and is somewhat hazardous owing to poor alignment and limited forward visibility around bends.
- If development were approved in this location it is likely residents would be reliant on use of private car to access local services and schooling contrary to NPPF and Norfolk’s 3rd Local Transport Plan.
- There is only a limited bus service to lower Tasburgh
- Six additional dwellings would create 36 vehicular trips per weekday according to TRICS.
- NPPF supports the need for safe and sustainable access for all people.
- Encourages the importance of being able to make every day journeys without the reliant on the private car
- Consider site would be poorly located in terms of transport sustainability
• There appears to be a problem with surface water flooding at the junction with Flordon Road. This appears to be due to lack of capacity in the ditch system. This needs to be addressed as part of any consent if approval is granted

3.4 Historic Environment Service Support with conditions
• There have been a number of archaeological finds of the sites, potential for there to be archaeological remains from prehistoric to post medieval periods.
• It’s also close to the River Tas and historical maps show occupation from at least 16th century.
• As a result the site is of archaeological interest
• Condition required for trench excavation with potential for further excavation and monitoring

3.5 Norfolk Rivers IDB
• Site does not require a FRA, would like confirmation at detailed design stage how surface water drainage will be managed
• If surface connects into existing ditches and drains and water will fall into the Norfolk Rivers IDB district and will be liable for a surface water development contribution and land drainage consent
• Can approval from Norfolk Rivers IDB be added as a planning condition

3.6 NCC Ecologist Support subject to conditions
• Ecology report has been submitted with the application
• Report concludes that the proposed development is unlikely to have a significant impact on protected or notable species
• Portion of mixed species hedge will be lost and best practice measures are recommended

3.7 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager
• Policy 4 of JCS sets affordable housing percentage at 30% for sites 0.4 -0.6 hectares
• Requirement for 2 affordable homes
• Bearing in mind location, 2 houses for sale on shared equity terms of 75% of their market value are acceptable
• Providing them as semi-detached pair would be ensure they are more affordable
• Three bedroom house of about 86sq metres would also be acceptable.

3.8 SNC Water Management Officer Support with conditions
Most sustainable method of surface water drainage disposal should be adopted
Main sewer on Low Road and also on the location of rising main is through plot 6 need to check any wayleaves with Anglia Water Advisory comments on surface water drainage and land drainage consent

3.9 Representations
13 letters of objection from twelve households
• Site is outside the development limit
• Tasburgh identified as a service village in Joint Core Strategy and land was allocated in Upper Tasburgh for 10 -20 dwellings
• Site was put forward as being part of the development boundary but rejected this should be respected
• How can these policies be out of date when they have only just been adopted
• Undermine right of existing residents and the local community
• Planning frameworks are necessary to protect the local countryside
• The development is unsustainable
• Important farm land
• Headland and hedgerow important wildlife haven
• Adversely affect the character of the listed building opposite
• Will not make a significant impact on the housing supply and there are thousands of homes planned
• Economically only benefit the applicants
• Limited employment benefits
• Lower Tasburgh is not well served by amenities
• Upper Tasburgh village hall, primary school and playing field, shop and post office have closed and not there is only a visiting post office
• No doctors, shops or significant amenities.
• Limited bus serve goes to Lower Tasburgh a few times a day
• Detrimental to highway safety three way junction on a heavily traffic road, large volume of traffic and do not comply with speed limit.
• Visibility is not good
• Increased traffic will be dangerous for vehicles and pedestrians as there are no pavements
• No room for visit parking
• Water pools on the site and spills onto the road
• Significant remedial works would be required to deal with the drainage issues
• Development will make flooding situation worse
• Character of Low Road is a mixture of historic ribbon development interspersed with green field sites, farm land and nature reserve
• proposed development is out of character with pattern of development in the local area and Tas Valley
• Density out of keeping with the area
• No community consultation
• Garages should be accommodated to the side so plots not wide enough
• Busses not suitable of travelling to work, if the service is cancelled need to walk from A140
• Children would have to travel to school by car
• Should be a condition that a public footpath and cycle path from Low Road to village Hall Playing fields and also from Bungay Road to Brands Lane also owned by the applicant where an existing permissive footpath has been closed
• Question the location of the hedge and the impact on visibility should be set back in line with wall for Kyslestones
• Suggest development should be set back and provide a village green area on the frontage
• Set precedent for further development
• Loss of amenity from noise and disturbance, loss of privacy and overlooking.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application site is between Kyslestones and Pilgrims Cottage on the south east side of Low Road in Tasburgh. The site is opposite the junction with Flordon Road and the Mill House opposite is a listed building. The land to the east forms part of the development boundary for Tasburgh.
4.2 The application is for outline permission for 6 dwellings with all matters reserved, an indicative layout and access have been provided, but do not form part of the application. Policy DM1.3 seeks to direct development to sustainable locations within development boundaries and allocated sites. The Joint Core Strategy sets out the growth strategy for the area including designating Tasburgh as a Service Village. The site is located in the Norwich Policy Area where the Council does not have a five year land supply, as such paragraph 49 in the NPPF makes it clear that in such circumstances the development plan policies cannot be considered up to date and housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, even if the site specific allocations have only recently been adopted.

