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

Please note that planning application Item Nos 1-6 will be heard from 10am.

Planning application Item Nos 7-12 will be heard from 1.30pm onwards.

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 3 February 2016

Time
10.00 am
* Please note change of room

Place
* Colman & Cavell Rooms
South Norfolk House
Cygnet Court
Long Stratton, Norwich
NR15 2XE

Contact
Owen Pugh tel (01508) 533685
South Norfolk House
Cygnet Court
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

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

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

The order of the agenda may change at the discretion of the Chairman, so it is advisable to arrive at the commencement of the meeting if you are intending to speak on items 1 to 6, and arrive at 1.30pm if you intend to speak on items 7 to 12.

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.

PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

HEALTH AND SAFETY INFORMATION

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

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

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

3. To receive Declarations of Interest from Members;

(Please see flowchart and guidance attached, page 8)

4. Minutes of the Meeting of the Development Management Committee held
6 January 2016

(attached – page 10)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;

(attached – page 17)

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>2014/2611</td>
<td>EASTON</td>
<td>Land North and South of Dereham Rd, Easton</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2015/2449/F</td>
<td>WRENINGHAM</td>
<td>Land Off Church Road Wreningham Norfolk</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2015/2536/F</td>
<td>GREAT MOULTON</td>
<td>Land North Of High Green Great Moulton Norfolk</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2015/1485/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land Rear Of 14 Norwich Common Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2015/1487/F</td>
<td>THURLTON</td>
<td>Home Farm Low Road Thurton Norfolk</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2015/1663/F</td>
<td>ASLACTON</td>
<td>Waveney Pumps Newport Drive Station Road Aslacton Norfolk NR15 2DU</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2015/1921/F</td>
<td>CAISTOR ST EDMUND</td>
<td>Land North Of Tas House Norwich Road Caistor St Edmund Norfolk</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2015/2147/A</td>
<td>TOFT MONKS</td>
<td>Junction Of Pound Lane With Yarmouth Road (A143) And Junction Of Church Road With Pound Lane Toft Monks Norfolk</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2015/2276/H</td>
<td>TASBURGH</td>
<td>Jasmine Cottage Low Road Tasburgh Norfolk NR15 1AR</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2015/2522/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Land North Of Glenhurst Folgate Lane Costessey Norfolk</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2015/2655/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land South East Of 9 Spinks Lane Spinks Lane Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2015/2803/F</td>
<td>WICKLEWOOD</td>
<td>Workshop Crowntorpe Road Crowntorpe Norfolk NR18 9EW</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Sites Sub-Committee;**

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

7. **Enforcement Reports** (attached – page 144)

8. **Planning Appeals (for information)** (attached – page 151)


10. **Date of next scheduled meeting** – Wednesday 2 March 2016
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

3. FILMING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS: GUIDANCE

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

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

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

| CNRDP | Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan |
| J.C.S | Joint Core Strategy |
| LSAAP | Long Stratton Area Action Plan – Pre Submission |
| N.P.P.F | National Planning Policy Framework |
| P.D. | Permitted Development – buildings and works which do not normally require planning permission. (The effect of the condition is to require planning permission for the buildings and works specified) |
| S.N.L.P | South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 |
| S.S.A.P. | Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document – Pre Submission |
| WAAP | Wymondham Area Action Plan – Pre Submission |
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?
OR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

YES

NO

YES

NO

NO

YES

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 6 January 2016 at 10.00 am.

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

Apologies: Councillor C Gould

Substitute member: Councillor N Legg

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors), the Place-Shaping and Majors Team Leader (J Hobbs), the Senior Planning Officer (C Raine) and the Property Consultant (S Bizley)

(The press and 11 members of the public were also in attendance)

242. 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>2015/1697 (Item 1)</td>
<td>LITTLE MELTON</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice All lobbied by applicant, objectors and the Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2348/CU (Item 4)</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Cabinet member – left the meeting for this item, did not take part in discussion and did not vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2858/RVC (Item 5)</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Cabinet member – left the meeting for this item, did not take part in discussion and did not vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2356/TPO (Item 6)</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>‘Other’ interest – Applicant is known to members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

243. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meetings dated 2 December 2015 and 9 December 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
244. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/1697</td>
<td>LITTLE MELTON</td>
<td>Mr J Heaser – Chairman Little Melton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr T Hedges – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr A Presslee – On behalf of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr M Aust – On behalf of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr G Wheatley – Local member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2172/F</td>
<td>BRACON ASH</td>
<td>Mr C Chapman – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr S Jones – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr D Adams - Applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee made the decisions indicated in the Appendix to these minutes, conditions of approval or reasons for refusal of planning permission as determined by the Committee being in summary form only and subject to the final determination of the Director of Growth and Localism.

245. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

It was unanimously

RESOLVED: that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for a period during discussions relating to Appendix 3 of Application 1 (2015/1697 Little Melton) on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act (as amended).

246. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals

(The meeting closed at 12:10pm)

__________________________
Chairman
Development Management Committee  

6 January 2016

Minute No 244

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

Applications referred back to Committee

1  
Appl. No : 2015/1697
Parish : LITTLE MELTON

Applicants Name : Vello Ltd
Site Address : Land north of Gibbs Close, Little Melton
Proposal : Application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 27 dwellings, access, roads, open space, parking areas and associated works

Decision : Members voted 7-1 (with 3 abstentions) for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions
1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. Surface water management plan
4. Reporting of unexpected contamination
5. Ecology mitigation measures
6. Standard Estate Road construction conditions
7. Construction Traffic Management
8. Highway Improvements – Offsite works
9. Boundary treatment to be agreed
10. Landscaping scheme to be submitted
11. Ecology management and maintenance
12. Details of foul water disposal
13. Water conservation
14. Renewable energy 10% provision
15. External materials to be agreed

Subject to completion of Section 106 agreement relating to affordable housing and open space management

Updates

Additional Ward Member comments
A number of queries have been received from Cllr Wheatley with regard to the viability report as follows:

- Comment: Site Description inaccurate
  Officer response: the site description contained within the introduction section is incorrect, but officers have not relied on this in the consideration of the resulting findings/figures contained within the report

- Comment: Officers’ report consider application site as brownfield
  Officer response: Bullet point 4 of paragraph 3.2 of the committee report only highlights a statement made by the agent insofar as they are seeking to highlight that providing 20%
affordable housing is not inconsistent with other schemes granted by the District and use two examples in support of this point. No statement is made by officers on the status of the land.

- Comment: Abnormal Costs section of report has untitled amounts
  Officer response: the formatting of this section in the report makes reading difficult. However the figures included within the abnormal costs do add up to the total set out, and these are then used in the economic appraisal calculations for the three options within the Viability report. Furthermore, it is considered that the items included in this section can be fairly included within a viability assessment.

- Comment: Concern over residual land value in Option 2.
  Officer response: Paragraph 8.2 of the viability report is considered to be arrived at following detailed account of development values and development costs as shown on page 14 of the viability report and that the figures and conclusion contained within paragraph 14 are considered to be reasonable.

Comment from Applicant

The agent has requested that the following list of documents be given to members:

- Agent’s letter dated 11 September, DCLG document entitled “Section 106 affordable housing requirements, review and appeal” April 2013, Ministerial statement 09/11/2015 relating to affordable housing.
- Agent’s e-mail dated 15 December and 2 x extracts from the GNDP’s Annual Monitoring Report 2014-2015 dated December 2015
- The agent has requested that the public open space be managed and maintained by a private management company, and in that event it should be the subject of a common practice to deal with the arrangements for public open space as part of the S106 agreement in that it offers flexibility to establish who will be responsible for open space in that provision is made for it to potentially be either SNC, Parish/Town Council or private management company, such an arrangement is in place for the extant permission for 20 dwellings on part of the site (2012/1836). This continues to be an acceptable solution for this proposal and officers would wish for this to continue to be the suggested way to deal with open space here. Officers would wish to confirm that there is no fundamental planning reason why a condition could not be used to secure the POS’s management and maintenance (not provision however) via a condition if this was deemed to be an acceptable alternative to members.

Major applications raising issues of significant precedent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th></th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2015/1760/D</td>
<td></td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicants Name: Mr John Dale
Site Address: Land north of the A11 Silfield Road Wymondham Norfolk
Proposal: Proposed development for 90 new dwellings including parking, garages, road infrastructure, drainage and green infrastructure

Decision: Members voted unanimously to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to APPROVE

Approved with conditions

1. In accordance with submitted drawings

Subject to further satisfactory information being provided in respect of landscaping, highways and design and confirmation from Lead Local Flood Authority that they are satisfied that a detailed scheme can be agreed to adequately deal with surface water.
Development Management Committee
6 January 2016

Updates

Norfolk County Council Highways
- No objection subject to a few additional minor revisions relating primarily to the setting out of visibility splays and other detailed issues which can be secured by condition

South Norfolk Council Design Officer comments
- Further amended plans have been received to respond to previous comments and there is no objection to the application

The Lead Local Flood Authority
- Has confirmed an objection to the application on the grounds of a lack of information in relation to the drainage strategy for this parcel of development. However in general for the Wymondham South development they have advised that as there is a discharge of condition application to cover the drainage matters, it is for the Local Planning Authority to determine whether this approach is acceptable (i.e. drainage matters being resolved by the discharge of condition). Officers consider that a scheme can be agreed to address surface water through the condition on the outline consent, and this is a sufficient mechanism to secure this matter.

Amended plans
- Have been received (05.01.2016) to address the Landscape Officer’s comments. However given the limited timescales, an assessment by officers of these amended plans will still need to be undertaken so delegated authority to approve subject to satisfactory resolution of the outstanding landscaping matters is still sought.

Other applications

3  Appl. No : 2015/2172/F
Parish : BRACON ASH
Applicants Name : Mr David Adams
Site Address : Team Lotus International Hethel Industrial Estate Potash Lane Hethel
Norfolk NR14 8EY
Proposal : New race shop to house Classic Team Lotus
Decision : Members voted unanimously 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. Access construction and culvert details
4. Visibility splays, approved plan
5. Provision of parking, service
6. Surface water
7. Details of foul water disposal
8. External materials to be agreed
9. External lighting
10. Specific use
11. No power tools outside building
12. Contaminated land – submit scheme
13. Implement approved remediation
14. Reporting of unexpected contamination
15. No generators, air handling plant
16. Ecology mitigation
17. Additional ecology survey
18. Bat boxes on site
19. Tree protection
Development Management Committee 6 January 2016

20. Landscaping scheme to be submitted

Subject to the expiry of the consultation period and no new material planning issues being raised

Updates

1 letter of support received from Group Lotus
- Classic Team Lotus has an important role in preserving and celebrating the history of the Marque
- Group Lotus is pleased for the expansion in this location; for tours by media visitors and VIPs its location is especially valuable
- The location will enhance this activity

Applications on land owned by South Norfolk Council

4
Appl. No : 2015/2348/CU
Parish : LODDON
Applicants Name : Mrs Michelle Webster
Site Address : Loddon Business Centre 2B High Street Loddon Norfolk NR14 6AH
Proposal : Change of use of unit 9 in Loddon business centre from B1 to D1 – Psychotherapy

Decision : Members voted 9 - 0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions
1. Full planning permission time limit
2. In accordance with drawings

5
Appl. No : 2015/2858/RVC
Parish : LONG STRATTON
Applicants Name : South Norfolk Council
Site Address : Cygnet House Swan Lane Long Stratton Norfolk
Proposal : Amended from a pre-commencement to a pre-occupation condition to allow the commencement of the development on site

Decision : Members voted 9 – 0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions
1. Time limit
2. Reserved matters
3. Details of roads
4. Standard Estate Road
5. Construction of roads
6. Parking for commercial units
7. Cycle parking
8. Contamination – prior to first occupation
9. External lighting – details required
10. Details of noise sensitive development
11. Foul and sewage details
12. Surface water drainage scheme
13. Code level for water
14. Ecological mitigation
15. Archaeology
16. Finished floor levels
17. Boundary treatments
18. Hard and soft landscaping
19. Tree survey/AIA
20. Landscaping management plan
21. Implementation tree protection measures
22. Provision of fire hydrant
23. Retaining walls – details required
24. Commercial B1 Office only
25. Pedestrian link to St Andrews Close
26. Energy efficiency
27. No hardstanding until surface water strategy approved
28. Materials – details to be submitted
29. Submitted/amended plans
30. Masterplan
31. Affordable housing
32. Demolition in accordance with plans and specific methodology

Updates

Environment Agency comments
- No objection to the variation of condition to enable the condition to be varied to a pre-occupation condition to allow the remedial works to commence

Environmental Service comments
- Support the Environment Agency comments so have no objection to the proposal.
- Officers’ recommendation is therefore varied to that on page 67. Delegated authority to approve is no longer required. The recommendation is therefore one of approval subject to the imposition of conditions

Works to trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Appliance No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2015/2356/TPO</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Mr K Worsley</td>
<td>11 Greenfield Way Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2WP</td>
<td>Lime Tree (T3), reduce from 24m to approximately 17m in height. Shape and remove dead wood. (amended on site as agreed with applicant, photograph sent to applicant showing approximate reduction points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decision : Members voted 9 – 0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions
1. Standard time limit
2. In accordance with BS:3998
### Major applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appl. Nos</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/2611</td>
<td>EASTON</td>
<td>Easton Landowners Consortium Joint Venture LLP</td>
<td>Land North and South of Dereham Rd, Easton</td>
<td>The erection of 890 dwellings; the creation of a village heart to feature an extended primary school, a new village hall, a retail store and areas of public open space; the relocation and increased capacity of the allotments; and associated infrastructure including public open space and highway works.</td>
<td>Approve as previously recommended with conditions and S106 as set out in the previous report attached as Appendix 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Policies

1. **Planning Policies**

   1.1 See previous report attached as Appendix 2 and paragraph 4.2 of this report for the current planning policy position

### Planning History

2. **Planning History**

   2.1 2013/2293 Scoping opinion for Easton village masterplan Environmental Statement required

### Consultations

3. **Consultations**

   3.1 The consultations relate to this received in relation to the revised plan only, the previous committee report attached as Appendix 2 sets out those received previously.

   3.2 Easton Parish Council

      * Accept the proposed development in principle
      * Do not support the amended planning application as the Parish Council do not consider it sustainable for the following reasons:
        * The current application does not include the entire area of land allocated in the recently Site Specific Allocations DPD
        * The proposal would create piecemeal development
        * Lack of comprehensive approach – because of the exclusion of PC land
        * Density of housing
        * Lack of green open space
        * Strain on traffic movements and roads
        * Impact on social fabric of new development
        * The development shows assumed access through Jubilee Playing fields without consulting the Parish Council
        * The proposed foot/cycle way would be loss of existing amenity
        * Impact on wildlife, roads, pedestrian access, parking and contaminated land still remain
- Concern as to whether available funding will be sufficient
- The boundaries do not contain sufficient planting
- Sport England need to be consulted and provided with sufficient time to comment
- The parish council has recommended some suggestions/mitigation measures if the LPA are minded to approve the application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bawburgh Parish Council</th>
<th>No objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costessey Town Council</td>
<td>Object on the following grounds:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Out of scale with existing village
- Increased density on the rest of estate
- Impact on local road infrastructure
- Longwater Interchange impact on roads
- Easton Roundabout would not be able to cope with increase in traffic
- Increase pressure on Longwater Retail Park
- Traffic conflict at NDR/ A47 junction
- Cumulative impact on the area
- The A47 would need dualling
- Lack of public transport
- Footways by cyclists and pedestrians not satisfactory
- Infrastructure not good enough for school provision
- Health provision could not cope
- Contaminated land issues
- The parish council has recommended some suggestions/mitigation measures if the LPA are minded to approve the application

3.3 District Member

The revision does not necessarily need to be referred back to the Development Management Committee.

3.4 Sport England

Object

The site is not considered to form part of, or constitute a playing field as defined.

The guidance is given on the basis of the revised location plan which excludes the Parish Council playing fields to the north of Dereham Road. Should the application site change to include this land, Sport England would be a statutory consultee and our representations would need to consider the loss of these playing fields.

Sport England would encourage the Council to consider the sporting needs arising from the development as well as the needs identified in its Infrastructure Delivery Plan (or similar) and direct those monies to deliver new and improved facilities for sport.

Provision for outdoor sport
- The phasing/master plans do not appear to include any designated areas for sport, and the proposed Village Green does not appear to be sufficiently large to be able to accommodate significant provision for sports pitches.
Insufficient provision for outdoor space

Provision for Indoor Sport
- The sports hall element could potentially be met through the provision of a new village hall if it is designed to meet the standards for a one court hall contained within Sport England’s design guidance ‘Village and Community Halls’ (2001)
- Recommends some practice guidance

Not demonstrated that the scheme will make sufficient provision, either on-site or off-site, for outdoor or indoor sports facilities to serve the new residential developments.

3.5 SNC Community Protection Team
The Lead Local Flood Authority will respond to the application and therefore we will not provide comment at this stage.

3.6 Historic England
Object
- Impact on the setting of the Church of St Peter (harm to the Grade I listed building)

3.7 Highways England
No objection subject to conditions.

3.8 NCC Highways
Comments awaited

3.9 Lead Local Flooding Authority
Comments awaited

3.10 Representations
15 objections received, a summary of these is as follows:
- Amec Surveys appears incomplete and uninspired
- Impact on wildlife, flora species and the natural environment (such as hedges, vegetation)
- Unacceptable impact on wildlife breeding grounds
- Unacceptable impact on protected species
- Unacceptable impact on existing community
- Unacceptable impact in traffic terms
- No safe route access to the A47 for the movement of pedestrians and cyclists
- Considered a form of overdevelopment
- Loss of good agricultural land
- Development significantly oversized for the village and surrounding area
- Misleading promise of a village heart and new community centre – no intention of funding
- Lack of Provision for doctors surgery
- Contrary view of PC and local residents
- Amendments are not sustainable – impact on existing community and wildlife
- Unclear as to who will fund the new village hall
- Unclear as to whether Sport England have been consulted
- The footpath and cycle path provides false impression as to access routes
- Unclear about the maintenance of the buffer zones
- Contaminated land issues still remain
- Inspectors report was misleading in its growth assumptions
• The Nair /Green objection letter focuses on overcrowding
• Lack for funding resources
• disabled person access out of the village is very limited – no bus service or GP surgeries
• Parish Councils interests do not reflect the views of the village
• The proposed development will be dense and there will be an increase in dwellings, which is not considered a complete plan for the village
• Do not consider the proposal sustainable

4 Assessment

Introduction

4.1 This application was considered by the Development Management Committee on the 3rd June 2015 and the committee resolved to agree the recommendation to approve the application subject to conditions and a S106 agreement being entered into. Since this resolution was made, it has become apparent that discussion between the parties which make up the consortium of applicants have unfortunately not been able to reach an agreement in respect of this, and this has led to the application site being reduced by removing the Parish Council’s land. This would allow the matter to be concluded in that the S106 can look to be progressed with all necessary signatories. The Parish Council not needing to be a signatory as they would no longer have land included as part of the application. The Parish Council’s land being 2.45ha and located between the A47 dual carriageway to the north and Dereham Road to the south. The now revised site area is 44.01ha as opposed to 46.457ha, with 890 dwellings proposed rather than 907.

In light of this amended site area, the Council has re-consulted all parties to notify them of this change and offer them the chance to comment on this revision.

The following is an assessment of the impacts of the reduced site area.

Key issues

4.2 By way of clarification, since the previous resolution was made the Council has now adopted its Local Plan (October 2015) and consequently the site in question forms part of the EAS1 allocation within the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document. The previous report (included as Appendix 1) did attach weight to the allocation within its assessment given that the plan was at an advanced stage at the time of consideration, and as such this does not raise any significant issues with the exception of reaffirming the approach taken in the previous application insofar as the need to assess the scheme against the requirements of the allocation EAS1, and the stated criterion included within it. The adoption of the Local Plan also means that those policies set out in the previous committee report from the 3rd June 2015 as being applicable is no longer up to date. Those contained in paragraph 1.3 of the previous report are no longer applicable as they have been replaced by those in the recently adopted plan as set out in paragraph 1.5 of the previous report. Those contained in paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 of the previous committee report, the NPPF and the JCS respectively, remain applicable.

4.3 It should also be noted that when considering the application previously, the committee report at that time made reference to the Council being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply within the Norwich Policy Area. However, the Council cannot demonstrate such a supply. The main implication of this is that it renders the housing policies of the plan out of date in the decision making process, however, as set out above this site forms part of an allocation where residential development is expected to be delivered in any event.
4.4 The revised site, lies within the development limit for Easton and is allocated under EAS1 for housing. The allocation has 21 criteria to be taken into account in the consideration of the proposal. The previous committee report assessed the proposal against these stated criterion and concluded that these were satisfactorily addressed, having due regard to the outline status of the application.

4.5 Whilst the number of dwellings proposed is less than originally proposed (890 instead of 907), the overall density has increased from 19.16 dwellings per hectare to 20.22. It is evident from the revised masterplan that this modest increase would be easily facilitated by relatively modest increase in numbers across what is a large site area. The reduced site area does not result in the failure of the scheme to meet these stated criterion, and those conditions recommended previously remain applicable.

4.6 The consultation process has resulted in objections from Parish Councils and local residents. However, it is considered that these do not raise any new issues which were not addressed in the previous consideration of the application.

4.7 With regard to other consultations received, Historic England has re-affirmed its previous concerns to the proposal in the context of potential harm to the Church of St Peter (Grade I listed), and suggest further mitigation is provided. It is evident that the increase in density would not be facilitated through the reduction in the buffer between development and the church as previously highlighted in the submission, and on which the previous resolution was based. As previously highlighted the site has now been adopted, despite the Historic England expressing concern through the local Plan process. On balance, it is not considered that the change in application site area has increased the impact of the development upon the Church of St Peter.

4.8 An objection has been received from Sport England which raises concern on the basis of their being a lack of provision for outdoor sport, and also highlights the need for indoor sport provision but confirms that the village hall could be designed to meet this need if the prescribed standards are met. This is contrary to Policy 8 of the JCS. Sport England highlight that Easton College has extensive sports facilities in close proximity which could help some facilities to meet demand from the proposed development.

4.9 It is considered appropriate to consider the following points in respect of Sport England’s response.

4.10 As indicated by Sport England, Easton College offers extensive sporting facilities which can be accessed via residents of Easton. It is considered that the existence of such facilities, mean that local people, clubs, organisation etc do presently have access to high quality sporting facilities, for example Easton FC use Easton College as their home ground. It would seem that these facilities are also a contributing factor in the present, and historic, lack of any meaningful and/or sustained sporting use of the playing field within Easton (this being the parcel of land under the ownership of the Parish Council which has been excluded from the application site). This could also be brought back into use now that it has been deleted from the current scheme, should the Parish Council wish to do so.

It is also evident that the evolution of the allocation EAS1 has sought to establish a significant open space which seeks to establish a “village green” rather than seeking to provide formal sports pitches. This would appear to be a logical approach whereby it would result in a facility (village hall and green) which would complement the formal sports pitches available at the college to the benefit of the village.

4.11 Sport England make reference to Policy 8 of the JCS, it is important to note that this Policy is not specifically a sport related policy. Policy 8 is entitled Culture, leisure and entertainment and focuses mainly on cultural implications of development. It does indicate the need to provide for leisure activities, including new or improved built facilities and green space including formal recreation. It is considered that the village hall and associated green does actually fulfil the requirements of Policy 8 of the JCS, notwithstanding the views of Sport England.
4.12 Sport England makes reference to the Fields in Trust Standard for calculating the provision for outdoor space, and using this sets out a requirement for 3.3ha to be provided for outdoor sport. It is evident that the Council's adopted recreation space standards require greater levels of open space than this standard in any event, with 3.7ha for recreation space and 1.61 for play space. This scheme proposes to deliver the amount of space required by the Council's standard.

4.13 It is considered that the scheme makes the provision for sufficient recreation space within it, having due regard to the Council's adopted standards. Furthermore, the outline nature of the scheme, allows for a scheme to be developed that meets with the needs of the village in terms of recreation space and facilities when reserved matters applications are made.

4.14 No objections have been received from any technical bodies, for example Highways England, in respect of the reduced site area.

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

5. Conclusion

5.1 It is considered that the reduced site area continues to satisfy the requirements of the planning policy, including the requirements of the site allocation. On this basis the development Management Committee is invited to agree to resolve to approve the amended application subject to the attachment of relevant conditions to the approval and the completion of the S106 agreement.

5.2 Officers would also request that in the event that the Parish Council wish to re-enter into a partnership with the present applicant's (as previously envisaged), then the previous resolution in relation to the enlarged application agreed by the Development Management Committee on the 3rd of June 2015 (which includes the Parish Council's land) can be reverted back to without the need to report the matter back to the Development Management Committee.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Raine 01508 533841 craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2.  
Appl. No : 2014/2611/O  
Parish : EASTON  
Applicants Name : Easton Landowners Consortium Joint Venture LLP  
Site Address : Land North And South Of Dereham Road Easton Norfolk  
Proposal : The erection of 907 dwellings; the creation of a village heart to feature an extended primary school, a new village hall, a retail store and areas of public open space; the relocation and increased capacity of the allotments; and associated infrastructure including public open space and highway works.  
Recommendation : Approval with conditions

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

Subject to the completion of a S106 agreement to secure affordable housing, open space, land for primary school extension, green infrastructure, ecology mitigation and travel plan, and Community Infrastructure Levy

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
Development Management Committee

NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
ENV 2: Areas of open land which maintain a physical separation between settlements within the Norwich Area (Part Consistent)
ENV 6: Areas which contribute to maintaining the landscape setting
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
EMP 4: Employment development outside the Development Limits and Village Boundaries of identified towns and villages (Non Consistent)
TRA 13: Corridors of movement
ENV 14: Habitat protection
ENV 15: Species protection
ENV 21: Protection of land for agriculture
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings
LEI 12: Costessey Pits
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
TRA 19: Parking standards

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage. Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be Spring 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to the emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.5 Development Management Policies
DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.2 Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development
DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.1 Housing Quality
DM3.2 Meeting housing requirements and needs
DM3.9 Design Principles
DM3.11 Promotion of sustainable transport
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.15 Pollution, health and safety
DM3.16 Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
DM3.17 Improving the level of local community facilities
DM4.1 Building Fabric Energy Efficiency, Carbon Compliance and Allowable Solutions
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.4 Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.6 Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.9 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.11 Heritage Assets

1.6 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
EAS1 Land south and east of Easton

1.7 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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

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

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/2293 Scoping opinion for Easton village masterplan Environmental Impact Assessment required

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Councils: Easton

Object,
When JCS was produced we said that development should only take place when necessary infrastructure was provided, upgrades to Longwater junction and Easton Roundabout. Longwater is already gridlocked at certain times of the day and the scheme does not provide a solution to the problems including for cyclists and pedestrians. This is impossible to exit at certain times of the day, this situation would be made worse by this development and there is also uncertainty over the western end of the NDR. Anglian Waters has identified a potential drainage solution, however, we would want to know exactly what is planned in this respect.
The size of the development is out of all proportion with the existing village.
We have no Doctor’s Surgery. Concern at Roundwell Medical Centre’s capacity to cope. Outlying surgeries such as Mattishall cannot take more patients.
The size of the proposed village hall and car park is not acceptable. Gt Witchingham’s new hall is 535sqm and this would be more appropriate than 300sqm as suggested
Response on 17 May 2015 from new member of Easton PC:

- Quality of TROD footpath along Dereham Road poor, now accessible for all under Equalities Act.
- Footpath could not be used by cycles
- Crossing on Dereham Road proposed unsafe due to road speeds, suggest signalised pedestrian crossing instead
- Further details of the proposed new footway required to ensure it is safe for people to use.
- Request all pedestrian and cycle routes in place before development can commence.

Marlingford and Colton

- Object.
- Volume of traffic.
- Access between Marlingford and the Dereham Road/A47 would become noticeably less direct.
- Access between Colton and the Dereham Road/A47: for such traffic, there would be two give-ways at Church Lane, Easton – this route is the main access to the Dereham Road/A47 for residents of Colton; it also has significant HGV traffic and, seasonally, heavy farm vehicle (tractor and trailer) traffic. It is the Council’s view that access would become significantly more difficult.
- Road infrastructure in the wider context: although steps are being taken to improve the Longwater interchange, it is clear that major investment in infrastructure will be needed at the interchange and in the area to the north of the A47.
- Surface Water Drainage, the Parish Council fully endorses the views expressed by the Flood Defence Officer. It seems essential that surface water run-off from the proposed development does not exceed the existing run-off rate, and, preferably, would be less, as indicated in the Flood Defence Officer’s report. Likewise, it seems essential to have in place, as stated in the Flood Risk Assessment, the implementation of ‘arrangements to ensure adequate, long-term maintenance of private drainage systems/riparian ditches’. Further, those measures should extend all the way from Easton to the River Yare.
- Lighting, the Parish Council would encourage the use of all possible measures to reduce light pollution of the night sky.

Bawburgh

- No objection subject to appropriate supportive infrastructure being provided.

Costessey Town Council

- Object. Given the well documented capacity problems at Longwater Interchange and surrounding areas, CTC cannot support this application for development unless the necessary highway/infrastructure improvements have been made to mitigate the traffic congestion.
- In light of a re-consultation on the basis of additional/amended highway related information and mitigation further comments are envisaged, these will be reported via the committee update procedure.

3.2 District Member

- To be determined by Development Management Committee

3.3 Highways England

- No objection subject to conditions

3.4 Natural England

- No objection
| 3.5 | Historic England | Object. The proposal is for a large development extending in a broad arc from the east side of the existing village, across the southern side of the village and around to the west of the village. A new village centre is to be located immediately south of the existing school. English Heritage is satisfied that the majority of the scheme would not adversely impact on the historic environment, but is concerned that a relatively small component of the housing on the western edge of the development would result in harm to the Grade I listed Church of St Peter. English Heritage do not believe that the harm has been adequately justified as required by paragraph 132 of the NPPF and therefore recommends that that application should not be approved in its current form and that the layout should be modified to mitigate this harm prior to being approved. |
| 3.6 | Broadland District Council | No comments received |
| 3.7 | Historic Environment Service | No objection subject to a condition |
| 3.8 | SNC Landscape Officer | No objections, but concern over the future management of woodland buffer zones shown. This matter can be addressed further through conditions. |
| 3.9 | Anglian Water Services Ltd | No objection subject to conditions |
| 3.10 | SNC Design Officer | Principles of masterplan presented provide good basis for further design work at the reserved matters stage. Condition required for design code to ensure cohesive development. Building for Life Assessment to be orally updated at committee |
| 3.11 | SNC Ecology and Green Infrastructure | Observations – Green infrastructure strategy should be secured outside of a S106 agreement either through submission of further information or secured by way of condition. New public rights of way (PROW) are created to improve access to the countryside, these may be informed by the GI Strategy, a developer “welcome pack” shall be created and provided to all new residents and in public places for existing residents. Slow worm mitigation should be addressed through the submission of a mitigation plan as opposed to via a S106 agreement. |
| 3.12 | Environment Agency | No objection subject to conditions. |
| 3.13 | SNC Environmental Services (Protection) | No objection subject to a condition in respect of unknown contamination. |
| 3.14 | NCC Highways | After discussions on the highway improvements required no objection subject to conditions and comments received. (Appendix 1 for full response). |
| 3.15 | SNC Property Consultant | A viability assessment was submitted with the application. Following discussions with the applicants this assessment is accurate. |
| 3.16 | SNC Affordable Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager | No objection to the application, the proposed 17% affordable housing level is accepted after consideration of the viability. The Section 106 agreement will secure this provision. |
3.17 NCC (Mineral and Waste)  
Object on the grounds of mineral resource safeguarding

3.18 NCC Planning Obligations Co-ordinator  
No objection subject to transfer of land to NCC for expanded primary school

3.19 Police Architectural Liaison Officer  
No objection

3.20 SNC Flood Defence Officer  
No objection subject to condition

3.21 NHS England  
No comments received.

3.22 NHS Clinical Commissioning Group  
No comments received.

3.23 Other Representations  
Roundwell Medical Centre - No objection.

St Peters Church of England Primary School  
The Governors are satisfied that the available evidence suggests that this burial site is likely not to be in the area of the school extension and also that Foot and Mouth disease is an animal disease that is not a danger to humans. However, in order to dispel the concerns in the village we would support the proposal suggested by Boyer Planning Ltd that the planning application has a condition put on it stating that investigative work be carried out to establish the exact location of this pit before any development of the school can take place.

Mattishall and Lenwade Surgery  
No spare capacity for more patients at this time

Petition with 502 signatures objection to scale of development, the village and surrounding area cannot cope.

297 letters submitted with the following issues identified against a checkbox. Different objectors selected different issues, but all issues raised were:
- Road capacity
- Pedestrian access
- Need for additional housing
- Medical services capacity
- Primary school size and road safety around school
- Contaminated land – foot and mouth burial pits
- Flooding risk increase
- Wildlife – surveys not adequate
- Food Hub – consider proposals in conjunction with application

176 letters of objection received, a summary of their concerns is as follows:
- Roads are close to capacity, frequent traffic jams,
- Dangerous for pedestrians including school children,
- TROD is not suitable to meet the needs of all e.g. disabled residents,
- Traffic pollution,
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- Inadequate pedestrian access available to local facilities e.g. school medical practice,
- Amount of housing proposed is disproportionate to Easton,
- some growth is considered to be reasonable but scale as proposed is too great,
- The Council has a 6.76 year housing land supply,
- Insufficient medical facilities to cope with demand,
- Extension of school is insufficient to deal with the number of pupils which will arise from the development,
- Historic foot and mouth burial pits mean the it cannot be guaranteed that the land is 100% safe for the village heart or school extension,
- flooding concerns,
- Inadequate surveys and provision made to protect wildlife,
- Contrary to South Norfolk Place-Making Guide
- Impact upon trees and wildlife
- Disturbance and noise,
- Consideration of proposed Food Hub required
- Contrary to Local Plan Policies HOU4 and ENV6
- Contrary to JCS in respect of need for infrastructure upgrade expansion
- Surveys in submission are inaccurate e.g. traffic surveys conducted on school holidays.

The campaign group “Easton Against Development” “EAD) has also expressed concern at the scheme, including on the above grounds.

Note: In light of a further re-consultation on the basis of additional/amended highway related information and mitigation further comments are envisaged, these will be reported via the committee update procedure.

4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The site is located within the parish of Easton and consists of 46.45ha of land to the east, south and west of the existing built up area of the village. The site is predominantly made up of agricultural land, 29.32ha of the site is occupied for Easton and Otley College, with 22.98ha of it in arable production.

4.2 The site boundaries are formed by the A47 and the Dereham Road as well as the property boundaries of Bawburgh Road, Dereham Road, Cardinal Close, Woodview Road, Burton Close, Garnett Drive and Parkers Close and a number of field boundaries.

4.3 The application seeks outline planning permission with all matters reserved for the following:
  - 907 dwellings;
  - Land for an extended primary school;
  - a new village hall;
  - An A1 retail store;
  - areas of public open space including a village green;
  - relocated allotments, and;
  - highway works.
The application has been accompanied by the following documents:
- application form;
- plans (location plan, illustrative masterplan, phasing plan, building heights plan, land use plan, density plan and constraints plan);
- Arboricultural Impacts Plan;
- Archaeological assessment;
- A range of ecology related surveys;
- Design and Access Statement;
- Energy Statement;
- Environment Statement (including Non-Technical Summary);
- Flood Risk Assessment;
- Heritage Impact Assessment;
- Lighting Assessment;
- Geotechnical and Geophysical Reports;
- Planning Statement;
- S106 heads of terms;
- Statement of Community Involvement;
- Transport Assessment;
- Utilities Assessment.

Current policy background

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

With regard to the Adopted South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP), Annex 1 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 215 states that where a plan is adopted pre 2004, such as is the case with the SNLP, decision makers should give due weight to policies in existing plans according to their consistency with the NPPF. Therefore, where reference is made to SNLP policies within this assessment, the level of weight for each policy will be set out.

By way of clarification, the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (JCS), which also forms part of the Development Plan, was adopted in March 2011, with amendments in 2014, and as such paragraph 215 of Annex A of the NPPF as above is not applicable to the JCS.

Paragraph 216 of Annex A of the NPPF goes onto address the weight attributable to emerging Plans, in this case we have the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (SSAPD) and Development Management Policies Document (DMPD), depending on the stage of preparation of said documents, extent of unresolved objections to policies within the said documents and the degree of consistency with the NPPF.

With regard to the NPPF, paragraph 49 confirms that:

"Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development."

Paragraph 14 of the NPPF confirms that:

"for decision-taking this means:
Approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay;
and
Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:"

31
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; or

Specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted."

4.11 The NPPF confirms that sustainable development has three roles, 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.

4.12 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF also confirms that:

"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."

Relationship to the Development limit for Easton (as defined within the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2013)

4.13 The site lies outside of the development limit for Easton and as such is contrary to Policy HOU4 of the SNLP.

4.14 Policy HOU4 seeks to locate development of residential development within the defined development limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, of which Easton is one. On this basis the proposed 907 dwellings would not accord with this policy.

4.15 With regard to establishing the weight attributable to Policy HOU4 in light of the requirements of paragraph 215 of Annex of the NPPF as set out in paragraph, Policy HOU4 is considered to be fully consistent with the NPPF as it is consistent with positive planning for new development, and provides sufficient land for supplying housing for present and future generations as set out in paragraph 7 of the NPPF by virtue of the Council being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply including a the 5% buffer. The Council’s current position is that it has a 5.1 year supply as of the 1st of December 2014.

4.16 Policy ENV8 is applicable to residential development outside of defined settlement limits. It states that:

"Permission for development in the open countryside, outside the development limits and village boundaries of existing settlements and areas identified for development in the Plan, will only be granted if it:

vi) Is requisite for agriculture or forestry; or

vii) Is justified to sustain economic and social activity in rural communities, and demands a rural location; or

viii) Is for the suitable adaptation and re-use of an existing rural building.

All such development must

ix) Respect the intrinsic beauty, the diversity of landscape, the wealth of natural resources, and the ecological, agricultural and recreational value of the countryside; and

x) Be sensitively integrated into its rural surroundings in terms of siting, scale and design, while avoiding creating ribbon development or an unduly fragmented pattern of development.

4.17 As referred to above, given that this was adopted pre 2004, it is necessary to establish how much weight can be attributed to those in the decision making process by assessing its consistency with the NPPF. This matter was recently considered by the Secretary of State (SoS) and Planning Inspectorate in the Appeal decision for Chapel Lane, Wymondham (2012/1434) in which the SoS agreed with the Inspector’s observation at paragraph 101 which stated:
“With regard to Local Plan Policy ENV8, I accept that is, to some degree, the ‘other side’ of Local Plan Policy HOU4 that allows housing within Development Limits [54]. However, on its face it is a policy that is designed to protect the countryside, rather than being one of the ‘relevant policies for the supply of housing’. As such, I consider it is not out-of-date, though I accept that, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, addressing a housing land shortfall may well necessitate conflicting with this policy.”

4.18 Therefore, it is considered that Policy ENV8 continues to carry significant weight in the decision making process and the proposal is unacceptable as it does not satisfy any of the above stated criterion, and would lead to unacceptable residential development in the countryside.

4.19 In the context of the Development Plan, the scheme conflicts with current policies HOU4 and ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, but emerging policies are relevant and form part of the planning balance in this instance as discussed further below.

Emerging Policy within the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document

4.20 Whilst acknowledging the above policy position in respect of the SNLP, it is necessary to have regard to emerging policy in respect of this site, and in particular Policy EAS1 the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document SSAPD. This policy seeks to allocate 52.6ha of land for housing (900 dwellings) and associated infrastructure, including a village centre.

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF confirms that:

From the day of publication, decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given)
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

4.21 In the context of para 216 of the NPPF, it is considered that Policy EAS1 of the SSAPD can be afforded significant weight in the decision-making process for the following reasons:

The Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document has been through examination by a Planning Inspector and proposed modifications have been consulted on, at present this is ongoing and due to expire on the 5th June 2015. It is evident that the proposed modifications do not include any significant revisions to Policy EAS1. Furthermore, Policy EAS1 is considered to be consistent with the aims of the NPPF, and in particular, in relation to boosting the supply of housing. This policy is therefore given significant weight in this recommendation.

Policy EAS1 states the following:

52.6 hectares of land is allocated for housing and associated infrastructure. This allocation will accommodate approximately 900 dwellings and supporting facilities, including a new village centre.

The developer(s) of the sites will be required to ensure the following:

Master Plan
- A comprehensive master plan which will need to cover the provision of social and green infrastructure and highways improvements, taking into account the other requirements of this policy, and address:
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- Phasing which clearly identifies when key infrastructure will be provided in relation to the provision of new housing. Phasing should be designed to ensure development minimises the disturbance to existing residents;
- The relationship to any continued expansion of Easton College, the Royal Norfolk Showground (including the loss of any land currently used for Showground parking) and the proposed Easton Gymnastics Club site (Policy EAS 2);
- The approach to densities across the allocation, including higher densities close to the proposed village centre;
- Careful consideration of development west of the allotments, including the possible retention of this area as open space.

Enhanced Facilities

- Provision of a new village centre in the vicinity of the indicative site shown on the Easton Inset Map, to include a new village hall, village green/focal recreation space, post office/small scale convenience goods retail opportunity (approx. 250m² net), shared parking provision with primary school;
- Expanded primary school provision in agreement with the Education Authority.

Heritage Assets

- Application to be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of St Peter’s Church as a heritage asset, the extent of its setting and the contribution that its setting makes to its significance;
- Ensure that sufficient open space and landscaping is retained to the south, south east and south west of St Peter’s Church and that sufficient planting is provided, such that its setting, and the wooded setting of Diocesan House and the Vicarage, are protected.

Landscaping and Green Infrastructure

- Protection of the existing allotments and any other sites in community use, or relocation to an equivalent or better site;
- Provision of a landscape buffer and enhancements to the A47 corridor - layout and landscaping should take into account both visual enhancement and the noise implications of the neighbouring A47 and Showground and include any proposals for acoustic barriers;
- Identification and protection of significant biodiversity features, including trees and hedgerows, incorporated within open spaces and with off-site mitigation where on-site protection cannot be achieved;
- Green infrastructure enhancements, including the approach to the area between the village and Easton College;
- Proportionate contributions to the access improvements to the Yare Valley and Bawburgh/Colney Lakes.

Transport

Highways and transport improvements agreed with Norfolk County Council and, where appropriate, the Highways Agency, to include:

- Proportionate contributions to short, medium and long term improvements to the A47 Easton and Longwater junctions to ensure that junction capacity does not become a constraint on development;
- Provision of new vehicular accesses for development to the south of the village, to supplement Marlingford Road and Bawburgh Road;
- Provision for, and proportionate contributions to, Dereham Road Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), including improved access to facilities in Costessey, and other public transport enhancements in accordance with the latest version of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATS) Implementation plan;
- Safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle links to key locations, including Longwater employment and retail, Costessey Medical Centre, Ormiston Victory Academy, Costessey Park and Ride site and Easton College.
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Site conditions and constraints
- Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 applies as this site is underlain by safeguarded mineral resources.
- Investigation of ground conditions at the former gravel pit site north of Dereham Road;
- Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place;
- Site layout to take account of water mains and sewers crossing site.

Taking into account the above, it is considered appropriate to consider the proposal in the context of the requirements of EAS1. An assessment is as follows, based upon the headings provided in the Policy.

Transport

4.22 EAS1 requires highway and transport improvements, to a standard to meet the requirements of both NCC and Highways England (formerly the Highways Agency). These specifically relate to improvements to both the A47 Easton and Longwater junctions, new vehicular accesses for development to the south of the village (Marlingford and Bawburgh Road) provision for a contributions to Bus Rapid transport (BRT), safe and convenient pedestrian and cycle links to key locations e.g. Longwater employment and retail, Costessey medical centre, Ormiston victory Academy etc..

4.23 Significant concern has been raised by the residents of Easton at a number of issues related to transport implications, including the lack of adequate pedestrian and cycle facilities and the ability of the local highway network to cope with the extra traffic which would be brought about as a consequence of the development, having regard to the existing difficulties experienced in relation to traffic in and around Easton.

4.24 Significant discussions have taken place, between the developer, South Norfolk Council, Norfolk County Council and Highways England in order to establish a range of mitigation measures to ensure that safe and convenient pedestrian and cyclist facilities are provided to access key facilities and establish improvements to the road network to secure the safe and efficient functioning of the local highway network. The following position has been established:

4.25 Highways England has confirmed that they have no objection subject to the imposition of conditions.

4.26 Norfolk County Council in their capacity as Highway Authority has confirmed the following:

The development will be accessed from a number of roads; Church Lane off Dereham Road, Marlingford Road and Bawburgh Lane.

Both the Marlingford Road and Bawburgh Lane access points have been drawn up to discourage significant additional traffic and use. Finally a new access road on the eastern side of the development will be provided which will connect to Dereham Road with a priority junction.

The revised junction forms have been submitted in an indicative form only and will be subject to detailed design as conditions, including trigger points for delivery of the improvements to which they relate.

A significant quantum of the development is within the necessary 3 mile walk to school catchment and the whole development is within walking and cycling distance of employment, medical facilities and a wide range of shopping and leisure facilities.
4.27 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) clearly states in Section 4 that 'the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel' (paragraph 29).

The Framework goes on to state in paragraph 35 that:

'devlopments should be located and designed where practical to ..... give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, have access to high quality public transport facilities; create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians...'.

Therefore a key element of the development is the delivery of a 3 metre wide shared use footway/cycleway from the development, along Dereham Road to the Longwater Interchange, over the Interchange and connecting into the existing footway/cycleway on William Frost Way and then along Dereham Road to Costessey.

4.28 Crossing of William Frost Way will be by using a new controlled crossing (Drawing No: Figure 9.2). Improvements to the route at the Longwater Interchange include signalised crossings on the west bound on and the east bound off slips of the A47(T) and the widening of the footway over the bridge (with an increased height in parapet).

4.29 In addition, footways and footway/cycleways will be provided along the site frontage on the Dereham Road and the existing TROD path will be upgraded to a 3 metre wide footway/cycleway. Crossing points will also be provided within the site frontage and near the Premier Inn/Showground public house.

4.30 The proposed footway/cycleways are conditioned and should be designed by and delivered by the various trigger points. NCC Highway Authority has requested the proposed footway/cycleway is provided prior to first occupation of any dwelling. It should also be noted that the Parish Council have requested the improvements are completed prior to commencement of development. The Highway Authority has not requested the improvements prior to commencement of development and so it is not considered reasonable to request this as a trigger point. The provision prior to first occupation has been considered and discussed with the applicants in relation to viability. Further information has been requested on the impact on viability and the final trigger point will be orally updated to committee.

4.31 These schemes are purely indicative at present and will be subject to detailed design as the development progresses.

4.32 The local Highway Authority has recommended that the delivery of the footway/cycleway along the southern side of Dereham Road and the connection across the Longwater Interchange to further footway/cycleway facilities be completed before first occupation of any dwelling. This is considered as a fundamental pre-requisite of the development as no such facility currently exists and it will provide an appropriate route for vulnerable road users particularly school children.

4.33 It is acknowledged that Highways England has recommended a slightly different trigger point for the delivery of the signalised crossings on the slip roads however the local Highway Authority maintains that these should be delivered at first occupation of any dwelling.

4.34 Dereham Road from the Longwater Interchange to the edge of the existing village is currently wide, has right hand turn lanes, lacks any speed controls or entry features and is in the same format as it was when it was a 60 mph trunk road.
4.35 To produce a highway corridor more appropriate for an urban speed limit the developer is proposing to narrow the carriageway, extend the 30 mph limit, remove the right hand turn lanes and provide an entry feature, all of which should enhance the village environment.

4.36 In terms of Travel Planning, it has been agreed that Norfolk County Council will deliver the Travel Plan at a cost of £250 per dwelling. The Travel Plan is conditioned below and funding will be secured via a Section 106 agreement.

4.37 It is anticipated that existing bus services will divert and serve the development as the development is built out. When reserved matters applications are submitted, bus stops and shelters will need to be provided at agreed locations along the main estate spine road.

4.38 By way of clarification, the submitted phasing plan has been used to define when the various pieces of highway infrastructure will be delivered.

4.39 In light of the above and provided the S106 is secured prior to the issue of any planning permission, the Highway Authority has no objection to the scheme.

4.40 In summary, the scheme is considered to deliver a range of traffic, cyclist and pedestrian improvements consistent with the aims of emerging Policy EAS1 and policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.41 The potential Food Hub has been identified in letters of representation and the need to consider the impact of any such proposals with this application. At present there are no proposals for this use that form a material planning considerations, such as a planning permission or defined location in an adopted policy document. Whilst there may be information that indicates there could be a potential development in the vicinity of this site in the absence of a planning permission or adopted policy document the Council can give no weight to such proposals in the determination of this planning application. Therefore no weight can be given to any potential location of such a development at this time.

Masterplan

4.42 A masterplan to cover social and green infrastructure, phasing, relationship to continued expansion of Easton College, the Royal Norfolk Showground (including the loss of any land currently used for Showground parking) and the proposed Easton Gymnastics Club site (Policy EAS 2), densities and careful consideration of development west of the allotments, including the possible retention of this area as open space.

4.43 A plan has been submitted indicating the likely phasing of the residential components of the site with the 907 dwellings being delivered across seven phases and makes provision for the various other social infrastructure to be developed namely the additional school land, village green and hall, retail unit and allotments.

4.44 This phasing plan is being used to inform the content of the S106 legal agreement in terms of linking the delivery of the social infrastructure to housing delivery across the site.

4.45 The illustrative masterplan has been developed in the full knowledge of both Easton College and Norfolk Showground so as to conflict with their future aspirations, and the masterplan does not conflict with the Easton Gymnastics Club expansion which already benefits from planning permission to extend their premises, with work having commenced earlier this year.

4.46 A density plan has been submitted in support of the scheme which adopts a principle of having the lowest density around the rural edge of the site, with higher densities areas positioned more centrally within the various parcels of land. This approach of having higher densities in central location means that no higher density developments will be located adjacent to existing residents.
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4.47 The design approach to the masterplan for the site is considered to be acceptable. A condition for a design code to ensure a cohesive development is recommended. The Building for Life assessment scores will be orally updated at committee.

4.48 This section of Policy EAS1 makes reference to the need to carefully consider development to the western part of the site, this is considered in detail in the "Heritage Assets" assessment later in this report.

4.49 Policy EAS1 also makes reference to the need for a larger area of allotments than presently provided in Easton. The masterplan makes provision for this and this will be secured as part of the S106 agreement.

Enhanced facilities

4.50 Enhanced facilities in the form of a new village centre is to be provided. This will consist of a new village hall, village green/recreation area, associated parking provision which can also be used for parking associated with the functioning of the primary school, and a post office/A1 retail premises (250sqm net). Additional land is also to be provided to facilitate the expansion of the existing primary school.

4.51 The illustrative masterplan highlights where the village centre is to be provided, and this is consistent with the Easton Inset Map which accompanies the policy.

4.52 The schemes proposes a total of 5.4ha of land in total for public open space which is considered to be satisfactory in the context of council guidance for calculating open space provision. 0.16ha of this would be used to facilitate a new village hall. This is considered to be a sufficiently large site to facilitate an appropriately sized village hall. There has been significant debate in relation to the size of village hall required to meet the needs of the community, the application does make reference to a 300sqm facility and concern has been expressed locally that this is not sufficiently large enough to meet the needs of an expanded village.

4.53 It should be stressed that this is an outline application, and as such any outline planning permission would not restrict the size of village hall that could come forward at reserved matters stage, and it is evident that the land set aside for the village hall could facilitate a village hall that is larger than 300sqm.