4.3 In terms of the presumption in favour of sustainable development under paragraph 49 of the NPPF, this confirms that 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.

4.4 The following is an assessment of whether the scheme can be considered to represent sustainable development:

Economic Role

4.5 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.”

4.6 The proposed dwellings will make a contribution to the delivery of the five year land supply and will make a small contribution to the economy through employment during the construction period and subsequent spending from the occupiers.

Social Role

4.7 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.”

4.8 The Highway Officer has raised an objection to the application on transport sustainability ground and access to local services being dependent on the private car. It is however, important to note that the recently adopted development limit for Tasburgh is located directly to the north east of the site, making it difficult to say this site is not sustainable if the adjacent dwellings are within the development limit and therefore considered sustainable. There are a range of services including school, public house and village hall within the main village which are within reasonably easy reach. The proposed layout of the dwellings is only indicative, but shows that they could be accommodated and high quality development could be accommodated on the site, without causing any significant amenity issues.

Environmental Role

4.9 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.”
4.10 The site is outside the development limit and will result in an encroachment on the open countryside but would not cause a significant harm to the character of the area which forms part of the river valley. The dwelling will be located in flood zone 1 (low risk) and there is not any significant harm to biodiversity.

4.11 On balance although the proposed development is located outside the development limit and there is no direct pedestrian link to local services, it would provide additional dwellings in a location where there is a shortage. Paragraph 14 in the NPPF makes it clear the “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 in this Framework taken as a whole. In this instance there are no adverse impacts which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and the development is considered to be sustainable development in terms of the NPPF.

4.12 Although the site is within flood zone 1 (low risk) there is an existing issue with flooding on the road adjacent to the site. The Highway Authority is aware of the issue and has confirmed it is because of a blocked culvert which they are in the process of organising the repair of; the flood is not caused by the application site. The Highway Authority has however suggested that the drainage pipe is of a poor quality and as a result would not be particularly suitable to take additional capacity.

4.13 As this is an outline application exact means of surface water drainage would be agreed by condition. The Water Management Officer has given advisory comments on the need to provide the most sustainable drainage in line with the hierarchy in the PPG. There is a main sewer in Low Road so foul drainage could be dealt with via mains sewer; there is also a rising main on the site which will need to be taken into account in the layout at reserved matters stage.

4.14 Concern has been raised regarding the impact on the additional traffic on the highway network and highway safety. Although objecting on sustainability grounds the Highway Officer has raised no objection on highway safety grounds. It is therefore considered that the development accords with policy DM3011 in the Development Management Policies.

4.15 The design of the proposed dwellings would be subject to a reserved matters application, but it is consider that the site is of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed dwellings without causing any significant amenity issues. There is a mix of dwelling styles and types along Low road and the proposed dwellings need not be out of character with the local area or cause significant harm to the Tas Valley landscape.

4.16 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.” It is considered a development could be designed so it would not significantly harm the setting of the listed buildings within the vicinity of the site in accordance with policy DM4.10 of the Development Management Policies.

4.17 The site is of archaeological importance, The Historic Environment Service have requested a programme of archaeological investigation, which has been conditioned.

4.18 A satisfactory ecological report has been submitted with the application and the NCC Ecologist considers that the proposed development would not result in any harm to protected or notable species.
4.19  The site is over 0.4 of a hectare and in accordance with policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy there is a requirement for 30% affordable housing. It has been agreed that two houses will be provided on shared equity terms at 75% of market value. An updated viability report is being provided to cover the provision of two affordable homes. This provision will be secured by the means of a S106 agreement.

4.20  Paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires Councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes. This can be a material planning consideration for this application as some of the properties could be suitable for delivery by self-build. In the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

4.21  Concern has been raised over setting a precedent for further development but any future applications would be assessed on their own merits.