4.54 The application does not propose to construct a village hall, it proposes to provide the land for this and the associated parking to the Parish Council via the S106 agreement along with the village green/recreation area. This is primarily on the basis that the development does not result in the loss of the present village hall, which the Parish Council will continue to have control over. Therefore, they have the option to continue to keep this facility or they could use any revenues from the disposal of this towards the delivery of a new village hall. It should also be noted that the development would deliver significant CIL funds to the Parish Council (they would receive 15% of the total CIL funds for the development which equates to in the region of £975,000 across the entire development) which could be used to deliver the scheme.

4.55 In terms of the land to facilitate the expanded primary school, an area of land has been identified on a plan and NCC has confirmed that they are satisfied with the location, configuration and size of the land offered and this will be duly provided to NCC as part of the S106 legal agreement.

4.56 In terms of the post office/A1 retail premises, the masterplan makes provision for this to be provided.
4.57 Whilst in outline, the application makes provision for a 300sqm unit and as such the proposal broadly complies with this requirement. In terms of para 24 of the NPPF, there is a requirement for a sequential test for main town centre uses such as A1 where they are not in a town centre and not in accordance with an up to date plan. It is considered that in this instance, a sequential assessment is not necessary in light of the stated aspirations of EAS1 to secure enhanced facilities, including an A1 retail premises, and acknowledging the advanced status of this policy. It should be noted that the relatively modest size of this A1 premises means that it falls beneath the size thresholds expressed in para 26 of the NPPF in respect of the need to undertake an assessment of the impacts of the development upon vitality and viability of town centres.

Heritage Assets

4.58 By way of background, the text within policy EAS1 as set out above has been revised as part of the proposed main modifications to the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document to reflect those concerns raised by Historic England that the previously suggested policy wording did not provide sufficient safeguards to adequately protect the setting of Grade I listed St Peters Church.

4.59 With this in mind, the application is accompanied by a Heritage Impact Assessment in acknowledgement of the need to understand the impact of the development upon the St Peters Church (Grade I), the extent of its setting and the contribution its setting makes to its significance.

4.60 The report recognises that the proposal would have an impact upon St Peters Church, however, it highlights that this impact can be minimised by setting residential development away from the Church, by adding to the exiting vegetation to the south of the Church and directing traffic movements away from the Church by providing new roadways away from the Church. This is highlighted on the submitted masterplan which can be used to inform any subsequent reserved matters on the phase adjacent to the Church.

4.61 This proposed mitigation has been assessed by Historic England who have concluded that whilst the majority of the scheme would not adversely impact on the historic environment, a relatively small component of housing on the western edge of the development would result in harm to the St Peters Church, and this harm has not been adequately justified in the context of paragraph 132 of the NPPF which states:

When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

4.62 On this basis the scheme should be modified to mitigate this harm prior to it being approved.

4.63 Having regard to the views expressed above, the proposal has also been considered by the Council’s Conservation Officer, they consider that the proposed mitigation would have sufficient regard to St Peters Church and that the scheme would not compromise its setting. The proposals are therefore not considered to harm the special historic or architectural interest of the listed building, and meet the requirements of Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, and paragraph 132 of the NPPF.
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4.64 It is also evident that the views of Historic England were recently considered as part of the examination into the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document in respect of the allocation covered policy EAS1 and in particular their request to restrict the extent of the allocation to exclude the land at the western end of the village. It is clear that the proposed modifications have not included this request, but have amended the supporting text as referred to above.

4.65 In considering the points raised, by Historic England, the Local Planning Authority consider that the Heritage Impact Assessment is fit for purpose, and that the scheme does have appropriate regard for St Peters Church, and its setting, when considering the proposed mitigation highlighted on the masterplan and that a detailed reserved matters application could add sufficient detail in respect of the make-up of the area to be retained to the south of the Church.

Landscaping and Green Infrastructure

4.66 The current masterplan makes provision for an alternative allotments site, immediately adjacent to the existing site, this is also a larger site than is presently provided this will secured via the S106 agreement.

4.67 The landscape buffer and enhancements to the A47 corridor and noise mitigation are considered to be appropriate to agree in detailed landscape schemes via subsequent reserved matters approvals. It is acknowledged by the agent that in respect of the section adjacent to the A47 a suitable noise buffer will be required and this is likely to be via an earth bund.

4.68 As suggested within EAS1 the application has identified those significant biodiversity features (including trees and hedgerows) within its submission, including a number of supporting surveys (ecological and arboricultural). The masterplan has due regard for the findings of the above surveys and would sufficiently inform any subsequent reserved matters applications.

4.69 In acknowledgement of the reference to green infrastructure enhancements, including the approach to the area between the village and Easton College, it is considered that the detailed design of these can be secured at reserved matters stage based upon a Green Infrastructure which can be agreed via a pre-commencement condition.

4.70 Reference is also made to proportionate contributions to the access improvements to Yare Valley and Bawburgh/Colney Lakes. It is evident that the Regulation 123 associated with Community Infrastructure Levy funding makes it clear that strategic green infrastructure is to be provided via CIL. In this instance it is considered that access improvements to the Yare Valley and Bawburgh/Colney Lakes would be covered by this, rather than as being required to be directly delivered by this development.

Site conditions and constraints

4.71 Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16 applies as this site is underlain by safeguarded mineral resources. In respect of NCC’s comments, an appropriate condition will be added to any consent to ensure minerals extracted through the site during the construction process are quantified.

4.72 Policy EAS1 also identifies the following matters. There should be investigation of ground conditions at the former gravel pit site north of Dereham Road. Environmental Services have requested conditions addressing this. Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place, which has been confirmed by Anglian Water subject to conditions. The site layout must also take account of water mains and sewers crossing site which would be determined at a reserved matters stage.
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4.73 In summary, in assessing the scheme against the aims of emerging Policy EAS1, and having due regard to the outline nature of the scheme, it is considered that the current proposal is acceptable and would allow for all subsequent reserved matters applications to deliver schemes that meet the aims of emerging Policy EAS1.

Sustainable development

4.74 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be seen as the golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking. On this basis it is necessary to establish whether the current proposal represents sustainable development in the context of the NPPF as a whole. The following seeks to establish this.

4.75 Firstly, it is considered appropriate, to establish the benefits of the scheme which will in turn be referred to in the following assessment. These are set out as follows:

- The scheme would provide 907 new homes, including 17% of these as affordable housing units.
- The scheme would facilitate a new village green and land for a village hall, and public open space throughout the wider site.
- An A1 retail premises.
- Highway, pedestrian and cycling upgrades including improved linkages to Costessey via the Longwater Interchange.
- 0.84ha of land to facilitate a school expansion.

4.76 Paragraph 7 of the NPPF confirms that sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental, and defines these as the economic, social and environmental roles. It goes on to stress that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. With this in mind it is considered appropriate to firstly assess the scheme in the context of each of these roles, and then reach an overall view on whether the scheme is considered to represent a sustainable development. Each of the three assessments also includes reference to other policies as necessary.

4.77 Economic implications
Paragraphs 18-22 of the NPPF highlight the government’s commitment to securing sustainable economic growth, and defines 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."

4.78 In local planning policy terms:
Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Policy 9 Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area and Policy 10 Locations for new major development in the Norwich Policy Area highlight Easton as a key location suitable for significant growth.

4.79 The above policies are consistent with the aims of the NPPF in terms of economic implications in highlighting the importance of economic growth and that a location such as Easton will play a key role in achieving this objective.
With regard to the economic implications of the scheme, in the short and medium term, the construction of 907 dwellings and the A1 retail unit would make a contribution to the local economy. This would be via the associated construction works which could employ local tradesman etc, and also through the inevitable associated spend in the locality, shops etc.

4.80 In the medium and long term, the A1 shop would create jobs and spending from local residents.
4.81 It is also considered that the application sufficiently demonstrates that the scheme is capable of being delivered.

4.82 In summary, the scheme would be of economic benefit to the local area and meets local and national policy aspirations in this respect.

Social implications
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.”

Paragraphs 18-22 of the NPPF highlight the Government’s commitment to economic growth which in turn contributes towards creating strong, vibrant and healthy communities. Paragraphs 29 – 41 confirm the Government’s commitment to promoting sustainable transport which assist with improved health. Paragraphs 47 – 55 highlight the need to deliver high quality housing. Paragraph 69 – 78 highlight the need to promote healthy communities.

4.83 In local planning policy terms, JCS Policy 7: Supporting communities expects new development to maintain or enhance the quality of life and wellbeing of communities. SNLP Policy LEI 7 open space provision in new developments and Policy TRA 1 Provision of pedestrian links confirm the need to secure sufficient open space and need to provide suitable pedestrian links within developments emphasising the importance role both play in achieving health and wellbeing.

4.84 From a policy perspective, it is clear that both local and national policy are consistent with one another in seeking to improve the quality of life for everyone, and highlight the important role housing plays in this, as well as providing services and facilities that reflect people’s needs. It is also important to be able to access these services and facilities.

4.85 The provision of 907 houses would provide the supply of housing, and these will contribute towards the Council’s five year housing land supply figure in the coming years which contributes towards the aim of “providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations.”

4.86 This is considered to represent a significant positive aspect of the scheme.

4.87 The applicant has confirmed that they will provide 17% of the total number of dwellings as affordable units. Given that this is beneath the amount outlined in Policy 4: Housing delivery of the JCS, the application was accompanied by a viability assessment which sought to highlight why this was not viable. This document has been assessed by the Council’s Property Consultant and they have confirmed that it is an accurate reflection of the proposal in financial terms. With this in mind it is considered that 17% is acceptable as Policy 4 of the JCS recognises that affordable housing provision is dependent on the overall viability of the development. In light of this figure, the S106 agreement will include a “claw back” provision.

4.88 The social role highlights the need for there to be “accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being”.

4.89 It is evident that there is a need to provide suitable links to such services, and in particular, to ensure that there is the ability to safely access those across the A47 in Costessey e.g. Ormiston Victory Academy, Roundwell Medical Centre etc. This requirement is directly reflected in emerging Policy EAS1 as set out above, again as set out above the scheme does provide safe and convenient links to facilitate access to key services.
4.90 As set out above, it is proposed to provide significant open space within the development including a new village heart. The S106 agreement will make provision for the transfer of the land along with contributions towards its ongoing maintenance and management. This would make a positive contribution towards health and social well-being.

4.91 Significant concern has been raised at the lack of capacity at local surgeries to cope with the inevitable demand from the proposed development. Roundwell Medical Centre is the nearest available facility, and they have confirmed that the Council that the centre has the ability to deal with the future requirements of the development. On a point of clarification, it should be stressed that there is no local planning policy requirement to provide a new surgery as part of the proposed development.

4.92 There has been concern at the potential lack of availability of school places, Norfolk County Council (NCC) has confirmed that the primary school within the village will need to be enlarged in order to cope with additional children. Consequently, as set out above, the application proposes to transfer 0.84ha of land to NCC in order to facilitate this. This would be secured as part of the S106 agreement. NCC has confirmed that it is satisfied with the amount, location and shape of land to be provided. In terms of secondary education, NCC have confirmed that sufficient capacity can be provided at Ormiston Victory Academy.

4.93 Any additional buildings or infrastructure required in relation to school premises could be funded via CIL monies.

4.94 In terms of creating a high quality built environment, the outline nature of the proposal results in there being limited capacity to fully assess the quality of the built environment and the role this would play in creating a positive environment for future occupiers and visitors, however, there is no planning reason why this could not be secured at reserved matters stage. The Council’s Design Officer has confirmed that further regard would need to be had to the impacts of the scheme in visual terms, but that it is not unreasonable for this to be done via a suitably worded condition requiring the agreement of a Design Code before any reserved matters application is submitted.

4.95 In summary, the scheme would result in some positive aspects from a social perspective.

Environmental implications
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."

Paragraphs 29 – 41 of the NPPF highlights promotion of sustainable transport modes and reduce the need to travel therefore reducing use non-renewable natural resources. Paragraphs 109 – 125 confirm the need to conserve and enhance the natural environment. Paragraphs 126 – 141 confirm the need to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

4.96 In local planning policy terms, JCS Policy 1 Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets requires all development to be located and designed to use resources efficiently, minimise emissions and adaptable to climate change. Policy 3 energy and water minimise reliance on non-renewable energy sources. With regard to the South Norfolk Local Plan, ENV8 prevents development within the open countryside unless specific criterion are met. IMP2 landscaping requires development to incorporate a high standard of landscaping.

4.97 It is considered that the adopted policies are consistent with the aims of national policy in respect of the environment.
4.98 As set out above, Historic England has raised concern in respect of the western most part of the proposal, for the reasons set out above, the Council consider that the proposed mitigation does sufficiently safeguard St Peters Church including its setting.

4.99 In terms of ecology, it is considered that appropriate surveys have been provided to assess the impacts of the scheme upon wildlife and subject to conditions in respect of protected species there is no objection.

4.100 Historic Environmental Services has confirmed that sufficient work has been carried out in respect archaeology, and request a condition be attached to any subsequent permission.

4.101 With regard to drainage, the Environment Agency, Anglian Water and the Council’s Environmental Protection Team have all been consulted. They have all confirmed that there are no fundamental objections in respect of either foul or surface water drainage subject to the imposition of conditions. Furthermore, the Environment Agency and the Council’s Environmental Protection Team have confirmed they have no objection in terms of ground contamination subject to a condition.

4.102 In terms of the environmental role, it is considered that the scheme does satisfy the environmental requirements of the NPPF.

4.103 In summary, paragraph 8 of the NPPF makes it clear that the dimensions to sustainable development are not to be undertaken in isolation, as they are mutually dependent. Therefore, in making a judgement on whether the scheme represents sustainable development, it is necessary to make a rounded judgement, based upon the merits of the scheme when considered against the aims of the NPPF. With this in mind, it is considered that the scheme does present a number of economic, social and environmental benefits and as such can be considered to represent a sustainable development in the context of the NPPF.

Other issues

4.104 The outline nature of the scheme means that it is not possible to undertake a detailed assessment of the scheme in respect of neighbour amenity with regard to light, outlook and privacy. However, it is evident from the submitted information that any reserved matters application could design a layout and house types which would prevent significant harm being caused in respect of the residential amenity including the aforementioned issues.

4.105 The amenity of future residents will be considered at the reserved matters stage through the final layout and plan of different phases. However, to ensure appropriate noise protection from the A47 a condition is recommended to agree appropriate mitigation measures as needed.

Environmental Impact Assessment and Appropriate Assessment

4.106 The proposals have been considered against the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2011. An Environmental Statement (ES) accompanied the application. The environmental, social and economic impacts raised in the ES have all been considered and are adequately addressed as detailed in the above report and subject to the recommended conditions.

4.107 The proposal would not affect the integrity of any internationally protected sites (Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation) individually or in accumulation with other permitted development and extant consents in the surrounding area and therefore, in accordance with Regulation 61 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, it is considered that the development would not have a significant impact on any protected habitats and accordingly no Appropriate Assessment of the development is required.
4.108 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) which would be collected at the reserved matters stage.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Planning law requires that applications must be determined in accordance with Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.2 As set out above the scheme is contrary to policies HOU4 and ENV8 of the SNLP which as set out above continue to be up to date and carry significant weight in the decision-making process given SNC has an up to date five year land supply.

5.3 However, it is evident that the NPPF and the emerging policy EAS1, are material considerations in the determination of this application. It is also considered that this emerging policy carries significant weight in the decision-making process in acknowledgement of the contents of paragraph 216 of the NPPF, whereby the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document has been through examination by a Planning Inspector and proposed modifications are presently being consulted on, the proposed modifications do not include any significant revisions to Policy EAS1, and finally, Policy EAS1 is considered to be consistent with the aims of the NPPF, and in particular, in relation to boosting the supply of housing. The emerging policy is therefore given more weight in the overall consideration of this application than policies HOU4 and ENV8 of the SNLP.

5.4 The concerns raised by the local community have been considered in forming this recommendation on the application. However, the impacts of the development are considered to be acceptable with appropriate mitigation through condition or the Section 106 agreement and there is no material planning reason why the development should be refused.

5.5 In conclusion, notwithstanding the acknowledged conflict with Policies HOU4 and ENV8, it is considered that the material considerations in the form of the scheme represent sustainable development in the context of the NPPF and in the overall planning balance, and being consistent with the aims of emerging Policy EAS1, which carries significant weight, the scheme is recommended for approval subject to conditions and a S106 agreement.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Raine 01508 533841 craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2. **Appl. No**: 2015/2449/F  
**Parish**: WRENINGHAM

Applicants Name: Mr Julian Wells  
Site Address: Land Off Church Road Wreningham Norfolk  
Proposal: Erection of 10 residential units (Class C3) with associated landscaping, drainage and highway works.

Recommendation: Approval with Conditions  
1. Full permission time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted details  
3. Visibility splays  
4. Provision of on-site parking and access  
5. Construction traffic management and worker parking  
6. Off-site highway works (TROD footpath)  
7. Ecological mitigation  
8. Retention of trees and hedgerows  
9. Planting scheme to be agreed  
10. Landscape management scheme to be agreed  
11. Hedge heights  
12. Tree and hedgerow protection  
13. Contaminated land  
14. Remediation scheme  
15. Unexpected contamination  
16. Air source heat pump specifications  
17. Renewable energy  
18. Water efficiency  
19. Materials  
20. Archaeological written scheme of investigation  
21. Surface water drainage  
22. Foul water strategy  
23. Fire hydrants  

Subject to the completion of a S106 to cover affordable housing.

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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

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

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

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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

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

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

2. Consultations

2.1 Parish Council

Object

Summary of detailed comments:
- Notes the Parish Council’s response to the LDF (Nov 2011) (extract).
- (Feedback from Parishioners) The design of the houses should be consistent with those in the immediate vicinity.
- This design presents large block shaped town houses of a uniform appearance which create a dissonance with the existing mix of styles in Church
- The height of the housing (9.5m for the tallest) will dominated the skyline at the highest point in the village.
- Taking as a cue the large houses on Hethel Road / Church Road intersection is to ignore the low level housing on the south-side of Church Road.
- A much reduced roof-line height for all the development's houses is expected.
- The uniform placing and appearance of the houses creates a vista unlike anything in the rest of Wreningham.
The development should offer a variety of design, placement and appearance.

A kerbed footpath to be created along the front of the site instead of the “pedestrian refuge” verge with the replacement hedge retained.

The site plans address boundary hedging but does not tackle planting within the site. The spaces between and in front of the houses are grassed. This does not fit with the look and feel found opposite or in the rest of Church Road.

It’s acknowledged that the land had has been designated for development by SNC. However, it is not accepted that what is placed on that land is a “done-deal”.

The councillors (and parishioners) wish to influence the design and its implementation to create an attractive, interesting and valued space for the village and which reflects the rural nature of the village.

(The Parish also makes a number of suggestions for improvements to the site, including) taking cues from buildings opposite Hethel Road on Church Road and Glebe Close.

(Issues also raised by the Parish for SNC planners to address and answer include) management of works traffic; width of the corner on Church Road and suggestion to widen/remodel corner; foul water drainage issues; responsibility of ownership and management of the boundary hedges around the site; responsibility for keeping ditches clear and operational; and maintaining accessibility of public footpath.

2.2 District Member

To Committee.

The design of the houses in terms of height, their relationship with other housing styles in the immediate vicinity and issues raised in relation to a lack of variety in terms of design, placement and appearance should be considered.

2.3 SNC Landscape Officer

No objection

Comments on amendments:

- The drives for plots 1-3 are now changed to gravel – this is acceptable.
- I note that the agent is looking into how the responsibility for the frontage hedge will be allocated. A simple, but stringent, management plan will be required for all of the new planting.
- The main landscape issue continues to be the need to remove the existing roadside hedge in order to facilitate the proposal.
- There needs to be conditions to cover approval of planting details, and their subsequent management and implementation of tree protection.

Original comments:

- The main issue is the need to remove the existing roadside hedge in order to facilitate the proposal. The information provided within the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment confirms that its hedgerow would qualify as ‘important’ under at least one criterion of the Hedgerows Regulations.
- The scheme proposes the planting of a new hedgerows and trees, and that these be demised to the respective dwellings. My concern is that such divided responsibility will result in a varied effect, when a consistent approach is required. My suggestion is that the frontage planting be assigned to as few
parties as possible and that a simple, but stringent management plan be required

- The drives for plots 1-3 are shown as being asphalt, whilst the other plots are mostly gravel. If a fixed surface is necessary, a surface-dressed solution might be visually more coherent.
- There needs to be conditions to cover approval of planting details, and their subsequent management and implementation of tree protection.

2.4 NCC Planning Obligations Coordinator
No Comments received.

2.5 NCC Public Rights Of Way
No objection
- Wreningham FP5 is adjacent to the application site and a minimum width of 3 metres has been allowed to accommodate the public right of way.
- As the footpath has been adequately accommodated, we have no objections to the application.

2.6 NCC Ecologist
No objection
- The ecological survey is comprehensive and I am satisfied that it adequately assesses the potential impacts of the proposed development on ecology.
- If you are minded to approve this development I recommend that Section 5 of the aforementioned report is conditioned as part of the decision.

2.7 Norfolk Wildlife Trust
No objection
- We have no objection to this application, regarding impacts on Wildlife.
- If this application is approved, measures to mitigate and enhance biodiversity, as set out in the ecological report, should be included within appropriate planning conditions.

2.8 Norfolk Fire Service
No objection
- We will require a fire hydrant to be installed.
- No development shall commence on site until such scheme has been submitted for the provision of the fire hydrant on the development.

2.9 Natural England
No comments to make.

2.10 SNC Play and Amenities Officer
To be reported.

2.11 Historic Environment Service
No objection
- An archaeological evaluation by trial trenching has been carried out.
- All the evaluation trenches contained buried archaeological features, comprising a number of linear features as well as numerous pits and postholes.
- Most of these features date to the Late Saxon and early Medieval periods and are likely to be the remains of roadside settlement of this date alongside Church Road. Consequently it is likely that significant further heritage assets with
archaeological interest will be present at the site and that their significance will be adversely affected by the proposed development.

- If planning permission is granted, we therefore ask that this be subject to a programme of archaeological work in accordance with the NPPF.

2.12 SNC Listed Buildings Officer

No objection

- The proposed development would not have any adverse impact on the setting of heritage assets.

2.13 Historic England

No objection

- The proposed development would not have any adverse impact on the setting of All Saints Church, however we do feel that the proposals could be improved by positioning dwellings directly onto Church Road.

2.14 Norfolk Police

No comments received

2.15 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team

No objection

- Verbally recommended that conditions and informative be attached to any permission granted for site investigation and risk assessment plus site remediation and reporting of unexpected contaminations.

2.16 NCC Highways

No objection

Comments on final amendments:

- The amended plans are acceptable.
- Suggest a condition for a detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works (TROD footpath)

Original comments and amendments:

- The principle of the development of this site has been accepted.
- The site layout shows two new points of access onto Church Road to serve five dwellings each. This is considered as an acceptable approach.
- The layout shows vision splays at each of the new entrance points onto Church Road. The splays at the eastern most entrance should however be revised to meet the site side of the carriageway rather than the opposite.
- The site layout as proposed is acceptable. However in terms of the parking and turning layout, Plots 4 and 7 should be provided with an additional parking space as both of these properties are 4 bed units.
- As highway authority it is considered that the provision of a frontage footway would be of considerable benefit to residents.
- If a formal tarmac footway is not considered acceptable in visual terms a more informal TROD footway could be provided within the verge to link with the existing public footpath.

2.17 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Officer

No objection

- The affordable housing is an acceptable mix and tenure.
2.18 SNC Water Management Officer
No objection

- Suggest that further options be explored to enable a discharge rate from the site closer to the existing greenfield runoff rate and the on-site storage capacity increased to ensure that flood risk is not increased on the site or elsewhere.
- Maintenance responsibilities for the site drainage including French drains, ditches, the flow control and any existing watercourses should be identified and where appropriate incorporated into property transfer documents.
- Sufficient access should be provided for the management of the ditch and public right of way along the western boundary of the site.
- Recommend that the applicant provides a management schedule that identifies where responsibilities lie and maintenance requirements.

2.19 Environment Agency
No comments received.

2.20 Anglian Water Services Ltd
No objection

- The foul drainage from this development will have available capacity for these flows.
- Development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream if connection is made to manhole 9800 as there is insufficient storage capacity.
- Connection should be via new vacuum chambers which should be connected by individual junctions onto 125 diameter main. This should be conditioned.
- The proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets.

2.21 Lead Local flood Authority
No objection

- The application falls below our current threshold for providing detailed comment.

2.22 NHS England
No comments received

2.23 Representations
19 letters of objection, 1 letter of support and 1 letter neither supporting or objecting on the following grounds (as summarised):

- Takes away views overlooking fields.
- Road safety issues not properly considered and increased traffic.
- High rise multi-bedroom executive style housing is unsympathetic and inappropriate to the rural setting.
- Destruction of ancient hedgerow.
- Drainage, both foul and storm issues not properly addressed.
- The gap between our boundary and the new buildings is shown as a little wider than it actually is.
- Drainage concerns as our property is considerably lower than the site.
- Traffic flow to the T junction and the width of the road currently causes problems particularly with the coaches and large delivery lorries.
- The height of the proposed dwellings are far too tall for the location. They would otherwise look out of proportion for the village and dwarf the properties on the opposite side of the road.
• Concerned about the number of additional cars that each of the dwellings are likely to generate and use the narrow village road, which is already extremely busy.
• The hedgerow fronting the proposed development site meets the criteria of an "important" hedge under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 and as such is protected by the legislation and should not be removed.
• The number of houses should be reduced so that it looks less like a portion of a housing estate.
• There is a lot of individuality in the housing with bungalows as well as 2 storey houses whereas this development looks like Clonesville.
• There is no pavement or street lighting on Church Road so no pedestrian safety.
• It's the same boring "safe" design with no particular architectural merit of its own.
• Needs to have more variety and definitely some bungalows if it is to have any chance of blending in with the village.
• Concerned about the proximity of plots 1 & 2 to my house which will bring them into sight from my upstairs office and bedrooms.
• At the present time the footpath presents an open view when entered from Church Road and this will disappear due to the proximity of Plots 1 & 2 to the footpath. Suggests that the footpath should be 6m wide, rather than 3m.
• Feel that moving the existing hedge should be one of the conditions if planning approval is given.
• Existing sewage system cannot be extended.
• Suggest that a path be put in where the developers are building. It would make it safer for pedestrians when vehicles come round the bend that is before the proposed site.
• Excessive change to an open village that is not built up
• Wrong to build on quality agricultural land.
• Church Road already dangerously overloaded at busy times.
• Existing sewerage system cannot be extended.
• House design does not attempt to blend in with the long established properties.
• Church Road, along with the other roads out of the village, cannot safely withstand the extra volume of traffic.
• Large, executive style housing has no place in this small rural village.
• Commend the developers for proposing affordable housing however the lack of public transport could be a deterrent.
• Plans and some boundaries do not appear to accurately follow the ordnance survey data.
• Concerned about damage to environment and wildlife surrounded by various ponds containing Great Crested Newts.
• There is constant water standing on this part of the road, due to insufficient drainage.
• Widening of the road should be considered. Especially near the sharp corner, to allow for the safer passing of vehicles, especially as larger vehicles use the road.
• Disappointed that the new development has done the minimum required in relation to part L of the building regulations.
• The houses in this part of Church Road are largely individually built bungalows and chalet bungalows.
- The proposed property heights at this location - the highest point in the village - results in destruction of village character and as such is opposed to the South Norfolk Council Place-making Guide.
- Would prefer to see a design which isn't just 'more of the same'. Some imagination with either cottage-style or more modern innovation would be great,
- Concerned that the tight bend is very dangerous at times and the new driveways will only increase this. Now is an ideal opportunity to address this by widening the road to increase visibility, possibly adding a pavement to prevent vehicles eroding the bank.
- Would like to see more eco or low energy technologies and design.

3 Assessment

Site description and proposal

3.1 The site comprises approximately 0.78 hectares of agricultural land located to the north of Church Road in Wreningham, approximately 9 miles to the southwest of Norwich city centre.

3.2 The site is bounded to the south by a low bank and hedgerow separating it from Church Road. A larger hedge runs along the western boundary of the site. Between the site and the western hedge lies an existing Public Right of Way (PROW), running along the edge of the field, which continues to the north. A development of recently built houses lies to the east, with an existing fence and newly planted trees along the boundary, while to the north the open farmland continues to Hethel Road beyond. The site is divided into two broadly equal halves by a low ditch running from north to south. The proposed northern boundary is an arbitrary line within the existing agricultural field.

3.3 To the south of Church Road is a frontage of mixed residential properties of varying scale and design. These dwellings are served by individual private drives and are typically set back from the road with landscaped front gardens. Beyond the field to the north of the site, a number of isolated properties are located off Hethel Road.

3.4 There are no trees within the site boundary, but there is a hedgerow located around the perimeter, notably along the front of the site along Church Road. The east and west boundary is also delineated by a hedgerow and vegetation.

The application

3.5 The application is a full application and proposes the erection of 10 dwellings which would include a mix of 1, 2, 4 and 5 bedroom houses. These would comprise a combination of two storey detached and a pair of semi-detached properties. 3 of the 10 dwellings are proposed to be ‘affordable’ in accordance with the policy requirement as set out in Policy 4 of the JCS.

3.6 Two points of access are proposed on to Church Road to serve the development that connects to two private drives, each which serves five dwellings and their associated car parking. Pedestrian access is via these private drives, which comprise of shared surfaces. The proposal includes the provision of a 1.8m wide refuge and 0.9m TROD footpath along Church Road.

3.7 The application has been amended to address the Highway Authority’s requirements largely relating to the inclusion of a TROD footpath and minor amendments being made to visibility splays and parking arrangements. Further amendments include improvements to the site layout, house types and landscaping, which have been negotiated throughout the course of the application.
3.8 The main issues for consideration are the principle of development; highway considerations; drainage; layout, scale and design; heritage assets; residential amenity; public open space and landscaping; ecology and affordable housing.

Principle of development

3.9 Policy 15 of the JCS identifies Werningham as a Service Village in which land has been allocated to provide for approximately 10-20 dwellings between April 2008 and March 2026, subject to form, character and servicing constraints. A single site allocation has been adopted in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD to deliver this growth identified in Policy 15 and this is Policy WRE1: Land adjacent to builders yard, Church Road.

3.10 The application site (approx. 0.78 Ha) comprises all of the land proposed for the residential allocation in policy WRE1 of the Site Specific Allocations Document plus an additional 0.28 ha of land to the north of the site. Policy WRE1 sets out the requirements for development of the site and this is set out below:

3.11 Land amounting to around 0.5 hectares is allocated for housing and associated infrastructure. This allocation could accommodate approximately 10 dwellings. The policy requires the developer of the site to ensure the following:

- Vehicular access to be agreed with the Highway Authority, which may require an access road to ensure sufficient visibility.
- Public Right of Way (footpath) adjacent to site to be preserved.
- Site design avoids harmful impact on the setting of the nearby listed building and the tree protected by a TPO on the corner of the site.
- Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place.
- Historic Environment Record to be consulted to determine any need for archaeological surveys prior to development.

3.12 The application site itself comprises of 10 dwellings on all of the land proposed within the adopted development boundary for the residential allocation in policy WRE1 of the site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD and as such the principle of new residential development on this site is consistent with the aims of policy DM1.3 which seeks to permit new housing within a development boundary. Additional land of 0.28Ha is proposed to the rear of the site, which extends the site beyond the existing allocation to the north by approximately 3m to the boundary of Orchard Cottage.

3.13 The site has been extended in response to issues arising through the consultation process which has informed the site layout. The assessment below has regard to the key issues arising from this consultation, which include:

- Site access from Church Road limited to two access points –located to achieve 2.4m x 43m vision splays.
- Provision of a pedestrian refuge and TROD path along Church Road to allow safer pedestrian access in keeping with the rural character of Church Road.
- Houses set back from the site frontage to reflect the layout of existing properties to the south of Church Road, and to reduce the impact of the development on these dwellings.

Access and Highways

3.14 Policy DM3.11 requires the safe and free flow of traffic, ensuring highway safety is maintained and the free flow of traffic on the highway network.
Two points of access are proposed on to Church Road to serve the development. Other highway works include the provision of a 1.8m wide refuge along Church Road at the front of the site and an informal TROD footway to link with the existing public right of way along the western boundary. As recommended by Highway Officer the TROD is proposed to be 900mm wide located centrally within the wide grass verge. This allows some separation between the carriageway and the pedestrian route while allowing sufficient space to accommodate the level changes. The TROD is proposed to be located approximately 200mm above the level of the carriageway, sloping down where it connects to Church Road to enable a verge at a similar height above road level to be provided, forming a safe edge to the road in accordance with Highways Officers recommendations. The Highways Officer has suggested a condition for a detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works for the trod footpath to ensure that the highway improvement works are designed to an appropriate standard.

Amended plans have been submitted to address the technical design amendments required by the Highway Authority. Based on these amended plans the Highway Authority indicate they have no objection to the application subject to the imposition of conditions which include detailed plans of the roads, visibility splays and on-site access and parking.

The development proposals recognise the need for car parking that will provide spaces in direct relationship to the property they serve with dedicated parking spaces for each dwelling. Plots 1-3 have a shared parking area to the front of the dwellings, with two designated parking spaces for each. Parking levels are in accordance with the Council’s parking standards.

With regard to the public footpath to the west of the site, this is to be retained as a Public Right of Way. Norfolk County Council have advised that any proposed fencing separating the footpath from the development must be set at a minimum of three metres from the centre line of the existing boundary hedge. This is to allow a generous footpath width, and space to allow the ongoing maintenance of the existing hedge, as well as ensuring that there is an acceptable level of natural surveillance. A minimum width of 3m has been provided by the application and the Public Rights of Way Officer has confirmed that they have no objection to the application. It is therefore considered that the footpath has been adequately accommodated in accordance with the requirements of Policy WRE1 of the Local Plan, Site Specific Allocations Document.

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

Drainage

Surface water drainage

The surface water from the development is proposed to be contained in attenuation storage within ditch system up to the 1 in 100 year climate rainfall event, driveways constructed of permeable paving directing water to French drain at frontage, roof water discharging to rear boundary ditch and flow control limiting flows to 5 l/sec into off site land drainage network.

The applicant has incorporated drainage ditches within the adjacent boundaries that will connect to existing off-site drainage ditches to accept the discharge from the site. All ditches and drains within the application site, including the ditch to the rear of the properties are proposed to be the responsibility of each dwelling. The applicant has confirmed access rights to these ditches and that adequate details will be included within property transfer documents, which shall include a surface water management schedule, maintenance obligations and a right of access to ensure future occupiers are aware of their responsibilities regarding regular inspection and maintenance of the drainage system.
3.22 Whilst there is a general assumption that discharge rates lower than 5 l/sec are difficult to implement without long-term maintenance issues the proposed rate of discharge from the site, the Council's Water Management Officer has recommended that further options be explored to enable a discharge rate from the site closer to the existing greenfield runoff rate. Guidance in the British Standard – code of practice for surface water management for development sites, suggests that for small sites where there is a very low requirement an acceptable minimum threshold (below 5l/s) should be agreed with the drainage approving body on a site specific basis. A condition is suggested requiring the submission of details to agree the surface water discharge rate to ensure that flood risk is not increased on the site or elsewhere.

3.23 The Lead Local Flood Authority have assessed the application and has no comments to make as this scheme falls well below the current threshold for the Lead Local Flood Authority to provide comments. The Council’s Water Management Officer has assessed the proposals and is satisfied with the proposed surface water drainage options, subject to the above conditions to agree the discharge rate of surface water. Anglin Water has also confirmed from the details submitted that the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water assets and as such have no comments on the suitability of surface water management.

3.24 The development proposal is therefore considered to accord with the principles of the planning policy framework, being located on the land with a low risk probability of flooding and incorporating suitable drainage options within the boundaries of the site.

Foul water

3.25 The foul water drainage from this development is in the catchment of Saxlingham Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for the proposed flows. Anglian Water has confirmed that a connection can be made via new vacuum chambers which should be connected by individual junctions onto 125 diameter main. Subject to the imposition of a condition having regard to the new drainage connection, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and accords with Policy 1 of the JCS.

Layout, scale and appearance

3.26 Policy 2 of the JCS and section 7 of the NPPF requires all development to achieve good design.

3.27 The proposed development creates a low density linear development accessed from Church Road, which continues the existing pattern of ribbon development within Wreningham.

3.28 The location of dwellings within the site have been set back from the edge of Church Road. The requirement for shared private drives, imposed by the limitations on access points to Church Road as well as the space required for the pedestrian refuge, frontage hedge, and surface water drainage along the Church Road frontage pushes the houses further back from Church Road still. This set back is broadly in line with the recently built development of the corner of Hethel Road, which is considered to help minimise the impact of development on the existing properties to the south of Church Road.

3.29 To the west, the three affordable dwellings are located to one side of the drive, with two open market dwellings to the other side. To the east, the five dwellings are formed into a line with subtle changes in orientation, adding interest to the linear appearance of the development. Plot 10 is angled slightly to respond to the adjacent property, and pulled away from the western boundary to reduce the impact of development on this property, and the existing trees planted along the boundary.
The detached garages to plots 5, 6 and 10 are located in front of the main line of the development, presenting single storey gables to Church Road. The garages form ‘end-stops’ to the shared spaces, and further break up the appearance of the site and add interest, which is considered in keeping with the general character of Wreningham.

Having assessed the general arrangement of dwellings along Church Road and taken into account the comments received, it is considered that the proposed properties maintain the open character of the street and also ensures that the dwellings are sympathetic to the existing properties along Church Road.

In terms of scale, the proposed dwellings are two storeys high, with associated single storey garages. Individual house types vary in scale and massing, while retaining the proportions of traditional vernacular style dwellings in the village, which creates variation in form. Existing dwellings along Church Road have a mix of scales and forms, including bungalows, chalet bungalows, and two-storey houses. It is noted that the large properties proposed do not reflect all of the development to the south of Church Road, however larger properties are in evidence to the east of the site and elsewhere within the village of Wreningham.

Having assessed the scale of the existing and proposed dwellings, it is considered that the buildings are an appropriate response to the surrounding dwellings and village edge as well as the more recent development on the corner of Church Road and Hethel Road, which are larger two-storey dwellings. Consideration has also been given to views towards Church Road, and the scale and massing of the proposals have been carefully considered in order to achieve a balanced and varied aspect which sits comfortably within the wider landscape setting.

With regards to appearance, the detailed design of the proposals provide a variation of traditional rural housing styles and features commonly found in this location and within the surrounding South Norfolk villages, including red facing brick, render pantiles, timber windows, timberwork porches and chimneys.

While the houses all present their ridges and eaves to the front and rear aspect, a number of smaller gables are included to provide interest and articulation to the elevations. These take the form of canopies, porches, ‘extension gables’, dormer windows, and detached garages. The mass is further reduced by the inclusion of cat-slide dormers sitting within dropped eaves to a number of the dwellings, which also adds variety to the road and field views, and creates variety in ridge heights. The variations in height also create a softer transition between the private dwellings and the affordable dwellings.

The palette of materials proposed for the affordable dwellings, including surfacing materials to driveways and boundary treatments, is the same as it is for the private dwellings, ensuring that the appearance and quality of these dwellings is similar to the private dwellings.

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

Overall, whilst it is acknowledged that local concern has been raised about the design, layout and appearance of the scheme; it is considered that the layout and orientation of dwellings would be appropriate to the existing grain of development along Church Road. In addition to this the dwellings would have an active street frontage along Church Road, set back from the new road. The different house types, which are vernacular in appearance,
will ensure that the new dwellings are not unduly prominent and have their own distinctive character that relates positively to Wreningham. It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS, section 7 of the NPPS and policy DM1.4, DM3.9 and DM4.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD have been met.

Landscaping and Ecology

3.39 Landscape and ecological proposals form an important aspect of design, as set out in South Norfolk Local Plan Policies DM4.8, DM4.9 and JCS Policies 1 and 2. This recognition of the critical role landscaping and ecology mitigation can have to the success of a scheme is re-iterated in section 11 of the NPPF.

3.40 The development proposes the removal of the hedgerow that currently extends along the site frontage, abutting Church Road in order to allow for the requirement to form vision splays and a pedestrian refuge along the site frontage in the interests of highway safety, access and residential amenity. It is noted by the Landscape Officer and others that this hedgerow is an ‘important’ hedgerow as defined by emerging Development Management policy DM4.9 and as such its removal should be considered contrary to this policy. The applicant proposes the replacement of this hedgerow which, as the Landscape Officer recognises, will in time be of similar or greater ecological value to the site, however concern has been raised that its historic importance is irreplaceable. This consideration must be assessed in conjunction with the desire to provide a pedestrian refuge and TROD footpath along the site frontage and the requirement for appropriate visibility splays to be achieved across the site frontage. The Highways Officer has verbally advised that retaining the hedgerow and positioning a footpath within the site would not be acceptable and, in terms of the safety of users as well as the amenities of residents of the site, I do not consider this to be a suitable solution. Whilst recognising the status of the conflicting policies, I consider that in this instance greater weight should be afforded to the requirements of highway safety as the provision of appropriate viability splays and pedestrian refuge is site specific for development in this location.

3.41 The application outlines the proposed planting for the site in general terms whilst the Arboricultural Impact Assessment sets out in greater detail the existing landscaping of the site and the impact of the development on these site features. This assessment concludes that whilst there will be some impact on the trees and hedgerows to be retained on the site the overall impact of the development would be ‘neutral’.

3.42 Policy WRE1 requires the development of the site to have regard for the tree protected by a Tree Preservation Order on the corner of the site. The Landscape Officer has confirmed that the tree is outside of the site boundary and that the proposals will result in no harm to the protected tree.

3.43 In terms of landscape impact, comments have been expressed about the impact of the development on the open countryside and the rural character of the site. It is evident that there is a need to ensure the development has a defined relationship to the open countryside, particularly to the northern boundary whilst respecting the character of surrounding existing development. The northern boundary is proposed as a new native hedgerow and specimen trees with a ditch to the rear of the boundary giving a clear and defined edge to the development in this location. In considering this the Landscape Officer has confirmed that he has no objections to the proposals and it is considered that the layout has strong visual links to the surrounding countryside to the north, which provides a positive transition from build form to the countryside.

3.44 Whilst raising concerns about the loss of the southern hedgerow and future management of the new frontage hedge, the Landscape Officer has not raised a concern about the remainder of the landscaping proposals. In summary, whilst the concerns are
acknowledged, it is considered that the current scheme does not lead to significant harm in terms of landscape impact. I therefore consider that, subject to suitably worded conditions requiring the submission of a landscape planting scheme and a management plan, as well as the protection of those features to be retained on and adjacent to the site, this proposal accords with the principles of those policies outlined above.

3.45 The application is also supported by an Ecology Survey. The survey concludes that the larger part of the existing site has a relatively low ecological value since it has been arable farmland for a number of years. The County Ecologist has carried out an assessment of the proposals and concluded that the ecological survey is comprehensive and adequately assesses the potential impacts of the proposed development on ecology. The ecologist has recommended that ecological enhancements in line with Section 5 of the Ecology Survey are conditioned as part of any decision. It is therefore considered that subject to compliance with appropriately worded conditions to secure these details as identified in section 5 of the ecology survey, that the impacts on ecology are acceptable.

Residential amenity

3.46 Policy DM3.14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan requires development to have regard to the impacts on residential amenity.

3.47 Potential impacts on residential amenity of existing properties largely relate to those properties to the south of the site on Church Road. The design and position of the proposed dwellings along this boundary, which are set back from the road, are considered to be a sufficient distance from Church Road and screened by a proposed new hedge to prevent any direct overlooking or adverse impacts in terms of overshadowing of habitable rooms of the nearby residential properties. With regard to properties along the west and east boundaries of the site, the proposed dwellings are again a sufficient distance from the existing properties and are separated by an existing public footpath to the west and existing hedges along the site boundaries to prevent any undue loss of privacy. In respect of the amenities of existing nearby properties, it is therefore considered that the proposal is acceptable.

3.48 In terms of the amenities of the future residents of the proposed dwellings, the relative position of the proposed dwellings is acceptable ensuring no adverse impact on amenity in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy. Furthermore, the relationships between the proposed dwellings are sufficient that future owners will each have adequate levels of amenity in terms of outlook, privacy and light and have suitable sized and private amenity spaces.

3.49 The scheme is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of Policy DM3.14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan that requires development to have regard to the impacts on residential amenity.

Affordable Housing

3.50 JCS Policy 4 requires 33% affordable housing with a mix of house types and tenure which meets local need. The application proposes 3 affordable dwellings in accordance with the policy. The Council’s Strategic Housing Officer has confirmed that the proposed mix and tenure is acceptable.

3.51 Subject to a S106 to secure the affordable housing the proposal would accord with policy 4 of the JCS and are therefore acceptable.
Heritage assets

3.52 There are no listed buildings located within the application site and the site is not within a Conservation Area. The closest listed buildings to the site are Willy’s Croft, located to the southwest of Church Road and All Saints Church to the east of the site. The listed buildings are well screened from the site by virtue of other buildings and trees between it and listed buildings. The Listed Buildings Officer and Historic England have confirmed that the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on the setting of the heritage assets, including All Saints Church, which is separated by the new dwellings on Hethel Road. Whilst Historic England considers that the proposals could be improved by positioning dwellings directly onto Church Road, the Highways Officer has confirmed that this would not be an acceptable solution in terms of highway safety and the free flow of traffic.

3.53 It is therefore considered that the development is acceptable in terms of policy DM4.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Other matters

Contamination

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

Archaeology

3.55 The applicant has undertaken trail trenching on the site as part of this planning application. This work concluded that there are archaeological features on the site which the Historic Environment Service have advised are of significant historical interest. As a consequence of this and to protect these heritage assets, a programme of archaeological works has been requested. Section 12 of the NPPF has regard to the historic environment, including features of archaeological interest, and it is considered that the proposal can be considered in accordance with this, subject to the application of these conditions.

Energy and Water Efficiency

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

3.57 The applicant has indicated that this requirement will be met by air source heat pumps installed as part of the development proposals. It is suggested that full specification details for these units will be secured by condition in the interests of protecting the amenities of residents. Provision has been made for locating the ASHP units externally in rear gardens, screened from public view.
Section 106 Agreement and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

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

Financial Considerations

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

4. Conclusion

4.1 The principle of the application is acceptable on this site allocation and is considered to represent a sustainable form of development. Whilst local concern has been raised about the scheme, it is considered that the proposals as amended, results in a scheme with its own distinctive character that relates positively to its surroundings and existing dwellings. It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 1, 2, 4 and 15 of the Joint Core Strategy and Local Plan Policies ENV9, IMP2, IMP6, IMP9 and TRA1 and Policy WRE1 of the Site Specifics Allocations and Policies Document have been met. All other matters are considered acceptable and subject to the imposition of conditions and a S106 obligation the application is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  and E-mail:  Chris Watts 01508 533765 cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3. **Appl. No**: 2015/2536/F  
**Parish**: GREAT MOULTON  

**Applicants Name**: Mr T Heather  
**Site Address**: Land North Of High Green Great Moulton Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Erection of 10 new dwellings and garages  

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

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

Subject to S106 to secure affordable housing requirement

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
  Development Management Policies  
  DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
  DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
  DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
  DM3.2: Meeting rural housing needs  
  DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
  DM3.10: Promotion of sustainable transport  
  DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
  DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
  DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
  DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management  
  DM4.8: Protection of Trees and Hedgerows  
  DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design
1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
Place Making Guide

2. Planning History

2.1 No relevant history

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council
Refuse
- Number of properties in the LDF agreed with parish Council for 5-6. Proposed is too high a number for a small village
- The layout is unimaginative, would it be possible to build a cul-de-sac with only one access road
- 9 vehicular accesses close to a sharp bend. Constitutes a significant hazard
- 4 executive houses. Village has too many of this type, Parish Council would prefer a mix of smaller properties
- Land to rear can only be accessed through Heather Way

3.2 District Member
To Committee due to local concerns about drainage and other issues

3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd
Waste water treatment  Water recycling centre will have available capacity
Foul drainage, Drainage strategy condition required
Surface water does not relate to AW operated assets

3.4 SNC Design Officer
Original comments
Concerns with layout of submitted plans
Amended plans
No objections, ensure conditions adequately cover street frontage areas

3.5 Environment Agency
No comments received

3.6 NHS Clinical Commissioning Group
No comments received

3.7 NHS England
No comments received

3.8 Norfolk And Waveney Local Medical Council
No comments received

3.9 Long Stratton Medial Partnership
No comments received

3.10 Police Architectural Liaison Officer
Boundary protection with fencing

3.11 Historic Environment Service
Do not recommend any archaeological works
### Development Management Committee 3 February 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>SNC Landscape Officer</td>
<td>No objection subject to a condition for a comprehensive planting scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>NCC Ecologist</td>
<td>More detail required of the proposed ditch After further detail submitted: If minded to approve recommend condition re protected species appraisal and ditch detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team</td>
<td>If approved Contaminated land conditions and advisory notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>NCC Highways</td>
<td>Conditions to be attached if approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>SNC Housing Enabling &amp; Strategy Manager</td>
<td>Submitted plan No objection Amended plans No objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>SNC Water Management Officer</td>
<td>Anglian Water consulted to ensure capacity is available Condition for rainwater harvesting ownership of drainage ditch should be clarified Culvert works require permission from LLFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>NCC Lead Local Flood Authority</td>
<td>Screened application and it falls below current threshold for providing a detailed comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>Representations</td>
<td>2 letters of objection Over development Adopted plan site is for 5 dwellings not ten Great Moulton does not need a major development of this kind Other sites have permission which would result in 28 building plots in Great Moulton/Aslacton Insufficient infrastructure Field to rear only accesses along Heather Way Neither gateway or heather way suitable for farm machinery Loss of Agricultural land Disposal of foul drainage needs to be addressed Concerns with surface water drainage If approved fence to be erected to protect privacy 2 letters land to rear could be conditioned to become a play area for children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 Assessment

**Site description and proposal**

4.1 The site is approximately 0.55 hectares and is located on the western edge of the built up area of Great Moulton and will be accessed from High Green. The north of the site is bordered by open land with a dwelling situated close to the western boundary.
4.2 This proposal is for 10 dwellings which consist of the following:

Open market housing
Single storey
1 x 2 bedroom
1 x 3 bedroom
Two storey
5 x 4 bedroom

Affordable housing
2 x 1 bedroom
2 x 2 bedroom

Key planning issues

4.3 The area of land is within the adopted development boundary and allocated within the Local Plan (GRE1) for residential development. On this basis the principle of residential development is acceptable.

4.4 The allocation suggests that approximately 5 dwellings be provided and contains two criterion to be met, these being:

- Frontage development to High Green Only
- Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place.

4.5 It is noted that the proposed number of dwellings is greater than that indicated within the allocation, however, in considering the resultant impact of this it is necessary to the following material considerations:

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

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

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

4.7 The scheme proposed meets the requirements of criterion a) as it is an allocated site and the 10 dwellings is appropriate given the villages status as a service village and therefore complies with the requirements of b).

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

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

4.9 In terms of para 58, providing 10 dwellings on the site still results in a modest density entirely consistent with its surroundings and is therefore considered consistent with the aspirations of paragraph 58 of the NPPF.
4.10 In summary, whilst the number of dwellings proposed is greater than the approximate figure contained within the allocation, it is considered, that in principle, providing 10 dwellings within the village which is a service centre is acceptable, subject to the scheme satisfying the stated criterion set out within the allocation and all relevant planning policies in respect of matters such as design, neighbour amenity, highway safety etc. An assessment of the scheme, against these is as follows:

4.11 The first criterion is to provide frontage development only, which the layout complies with. In general design terms, the proposal is considered to be well designed and sympathetic to the existing form of development in this part of Great Moulton following revisions suggested by the Council’s Senior Conservation and Design officer. The scheme also responds positively to the requirements of the Councils Place Making Guide. All vehicular accesses are onto High Green. The arrangement of these has been assessed by the Highway Authority who has confirmed that they are satisfactory.

4.12 In terms of the second criterion, Anglian Water has confirmed that the Long Stratton Water Recycling Centre will have available capacity for the flows from the proposed development.