4.22  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 the absence of a five year land supply the proposed development has been assessed as to whether it is sustainable development in this context in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF. It is not considered that there are any significant and demonstrable adverse effects that outweigh the benefits of the development. The exact, design, layout, appearance, access and drainage of the site will be dealt with at reserved matters stage.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Helen Bowman 01508 533833
and E-mail:  hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No** : 2016/0519/F  
**Parish** : WOODTON

Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs Leslie and Kim Eade  
Site Address : Frogs Farm Springwood Lane Woodton Norfolk NR35 2NF  
Proposal : Replacement of derelict farmhouse to provide a three bedroom detached dwelling.

Recommendation : Refusal

1. Outside Development Boundary  
2. Unsatisfactory design  
3. Insufficient information about ecological impact

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 06 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes  
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design  
NPPF 10 : Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

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 15 : Service Villages  
Policy 17 : Smaller 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  
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  
DM3.12 : 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

**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 1992/0682 Conversion of redundant barn to single dwelling Approved
3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  Recommend approval; it would be nice to see a derelict plot restored

3.2 District Member  To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways  No objection. Asked for a condition regarding provision of a parking and turning area.

3.4 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team  No response

3.5 NCC Ecologist  There is a substantial amount of ivy growth around the back of the property in question and there appears to be at least 4 ponds within 100m of the development site. These features have potential to support bats or Great Crested Newts. All species of bat are protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and Schedule 2 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) making all species of bat European Protected Species. Great Crested Newts are also protected to the same degree.

The presence or absence of protected species, and the extent to which they could be affected by a proposed development, should be established before planning permission is granted, since otherwise all material considerations might not have been considered in making the decision (Circular 06/2005).

As such, we recommend that a Phase 1 Habitat Survey is undertaken, including an assessment for bats and Great Crested Newts, which would enable us to know whether this development could have an impact on ecology. Further surveys may be required depending on the outcome of the initial assessment.

3.6 SNC Water Management Officer  No response

3.7 Representations  One representation received; Support application as it would restore a building and provide much needed housing in Woodton.

4. **Assessment**

Proposal and site description

4.1 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a new detached dwelling. The dwelling would be two storey and be sited to the north-east of the converted barn known as Frogs Farm. The site formally had a dwelling sited on it, the remains of which are still there.

4.2 The site is located north west of the main village of Woodton. Woodton has been identified within the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) as a Service Village, with one site allocated for development by the Site Specific Allocations and policies Document. However, the site is located outside of the development boundary.
4.3 The adjacent dwelling, Frogs Farm, is a converted barn which was developed under planning application 1992/0682. Oaks Farmhouse is sited opposite, which is Grade II* Listed. There is a dwelling and annexe next to the farmhouse which were created by the conversion of associated outbuildings. The dwelling known as The Gables also lies opposite, and is an early 20th century dwelling. This group of dwellings form a loose, informal arrangement that is typical of the more rural parts of the district. Surrounding this group of dwellings is open fields.

Principle of development

4.4 Woodton has been identified under Policy 15 of the JCS as a service village which has a defined development boundary, within which infill dwellings may be acceptable, in addition to one allocated site. The village has a predominantly nucleated settlement pattern and is set in an attractive valley landscape. Outside of the development boundary are located several small clusters of dwellings; within one the site is located. The development boundary is located some 2km away to the south east from the site.

4.5 The application seeks permission to erect a detached dwelling to the north west of the applicant’s dwelling. Falling outside of the development boundary it would be contrary to DM 1.3, which requires all new development to be located on allocated sites or within development boundaries, unless specific DM policies allow for it, or there are overriding benefits.

4.6 Woodton falls within the Rural Policy Area (RPA), where there is a generous housing supply (16.94 years as of December 2015). This area is distinctively different from the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) and is treated as such in terms of housing supply. The submission refers to South Norfolk Council’s Annual Monitoring Report 2014/2015, which makes reference to the lack of a 5 year housing supply within the NPA, and as such applications should be determined using para 49 of the NPPF: “Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites”. However, the report goes on to state that this is only the case in the NPA. As such the Local Plan is considered to be sound, and new development should be plan led in the RPA. Furthermore the submission does not refer to any other specific Development Management Policy which would allow for development in the Countryside, as required under 2) c) of DM 1.3. Any overriding benefits are discussed below.

4.7 The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF. It is acknowledged that the proposed dwelling would have access to some facilities in the local area, and that there are some limited social and economic benefits to be had from the development. However the development would represent additional housing where there is no immediate need (as mentioned above, the Council has a 16.94 housing land supply in the RPA). Whilst it is recognised that Woodton has a range of services, they are located within the village itself, which is a significant distance from the site.

4.8 The site has a derelict dwelling on it, which appears to have been last used in 1970s. The building seems to be half the original size, and consists of approximately 2 walls and a chimney stack, together with some of the internal structure which supports part of the roof. A significant amount of ivy is present on one corner. As such the site has not been used as a dwelling for a considerable time, the building is not fit for purpose, and the use is therefore considered to be abandoned. As such Local Plan Policy DM 3.6 (replacement dwellings) is not considered to be applicable.

4.9 Paragraph 55 of the NPPF specifically addresses the provision of housing in rural areas. It states that housing should be located where it will enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities by avoiding isolated homes, and such homes should only be permitted in special circumstances. Dwellings that represent a “truly outstanding or innovative” design, reflect the highest standards in architecture, significantly enhance the immediate settings and are sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area will be considered to be special circumstances where new isolated homes may be permitted. It is acknowledged that the proposed design responds to the
previous dwelling at the site, however it is considered to fall short of the exceptionally high standards required under para 55. As such approval of the application under paragraph 55 is not considered appropriate.

Impact upon character

4.10 The proposed dwelling would be sited at the location of the remains of the dwelling. The submission indicates that the scale and form would be roughly replicated in the proposal. However the design of the dwelling appears somewhat confused, with different approaches taken to the two main elevations. Various window sizes and styles have been used, to include eaves dormers. Collectively the design fails to integrate itself into its setting, and would not make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness, failing to comply with either DM 1.4 or DM 3.8.

4.11 The impact upon the listed building is considered to be minimal, and acceptable under DM 4.10. The dwelling would not be readily viewed in association with Oaks Farmhouse, and therefore would not significantly impact its setting.

Biodiversity

4.12 DM 1.4 states that developments should take all reasonable opportunities to enhance biodiversity. Furthermore the Council is a responsibly authority under both the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended). The submission includes no ecological information regarding the biodiversity at the site. The NCC Ecologist has identified that the site has potential for important ecology, to include protected species. Without further information it is not possible to establish whether approval would result in harm to protected species, conflicting with the above policies.

Local financial considerations

4.13 Paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires Councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes. This can be a material planning consideration for this application as self-build has been identified as the method of delivering the site. Whilst an indication of self-build has been given by the applicant it should also be noted that at this stage it cannot be certain that the method of delivering this site will be self-build. In the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

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

4.15 The development would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) if approved.

5 Conclusion

5.1 DM 1.3 and paragraph 55 of the NPPF excludes new residential development within the open countryside unless specific criteria are met. In this case none are met; therefore the proposal is contrary to these policies.

5.2 It is also evident that the scheme fails to represent sustainable development in the context of the NPPF by virtue of the modest economic and social benefits of one dwelling being outweighed by the harm to the environment identified; which is the negative impact upon the character of the area.
6. Reasons for Refusal

6.1 The proposed development is in a site outside of any development boundaries and does not comply with any other specific housing in the countryside policy within the Local Plan or present any overriding economic, social or environmental benefits and as such it is contrary to Policy DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies and to the aims of the NPPF to secure sustainable development.

6.2 The proposal would fail to integrate into its setting, and would not make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness, failing to comply with either Policy DM 1.4 or DM 3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies.

6.3 The proposal fails to satisfactorily demonstrate that the development would not result in harm to protected species or achieve a net gain for nature, and therefore fails to comply with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended), and Policy DM 1.4 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Katherine Brumpton 01508 533681 kbrumpton@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Development Management Committee

7. **Appl. No**: 2016/0674/H
   **Parish**: TASBURGH

   **Applicants Name**: Mr & Mrs N & C Fisher
   **Site Address**: 31 Valley Road Tasburgh Norfolk NR15 1NG
   **Proposal**: First floor extension and alterations

   **Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions

   1. Full Planning permission time limit
   2. In accord with submitted drawings

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
   Development Management Policies
   DM3.4: Residential extensions and conversions within Settlements
   DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development
   DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life

2. **Planning History**

2.1 None

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council
   Recommend approval.

3.2 District Member
   To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 Representations
   None

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application site comprises a detached chalet bungalow in a road of similar properties and within the development boundary of Tasburgh. This application proposes a roof extension in the form of a flat roofed dormer window on the rear roof slope. This application is being reported to committee because the applicant is an employee of South Norfolk Council.