Other issues

4.13 In terms of assessing the scheme against the NPPF, all housing schemes should be assessed in the context of sustainable development.

An assessment is as follows:

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

Social Role

4.16 "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 high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural wellbeing"

4.17 The proposed scheme includes 3 affordable dwellings which meets the required 33% of the total number of units being affordable as required in Policy 4 of the JCS.

4.18 Safeguarding residential amenity is also considered to be part of securing a high quality built environment. It is considered that the relationship between the existing dwellings and the proposed properties as well as the relationship the new dwellings have with one another has been assessed and it is considered that the separation distances are adequate in all respects to safeguard amenity levels of existing and future residents. This also means that the proposal satisfies policy requirements in respect of Policy 2 of the Joint
Core Strategy and DM3.14 of the Development management Policy Document. In summary, it is considered that the scheme would contribute additional housing where there is a need and provides an attractive scheme for future residents.

Environmental Role

4.19 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."

4.20 A protected species appraisal has been submitted in support of the application. There is a presence of Great Crested Newts within the area and the Ecologist broadly concurs with the findings within the submitted report. Further information was asked for in relation to the proposed ditch and how it will be managed in relation to biodiversity. The Ecologist recommends that section 5 of the Protected Species Appraisal and the proposed ditch details are conditioned on the approval notice.

Drainage

4.21 There have been concerns raised by local residents concerning foul sewage and previous problems regarding the main sewer pipe blocking and the means of the disposal of foul sewage needs to be addressed. Also there are concerns with regard to the flow of surface water.

4.22 The Council's Water Management Officer recommends input from Anglian Water regarding the capacity of the existing sewage pipes to accommodate the proposed number of dwellings. Anglian Water has been consulted on the application and raised no objections. A condition has been requested requiring a foul water drainage strategy be approved before the commencement of work on the site.

4.23 The Council's Water Management Officer has also indicated that the riparian ownership details should be incorporated in to any transfer documents to ensure that any future maintenance responsibilities of the drainage ditch are identified and understood.

4.24 Any culvert or works affecting the flow of a watercourse requires the consent of the Lead Local Flood Authority which is separate from planning approval and as such this does not need to be pursued at this time. By way of background the Lead Local Flood Authority has been consulted and raised no objections.

4.25 Comments from the Environment Agency will be provided in updates to the committee.

4.26 In summary, the environmental role has been fulfilled.

4.27 Overall, having regard to the NPPF, the scheme is considered to represent a sustainable development.

Other issues

Highway safety

4.28 Concern has been raised by the Parish Council with regard to the number of entrances onto High Green and their proximity to a sharp bend and a single access would be preferable. The Highways Authority has no particular concerns with regard to highway safety issues. The highways authority recommended a frontage footway would be considered a benefit and this has been included in the amended plans.
4.29 There have also been concerns from both the highways authority and local residents with regard to access to the land to the rear of the proposed development. The submitted plans showed the only access to this land along an existing residential estate road. The amended plans now show an access to the land behind the development off High Green to the west of the proposed development.

Ecology

4.30 The development is to be carried out in accordance with the Protected Species Appraisal and further details agreed with the Ecologist. The condition requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the above.

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

This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy

5. Conclusion

5.1 The principle of a residential development on this site has been established in the Development Management Policies Document. The proposed development satisfies planning policy requirements in regard to design and layout, neighbour amenity and highway safety.

5.2 On this basis the scheme is recommended for approval subject to conditions and the applicant entering into a S106 agreement.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Raine 01508 533841 craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk Lynn Armes 01508 533960 larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other Applications

4. **Appl. No**: 2015/1485/F  
   **Parish**: WYMONDHAM

   **Applicants Name**: Estate Of Joan Alice Burton  
   **Site Address**: Land Rear Of 14 Norwich Common Wymondham Norfolk  
   **Proposal**: Proposed 1No. new chalet bungalow

   **Recommendation**: Refusal

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

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   - NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport
   - NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
   - NPPF 07: Requiring good design
   - NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities
   - NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
   - NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   Development Management Policies
   - DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
   - DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development
   - 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
   - DM4.7: Strategic gaps between settlements within the Norwich Policy Area

Wymondham Area Action Plan  
WYM21: Wymondham Development Boundary

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No recent history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Town Council**

   Comments on original scheme
   Refuse
   - outside development limits;
   - surface water drainage issues; overdevelopment of site;
• effect upon neighbouring properties;
• concern over safe and free flow of traffic.

Revised scheme
No comments received

3.2 District Member

To Committee:
• Outside development boundary.
• Surface water issues.
• Over-development of the site.
• Effect on Neighbouring Properties
• Concerns over safe free flow of traffic.
• Encroaches on strategic gap between Wymondham and Hethersett.

3.3 NCC Highways

Original scheme
Support conditionally

Revised scheme
No comments received

3.4 SNC Water Management Officer

Original scheme
No objections - but include advisory note -

Revised scheme:
No comments received

3.5 Representations

Comments on original scheme:
2 letters of objection:
• Share the view of the Town Council - overdevelopment of the site
• New driveway opposite Becketts Grove would create further hazard
• Poor surface water drainage.
• Loss of privacy and amenity from access being in close proximity to the dwelling and loss of privacy to rear garden.
• Impact on remaining land of No 14 Norwich Common.
• Inappropriate development and if allowed would set a precedent.
• Proposed single storey dwelling is higher than the existing two storey house and would be clearly visible from the road.

Comments received on revised plans:
1 letter received neither supporting nor objecting, but raising concern about the new access with increased access onto a busy road and opposite a new access which serves several hundred houses off Becketts Grove.

2 letters of objection.
• Reduction in number of dwellings still results in loss of privacy and amenity.
• Little consideration given to neighbouring boundaries.
• This is not infill as the land is to the rear of existing dwellings not between.
• Eroding the gap.
• If development goes ahead the noise pollution during development would cause major disruption and have an enormous negative effect on our business. The dust created, particularly from brick dust would not only increase our preparation costs but brick dust permanently damages vehicle paintwork.
4 Assessment

4.1 The proposal seeks to sub-divide the rear garden of the existing property for the construction of one new dwelling. The scheme as originally submitted provided two, two storey dwellings within the extensive rear garden of No 14, however, this has been revised to provide one single storey dwelling. The site is outside the Development Boundary of Wymondham and within the Strategic Gap of Hethersett-Wymondham. The new access to the site is off Norwich Common between Nos 14 and 16 Norwich Common.

Principle of development

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

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

Economic Role

4.4 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.”

4.5 The proposal is now for one single storey dwelling which would make a modest contribution to the economy of the area through employment at the construction stage and subsequent spending from the occupiers.

Social Role

4.6 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.”

4.7 As confirmed above, the Council cannot now demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. Although the proposed dwelling could provide some social benefit in terms of a single dwelling with reasonable access to services and facilities, this has to be weighed against other issues relating to the location of this site.

Environmental Role

4.8 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.”

4.9 The site is outside the Development Limits of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015 and the Wymondham Area Action Plan, the site is also within a designated Strategic Gap between Hethersett and Wymondham.
4.10 The application site is on the south side of Norwich Common where the pattern of development is sporadic in character. This specific site forms part of a small cluster of dwellings with street frontage and large rear gardens which contribute to the character of the location. The development of this site would erode the character of the area which is distinct from the new development on the north side of Norwich Common which is generally a denser form of development.

Summary of sustainable development consideration

4.11 The application site is set in a cluster of dwellings on the South side of Norwich Common. Although outside the Development Limits of Wymondham, it is opposite the established Development Boundary, and with access to a public footpath on the north side of Norwich Common would allow easy access to the main town and a range of services and facilities. However, the site does not meet all of the criteria to be considered as sustainable development.

4.12 Although the scheme is not considered to represent a sustainable form of development in the context of the NPPF, it is still appropriate to have regard to paragraph 14 of the NPPF in respect of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision making this means:

“where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless:

• Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole; or
• Specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted.”

4.13 The application site as already stated currently forms part of the extensive garden of No 14 Norwich Common, and while the application site is located within a small cluster of dwellings they fall within a designated Strategic Gap.

4.14 The importance of the gap between Hethersett and Wymondham is noted in the South Norfolk Local Landscape Review Strategic Gaps/Important Breaks September 2012 paragraph 4.6.4 which states “ S sporadic views of farmland may be obtained between clusters of roadside properties on the southern side of the B1172 and the far western part of the gap/break, thereby imparting a rural character to outward views from the road. This farmland forms part of a continuous belt of agricultural land between the existing built-up edges of Wymondham and Hethersett. The strong sense of openness and rural character of this land south of the B1172 may also be appreciated by users of the A11 as a result of various open and filtered views across the southern boundary of the gap/break”.

4.15 The development of the plot proposed would significantly erode the open character of this section of Norwich Common which makes a significant contribution to the character of the local area, including the Strategic Gap.

4.16 While I accept the development of one plot could be considered to make a positive contribution to the shortfall of dwellings in the Norwich Policy Area, the erosion of the open countryside in this instance would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of developing the site in terms of para 14 of the NPPF.
Other considerations

Design

4.17 The revised design and scale of the proposed dwelling is very modern and includes a large element of glazing. The single storey design and position within the plot would not result in any significant loss of privacy or amenity to the neighbouring properties and would not, in itself justify refusal.

Boundary treatment

4.18 Much of the rear boundaries benefit from trees and hedging the design and access statement notes that a Willows along the boundary would be felled to achieve the new access, however these are not the subject of a TPO and the in the event the application is approved, a condition could be included to ensure landscaping for the site is submitted and agreed. The south east boundary of the site is shown to have a new boundary fence which is also indicative on the plan, and could also be the subject of a condition in the event of an approval.

Access

4.19 The site is proposed to be served by a new access between No 16 and No 14. This has raised concern with the neighbours and Town Council with regard to highway safety and impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring property. However, subject to the necessary conditions, no objections have been raised by the Highways Authority. For this reason the scheme is considered to accord with policies DM3.11 and DM3.12

4.20 Paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires Councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes, and is this is a material planning consideration for this application as self-build could be a method of delivering the site. Whilst no 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 would be self-build. In the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance and outweigh the potential benefit of self-build.

4.21 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.

4.22 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) however, the other issues relating to this application outweigh the benefits of CIL.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The site sub-divides the existing garden of No 14 Norwich Common which is one of a small group of dwellings on the south side of Norwich Common which is outside the Development Limits of Wymondham. It is close to the Development Limit on the north side of Norwich Common which benefits from a pavement allowing easy access to the main town of Wymodham and a range of services and facilities. However, the impact of the development would result in significant harm to the character of the local area and for this reason does not satisfy all the elements of sustainable development in accordance with paragraph 49 of the NPPF.
5.2 The site is outside the development limits of Wymondham and located within the Strategic Gap between Hethersett and Wymondham which is of significant importance as noted in the South Norfolk Local Landscape Review Strategic Gaps/Important Breaks September 2012. The scheme as proposed would significantly and demonstrably harm the locality and this harm would outweigh the benefits of developing the site. The application should consequently be refused in the light of para 14 of the NPPF.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837 jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. Appl. No : 2015/1487/F  
Parish : THURLTON  
Applicants Name : Mr M Rushmer  
Site Address : Home Farm Low Road Thurlton Norfolk NR14 6PZ  
Proposal : Retrospective application for 2 No commercial dog kennels.  
Recommendation : Approval with conditions  
   1. In accordance with submitted drawings  
   2. Limit the number of dogs  
   3. Flood safety  
   4. Disposal of waste  

Authorise enforcement action to reduce the number of adult dogs on the site to 8.

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   Development Management Policies  
   DM1.1 : Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
   DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development  
   DM2.1 : Employment and business development  
   DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development  
   DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
   DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life  
   DM3.14 : Pollution, health and safety  
   DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management  
   DM4.5 : Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys  

2. Planning History  
2.1 2009/0139 : Retrospective application for extension to boundary wall  
           : Refused  

3. Consultations  
3.1 Parish Council : Amended proposal  
           : Refuse  
           • In views of the PC made on the original application i.e. that there are no objections from neighbours regarding noise levels, the PC agreed that their support for this application is withdrawn
### Original proposal

- We assume that appropriate dog breeding licences are in place and that there are no objections from neighbours regarding noise levels.

### 3.2 District Member

To be reported if appropriate

### 3.3 NCC Highways

Amended proposal
- No objection

**Original proposal**

No Objection
- Having reviewed the application the proposal are of a scale that would not have a significant impact on the immediate surrounding highway network

### 3.4 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team

**Amended proposal**

- Applicant has provided further details of noise mitigation and we understand that the number of dogs on site would be limited to eight
- Reducing the number of dogs along with an effective noise management plan help to reduce the noise activity from this site.
- Important to note that the overall number of dogs housed in close proximity there still may be some potential for some noise arising
- This may be difficult to control through planning conditions and may not amount to a statutory nuisance but may have the potential to cause disturbance to surrounding residential amenity.
- Recommend condition on waste disposal

**Original comments**

No objection
- Understand there is up to 20 breeding bitches on the site
- This department does not have a history of complaints regarding noise disturbance from this unit. However, having this quantity of dogs along with puppies does have the propensity to cause possible noise disturbance to nearby residents
- Request applicant provided further details of any mitigating measures he intended (or already) carries out to control the noise emanating from the site

### 3.5 Broads Authority

No Objection
- It is not considered that this small scale development would have any adverse visual or other impact on the Broads Authority Executive Area.

### 3.6 SNC Water Management Officer

**Amended proposal**

- Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted
- Site lies within fluvial and tidal flood zone 3 and may flood to a depth of 0.56 metres for a 1 in 100 year climate event.
- FRA advised that the site is at low risk of surface water flooding but the Environment Agency maps shows that the site has a high risk of flooding from surface water. However the area at high risk does not include the area where the kennels are located.
• Residual risk can be managed by the utilising the Environment Agency flood risk warnings
• Refuse could be found via Long Road toward Long Road
• A Flood and Fire Evacuation Plan has been provided
• Need to condition signing up Flood warning and flood evacuation plan
• FRA advises soakaways from proposed to deal with surface water drainage

Original proposal
• Flood risk maps indicate that the site lies within flood zones 2 and 3
• Flood Risk Assessment is required
• Due to the size and nature of the proposed development it is unlikely to have a significant effect on the fluvial flood plain.
• Emergency Flood Plan is also required

3.7 Representations
Three letters of objection from two households
• In principle do not object to the additional kennels but are already domestic kennels and I am concerned about the rising number of dogs at Home Farm
• Noise from dogs is overwhelmingly loud and is triggered at time of day or night
• Current noise from the dogs is audible in house with windows closed
• In garden noise is distressing and it is no longer possible to have quiet enjoyment of my property.
• What measures are in place for dog waste and litter, dog bedding currently burnt on bonfires which blows smoke across neighbouring properties
• Fly invasions which come into the house
• Question number of dogs that can be kept on the site without them becoming destressed
• If permission is granted can noise be controlled by condition

4 Assessment

4.1 The application relates to Home Farm which is, which is the last dwelling in a linear cluster of dwellings along Low Road in Thurlton. The Broads Area boundary is located to the north west and north east of the site on the other side of the road. The site is outside any development limit defined by the South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations. The site is within flood zone 3 (high risk).

4.2 This is a retrospective application for the construction of two sets of dog kennels (one with five compartments and one with six compartments) and the use of these for commercial dog breeding. There are currently in excess of 20 dogs on the site. The application has been amended to reduce this number of six breeding dogs; the applicant also has two pet dogs.

4.3 Policy DM1.3 seeks to provide development within sustainable locations, the site is located some distance from any defined development boundary. However, given the nature of the use where there is some potential for noise disturbance it is considered that a rural location is considered to be justified in this instance.
4.4 The Council has received letters raising concerns about the amount of noise from dog barking which current emanates from the site. There are currently in excess of 20 adult dogs and puppies on the site, there is obviously a direct relationship between the number of dogs and the noise generated. The applicant has agreed to reduce the number of breeding dogs to six and also has two pets dogs. This will substantially reduce the number of dogs on the site which will reduce the level of disturbance likely to be created. The applicant has also put forward a number of procedures to control the noise created by the dogs such as use of electronic listening devices and preparation of food etc. out of the sight of dogs; which will help, but realistically these relate to the management of the site and it is not possible to effectively condition them. Inevitably even with the reduction in the number of dogs from the site there will be some noise and disturbance created which is acknowledged by the Environmental Quality Team, but it is considered on balance that the level of noise created would not to be to an extent that would warrant refusal of the application. It is important that any conditions restricting the number of dogs is enforceable a condition is therefore proposed which limits the number of adult dogs (over one year old) to 8 which will allow for 6 breeding dogs and two pet dogs but no differentiation is proposed in the condition. Realistically it is not possible to control the number of puppies on the site at any one time.

4.5 The proposed design of the kennels is functional in nature but they are low level and form part of a group of buildings so does not have a significant adverse impact on the local landscape or the Broads Area.

4.6 The impact of the development on the highway network will not be significant and as a result the Highway Officer has not raised an objection to the application.

4.7 Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted and the site lies within fluvial and tidal flood zone 3, the site may be at risk to flooding up to a depth of 0.56 metres for a 1 in 100 year climate change event. The area is at high risk of surface water flooding but the location of the kennels is low risk. The use is a less vulnerable use which is acceptable within flood zone 3. The impact on the flood plain of the development is minimal and the residual risk can be managed by the utilising the Environment Agency’s flood risk warnings. A Flood and Fire Evacuation Plan has been provided which has been conditioned along with the signing up to the flood risk warnings.

4.8 Concern has been raised regarding burning of waste on the site. It is against the law to burn trade waste a condition has been proposed which requires any waste to be disposed by a trade waste provider.

4.9 It is recommended that authority is given to take enforcement action to reduce the number of adult dogs (over 1 year old) on the site to eight. Although there are more kennel compartments than dogs allowed on the site, it is not considered reasonable to require the removal of any of the physical kennels as the structures are not causing any harm of the landscape and the a condition is proposed restricting the number of dogs. The extra space means that dogs can be moved into separate kennels during cleaning.

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

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

In conclusion the use is considered acceptable in this countryside location and would not significantly adversely affect the local landscape or Broads Area or highway safety. With the reduction in the number of adult dogs on the site to 8 it is considered that the noise generated from the site would be reduced to an acceptable level which would not cause a significant loss of amenity to nearby residents in accordance with policy DM3.13 in the Development Management Policies.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Helen Bowman 01508 533833 hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No** : 2015/1663/F  
**Parish** : ASLACTON  
Applicants Name : Waveney (Holdings) Ltd  
Site Address : Waveney Pumps Newport Drive Station Road Aslacton Norfolk NR15 2DU  
Proposal : Demolition of existing industrial nissan hut and erection of seven new industrial units.  
Recommendation : Approval with Conditions

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 5 : The Economy

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.1 : Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development  
DM2.1 : Employment and business development  
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM3.14 : Pollution, health and safety  
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows  
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2015/1662  
Withdrawn  
Erection of single storey extension to existing industrial workshop.

2.2 2012/1955  
Approved  
Proposed new access road to existing industrial site with retention of existing access for car and transit sized vehicles only
3. Consultations

3.1 Aslacton Parish Council  

Amended plans:

Object

- Outside the Development Boundary and an intrusion into open countryside.
- Contrary to LDF.
- Applicant should have been put it forward as an allocation rather than via application.
- This site has historically never been allocated for this purpose.
- unsuitable as it has no direct access to a main road and will rely on a narrow country lane to access the A140.
- The road access from Plantation Road was for the specific use of Waveney Pumps which would seem to have been ignored by the Applicant as he is now proposing to split the site in two; it is clear that the Company never intended to use this road for deliveries by heavy lorries but have always intended to further develop the site. A misleading application that was approved by the Parish Council under a misapprehension; they believed that they were voting to improve life for residents in Station Road.
- There will only be one entry point in the case of fire which must be a strong consideration when looking at the proximity of dwellings and the fact that it is surrounded by arable land on three sides that is rotationally used for cereal growing.
- The Parish already has two industrial sites.
- Applicant has stated in support of the Application that he has 100 clients looking for commercial premises on his books. South Norfolk already has an abundance of vacant units available, and there are more beyond South Norfolk.

If the Council is minded to grant this application, the Parish Council recommends that Newport Drive be closed as access for vehicular traffic to the entire site; that the site remains as one whole; that all requirements of the Highways Authority and the Fire Service be fulfilled before any building starts. The line of the footpath FP14 should be restored in accordance with the definitive map. It should be noted that the road planings on the access from Plantation Road are not particularly suitable for cyclists and a tarmac surface should be constructed if they are expected to use this access.

Original scheme:

Object

- It is not part of the Local Development Framework
- There has been no demonstration of need for these units
- The site is in a residential area backing on to houses and would be an intrusion into open countryside
- The nissan hut, demolition for which permission if being sought, should have been removed when permission for the original brick building was granted; this was a condition of the permission.
- The access from Plantation Road was recommended for approval when the applicant claimed that the lorries that delivered to Waveney Pumps were too large to use Newport Drive and had to be off-loaded at the station site on to small vans. No lorries have been seen to use this access since it was
completed but it was not made clear that the lack of objection and the completion of the access would be followed by an application to develop the whole site; had this been understood, the Parish Council would not have made a recommendation for acceptance.

3.2 District Member  To Committee, due to concerns over balance of interests between providing employment and impact on local communities.

3.3 NCC Highways  Amended plans:
No objection subject to conditions regarding laying out of parking and turning as in plan and no vehicular access to the site via adjacent industrial premises.

Original scheme:
Vehicular access to only be via Plantation Rd. cycle parking should be provided.

3.4 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team  Comments on amended plan are the same as originally made
no objection subject to conditions:
- no power tools used outside,
- restriction on hours of operation,
- no generators, compressors, cooling fans etc to be installed

3.5 SNC Water Management Officer  Comments on amended plan are the same as originally made
No objection subject to advisory note in respect of surface water drainage

3.6 NCC Ecologist  Amended plan:
Having seen photographs of the outside of the nissen hut satisfied that no further survey work is required – however, precautionary approach is prudent and condition required that demolition is by hand and if that’s found, cease work and contact the Local Planning Authority.

Original scheme:
Photos needed of nissen hut to establish potential impacts in respect of roosting for protected species

3.7 NCC Public Rights Of Way  Amended plan:
Existing hedgerow to the site should have been infilled as appropriate as part of a previous approval on the site, this still needs to be undertaken. New fence adjacent to the public footpath will require prior agreement with them.

Original scheme:
Adjacent public footpath needs to be adequately protected and retained

3.8 The Ramblers Association  No comments received

3.9 Landscape Officer  Amended plans:
No objection in principle
Issues to be resolved before supported:

- With regards to the arboricultural information, my suspicion is that the existing trees along the west boundary will have root protection areas that extend further into the site as the existing ditch will have prevented uniform root growth. It may be that the proposed building line needs to be adjusted accordingly. The existing vegetation makes a good visual filter, so it must be safeguarded.
- The arboricultural report does not consider the effect of any future growth of the trees, especially the G1 oaks; again, this might have a bearing on the siting of the units.
- There is an implication that there will be fencing installed along the drive, but no details. We need to confirm what is to happen - has the existing security fencing been approved? The effect of this on the footpath is not ideal, and there is a significant narrowing of the path adjacent to an oak tree
- The access drive was agreed by 2012/1955; condition 7 of this planning permission require that hedge planting be undertaken, but this has not be complied with.
- If this application is to progress, I would like to see additional planting along the west boundary to fill-in gaps, also for the proposed planting on the north boundary to be on the outside of the fencing, in order to give a more rural effect.

3.10 Representations

Amended plans:

5 objections received, a summary of the reasons is as follows:

Road safety concerns regarding the site access, site is too close to existing residents and within the countryside, public footpaths have not been properly considered, industrialisation of the countryside, no ecological survey has been provided, increased noise levels, local road network id not suitable to accommodate industrial vehicles, not clear whether existing agricultural hardstanding adjacent to the access will remain as its use could restrict visibility via straw stacks etc being stored there, already sufficient industrial units available locally, a surplus would lead to them being empty and subsequently an eyesore and target for vandalism, lack of detail on intended use,

Original scheme:

9 objections received, a summary of the reasons is as follows:

Not planned for development, detrimental to neighbour amenity, including noise disturbance, already industrial premises available locally, road safety/traffic concerns, contrary to EMP4, previous refusal from 2000/0676 still applicable, pollution concerns, concern over future expansion, hazardous chemicals could be stored, Newport Drive is too narrow, out of character with rural area, no information on intended users

1 letter of support has been received

1 observation has been received (neither object/nor support) requesting further planting to be added to supplement existing and no bonfires should be allowed
4 Assessment

Site description and development details

4.1 The application site is situated on the edge of the village of Aslacton, and presently contains a nissen hut. The site is accessible via a long drive which adjoins Plantation Road to the west. To the north, south and west of the site is open countryside and to the east is an existing industrial premises (also under the ownership of the applicant). The boundary of the site is delineated by fencing and vegetation including mature trees. It should also be noted that a public right of way runs adjacent to the southern boundary of the site.

4.2 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of seven industrial units. The units are to be constructed using a steel frame with insulated cladding panels to the exterior. The layout is configured to have a terrace of 5 units along the western perimeter of the site and a pair of two units adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. The layout provides 26 parking spaces on-site with associated turning provision. The development makes provision for its vehicular access via a long access which adjoins the public carriageway to the west (Plantation Road). The development would allow for pedestrian and cyclist access from the east via the adjacent industrial premises only, given the fixed bollard arrangement proposed for the eastern boundary of the development. The proposed development would necessitate the demolition of the existing nissen hut on-site.

Assessment

4.3 Policy DM2.1 of the Local Plan is applicable to Employment and Business Development. Part 1 of this policy states that:

4.4 Development proposals which provide for or assist the creation of new employment opportunities, inward investment and/or provide for the adaptation and expansion of an existing business will be supported unless there is a significant adverse impact in terms of Policies DM1.1, 1.3 and other policies of the Local Plan.

4.5 The policy goes on to set out a number of parts specific to different circumstance, in this instance, given that the site is not an existing or allocated employment Area or within the development boundary for Aslacton Part 7 of the Policy DM2.1 is directly relevant. This states that:

4.6 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 (see Policy DM2.10); and/or
   B) Are located on sites well related to rural towns and villages and it is demonstrated that there are no sequentially preferable sites available; and/or
   C) Create accessible jobs and business opportunities in the rural area.

4.7 In considering the scheme against the first part of Policy DM2.1, it is clear that the creation of 7 industrial units would provide for new employment opportunities in that they are suitably designed to be used by a multitude of end users. Having established this, such a scheme will be supported unless significant adverse impact would occur.

4.8 With this in mind it is considered appropriate to assess the impacts of the proposal, and this is as follows:

4.9 In terms of highway safety, it is evident that vehicular access into the site would be restricted to a single access onto Plantation Road. The Highway Authority has confirmed that the access proposed is acceptable. It should be noted that the application originally proposed a further vehicular access into the site via the adjacent industrial premises to the east. This resulted in an objection from the Highway Authority and the scheme was...
subsequently amended to only cater for pedestrian and cycle access from the east. This will be controlled via a condition preventing vehicular access and by having a scheme of fixed bollards and fencing to the eastern boundary. This arrangement is acceptable to the Highway Authority.

4.10 In terms of visual impact, the site is relatively compact and the proposed layout results in a tightly grouped arrangement of units with parking adjacent. The units are functional in appearance, consistent with the proposed use and have modest eaves and ridge heights. The site in itself lies immediately adjacent to existing industrial premises and the site presently has buildings on it which would be demolished if the scheme were to be approved. The site sits some distance away from the Plantation Road and behind exist development on Station Road. Furthermore, the site is enclosed by mature vegetation and fencing. On balance, it is considered that the proposal would not have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the locality, including the open countryside.

4.11 In terms of neighbour amenity, the units would be some distance away from the nearest properties on Station Road and those which lie further away on Plantation Road. The access to the site is also sufficiently distanced from the east property on Plantation Road so as to be unlikely to lead to significant adverse impact in terms of noise, smell, dust, vibration etc. The Council’s Community Protection Team has been consulted and they have confirmed that conditions restricting the use of power tools outside of the units, limited hours of operation and no generators/compressors, chiller units or cooling fans be installed unless approved by the Council. These are all considered to be reasonable to be the subject of conditions.

4.12 It is evident that the site benefits from a row of mature trees, and vegetation to the western boundary which acts an effective and attractive means of enclosure to the site. Whilst the application is supported by an arboricultural assessment and the building locations informed by this so as to safeguard these trees, the Council’s Landscape Officer believes that the existence of a ditch adjacent to these trees may have resulted in a non-uniform root growth and as such suggested that the units be moved slightly further eastwards to ensure the trees are protected. It is anticipated that the agent will provide the necessary revised layout to this effect prior to committee and the assessment is made on this basis. In terms of site boundaries, it has been suggested that the new planting to the north-eastern perimeter of the site be outside of the existing fence line. However it is evident that the land beyond the fence is not within the control of the applicant and as such could not be delivered. On balance, it is considered that the retention of the existing fence is acceptable in visual terms. The proposed hedging inside the site along the north-eastern boundary would not provide any visual benefit to the site however, it would provide ecological benefits and as such is a worthwhile addition to the site.

4.13 The Council’s Landscape Officer has also made reference to the need to in-fill various sections of hedging on the site boundaries including along the access drive. It is considered that this can be reasonably delivered via condition requiring its implementation prior to first occupation.

4.14 There is a public right of way adjacent to the southern perimeter of the site, and both the Council’s Landscape Officer and Norfolk County Council’s Public Rights of Way Officer have made reference to the need for it to be appropriately retained, and specifically that a 1.5m width is made available. With this in mind there was some uncertainty over the potential positioning of a security fence along the driveway and how this would impact upon the retention of the right of way. However, the agent has confirmed that this is not to be the case, and they will amend the plan to clarify the uncertainty in the current proposed site plan. There has also been reference made to whether the existing fence on the southern boundary of the site has consent and whether it retains a sufficiently wide right of way. Given this uncertainty, it is considered appropriate to attach a planning condition to any
subsequent approval requiring agreement of the exact position and fence details to the southern boundary regardless of that presently shown on the plan in order to ensure that the appropriate width of the right of way is retained.

Other issues

4.15 In terms of drainage matters, the Council’s Water Management Officer has confirmed that they have no concerns and the County Ecologist has no concerns regarding protected species.

4.16 In terms of the three criteria in part 7 of the Policy DM2.1 it is evident that a) is not directly relevant as the scheme does not involve re-use of buildings or hardstandings. The site is immediately adjacent to the village, adjacent to an existing employment premises and as such is considered to fulfil criterion b) and the site would have the potential to create accessible jobs in the rural area in that it is not overly remote in terms of accessibility, and therefore satisfies criterion c).

4.17 Concern has been expressed that there are already premises available locally that could cater for the need identified by the applicant. It is evident that there is no policy requirement for an applicant to demonstrate that there is a need for future premises, and as such it would be unreasonable to take this into account in the decision-making process or make it a reason for refusal. There has also been concern raised at the lack of detail in respect of the potential use of the units proposed. It has been indicated that they will be for B1 (light industrial, offices) and/or B8 (storage or distribution) and a condition will be added to define this.

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

This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5 Conclusion

5.1 It is considered that the proposal complies with the relevant planning policies including Local Plan DM2.1 which is specifically relevant and the application is therefore recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Raine 01508 533841 craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2015/1921/F  
**Parish**: CAISTOR ST EDMUND

Applicants Name: Mrs Rebecca Gallagher  
Site Address: Land North Of Tas House Norwich Road Caistor St Edmund Norfolk  
Proposal: Siting of one number log cabin style mobile home, one number log cabin style day room, one single bedroom unit and one touring caravan for residential use  
Recommendation: Refusal

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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 17: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.3: Gypsy and Travellers sites  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety  
DM4.5: Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/0278 Certificate for lawful existing use of land for grazing and keeping horses and field shelter. Approved

2.2 2012/0277 Retrospective application for retention of field shelter and earth bund. Proposed erection of 2 stables with associated tack room and storage. Approved
3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council**  Refuse
- Outside any development area
- In the Tas Valley and open countryside
- Contrary to policy
- In an Isolated setting, remote from any amenities and not sustainable
- Although outside Flood Zone 3, subject to flooding
- Egress onto a fast bend on busy Stoke road, close to entrance to Chalk Pit and proposed access route to Trowse Solar Farm
- Vehicles exiting the site, particularly if towing caravans or horse boxes would present a serious hazard to traffic

3.2 **District Member**  To be determined by committee
- Outside development area
- Current SNC policy for Gypsy and Traveller developments
- Emerging government policy for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation

3.3 **SNC Water Management Officer**  No objections subject to conditions

3.4 **NCC Highways**  No comments received

3.5 **SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team**  No comments to make

3.6 **NCC Ecologist**  To be reported

3.7 **Historic Environment Service**  No comments received

3.8 **SNC Housing Access and Standards Manager**  To be reported

3.9 **Representations**  10 letter objection
- The area is of historical importance and understand it should not be developed.
- There are no facilities within the immediate area this includes mains sewerage.
- Soakaways and adding extra waste water are not going to help in an area just outside the flood zone.
- The style of the properties applied for (including the residential caravan) will not fit with the style of residences in the local area.
- Detract from the character and appearance of the area, especially the view down the valley from A47.
- Loss of value of houses within the vicinity.
- Not a sustainable development, isolated location, insufficient availability of local services, not justified by any of the exceptions set out in Para 55 of NPPF, carries with it significant harm.
- Contrary to Para 61 of NPPF
- Impact of the proposed design causes harm and should be refused in accordance with Para 64 of NPPF.
• Unacceptable visual impact and will create visual harm to the wider landscape, contrary to Para’s 109, 111, 112, 123 and 125 of NPPF
• Site lies in the Tas Valley
• Entrance located close to a bend on a busy road with a speed limit of 60mph
• Impact of residential amenity and quality of life
• Contrary to DM3.3

Letter of objection from the Tas Valley Society
• Application site highly visible from A47
• Inappropriate location
• Out of character with the immediate surroundings
• Outside development area
• Support the objections raised by others

4  Assessment

4.1 This application seeks change of use and siting of a mobile home, a single bedroom unit, a day room and a touring caravan with parking for 3/4 private vehicles and a horsebox trailer at land north of Tas House, Stoke Road (Norwich Road), Caistor St Edmunds. The site is located within a paddock used for the keeping of horses with an existing stable located to the northwest corner. To the south is a residential dwelling Tas House, to the east Stoke Road (Norwich Road), to the north and west open countryside. The site is clearly visible in the landscape.

4.2 The site lies within the B1 Tas Tributary Farmland where the landscape is described in the South Norfolk Place Making Guide as being a large area of land encompassing the Tas River Valley character area, located at the heart of South Norfolk and bounded to the north, south and west by surrounding Plateau areas. Outside the more built up areas, the general grain and pattern comprises of scattered farmsteads dispersed across the wider landscape, frequently clustered with small areas of woodland.

4.3 The application is for a Gypsy/Traveller family, the applicant Mrs R Gallagher currently manages the Traveller site at Costessey. The applicant is currently 'on call' 24/7/365 and her 'out of hours' life with her family is regularly interrupted by other occupants. This proposal looks to provide the applicant with a permanent home and benefits to her family without being disturbed and will enable the applicant to continue her management duties during normal working hours.

4.4 The main issues to be considered are: the principle of development, the need for traveller sites, the gypsy/traveller status of the applicant, highway safety and flood risk/drainage

Principle of Development in respect of Travellers

4.5 Planning law requires that applications are determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for South Norfolk comprises the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies 2015 (SNLP) and the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk.

4.6 The national Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document August 2015; Local Plan Policy DM1.3 and paragraph 55 of the NPPF strictly control development within the open countryside unless there are exceptional circumstances. The application has equally been assessed against Policy DM 3.3, which sets out criteria for the consideration of gypsy/traveller development both inside and outside of development boundaries.
4.7 National policy states that local planning authorities should strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan. Local planning authorities should ensure that sites in rural areas respect the scale of, and do not dominate, the nearest settled community, and avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure. Policy DM3.3 equally states that sites should not be so isolated from Settlements that the occupiers cannot gain convenient access to schools and facilities to meet their daily needs.

4.8 The site falls within the Parish of Caistor St Edmund the main settlement area is defined as an Other Village and benefits from a development boundary. However, this site is located well outside this development boundary and also those of the surrounding villages. The site therefore is considered to be in open countryside. The site is served from the Stoke Road (Norwich Road) designated as a 3B2 Local Access Route and is subject to a 60mph speed limit and it has no footpaths in this location. The site is remote from local shops and services and therefore conflicting with the aims of sustainable development, as represented in national and local policy.

Need for traveller sites

4.9 The 'Planning policy for traveller sites' document requires local planning authorities to have regard to the existing level of local provision and need for sites, the availability (or lack) of alternative accommodation for the applicant and other personal circumstances of the applicant. The Council does not currently have a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites for travellers. The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, published in 2014, contains a target of 35 traveller pitches between 2014 and 2031. Within the first five years (2014-2019) the target is 8 pitches. At the time of writing only 1 pitch has been permitted therefore there is a clear shortfall in available pitches.

4.10 The Council is currently at an early stage in the preparation of the Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan. Consultation on the Issues and Options stage was carried out last August, which included a call for sites to be put forward for consideration. The criterion to be used in the assessment of the sites was agreed by Cabinet on Monday 15 June, with the Preferred Options document and public consultation to follow. Given its early stage, the emerging Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan does not materially affect the determination of this application, and the information is provided for background purposes only.

4.11 Policy DM3.3 states that where there is no five-year supply of deliverable sites for Gypsies and Travellers in the district and/or no alternative site, these are factors that will be weighed in favour of the proposal and balanced against any harm.

4.12 This application is for a permanent consent and therefore, notwithstanding the lack of gypsy/traveller sites (of which full regard has been made), it is considered that the site is in an unsustainable location and should not be supported as a permanent site.

The status of the applicant

4.13 The Government's 'Planning policy for traveller sites' August 2015 states: "For the purposes of this planning policy "gypsies and travellers" means: Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling show people or circus people travelling together as such."
It goes on to state in determining whether persons are 'gypsies and travellers' for the purposes of this planning policy, consideration should be given to the following issues amongst other relevant matters:

a) whether they previously led a nomadic habit of life
b) the reasons for ceasing their nomadic habit of life
c) whether there is an intention of living a nomadic habit of life in the future, and if so, how soon and in what circumstances

4.14 The applicant's agent submitted a statement of Mrs Gallagher and her partner’s status, as stated above Mrs Gallagher manages the Traveller site at Costessey and it is her husband that travels in connection with his work as a motor salesman and horse salesman. However based on the information provided it is concluded that neither the applicant nor her partner meet the definition of gypsy/traveller as set out in the National Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. The planning definition within the Government's 'Planning policy for traveller sites' indicates that race or origin is not the determining factor in deciding whether someone is a gypsy/traveller for planning purposes. This report does not therefore seek to make an assessment of the issues relating to the applicant’s family ethnic history, because this is not a determinative factor in the consideration of her status for planning purposes.

4.15 In view of the above, the application is assessed as a conventional residential development rather than an application specifically for gypsy/traveller accommodation.

Principle of development for new residential units

4.16 In terms of policy the site is outside any development boundary and as such any new residential dwellings including mobile homes would be considered contrary to policy DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP). As it has been determined that the applicant or her partner do not meet the definition of a Traveller the siting of a residential mobile in this location is contrary to policy.

4.17 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes it clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that relevant policies in the local plan cannot be considered up-to-date where a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites does not exist. Caistor St Edmund is situated within the Norwich Policy Area where the Council cannot now demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, its housing supply related policies are considered to no longer be up to date in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 49 of the NPPF. Paragraph 49 also confirms that housing applications must be assessed in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. With this in mind it is necessary to establish whether the proposal represents sustainable development. Sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. The NPPF goes on to stress in paragraph 8 that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.

4.18 The NPPF three dimensions to sustainable development; economic, social and environmental, it looks to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s need and support its health, social and cultural well-being and protecting our natural, built and historic environment.

4.19 The proposal is for a single residential unit which would make a modest contribution to the economy of the area through spending from the occupiers. Due to the isolated location of the site, the provision of one residential unit in this location provides only minor social benefit. The site is not located within a development boundary nor is it close to one and is remote from local services. It is considered the development of this site would erode the character of the area which is characterised by farmsteads dispersed across the wider landscape, frequently clustered with small areas of woodland. Having due regard to the above assessment made in the context of not having a demonstrable 5 year housing land supply, it is considered the harm of providing one residential unit in this location which would encroach into the open countryside contrary to the provisions of DM1.3 and DM4.5, would significantly outweigh the limited benefits in social and economic terms. As such, when considered as a whole, the scheme does not represent sustainable development.
4.20 Having established that the scheme does not represent a sustainable form of development in the context of the NPPF, it is necessary to have regard for paragraph 14 of the NPPF in respect of the presumption in favour of development for decision-taking. If this site were to be developed the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character of the area and would not protect and enhance the locality and therefore result in significant and demonstrable harm to the open nature of this area. While I accept the development of one plot could be considered to make a positive contribution to the shortfall of dwellings in the Norwich Policy Area, the erosion of the open countryside in this instance would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of developing the site and is in conflict with para 14 of the NPPF and DM1.3 of the SNLP 2015.

Highway Safety

4.21 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 application proposes use of an existing access to serve the proposed residential unit, with on-site parking and turning proposed to serve the unit. The Highways Authority has assessed the proposal and raise no objections to the development. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Policies DM3.11 and DM3.12.

Residential amenity

4.22 Policy DM3.13 Residential amenity directs that development should not be approved if it would have a significant adverse impact on nearby resident's amenities. Given the nature of the proposal, it will not overlook the neighbouring property and its siting would not have any significantly detrimental impacts on the residential amenities of the neighbouring property in respect of privacy, light and noise. As such, the scheme would accord with the requirements of Policy DM3.13.

Flood risk and drainage

4.23 Concerns have been raised the impact of the scheme on local drainage systems and flooding issues. The application has been assessed by the Flood Defence Officer who has raised no objections and therefore I do not consider the application could be refused on the concerns raised.

4.24 There have been a number of objections to the proposal which raise a number of issues as well as those set out above. In particular, in terms of impact on residential amenities. Whilst I fully appreciate the concerns raised, given the nature of the development, I do not consider the proposal would give rise to a situation so detrimental to neighbours amenities as to warrant refusal on these grounds. Loss of value is not a material planning consideration.

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.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is considered to conflict with the aims of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies (SNLP) and in particular is considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS, Policy DM1.3, DM3.3 and DM4.5 of SNLP and the NPPF.
6. **Reasons for Refusal**

6.1 From the evidence submitted to demonstrate that the applicant and family, who are the proposed residential occupiers of the site, leads a nomadic habit of life in connection with their work/business, it is considered that the applicant and family do not meet the definition of a gypsy/traveller as set out within the national Planning Policy Guidance for Traveller Sites document. As a result there is no special justification to depart from the provisions of development plan policy and the proposal conflicts with DM1.3.

6.2 The proposal would result in the erosion of the rural landscape in a location removed from the settlement of Caistor St Edmunds contrary to Joint Core Strategy Policy 2, Policies DM1.3 and DM1.4 of South Norfolk Local Plan, Development Management Policies Document. As a consequence it is considered that in combination these factors outweigh the benefits of the development therefore conflicting with Paragraphs 8 and 14 of the NPPF.

6.3 The site is open paddock/pasture land, surrounded by open agricultural land, which contributes to the characteristics this area, its general grain and pattern comprises of scattered farmsteads dispersed across the wider landscape, frequently clustered with small areas of woodland. The proposal would be out of keeping with the open nature of the surrounding area and would be significantly harmful to its immediate setting and would also be demonstrably harmful to the defining characteristics of this part of South Norfolk. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and DM4.5 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
8. **Appl. No**: 2015/2147/A  
    **Parish**: TOFT MONKS

    **Applicants Name**: Mr Doeke Dobma  
    **Site Address**: Junction Of Pound Lane With Yarmouth Road (A143) And Junction Of Church Road With Pound Lane Toft Monks Norfolk  
    **Proposal**: Two main directional signs on the corner of Yarmouth Road (A143) and Pound Lane plus one repeater sign adjacent St. Margaret's Church Toft Monks, opposite Church Road.

    **Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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

   1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
      Development Management Policies  
      DM3.9 : Advertisements and signs  
      DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
      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 **2011/0349**: Installation of 14.97 mtr tall wind generator.  
       **Approved**

   2.2 **2010/0620**: Proposed use of existing farm as "Care Farm" (therapeutic use of farming practices to provide health, social or educational care services). Erection of a "Support Building" housing cloakroom facilities, a mess/workshop room, an office and internal connection to existing barn. Reposition of small ditch and construction of footbridge over with a path to two small poly tunnels.  
       **Approved**
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council

Amended proposal

- Concerned about the sign on the church verge do not wish to church to be blighted by modern unnecessary signs
- Signs on A143 should be sufficient as Church Lane is clearly marked
- Strongly object to signs
- Revised sign on Pound lane is acceptable as long as there are no other signs within our village
- Mobile sign still in position when is this going to be removed.

Original proposal

- The sign on the A143 doesn’t seem to be causing any problems
- The signs at the top of Pound Lane are far too large and why are their two signs
- Need to be reduced in size and make double sided
- Sign near church is intrusive and blight on the church
- Church Road is clearly marked with official highway signs so an additional sign should not be necessary
- There should be no signs of what they are selling
- Set up as Care Farm not a shop. Clients could be given maps with directions
- Traffic has significantly increased in recent years along with growth of Clinks Care Farm our village is being over taken by this venture.
- Signs permanent eyesore on our beautiful countryside

3.2 District Member

To be determined by committee

- Mindful of the social and economic benefits of the applicants but these need to be balanced against the concerns of residents about the impact these signs have on the local environment and in particular on the setting of Toft Monks Church

3.3 NCC Highways

Amended proposal

Support with conditions

- Signs re now back to back which is welcomed

Original proposal

- It is noted that the proposed signs are to replace the existing signs albeit it would appear that there are slightly larger than at present, and they are to be erected off the public highway.
- To avoid a proliferation of signs and highway safety the signs should be set on posts back to back
- Recommend condition that signs are non-reflective

3.4 SNC Design Officer

No objection

- The revised sign is an improvement upon the previous proposal and will have less of an impact of the setting of the listed church
3.5 Representations

Amended proposal

Three letters of objection

- Ruins setting of the church
- 'Barn Shop' is false advertisement
- Roads are not suitable for the extra traffic
- Trailer sign still in place
- Sign should be repositioned behind Church Road sign on the opposite side
- If we sign everyone's business where does it stop
- Signs at Church do not work and are not needed as people miss turning and turn round in are garden causing damage to our property

Original proposal

Four letters of objection

- Purpose of Clinks Farm is to therapeutic care no mention of a shop opening to sell produce which is causing traffic issues of the village
- Intrusive to the setting of the church
- Signs would increase traffic on damaged rural roads
- Signs are too large and obtrusive
- Originally a large number of signs were erected most of which have been removed still large sign on trailer in field.
- Puzzled as why planning permission has been requested for trailer sign
- Support the aims of Clinks Care Farm as a social enterprise
- Farm helpers could be sent maps or use sat nav.
- Damage the visual amenity of Toft Monks out of keeping with the landscape
- Toft Monks is in an area of Special Advertisement Control
- Contrary to policy IMP21
- If it must be opposite the near church they should be smaller, more muted colours and on the opposite side of the road to the church
- Norfolk County Council highway sign has been damaged and not repaired
- Signs on junction with A143 double sign would be more in keeping
- It should be smaller and less obvious muted colours
- Barn shop is not an accurate description of the development
- Countryside is spoilt by signs
- One letter of support

4 Assessment

4.1 The application relates to off-site directional signs for Clinks Care Farm in Toft Monks which provides therapeutic care packages within a farming environment.

4.2 A number of directional and advertisement signs were erected without permission most of which have now been removed. One of these signs included the trailer sign referred to be the letters of representation, confirmation of its removal will be given at committee.

4.3 There are currently two signs at the junction of Pound Land with the A143, which this application seeks to replace with a double fronted sign.

4.4 It is also proposed to replace the existing sign at on the corner of Church Road and Pound Lane.
4.5 The newly adopted policy in the Development Management Documents is policy DM3.9 which requires signs only be permitted if they are well designed and sympathetic to the character and appearance of their location having regard to their size, materials, construction, location, level of illumination and cumulative impact with other signs in the vicinity. The signs are not permitted if they are detrimental to highway safety or the amenities of the area. Policy DM3.9 does give provisions for directional signs for businesses dependent on passing trade.

4.6 Objections have been received from the Parish Council as well as a number of members of the public concerned about the adverse impact of that the signs have on the visual amenity of the area in particular the setting of the church and the impact of additional traffic.

4.7 The proposed signs of the junction of Pound Lane and the A143 have been amended so they are smaller and size and are positioned back to back on the same posts. This reduces the visual clutter at the junction substantially and it is considered that the impact on the visual amenity of the area is now acceptable. The Highway Officer raises no objection to the application but requests that the signs are not reflective. It is therefore considered that the signs accord with policy DM3.9 of the Development Management Policies.

4.8 The sign on the corner of Pound Lane and Church Lane is located close to the boundary with St Margaret’s Church which is a grade I listed building. It is proposed to locate a sign on a single post; the height of this proposed sign has been reduce so that it is less prominent but would not be obscured in the summer months by vegetation on the verge. 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.” Paragraph 134 of the NPPF requires that where there is less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm has to be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal.

4.9 The sign would cause a limited amount of harm to the setting of the listed building and the Council’s Conservation Officer does not raise an objection to the application and considers that the amendments proposed reduces the impact. It is therefore considered on balance that the amended sign would cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the heritage asset which could be balanced against the public benefits to the rural economy to make a positive recommendation for this sign. The Highway Officer has not raised objection to this sign.

4.10 In considering this application a balance needs to be reaches between the needs of the business and the visual amenity of the area. A large number of signs have already been removed and the proposed signs have been amended to reduce their impact on the rural landscape and the setting of the listed building which is now considered to be acceptable, whilst still meeting the requirement of the business.

4.11 Concerns has been raises about the amount of traffic the business is creating on the roads, this is only advertisement consent application, so it is only possible to consider the impact of the signs on highway safety not the use.

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

This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
5. **Conclusion**

5.1 It is considered the amended signs have an acceptable impact on the local landscape and cause less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed church which can be balanced against the benefits to the rural economy and do not cause any highway safety issues in accordance with policies DM3.9, DM3.11 and DM4.10.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Helen Bowman 01508 533833 hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No**: 2015/2276/H  
**Parish**: TASBURGH  

Applicants Name: Mrs V Charles  
Site Address: Jasmine Cottage Low Road Tasburgh Norfolk NR15 1AR  
Proposal: 2 storey rear extension.

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1  Full Planning permission time limit  
2  In accordance with amendments

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

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

2. **Planning History**

2.1 None

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Original application  
Neutral stance  
PC asks that the concerns of the neighbour regarding the size of the development are considered but has a neutral stance on the application.

Amended application  
No comments received

3.2 District Member  
Original application  
Can be delegated  
A neighbouring property has a well in their garden which I hope will not be affected in the event of planning permission being granted for the proposed extension.

Amended application  
To be determined by committee  
Neighbours directly affected still have concerns in particular the possibility of excavation for footings of the extension and the well in their garden adjacent to this
3.5 Representations

Original application

1 letter of support received

1 letter of objection received

- This will have a very high impact
- Loss of significant level of natural daylight
- Impact of light - outlook would be unacceptable
- Window facing us - overlooking private garden
- Extension is such on an elevated area already
- Imposing structure
- Effect on existing well

Amended application

- Object - loss of significant level of natural daylight
- Overshadowing of conservatory
- Extension is on an elevated site
- Loss of privacy
- Concern over effect on existing well

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks permission for a 2 storey rear extension. The applicant’s dwelling is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located in the development boundary for Tasburgh. The dwelling has an existing single storey rear extension with the rear garden boundaries defined by a close boarded wooden fence.