4.2 The assessment of this application gives due weight to the policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above because those policies are consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 The volume of the proposed dormer window is within permitted development tolerances. However, the original eaves would be altered as part of this proposal and so planning permission is required. The proposed extension would cover part of the rear roof slope and would alter the eaves to create a two storey projecting section. This would reflect an existing feature to the front of these dwellings and so it is considered that this proposal would have an acceptable design and appearance which would remain in keeping with the existing property.
4.4 The proposed extension would be seen in views along Valley Road from the south west. Various properties along this road have rear roof extensions, either as dormer windows or by raising of the roof slope. This has resulted in a variety of roof shapes although front elevations remain largely unaltered. If the roof extension had been set back to maintain the original eaves, it would be permitted development. While this proposal would alter the eaves, it is considered that the development would have similar visual impact to that which could be built without planning permission. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed extension would have an acceptable visual impact which would maintain the character of the street.

4.5 The proposed extension would not appear overbearing when viewed from neighbouring properties and would not introduce any unacceptable overlooking. Therefore, it would have an acceptable impact on residential amenity.

4.6 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.

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

5 Conclusion

5.1 It is considered that the proposed development would have an acceptable appearance and impact on the character of the street and existing residential amenity. Therefore, it accords with the principles of the policies DM 3.4, DM 3.8 and DM 3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Blanaid Skipper 01508 533985 and E-mail: bskipper@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Application on land South Norfolk Council has an interest in

8. **Appl. No**: 2016/0682/F  
   **Parish**: CAISTOR ST EDMUND

   Applicants Name: Ms Caroline Davison  
   Site Address: Venta Icenorum (Roman Town) Stoke Road Caistor St Edmund Norfolk  
   Proposal: Riverbank restoration works

   Recommendation: Approval with condition  
   1. Full Planning permission time limit  
   2. In accord with submitted drawings  
   3. Archaeological monitoring  
   4. Ecological mitigation

Subject to no significant comment being received prior to the expiry of the consultation period

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
   NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
   NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   Development Management Policies  
   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.”

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2015/0892  
   Installation of interpretation scheme panels, Approved to replace existing.

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
   Approve

3.2 District Member  
   To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Environment Agency  
   To be reported

3.4 Historic England  
   No objection  
   • Confirm works are necessary and would not adversely affect the scheduled monument  
   • We have received a scheduled monument consent application which we have raised no objection to.
3.5 NCC Ecologist  Details of mitigation required for water voles

3.6 Historic Environment Service  Verbally confirmed that archaeological monitoring would be required

3.7 Representations  None received

4 Assessment

4.1 The application relates to the River Tas which runs through Venta Icenorum (Caistor Roman Town) the site is a scheduled monument, there are a number of listed buildings surrounding the site including St Edmunds Church. The site is managed by South Norfolk Council.

4.2 The banks of the river Tas have been eroded by the bridge on the site, by winter flooding; which is putting the bridge at risk of collapse. This application is to restore the bank profile for a five metre section either side of the river and protect it from further erosion. It is proposed to use brushwood fascines to re-instate the profile of the bank. These fascines will be bound to posts and to each other using galvanised steel wire. The fascines will be backfilled with soil from the river bed. The bank will be further protected above by a turf reinforcing mat which would be planted with fragmenties plugs or grass seed which will help to bind the bank together. A geo-textile will be placed behind the posts to prevent the soils being washed out.

4.3 This is essential work to protect the river bank and the monument, formal comments from the Environment Agency will be reported at committee, but they have been fully involved in the pre-application discussions.

4.4 Historic England raises no objection to the proposed development which will not harm the monument. The Historic Environment Service has verbally confirmed that they would require an archaeological monitoring condition.

4.5 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 proposed works will not harm the setting of any of the listed building as required by policy DM4.10 of the Development Management Policies.

4.6 Information has been requested on the ecological mitigation to protect the water voles whilst work is being done.

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

5.1 In conclusion, the proposed works to the riverbank are required to protect the bridge and the scheduled monument and any ecological impact can be mitigated. The proposed works would not harm the scheduled monument or the setting of any of the surrounding listed buildings.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Helen Bowman 01508 533833
and E-mail:  hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Application submitted by South Norfolk Council

9. **App. No** : 2016/0749/F
   **Parish** : LONG STRATTON

   Applicants Name : South Norfolk Council
   Site Address : Leisure Centre Swan Lane Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2UY
   Proposal : Creation of new external sports pitch with associated features including; 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP), erection of perimeter ball-stop fencing, installation of hard standing areas around the AGP for pedestrians, maintenance and emergency access, installation of an artificial (flood) lighting system and installation of outdoor store for maintenance equipment.