4.2 Policies in the JCS, Local Plan and requirements of the NPPF seek to ensure that proposals are for an appropriate use, are of good design and do not adversely affect the character of the existing dwelling or the street scene to a material degree, or have an adverse impact on the privacy and amenities of neighbouring properties.

4.3 The rear extension has been amended and reduced from that originally proposed. The two storey aspect is to add a first floor above the existing single storey extension with the remainder of the single storey also extended into the rear curtilage.

4.4 Concern has been raised from the adjoining occupier regarding the size of the proposal and the possible effects on their privacy and amenities. While I acknowledge the concerns raised the proposal has been dramatically reduced from that originally submitted. While the proposal will be visible the two storey aspect is not adjacent to the boundary with the neighbour and the extension to the single storey will be partially shielded by the boundary fence.

4.5 Permitted development rights have not been removed from this application for additional first floor windows in the side elevation as any additional windows located in the side elevation must be obscure-glazed and non-opening unless the parts of the window that can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed to meet the requirements of Schedule 2, Part 1 Class A of the GPDO.

4.6 It is acknowledged that one neighbour has raised comments but in this instance I consider that the design and scale does not significantly impact on the privacy and amenities of the neighbouring property as to warrant a refusal and as such the proposal as submitted accords with policies DM3.4, DM3.6 and DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.
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.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The proposal while visible from the neighbouring occupiers, will not adversely affect the neighbouring occupier's privacy and amenities to an unacceptable degree.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Chrissy Briggs 01508 533832
and E-mail:  cbriggs@s-norfolk.gov.uk
10. **Appl. No**: 2015/2522/F  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY  
**Applicants Name**: Mr Trevor Bunn  
**Site Address**: Land North Of Glenhurst Folgate Lane Costessey Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Erection of 1 no. single storey dwelling to land north of Glenhurst

**Recommendation**: Approval with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Provision of parking, service  
4. Tree Protection  
5. External materials to be agreed  
6. Slab level to be agreed  
7. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
8. Construction access route and restoration  
9. New Water Efficiency  
10. PD removal for alterations to roof.  
11. Fence across north boundary to remain in place during construction

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
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  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.10: Promotion of sustainable transport  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM4.8: Protection of Trees and Hedgerows

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2013/0332  
Erection of 1 no detached dwelling to existing land  
Refused

2.2 2013/1826  
Erection of 1 no. detached single storey dwelling to existing site  
Refused
3. Consultations

3.1 Costessey Town Council
Refuse:
Previous applications and appeal refused.

Site outside newly approved development plan and is a back land plot, is within a river valley. Access to the site is via a narrow track off Folgate Lane. Single track has no passing places.

Access to site via Glenhurst would find it difficult to make the turn in one sweep thereby holding up traffic while it makes manoeuvres.

There would be very restricted parking at Glenhurst for contractors’ cars and vans, leading to extensive parking on Townhouse Road which is a very busy road and a bus route.

Plans misleading, double garage

It is conceivable that, as the house drive is too narrow, the main access point for building materials would be via Folgate Lane, despite any planning conditions. It would be difficult to monitor and impossible to control.

3.2 District Member
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 SNC Landscape Officer
Conditionally support subject to a fence on the north boundary of the site to protect access track from construction traffic.

3.4 SNC Water Management Officer
No objection but include advisory note regarding the disposal of surface water.

3.5 NCC Highways
Support with conditions

3.6 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team
To be reported

3.7 Representations
8 letter of objection (6 representing the same address)
- Outside development limits recently approved
- Access track is not within ownership of the applicant, works required to protect the roots of the adjacent TPO’d trees on a previous application which could not be achieved because of the ownership issues was reason for refusal.
- Proposed access for construction traffic and workmen will cause issues of traffic holdup on Townhouse Road.
- Vegetation which overhangs the highway is within the ownership of the neighbour and is on his own property therefore visibility from the access track onto Folgate cannot be improved on land which is within the applicant's control.
- Any improvements required to the track to meet the requirements of highways are outside the control of the applicant as the track is not within the ownership of the applicant.
- Issues for previous refusal have not been addressed.
Back land development
Impact on TPO'd trees.
Demolition of existing garage to access site will be close to neighbouring boundary therefore the noise and disturbance and loss of privacy from construction traffic in such close proximity to the boundary is unacceptable.
Question if the access route is wide enough to achieve access proposed.
No provision of passing place on access track as access onto Folgate Lane is blind and a passing place is required.
Additional traffic serving an addition dwelling once constructed will compound the impact on the roots of the protected trees.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application seeks full planning permission for a three bedroom bungalow with an attached double garage to be located on the site accessed by a track leading from Folgate Lane. To the south, east and west of the site are existing dwellings. To the north is a woodland with a Tree Protection Order (TPO). Two existing dwellings are currently accessed from the track off Folgate Lane (Meadow View to the east and The Acorns to the west of the site).

Background

4.2 A site to the east of the application site was granted permission at appeal in August 2012 for 62 dwellings on the paddocks to the east of the application site, a reserved matters application has been received under reference 2014/1440 and approved on the 6 February 2015. This will fundamentally alter the setting of the site.

4.3 This point was accepted in a previous application for this application site under reference 2013/0332 which was only refused on the design of the proposed property.

4.4 A later application was received under reference 2013/1826 which addressed the issue of design, but was refused only on the grounds of the impact on the TPO's to the north boundary of the access road. The required root protection system was to be on land outside the ownership and control of the applicant, it was considered any condition attached to a permission would be unlikely to be able to be implemented and therefore the necessary protection for the trees could not be achieved, for this reason and this reason alone the application was refused.

Principle

4.5 Although the Council has recently adopted the new South Norfolk Local Development Plan 2015, it cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply for the Norwich Policy Area, its housing supply related policies are considered to not be up to date in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 49 of the NPPF. Paragraph 49 also confirms that housing applications must be assessed in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. With this in mind it is necessary to establish whether the current scheme represents a sustainable development. Sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. It goes on to stress that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.
4.6 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."

4.7 The proposal is for a single dwelling which would make a modest contribution to the economy of the area through employment at the construction stage and subsequent spending from the occupiers.

Social Role

4.8 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."

4.9 The provision of one new dwelling in this location does have some social benefit but only limited in the context of supply.

Environmental Role

4.10 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."

4.11 While the site is outside the development limits of Costessey, and therefore contrary to policy, the site is immediately adjacent to the development limit and benefits from being within walking or cycling distance of local facilities. Set within an existing cluster of dwellings and in close proximity to a site granted permission for 62 dwellings the construction of a dwelling in this location is not considered to result in harm to the open countryside

Summary of sustainable development consideration

4.12 The site is in a location where the facilities and services are easily accessible by means other than private car, and where the development will not have an adverse impact on the open countryside, for this reason the site is considered to be sustainable.

Other issues

Design

4.13 The proposed dwelling is single storey and has been located within the plot to ensure there is no adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties in terms of shadowing, loss of privacy or residential amenities. The overall scale of the dwelling is in keeping with the scale of other dwellings in the immediate vicinity and the garden area of the plot provides adequate amenity space for the dwelling. In terms of design the proposal is considered to accord with policy DM3.8 of the SNLP 2015.

Access

4.14 Consideration has been given to the access off Folgate Lane, which has previously caused an issue and has also been raised by the Town Council. Norfolk County Highways Authority has been consulted and comment as follows:

"Having visited this site it was noted that the vision for exiting from the drive onto Folgate
Lane is hampered by the growth of conifer hedging along the road frontage. Although visibility to the north is good, to the south the visibility is poor with conifers overhanging the highway verge.

This issue was raised as part of a previous application in 2007 for two dwellings where a highway objection was raised.

The refusal was subsequently Appealed but the highway objection was not supported by The Planning Inspector who considered that as the site was within a 20 mph speed limit there were no particular issues and that highway safety was not compromised.

At the time of the most recent applications in 2013, the visibility was not considered a problem.

On the basis that the previous highway objection was not supported, it is not considered that an objection is warranted in this instance; The overhanging vegetation that restricts visibility is in any event a maintenance issue and could be easily resolved.

4.15 The provision of access for construction purposes is via Glenhurst situated on Town House Road. The existing garage of Glenhurst is to be demolished to facilitate an access road for construction purpose to the rear of the site. Information has been received from the applicant supplied by 2 builders, to demonstrate the measures required to facilitate the construction of the new dwelling. These include the pumping of cement for the purposes of laying the foundations and other methods of delivery and construction to meet the restricted access.

4.16 To ensure the necessary access is in place a condition has been included to require details (which include the restoration of the land after construction is complete) to be submitted agreed and constructed prior to the commencement of any development. The proposal as conditioned raises no objections from the Highways Authority, the scheme therefore accords with policies DM3.11 and DM3.12.

Trees

4.17 The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) submitted with the application retained the same information relating to the access track off Folgate Lane as the original 2013 application. However, previous discussions during the last application suggested the applicant has a right of way over the track, but has no right to make any alteration or improvements to the track, this includes the temporary surfacing required as part of the root protection system for the TPO’d trees of the north of the access track.

4.18 A revised AIA was requested and submitted and still sets out the requirements for the tree protection. However the revised application now addresses the issue relating to the construction traffic and to the provision of services to the proposed dwelling which can both be achieved without using the access track. For this reason the Landscape officer is now satisfied, that subject to the retention of the fence on the boundary of the site during construction, the issues relating to the TPO’d trees have been satisfactorily addressed.

4.19 Consideration has been given to any harm to the trees from additional residential traffic following construction. No alteration to the track is proposed and agricultural or maintenance traffic could already use the track without planning permission. In these circumstances, the level of traffic to serve one additional dwelling is not considered likely to result in harm to the TPO’d trees and the revised scheme is now considered to accord with policy DM4.8 of the SNLP 2015.

Residential amenity
4.20 The scale of the dwelling proposed, together with the design which is of single storey in this location will not result in loss of privacy to the adjacent neighbouring properties to such a degree as to justify refusal. Permitted Development Rights have been removed to prevent the alterations to the roof the of dwelling to ensure the amenities of the neighbours is protected in the future. Boundary treatment condition is also included to ensure all necessary boundary treatment is in place prior to the occupation of the dwelling to protect the amenities of the neighbouring properties. Subject to the condition the scheme accords with DM3.13 of the SNLP 2015.

4.21 Under paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires Councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes. This can be a material planning consideration however no indication of self-build has been given by the applicant at this stage and 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.

4.22 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 It is considered that the level of harm identified, namely encroachment into the countryside is not sufficient to represent significant and demonstrable harm that outweighs the benefits of providing additional housing (albeit 1 dwelling) within the Norwich Policy Area where the Council does not have a 5 year supply.

5.2 The design of the proposal is acceptable in this location and there is no adverse harm to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties. The previous issue of root protection for the TPO's adjacent to the site has been addressed and the scheme is now considered acceptable.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837 jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
11. **Appl. No**: 2015/2655/O  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: Mr T Skitmore  
Site Address: Land South East Of 9 Spinks Lane Spinks Lane Wymondham  
Norfolk

Proposal: Erection of new dwelling and garage

Recommendation: Refusal

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 04: Promoting sustainable transport
- NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities
- NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**
- Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
- Policy 2: Promoting good design
- Policy 3: Energy and water
- Policy 4: Housing delivery
- Policy 6: Access and Transportation
- Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
- Policy 15: Service Villages
- Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**
- Development Management Policies
  - DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
  - DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development
  - DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
  - DM3.10: Promotion of sustainable transport
  - DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic
  - DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking
  - DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
  - DM3.15: Outdoor play facilities/recreational space
  - DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management
  - DM4.3: Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
  - DM4.7: Strategic gaps between settlements within the Norwich Policy Area
  - DM4.8: Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
  - DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2013/0111 Erection of 7 new dwellings and garages Withdrawn

2.2 2014/0096 Erection of five new dwellings and garages with associated works to existing highway Refused
Development Management Committee 3 February 2016

2.3 2015/1836 Erection of 5 new dwellings and garages with highway improvements. Approved

Appeal History

2.4 2015/1836 Erection of five new dwellings and garages with associated works to existing highway Withdrawn

3. Consultations

3.1 Wymondham Town Council Refuse:
- Concern about drainage and flooding
- Contrary to highway safety issues.
- Within the strategic gap (Wymondham-Hethersett)
- Outside Development Boundary of WAAP

3.2 District Member To be determined by Committee:
- The proposed development is in the strategic gap between Wymondham and Hethersett which is protected under the approved Wymondham Area Action Plan.
- Over development of the site.
- Additional risk of flooding

3.3 NCC Ecologist To be reported

3.4 SNC Water Management Officer Site within an area of high risk for surface water flooding for the dwelling and garage.

Support subject to conditions relation to measures for the disposal of surface water and foul drainage

3.5 SNC Landscape Officer No objection subject to retention of hedges and trees as submitted.

3.6 Representations 8 letters of objection
- Impact on existing already in area
- Drainage inadequate
- Loss of ditches
- Overdevelopment of site.
- Large property which eats into the Strategic Gap which needs to remain undeveloped.
- Junction of Spinks Lane will be made more dangerous with increased traffic.
- Encroaching on quality of life for neighbouring residents.
- Will encourage similar application by other land owners on sites outside development boundaries.
- It should be rejected if the Wymonaldam Area Action Plan is to mean anything.
- What happens to the remainder of the land?
- Application should not be seen in isolation but rather an addition to the previous application in which 5 dwellings were granted.

4 Assessment

4.1 The proposal seeks outline permission for an additional plot to an already approved scheme off Spinks Lane Wymondham. The site is outside the built up area of Wymondham and within a local strategic gap. To the north of the site is a group of residential properties and to the south a series of barn conversations now used for residential purposes. To the
west of the site is an area of land that has been granted outline planning permission for 275 dwellings between Norwich Road, Spinks Lane and the A11 outside of the strategic gap (ref 2012/1241). The report for the previous application for 5 dwellings was approved at Development Management Committee on the 16 September 2015 and is attached as Appendix 2 for ease of reference (2015/1836).

Principle of development

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

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

Economic Role

4.4 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.”

4.5 The proposal is now for one single storey dwelling which would make a modest contribution to the economy of the area through employment at the construction stage and subsequent spending from the occupiers.

Social Role

4.6 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.”

4.7 As confirmed above, the Council cannot now demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. Although the proposed dwelling could provide some social benefit in terms of an additional single dwelling in addition to the 5 already approved with reasonable access to services and facilities, this has to be weighed against other issues relating to the location of this site.

Environmental Role

4.8 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.”
The site is outside the Development Limits of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015 and the Wymondham Area Action Plan. Development of this site would also lead to the loss of part of the designated Strategic Gap between Hethersett and Wymondham.

Policy DM4.7 allows for development within the strategic gap where it would not erode or otherwise undermine the openness of the strategic gap.

The proposal for 5 dwellings recently approved broadly represents an infill development between existing residential units adjacent to Spinks Lane and does not significantly erode the strategic gap or significantly compromise its openness.

This view is reinforced in South Norfolk Council’s South Norfolk Local Landscape Review Strategic Gaps/Important Breaks September 2012 paragraph 4.6.5 which states that: *Photographs D and E, taken from Spinks Lane, illustrate clusters of buildings along this north-south orientated lane on the western edge of the gap. These residential properties have a close visual and physical connection with other properties within the Wymondham built-up area and their rear garden boundaries provide an appropriate western boundary for the gap/break. The block of trees and scrub located between these two clusters provides an important contribution to the rural character of the gap/break.*

The 5 dwellings approved adjacent to Spinks Lane will relate well to the existing frontage development along the Lane. However, the development of the plot proposed would create development in depth, which would increase the degree of encroachment into the Strategic Gap and erode the open, undeveloped character of that area.

In the light of the above, the development of the site would not protect or enhance the natural or built environment and does not therefore satisfy the requirements of sustainable development.

Although the scheme is not considered to represent a sustainable form of development in the context of the NPPF, it is still appropriate to have regard to paragraph 14 of the NPPF in respect of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision making this means:

“where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless:

- Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole; or
- Specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted.”

The application site currently forms part of undeveloped land between existing residential properties and barn conversions and provides an important gap between Wymondham and Hethersett.

The importance of the gap between Hethersett and Wymondham is noted in the South Norfolk Local Landscape Review Strategic Gaps/Important Breaks September 2012 paragraph 4.6.4 which states “Sporadic views of farmland may be obtained between clusters of roadside properties on the southern side of the B1172 and the far western part of the gap/break, thereby imparting a rural character to outward views from the road. This farmland forms part of a continuous belt of agricultural land between the existing built-up edges of Wymondham and Hethersett. The strong sense of openness and rural character of this land south of the B1172 may also be appreciated by users of the A11 as a result of various open and filtered views across the southern boundary of the gap/break.”
4.18 As concluded above, the development of the plot proposed would significantly erode the open character of this part of the Strategic Gap between Wymondham and Hethersett.

4.19 While I accept the development of one plot could be considered to make a positive contribution to the shortfall of dwellings in the Norwich Policy Area, the erosion of this particularly important area of open countryside in this instance would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of developing the site in terms of para 14 of the NPPF.

Other considerations

4.20 The application is for outline with only access to be approved at this stage. The access to the site has already been assessed by the Highways Authority and as a result passing bays have been included. No further comments are made and no additional conditions would be required in the event of permission being granted.

Affordable dwellings

4.21 The addition of an additional dwelling on the site would increase the number of affordable dwellings required to 2 because of the total size of the site. The approved scheme included a Section 106 agreement to secure the provision of one affordable dwelling.

4.22 Following Government advice in relation to the provision of affordable housing, and formal requests to change 106 agreements in relation to affordable housing provision, it has been decided that any planning applications for housing schemes which require affordable housing will be required to provide a Viability Appraisal to demonstrate that the affordable housing can be delivered with the scheme, before the application can be approved. The applicant has been made aware the increase in the size of the site to include the additional plot would increase the number of affordable units to be provided. No Viability Appraisal has been submitted with this application, but the applicant wishes the application to be determined as submitted.

4.23 Notwithstanding the absence of a viability appraisal, I do not consider that the benefit of one additional affordable dwelling outweighs the harm caused by the development identified above.

Trees

4.24 The survey carried out with the previous application for the five dwellings has been assessed and no additional comments are made other than for the retention of trees and hedges as set out in the accompanying report. Subject to a condition no objections are raised on Landscape grounds.

4.25 Paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires Councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes, and this is a material planning consideration for this application as self-build could be a method of delivering the site. Whilst no 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 would be self-build. In the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance and outweigh the potential benefit of self-build.

4.26 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.
4.27 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) but would be charged at reserved matters stage should permission be granted. However the benefits of CIL do not outweigh the other planning considerations.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The additional plot to the rear of the site is in an area of open, undeveloped countryside, and while the recent permission for 5 dwelling on the site frontage is not considered to result in significant harm to the undeveloped area, the application for the plot to the rear of the site is considered to cause harm to the open, undeveloped character of the area which is outside the Development Limits of Wymondham.

5.2 The site is located within the Strategic Gap between Hethersett and Wymondham which is of significant importance as noted in the South Norfolk Local Landscape Review Strategic Gaps/Important Breaks September 2012. The scheme as proposed would significantly and demonstrably harm the locality and this harm would outweigh the benefits of developing the site. The application should consequently be refused in the light of para 14 of the NPPF.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837
and E-mail:  jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
| 18. | **Appl. No** : 2015/1836/O  
     | **Parish** : WYMONDHAM  
Applicants Name : Mr T Skitmore  
Site Address : Land south east of 9 Spinks Lane, Spinks Lane, Wymondham Norfolk  
Proposal : Erection of 5 new dwellings and garages with highway improvements.  
Recommendation : Delegate Authority to Director of Growth and Localism to Approve with Conditions  
1. Standard Time limit  
2. Approval of details  
3. In accordance with submitted drawings  
4. Tree Protection Plan to be agreed  
5. Inclusion of swift boxes and sparrow terraces within development  
6. Landscaping scheme to be agreed  
7. Vehicular access works in accordance with submitted drawings  
8. Visibility splays works in accordance with submitted drawings  
9. Provision of parking and turning in accordance with submitted drawings  
10. Provision of off-site highway works in accordance with submitted drawings  
11. Off-site highway works to be implemented prior to first occupation  
12. Water efficiency of 105 litres/person/day for all new dwellings  
13. Foul water drainage disposal strategy and management to be agreed  
14. Surface water drainage strategy and management to be agreed  
Subject to completion of a S106 Agreement and pending no further substantive issues being raised.  

1. **Planning Policies**  
1.2 National Planning Policy Framework  
   NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
   NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
   NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
   NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
   NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
   NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
   Policy 2: Promoting good design  
   Policy 3: Energy and water  
   Policy 4: Housing delivery  
   Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
   Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
   Policy 15: Service villages  
   Policy 20: Implementation  
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
   TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links  
   TRA 3: Provision of cycle facilities  
   TRA 17: off-site road improvements  
   TRA 19: Parking standards  
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
   ENV 9: nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)
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ENV 14: Habitat protection
ENV 15: Species protection
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes

1.4 Emerging South Norfolk Local Plan
Please note that these policies are not yet part of the Development Plan. They were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 17th April 2014 but have not yet completed the Examination stage.
Full weight cannot be given to them until final adoption which is likely to be Autumn 2015. In line with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) some weight can be applied to the emerging policies as they advance through their preparation.

1.5 Development Management Policies
DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development
DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.11 Promotion of sustainable transport
DM3.12 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.14 Amenity, noise and quality of life
DM3.16 Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
DM4.3 Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.4 Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.10 Incorporating landscape into design
WYM21 Wymondham Area Action Plan

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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

S69(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”

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

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/0111 Erection of 7 new dwellings and garages Withdrawn

2.2 2014/0096 Erection of five new dwellings and garages with associated works to existing highway Refused
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**Appeal History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Management Committee</th>
<th>16 September 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3</strong> 15/00030/AGREFU</td>
<td>Erection of five new dwellings and garages with associated works to existing highway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Consultations

| **3.1** Wymondham Town Council | No objection. |
| **3.2** Local District Member | No objection. |
| **3.3** SNC Landscape Officer | Application should be determined as a delegated decision. |
| **3.4** SNC Affordable Housing Officer | No objection. |
| **3.5** SNC Flood Defence Officer | No objection, subject to conditions. |
| **3.6** Environmental Services (Protection) | No objection. |

*In the event that contamination was not previously identified and found, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority.*

| **3.7** County Ecologist | No comments received |
| **3.8** NCC Highways | No objection. |

*All other highway improvements being proposed are considered as satisfactory to cater for the additional traffic that will result from the development.*

### 3.9 Representations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letters of objection received:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Will not make a difference to land supply.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Same as previous application which was unanimously refused.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Harm to rural character of lane and hamlet of Spinks Lane.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Outside of the development boundary for Wymondham.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Part of the designated strategic gap.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Increase in traffic on Spinks Lane, which is single track and impact of traffic from other approved nearby developments.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Increased flood risk and surface water and existing capacity.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Inconsistencies in FRA and plans showing historic ditches.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fail to see how using 375mm dia pipe will cause anything other than increased serious flood risk.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Impact on wildlife and habitat.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Over-development and is not sustainable in any terms.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Additional vehicles will make the lane more dangerous for its' users.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4 Assessment

Location and description of site

4.1 The application site consists of approximately 0.4 hectares of agricultural land located on the east side of Spinks Lane in Wymondham. The site is outside the built up area of Wymondham and within a local strategic gap. To the north of the site is a group of residential properties and to the south a series of barn conversions now used for residential purposes. To the west of the site is an area of land that has been granted outline planning permission for 275 dwellings between Norwich Road, Spinks Lane and the A11 outside of the strategic gap (ref 2012/1241). A location plan of the site is attached as Appendix 1.

The Proposal

4.2 The application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of 5 dwellings including access with all other matters reserved for future approval. Access into the site is proposed off Spinks Lane.

4.3 Members should note that this application follows a previous refusal in December 2014 for the same scheme, ref 2014/0096.

4.4 The reasons for refusal were that the principle of residential development on this site was not acceptable, by virtue of the site being outside existing and emerging development boundaries, there being a five-year land supply within the Norwich Policy Area and the development not therefore on balance being considered sustainable development. The previous refusal also expressed concern at the failure to demonstrate that adequate provision for dealing with foul water drainage.

4.5 Since the refusal, an appeal has been received by the Planning Inspectorate (ref 15/00030/AGREFU) for planning application ref 2014/0096. Members should note that a report was presented to the 19th August 2015 Development Management Committee (Appendix 2) where it was agreed that the previous scheme as reported in December 2014 is now acceptable in planning terms and consequently agreed officers to confirm to the Planning Inspectorate that the Council do not wish to contest the current appeal to be considered at informal hearing, with the provisional date of 20 October 2015. The Planning Inspector is due to make a decision later in the year on the outcome of the appeal.

4.6 In terms of this new application it must be considered on its own merits in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
Key considerations

4.7 The main considerations are the principle of development and policy considerations, highway matters, residential amenity, drainage, trees, hedges, and ecology and layout.

Principle of development

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

4.9 The following is an assessment of whether the scheme can be considered to represent sustainable development. It should be noted that this approach was adopted in assessing the scheme previously with a copy of the committee report from December 2014 attached as Appendix 2.

Economic Role

4.10 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.”

4.11 The previous committee report confirmed that the weight of the benefit of providing additional dwellings in Wymondham was reduced as the Council could demonstrate that it had an up to date 5 year housing land supply of deliverable sites at that time (December 2014) and had already provided “sufficient land of the right type” in respect of housing as required by the NPPF.

4.12 Given that this is now not the case, the benefit of providing 5 new dwellings is greater than previously considered, and this needs to be reflected in reassessing the proposal in the context of establishing whether the scheme is considered to be a sustainable development. It is evident however that 5 dwellings in itself does not make a significant contribution to the lack of housing supply on its own. As previously stated the scheme would continue result in some short term economic benefits as part of any construction work and in the longer term by local spending from the future occupants.

4.13 In summary it is considered that the scheme would bring forward a level of economic benefit, and this is greater than previously expressed in the committee report from December 2014, although it is only for 5 new additional dwellings.