   Recommendation : Approval with conditions

   1. In accord with submitted drawings
   2. Hours of Use
   3. Ecology
   4. Ecology bird and bat box
   5. Lighting
   6. Landscape scheme

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   NPPF 03 : Supporting a prosperous rural economy
   NPPF 08 : Promoting healthy communities

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 14 : Key Service Centres
   Policy 8 : Culture, leisure and entertainment
   Policy 5 : The Economy

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   Development Management Policies
   DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
   DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
   DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking
   DM3.15 : Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
   DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
   DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design
   DM4.4 : Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space

1.4 Emerging Long Stratton Area Action Plan

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2016/0749 : Creation of new external sports pitch with associated features including; 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP), erection of perimeter ball-stop fencing, installation of hard standing areas around the AGP for pedestrians, maintenance and emergency access, installation of an artificial (flood) lighting system and installation of outdoor store for maintenance equipment.
2.2 2010/0698 Proposed external signage Approved

2.3 1994/1371 Extension to leisure centre to provide multi-function/aerobics activities room, store room, installation of lift and reposition fire-escape stair Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council No comments received at time of writing

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways Should the LPA be minded to approve the application a condition regarding floodlighting illumination is required.

3.4 Landscape Officer Further information requested regarding the tree.

3.5 Ecologist Support the Ecology Appraisal submitted with the application and would recommend conditioning section 5.3 – 5.5 of the Ecology report and condition one bird box and one bat box in suitable locations.

3.6 Representations 1 comment
No artificial light towards John Hill Close

4 Assessment

Context

4.1 The site is located to the south/west side of the Long Stratton Leisure Centre along Swan Lane. This side of the proposed site contains a large open field with Long Stratton High School to the south and St Mary’s Junior School to the north.

4.2 The immediate surrounding context of the site and Swan Lane is varied in character and consists of a number of development types such as schools, medical practice, care provision and government building accessed via Swan Lane. The surrounding development is primarily low rise and well-spaced.

4.3 The site is situated within the Long Stratton Area Action Plan and Norwich Policy Area.

The Proposal

4.4 The proposal seeks permission for a new external sports pitch with associated features including 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP), erection of perimeter ball-stop fencing, installation of hard standing areas around the AGP for pedestrians, maintenance and emergency access, installation of an artificial (flood) lighting system and installation of outdoor store for maintenance equipment.

4.5 The artificial lighting system will include 15m high steel masts. Lighting details have been provided to show optimisation and lighting projections.

Principle

4.6 There is good separation distance between the proposed sports pitch and the surrounding buildings. The closest building to the proposed sports pitch would be in relation to the Long Stratton Leisure Centre. The proposed sports pitch is well related to the leisure centre as a
result the proposed development would be in keeping with its setting. The proposal would enhance the recreational quality and capacity of the site and would consequently accord with Local Plan policy DM3.15.

4.7 Section 8 of the NPPF (2012) promotes healthy communities. This proposed development will increase physical activity and contribute to the local economy, which also complies with section 3 of the NPPF (2012) supporting a prosperous rural economy.

4.8 The Long Stratton Area Action Plan section 9 contains recreation objectives and aspirations to improve the Health, well-being and quality of life of people living in Long Stratton. This vision coincides with the Local Plan. It should be noted the Long Stratton Area Action Plan has been through examination and is awaiting the inspectors report, which means a significant degree of weight can be applied to its content in decision-making. I consider this proposal complies with the emerging policy LNGS7 within the Long Stratton AAP.

4.9 Policy 14 of the JCS states Long Stratton is expected to accommodate at least 1,800 dwellings. The proposed sports pitch in connection with the Leisure Centre will help provide this expanding demand on sports provision and facilities.

4.10 I consider the proposed development would create some visual difference to the existing space, but I do not consider it constitutes significant harm given its good separation distance from surrounding buildings and its good relationship with the existing Leisure Centre.

4.11 The proposed development has been prepared in accordance with published Design Guidance Notes (The Football Association (FA) / Sport England) pertinent to external artificial sports facility provision. The 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) design is in accordance with The FA Guide to 3G Football Turf Pitch Design Principles and Layouts (U11 and U12 (9v9) Option 4).

Design

4.12 The design and access statement states;

- The proposed height of new open steel mesh ball stop fencing and entrance gates around the entire pitch perimeter enclosing the 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) will be 4.5m above ground level.

- The proposed height of new open steel mesh pitch perimeter barrier and entrance gates immediately surrounding the 3G artificial grass playing surface internally within the fenced enclosure will range from 1.20m to 2m above ground level.

- The proposed height of new open steel mesh fencing along new hard standing clean access is 1.80m above ground level.

- The proposed height of new timber post and rail fencing along existing hard standing clean access routes is 1.20m above ground level.

- The proposed floodlight system comprises six (6no.) masts mounted with associated luminaires at heights of 15m high above ground level to the 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP).

- The proposed maintenance equipment storage container will be 2.59m above ground level.
4.13 The proposed development site is not directly adjacent to any residential development. There is good separation distance between the proposed sports pitch and residential development. The proposed sports pitch will be clustered between Long Stratton High School and the Leisure centre.

4.14 In my opinion, the proposed development complies with South Norfolk Policy DM 3.8 (Design).

Pedestrian and Vehicular Access

4.15 The new 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) will be secured within the new and existing boundaries of Long Stratton Leisure Centre to maintain site security out of permitted operational hours. Pedestrian and vehicular access during the day and during evenings and weekends is provided from existing entrances from Manor Road and Swan Lane. The location for existing onsite vehicular parking around the playing fields provides an optimal opportunity for community users arriving by car. For pitch users arriving by car, the close proximity of onsite car parking is ideal for community involvement and participation.

4.16 Forty nine (49no.) parking spaces are currently available for use at the Leisure Centre, with a minimum of twenty four (24no.) additional spaces (an additional 50%) available at the Council's visitor car park at South Norfolk House, which would be available for immediate use. In addition to this, the Council could also open up further parking at South Norfolk House which would bring a further two hundred (200no.) spaces if needed, and the Council (as part of the development of Long Stratton Leisure Centre, which we expect to happen in 2017), also have the option of adding another 20-25 spaces on some unused land next to main Leisure Centre building.

4.17 Existing onsite parking areas, public transport and green travel initiatives including walking and cycling will continue to be available for community users. The expected usage of the facility will be primarily local organisations and it is therefore expected that the requirement for car parking will be satisfied by existing and extended onsite parking arrangements, offering ample space to accommodate users of the proposed pitch travelling by car. It is therefore concluded that onsite parking provision can accommodate the expected vehicular traffic during operational hours of use during the day and at evenings and weekends for pitch users.

4.18 In my opinion, the proposed development complies with Local Plan Policy DM 3.11 and DM3.12.

Landscaping

4.19 The design and access statement states; the proposed development will replace part of an existing grassed playing field at Long Stratton Leisure Centre. With the exception of hard landscaping, all other soft ground surrounding the area affected by the development shall be reinstated to grass (soft landscaping) to enable effective grounds maintenance to surrounding grassed areas and retention of grassed playing pitches. Also to eliminate offsite disposal, all excavated topsoil will be retained onsite and used to form a sculpted grassed mound located East of the AGP. Other recycled soil arising will be used to infill and redundant jumping pit adjacent to the AGP. Soil shall be reinstated to grass (soft landscaping) in accordance with BS 4428 Code of Practice for General Landscape Operations. New hard landscaping treatment around the facility is restricted to porous asphalt surfacing for pedestrian access, goals storage, spectator viewing space, vehicular access for maintenance and emergency.

4.20 The landscape officer has commented that the tree could merit a TPO, but in this case it is considered the benefits of the proposal outweigh the protection of one tree when replacement trees can be secured via condition.
Lighting

4.21 The installed appearance of the new artificial lighting system will include six (6no.) 15m high sectional octagonal mid-hinge steel masts finished galvanised (Z275) self-coloured, mounted with twelve (12no.) luminaires c/w 2kW lamps and fittings finished raw aluminium.

4.22 At the time of writing I have not received Environmental Protection Team comments but these will be reported to the meeting. In view of the separation of the lights from residential properties and the designs proposed, my initial assessment is that the proposals are acceptable and will not cause unacceptable light pollution.

Residential Amenity

4.23 In addition to lighting, a potential influence on residential amenity could be noise from the use of the facility. In view of the recreational context of the site and similar multi-purpose pitches in the vicinity, I consider some degree of noise is unlikely to prove unreasonable. The most effective way to control the impact of noise would be controlling the hours of use. The proposed hours of use are as follows:

- Monday to Friday 08:00 – 22:00
- Saturday 10:00 – 20:00
- Sunday and Bank Holidays 10:00 – 20:00

4.24 Subject to further advise from the Environmental Protection Team I consider these times to be reasonable in the circumstances of this site. In my opinion, the proposed development complies with Local Plan policy DM3.13.

4.25 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 I consider the proposal can be accommodated on the site without unacceptable harm to the appearance of the area, highway safety and the amenities of local residents. Any adverse impact can be mitigated by the recommended conditions and the facility will bring significant benefits. Subject to final comments from the Environmental Protection team, I consider the proposal accords with relevant planning policies identified above and should be approved.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Elizabeth Thomas 01508 533793 ethomas@s-norfolk.gov.uk
This report schedules progress on outstanding enforcement cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ALLEGED BREACH</th>
<th>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DICKLEBURGH</td>
<td>Material change of use - Breach of a condition -</td>
<td>24.04.07</td>
<td>Enforcement Notices served and initially complied with. Ongoing negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational development</td>
<td></td>
<td>to secure future of the listed building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Unauthorised works to a listed building</td>
<td>12.04.10</td>
<td>Listed Building Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of lean to structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 27.01.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing negotiations on revised scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Application submitted and awaiting validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLETON RODE</td>
<td>Change of use of land</td>
<td>21.07.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standing and Occupation of Residential Caravan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 29.12.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultants employed to secure mitigation scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04.03.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Further Enforcement Notice served re caravan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date within 3 months of first occupation of the permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dwelling house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORTWELL</td>
<td>Standing of caravan</td>
<td>15.06.11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance extended one year to 14.09.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matter to be brought before forthcoming Committee due to change in circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/0254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORTWELL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 27.10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Owner previously unable to comply due to personal circumstances but further action now underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROWNTHORPE</td>
<td>Formation of Access</td>
<td>16.11.11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 27.10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Drift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Owner previously unable to comply due to personal circumstances but further action now underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crownthorpe Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/8025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAXLINGHAM</td>
<td>Storage of a caravan</td>
<td>27.02.13</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THORPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 10.03.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land on the North side of Windy Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due to personal circumstances compliance delayed, contractors contacted with a view to carrying out work shortly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/8069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAINSTHORPE</td>
<td>Construction of hardstanding/roadway</td>
<td>01.04.15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice quashed upon appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to rear of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Permission granted with conditions by Inspector NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Beat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/8218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Standing of residential mobile home</td>
<td>22.07.15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Beeches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 4 months after the mobile home is no longer occupied by specified occupier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crownthorpe Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/6005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Breach of Condition Formed habitable room</td>
<td>19.08.15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Silvo Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/8106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 3.6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT MOULTON</td>
<td>Change of use of land for travellers site</td>
<td>16.09.15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Common Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/8139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORNCETT ST PETER</td>
<td>Change of use of land for travellers site</td>
<td>16.09.15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laynes Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilderswood Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hearing date 25.05.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/8247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the standing of a residential caravan</td>
<td>14.10.15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashgate House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketteringham Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/8075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KETTERINGHAM</td>
<td>Change of use of land for travellers site</td>
<td>14.10.15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land North of High Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/8301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hearing date 12.07.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINGHAM</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the standing of a portacabin</td>
<td>11.11.15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land South of New Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/8116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HINGHAM</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the standing of a mobile home</td>
<td>09.12.15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to North of Woodrising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 27.04.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/8233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Enforcement Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of complaints</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices Issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of Condition Notices Issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 215 Notices Issued</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary stop notices issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENF-PROC
11.04.2016
### Planning Appeals
Appeals received from 18 March 2016 to 18 April 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/1614</td>
<td>Hethersett Land West Of Ketteringham Lane</td>
<td>Mr Mark Levers</td>
<td>Erection of a new 4 bedroom house meeting the criteria of paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hethersett Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2557</td>
<td>Poringland 37 Stoke Road Poringland Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Allan Wright</td>
<td>Sub-Division of garden &amp; erection of a dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk NR14 7JN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2655</td>
<td>Wymondham Land South East of 9 Spinks Lane</td>
<td>Mr T Skitmore</td>
<td>Erection of new dwelling and garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spinks Lane Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2810</td>
<td>Hethersett Land West Of Station Farm Station</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Janes</td>
<td>Proposed small directional sign on land next to A11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lane Hethersett Norfolk NR9 3AY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals
Appeals decisions from 18 March 2016 to 18 April 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>2015/1782</td>
<td>Wymondham Barnabee Barn Wramplingham Road</td>
<td>Mr Nic Sharp</td>
<td>Proposed summerhouse to garden, porch to east elevation, removal of shipping container to allow for cart shed with store to rear.</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downham Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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