Social Role

4.14 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.”
4.15 The previous committee report considered that given the Council could demonstrate an up to date 5 year housing land supply at the time of writing (December 2014), this meant that this largely satisfied the requirements set out in respect of the social role in that it could provide sufficient housing in the context of the social role of the NPPF, and therefore the social benefits of this scheme were limited.

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

4.17 Whilst Wymondham has a significant range of facilities, there is a lack of available secondary school places within Wymondham when taking into account committed developments in the town. This would potentially necessitate accessing secondary school places outside of Wymondham which is considered to be likely to result in unsustainable transport practices and compromise social cohesion. These concerns were expressed in the previous committee report. In this instance, it is considered that the limited scale of the development proposed would be likely to result in very low numbers of children and as such would be unlikely to have any significant detrimental impacts in terms of unsustainable transport practices or social cohesion. This view was also confirmed as part of the previous committee report at paragraph 4.24.

4.18 In summary, it is considered that as the scheme would contribute additional housing, albeit a limited amount, where there is a need there would be greater social benefits than previously expressed in the committee report from December 2014, and despite the limitations of the scheme in terms of the likely lack of secondary school places in Wymondham in the future (having due regard to known growth), this does not result in a scheme which does not fulfil the social role in the context of the NPPF.

Environmental Role

4.19 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."

4.20 As set out in the previous committee report, the site continues to be outside the existing or proposed development limit (contrary to Policy ENV8 of South Norfolk Local Plan) and also lead to the loss of part of the defined strategic gap (contrary to Policy ENV2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan).

4.21 It is considered that this encroachment in to the open countryside, which also forms part of the strategic gap, represents a level of harm in environmental terms.

4.22 Members should note that Policy WYM21 of the emerging Wymondham Area Action Plan (WAAP), which seeks to restrict development outside of the development boundary, has been challenged and subsequently deleted from the emerging WAAP. Having had regard to paragraph 216 of the NPPF it is evident that this policy does not carry sufficient weight to represent a reason for refusal.

4.23 With regard to Policy ENV8 officers would wish to highlight that it is considered necessary to have regard to paragraph 4.9 of the previous committee report which in establishing the level of weight to be given to Policy ENV8 Officers highlighted an Inspector's decision for Chapel Lane, Wymondham, and in particular, this highlighted that despite Policy ENV8 not being out of date, it was likely that addressing a housing land shortfall may well necessitate conflicting with such a policy.
4.24 In the context of ENV2 it is clear that this residential scheme would result in some erosion of the strategic gap and does fall to be considered as "inappropriate development" when having regard to the definition defined in the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.25 In terms of the strategic gap, the emerging Development Management Policy (DM 4.8) carries limited weight in the decision-making process by virtue of it still being the subject of challenge via the local plan process. The policy allows for development within the strategic gap where it would not erode or otherwise undermine the openness of the strategic gap. Whilst giving limited weight to this policy here in the decision-making process, it is apparent that this proposal for 5 dwellings broadly represents an infill development between existing residential units adjacent to Spinks Lane and does not represent the significant erosion of the strategic gap or significantly compromise its openness.

4.26 This view is reinforced in South Norfolk Council's South Norfolk Local Landscape Review Strategic Gaps/Important Breaks September 2012 paragraph 4.6.5 which states that:

4.27 Photographs D and E, taken from Spinks Lane, illustrate clusters of buildings along this north-south orientated lane on the western edge of the gap. These residential properties have a close visual and physical connection with other properties within the Wymondham built-up area and their rear garden boundaries provide an appropriate western boundary for the gap/break. The block of trees and scrub located between these two clusters provides an important contribution to the rural character of the gap/break.

4.28 The proposed scheme would replicate the exiting arrangement of frontage development onto Spinks Lane which displays a close visual and physical connection to Wymondham and retain the block of vegetation referred to which acts as an appropriate western boundary to the strategic gap.

4.29 In summary, there would be some environmental harm brought about by the scheme as it does represent a level of encroachment into the open countryside and the strategic gap, contrary to the provisions of ENV2 and ENV8. This position remains the same as that previously expressed in the committee report from the 10th December 2014.

Summary of sustainable development consideration

4.30 Having due regard to the above assessment made in the context of not having a demonstrable 5 year housing land supply, it is considered that the benefits of providing additional housing, albeit not a significant amount of new housing, is sufficiently high that the concerns regarding encroachment into the countryside, including the strategic gap is outweighed by the benefits and as such, when considered as a whole, the scheme represents sustainable development. Whilst this a different conclusion to that reached previously, it is considered that the changing land supply figure is sufficient justification for reaching the conclusion set out in respect of establishing whether the scheme is sustainable.

4.31 Having established that the scheme represents a sustainable development in the context of the NPPF, it is necessary to have regard for paragraph 14 of the NPPF in respect of the presumption in favour of development for decision-taking. This states that:

"where the development is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless:
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4.32 As set out above, it is accepted that the Council’s housing related policies are out of date by virtue of not being able to demonstrate an up to date 5 year housing land supply, and therefore the Council should only prevent granting planning permission if the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme when assessed against the policies of the NPPF when taken as a whole or specific policies of the NPPF indicate restricting the development.

4.33 In this instance, it is considered that the concerns set out in respect of the encroachment into the countryside, including the strategic gap does not represent harm that significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits of providing additional housing where there is a need to do so, acknowledging that the scheme is for a limited number of new dwellings.

Trees and Hedgerows

4.34 An Arboricultural Assessment has been submitted showing how the design of the site has tried to consider the existing trees and how the retained vegetation will be protected beyond the development phase.

4.35 Since the previous application (ref 2014/0096) was submitted, South Norfolk Council has served a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) for trees on and near to land at Spinks Lane, which include T1. The justification for serving the TPO was the contribution that these trees make to the landscape character and amenity value of Spinks Lane.

4.36 The scheme has been designed in such a way to remove the requirement to widen Spinks Lane within the Root Protection Area (RPA) of the protected tree T1. The Landscape Officer has confirmed that the layout is acceptable in terms of ensuring that structures are located outside the RPAs of the trees to be retained.

4.37 An assessment of the frontage hedge against the criteria of the Hedgerows Regulations has been carried out. The hedgerow is classed as protected under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. The revised site plan (5338/20/H) shows that the majority of the frontage hedgerow is to be retained. However, a small section of the hedgerow is proposed to be removed to obtain the viability spay for the access into site. The hedgerow assessment confirms that the section to be removed is the poorest section in terms of species richness, and that whilst it contains a similar number of tree/shrub species, the bulk of the hedgerow is dominated by Hawthorn in this location. To mitigate against this loss it is proposed that a new native hedgerow will be planted back behind the visibility splay. The Landscape Officer has carried out a review of the development and has no objection to the amended proposals.

4.38 It is considered that by ensuring that structures are located outside the RPAs of trees to be retained and the retention of the majority of the hedgerow at the front of the site as well as additional planting, demonstrates that the site can be developed in a sympathetic and respectful manner to the existing landscape characteristics and accords with Local Plan Policy IMP2 (Landscaping).

Access and Highways

4.39 The application proposes that Spinks Lane be widened in two locations along the frontage of the site to a width of 4.5 metres, approximately 1 meter each side of the existing road, to allow vehicles to pass each other. A plan shows how viability splays from the proposed new access will also be achieved to provide safe access to the site.
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4.40 Norfolk County Council Highways has assessed the scheme and conclude that in view of the requirements to protect the roots protection areas of the oak tree (T1), the design is considered as acceptable to cater for the additional traffic that will result from the development and raise no objection.

4.41 Access into the site is provided off Spinks Lane that links to the primary vehicular access into the site to the north. Pedestrian access continues to be provided along Spinks Lane, which has no footpaths, together with pedestrian access into the site along its primary access. Due to the relatively low number of vehicles that use this section of Spinks Lane and the small increase in additional traffic anticipated from this development, Norfolk County Council Highways have confirmed that they have no objections in terms of vehicle and pedestrian safety and that the proposals meet with the necessary highway safety standards.

4.42 In terms of transport sustainability, the site is within the 400 metres walking distance recommended for access to public transport stops on Norwich Road and has good road access to local facilities in Wymondham. A footway / cycleway is also proposed along the south side of Norwich Road from Spinks Lane westwards as part of the approved development to the west ref 2012/1385, which could benefit the development. The site is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of transport sustainability only.

4.43 Provision for refuse and recycling has the potential to be accommodated on-plot with provision for refuse collection points on the edge of private driveways accessible to the public highway.

4.44 The Highways Authority has suggested a number of conditions prior to the first occupation of the development relating to: details of vehicular access to be provided and retained at the position shown on the approved plan; arrangements made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway; visibility splay measuring 2.4 m x 43 metres to be provided each side of the access; on-site car parking and turning area to be laid out, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan; no works to commence on site unless otherwise agreed in writing until a detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works as indicated on drawing number 5338 20 RevG; and off-site highway improvement works completed to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority.

4.45 Whilst it is noted that local objection on highways grounds has been received, the County’s technical consultees have found no reason to object to the development, and therefore the development is considered acceptable on the grounds of highway impact and the saved Local Plan Policy IMP8.

Design and Layout

4.46 Whilst this application is for outline planning permission only with matters relating to design being reserved, the applicants Design and Access Statement and indicative site plan and elevations demonstrates how the scheme could achieve a high quality design by having appropriate regard to the sites context. The scheme aims to do this by proposing dwellings of traditional construction and finished in materials found in the local area that relate to the rural character found on Spinks Lane.

4.47 The scheme has been evaluated against the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide and has the potential to achieve a high quality design, subject to any reserved matters application being submitted in accordance with the Design and Access Statement and indicative site layout.
Residential amenity

4.48 The amenity of existing residents must be considered under saved policy IMP9 of the Local Plan. The key concern at the outline stage would be whether the development layout in combination with the proposed scale could be accommodated on the site without detriment to the outlook, privacy or direct daylight or sunlight of existing residential properties. Concerns have been raised by some residents about the proximity of plot 1 to the neighbouring property to the north (no. 9 Spinks Lane) in relation to overshadowing and residential amenity.

4.49 Having assessed the site layout and scale of dwellings it should be noted that plot 1 is proposed as a bungalow. It is considered that the development has been designed in such a manner to avoid any direct overlooking or adverse impacts in terms of overshadowing of habitable rooms of the nearby residential properties. Proposed properties are located an acceptable distance away from existing neighbouring dwellings and are of a scale that will avoid any unacceptable loss of sunlight to rear gardens.

4.50 The proposal is only outline at present, but indicative information has been submitted. The design and position of the properties along the boundaries shows how it helps to minimise any direct impact on the amenity of existing properties and as such is considered acceptable. In a similar way, where the development sides on to existing properties it is felt that there is an acceptable distance between the existing properties and the proposed development. I am therefore satisfied that the development could accord with policy IMP9 of the SNLP at reserved matters stage.

Ecology and Protected Species

4.51 An Ecological Assessment of the site and immediate locality has been undertaken and no further work is identified as being required beyond the reports prepared and submitted. The County Ecologist has reviewed the proposals and notes that no protected species have been found on site. A reptile survey and great crested newt preliminary assessment has also been undertaken and the nearby ponds are deemed to have a low likelihood of great crested newts using them. The County Ecologist has identified that there is a chance of transient reptiles using the site, however mitigation is proposed to manage the ground vegetation before and during the construction phase.

4.52 The County Ecologist has recommended a condition requiring that 5 Swift boxes and 2 sparrow terraces are incorporated into the design of the dwellings and a planting plan is submitted and agreed by the planning authority before the construction commences.

4.53 Having considered the comments from the County Ecologists and reviewed the information submitted with this application I am of the opinion that the development accords with policy ENV14 (Habitat protection) and ENV15 (Species protection) of the SNLP.

Affordable Housing

4.54 The site proposes one affordable home on the site (a 2 bed 4 person bungalow), which meets the policy requirement of the JCS Policy 4 requiring 20% of the development to be affordable on sites for 5-9 dwellings or 0.2 – 0.4 ha hectares. The Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer has confirmed that the affordable housing package is in accordance with policy and this will be agreed through a S106 Agreement.
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Drainage

4.55 The previous refusal expressed concern at the failure to demonstrate that adequate provision for dealing with foul water drainage (reason 2). Since the decision has been issued the Council has received further information in respect of foul water drainage and is now satisfied that a suitable foul water drainage system can be put in place. A planning condition would be recommended to be attached to any subsequent approval to agree the exact details of the foul water drainage system.

4.56 Revised surface water drainage information has been submitted in response to initial concerns being raised. The revised details have been assessed by the Council’s Flood Defence Officer and they have confirmed that they have no objection subject to the imposition of conditions relating to the agreement of surface water details.

Other matters

4.57 Policy 3 of the JCS required the sustainable construction of the building and the compliance with Code Level 4 for water conservancy. Compliance could be secured by way of condition if the application were to be approved.

4.58 The Historic Environment Service has carried out an assessment of the proposals and has confirmed that based on the information currently available, the proposal does not have any implications for the historic environment and they do not wish to make any recommendations for archaeological work.

4.59 The Environmental Protection Team raises no objection to the proposals but a condition is suggested that in the event that contamination was not previously identified is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority.

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

4.61 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.

4.62 The proposals have been considered against the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2011. The environmental, social and economic impacts have all been considered and are adequately addressed as detailed in the above report and the proposal is not considered EIA development.

4.63 The time given to comment on this revised application has raised concerns with some residents. The application was consulted upon on 19 August, requiring comments to be received by 9 September from neighbours. Members should note that a small number of the neighbours previously consulted on application ref 2014/0096 were not consulted on this application. As such the additional neighbours identified have been consulted for 21 days and the recommendation of this application is subject to delegated authority to the Director of Growth and Localism to Approve with Conditions pending no further substantive issues being raised. It is, therefore, considered there has been sufficient consultation on this application and should any new issues be raised the application would need to be brought before Committee at a later date.

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

5.1 Following the change in the council’s current position in respect of housing land supply, whereby there is no longer an adequate supply in the Norwich Policy Area, it is considered that the scheme represents sustainable development and that it does not conflict with any specific policies within the NPPF whereby permission should be restricted which must be established in considering a proposal in the context of paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

5.2 Consequently, in establishing this position, it is considered that the level of harm identified, namely encroachment into the countryside, including the strategic gap is not sufficient to represent harm that significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits of providing additional housing within the Norwich Policy Area where the Council does not have a 5 year supply.

5.3 On balance, the scheme is considered to represent sustainable development where no significant harm would demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme. On this basis the application is recommended for approval subject to delegated authority to Director of Growth and Localism to Approve with Conditions pending no further substantive issues being raised, and completion of a S106 Agreement.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Watts 01508 533765 cwatts@e-norfolk.gov.uk
Parish : WICKLEWOOD

Applicants Name : Mr Kevin Musk
Site Address : Workshop Crownthorpe Road Crownthorpe Norfolk NR18 9EW
Proposal : Convert a garage at Crownthorpe Road to Commercial Offices and build a store for light use. Replace hedges and trees to landscape and make access to office and store

Recommendation : Refusal

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
Policy 17 : Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development
DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM2.1 : Employment and business development
DM2.10 : Conversion and re-use of buildings in the Countryside for non-agricultural use
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.10 : Promotion of sustainable transport
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM3.14 : Pollution, health and safety

2. Planning History

2.1 2011/1124 Use as workshop/lab.sales Refused

2.2 2008/1712 Proposed conversion of former workshop/test lab into dwelling Refused

2.3 2005/0276 Proposed conversion of existing workshop to 2no storey dwelling Refused

Appeal History

2.4 2008/1712 Proposed conversion of former workshop/test lab into dwelling Dismissed

2.5 2005/0276 Proposed conversion of existing workshop to 2no storey dwelling Dismissed
3. Consultations

3.1 Wicklewood Parish Council
No comments received

3.2 District Member
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways
Location of site is poor, and should be questioned, but no highways objection, subject to conditions.

3.4 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team
No comments received

3.5 Representations
3 letters of objection
- Major redevelopment of the site with further development proposed.
- Second entrance will affect an already busy and dangerous road and residents’ access to their properties.
- No facilities on site: a new bore hole and septic tank will have to be installed as the proposed office has 11 staff.
- Impact on privacy with the coming and going of staff and customers.
- Owner of the site has raised level of land, Environment Agency informed but nothing has been done therefore the land needs testing for hazardous materials.
- Previous applications have been considered unsustainable therefore what has changed?
- Road already over-used this would make it worse.
- Site unpleasant at present and tempting to support proposal, however, if approved it would open the flood gates to further development.
- Light Pollution

4. Assessment

4.1 The application as submitted seeks to convert the existing building to offices, with the construction of a new building for use as storage facilities associated with the business. The scheme also includes the replanting of the site to provide landscaping with additional access to the offices and stores. Solar panels are included on the south east elevations of the existing and proposed building.

Background

4.2 Permission was granted in 1989 for the erection of the building as a domestic garage/workshop for the property known as The Drift. The building was constructed some 1.3 metres higher than the approved plan. An enforcement notice was served to reduce the building to that of the approved height and to brick in the unauthorised openings; however, the enforcement notice was appealed and quashed. The building was used for the design of a prototype sports car, until the operations moved to a larger industrial building near Snetterton, however it was concluded that the only lawful use of the building was domestic.

4.3 In 2008 a planning application under reference number 2008/0171 was submitted for the conversion of the building to residential, this application was refused, and the decision appealed. At that time the Inspector concluded that there was no evidence to suggest the building was anything other than a domestic garage for the property identified as The Drift (shown on the Ordnance Survey as Copper Beeches), but did note that the premises were in separate ownership, (the applicant for the 2008 application remains the site owner).
The Inspector noted at that time the “building was a permanent and substantial structure, domestic in style and scale and physically capable of conversion to residential use”. The Inspector also noted that; “the building was of no historic or architectural value and buildings of this nature and in the use permitted in this case are not uncommon in the countryside”. In addition the appeal decision stated; “the conversion of the building to residential use, together with such likely associated effects as access, driveway and turning area which are usually found within the curtilage of a rural building, would change the character of the land and intrude into the surroundings, eroding its pleasant open character and appearance as part of the countryside”.

Principle

Policies in the NPPF and the recently adopted South Norfolk Local Plan seek to ensure development is in a sustainable location. Policy DM2.10 which promotes the re-use of buildings in the Countryside for commercial purposes before consideration is given to conversion to residential is also a consideration in this instance. Under criteria b of policy DM2.10 the policy states; ........ the building to be re-used should be standing and of adequate external dimensions to accommodate the proposed use, without the need for the erection of major extensions and additional outbuildings and / or significant changes in materials and appearance that would have a serious adverse impact on the rural characteristics of the original building.... In addition criteria c requires the development to be sympathetic to the setting; and criteria d any commercial use should not have an adverse impact or give rise to the dispersal of activity on such a scale as to prejudice the vitality and viability of local rural towns and villages.

The first point is to establish if this site is sustainable. The site is outside the Development Limits of Wymondham and, as already stated, the building was previously part of the domestic property known as The Drift. The building is now in separate ownership and has no lawful use independent of that dwelling. The site is isolated from the main centre of Wymondham, is not served by a footpath, has no easy access to a bus stop and given the poor alignment of the road walking or cycling to the site is not a safe option. For this reason the site is not easily accessed by any means other than the private car. For these reasons, the site is not considered to be in a sustainable location.

Turning to policy DM2.10 for the conversion of existing building in the Countryside. The size of the existing building is limited, and the applicant requires an additional building of similar size for the storage facilities of the company.

The site is open and undeveloped in character with the exception of the existing building close to the south east boundary. The building itself is structurally sound and is capable of conversion. However, the size of the building is not adequate to meet the needs of the application and therefore a separate building for storage is required. The additional building would erode the undeveloped character of the site and be directly contrary to the criteria b and c of DM2.10, which does not make provision for additional buildings to facilitate the conversion of the existing building.

Use of site and level of associated activity

The applicant currently operates from Penfold Drive and installs and maintains fire and security systems. Supporting documentation from the applicant suggests the company has outgrown the current premises from which they operate, and with their lease expiring in April are seeking alternative business premises. The applicant wishes to remain within the local area, but claims that to date has been unsuccessful in finding suitable premises until this building became available. The applicant believes the nature of the business they operate and their proposed expansion plans would be acceptable in this location and have minimal impact on the neighbouring properties and enable expansion which would benefit local people, and the location of the site is easily assessable to local towns and the A11 making it an ideal local opportunity for investment.
4.10 From discussions with the company, the approximate level of activity on the current operational site are as follows: 5 office staff who are based on site every day, an additional 2 who are there approximately 50% of the time but travel the country as part of the business. 6 vans which are with the operatives would only visit the site when supplies are required, but not on a daily basis. Deliveries to and collections from the company by courier service are approximately 3 to 4 times a week and postal van mostly on a daily basis. Many of the orders made by the company are delivered directly to site and not to the company. The level of activity generated from the current site is not high. I have discussed the level of activity with the Highways Officer, and even allowing expansion of the site, it is unlikely to raise issue in terms of highway safety. For this reason the proposed use of the site for this particular business is considered to be acceptable from a Highway perspective.

4.11 However, an important consideration if permission were to be granted is the financial investment the company would make and if in the future further expansion would be supported if required. As already stated the existing building is not adequate for the operations of the business and require the additional building which is not permitted by policy DM2.10. Further buildings to allow increased expansion would further erode the open character of this site which is not in a sustainable location; it should therefore be questioned if it would be reasonable to encourage a business to invest in a site where future expansion may not be supported due to the site not being suitable for further development.

4.12 For this reason consideration must be given to the suitability of the site for the use proposed. In this instance, given it is not in a sustainable location, the proposed development required to enable the company to operate from the site (which is contrary to policy), and the lack of potential because of policy restrictions to allow further development and expansion of the business, the scheme is considered to be contrary to the principles of Section 1 and 3 of the NPPF, policy DM1.1 and DM2.10 of the SNLP 2015 and therefore cannot be supported.

Other issues
Amenity

4.13 The existing building is close to the fence erected some years ago which now divides the application site for the property The Drift. The existing windows in the south east elevation of the site look directly onto the existing fence and not over the rear garden of the neighbouring property. The proposed new storage building adjacent to the existing building has been designed in terms of height and layout to ensure there is no adverse impact on the neighbouring property. I also consider the use of the site as proposed is of a nature which (subject to any conditions in the event of permission) will not have an adverse impact on the neighbouring properties and therefore in terms of impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties the proposal accords with policy DM3.13.

Access

4.14 The Highways Authority originally raised concern on the 2008 application because at that time the only access to the site was to The Drift and further to the south of the application site. Visibility was restricted due to an existing tall conifer hedge which ran the entire length of the highway boundary of the current application site.

4.15 Since 2008, the site has been cleared of all hedging along the frontage and has installed a new access further to the north of the site without the benefit of planning permission which is the subject of an Enforcement Notice, part of which requires the removal of the materials andmetalling 5 metres back from the highway. To date this work has not been carried out and remains the subject of Enforcement Action.
4.16 While not raising objection to the proposal, Highways Authority has noted: "The location of the site is rather poor in highway terms for access other than in a vehicle. Although the site is close to Wymondham, the alignment of Crowntorpe Road is such that walking to the site is not a particularly safe or attractive option. The nearest bus stop is on Tuttles Lane which would be a walk of 850m along Crowntorpe Road and across the two bridges on Chapel Lane. The sustainability of the location has therefore to be questioned".

4.17 The scheme as now proposed shows two access points off Crowntorpe Road, and with the site now free of vegetation there is no restriction in terms of visibility. However, comments received from the Highways Authority, while raising no objection, require a condition to restrict all access and egress from the site to the access at the northern point of the site, the existing access (which is the subject of the Enforcement Notice) is required to be permanently closed and the verge reinstated, (the details of which will need to be agreed). Subject to the Highways Authority requirements of access, visibility splays; closure of an existing access and any landscaping to be set back to ensure visibility, the scheme is supported by the Highways Authority and considered to accord with policies DM3.11, and DM3.12.

Landscaping

4.18 As already stated the site is currently open with all previous hedging removed. The application as proposed includes landscaping which at this stage is indicative. Any hedging along the frontage of the site would need to be set back by a minimum distance of 3 metres as required by the Highways Authority to ensure good visibility is retained from the new access. Overall a landscaping scheme would significantly improve the visual appearance of the site which is a significant area of land currently open in nature. Any landscaping would also increase ecology opportunities which should be encouraged. The scheme as suggested and with the necessary condition would accord with policy DM4.9 of the SNLP 2015.

4.19 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.

4.20 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) but there are other issues which outweigh the benefits of CIL.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The site is outside the development limits and is not served by a public footpath and is not easily accessible without the use of a private car, for this reason the location of the site is not considered to be in a sustainable location.

5.2 The existing building is substantial; however the size of the building for the proposed use is inadequate and requires a further building to be constructed for storage purposes, which is contrary to the provisions of policy DM2.10.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837 jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Enforcement Reports

1. **Enforcement Ref**: 2012/8069
   **Parish**: STOCKTON
   **Site Address**: Stone Farm, Norwich Road, Stockton, Norfolk, NR34 0HL
   **Development**: Unauthorised fence
   **Developer**: Mrs L Tebenham

1. **Background**

1.1 It was brought to the Council’s attention that a 1.83m close-boarded fence had been erected adjacent to the highway without the benefit of planning permission. A retrospective planning application was submitted under reference 2012/0947/F to regularise the fence.

1.2 The application was subsequently refused on two grounds. Firstly, that the fence was on land forming part of the public highway and represents an obstruction to the public at large and endangers the satisfactory functioning of the local highway. Secondly, that the fence is out of keeping and does not respect the character and traditions of the boundary treatments within the locality which are predominantly native hedges.

2. **Planning Policies**

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   NPPF 07: Requiring good design

2.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 2: Promoting good design
   Policy 6: Access and transportation

2.3 Development Management Policies
   DM3.8 Design Principles
   DM3.11 Road safety and the free flow of traffic

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

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

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

3. **Relevant Planning History**

3.1 **2012/0947** Retention of fence
   **Refused**

3.2 **2011/0442** Proposed Garage/Store and change of use of agricultural land to domestic use.
   **Approved**
3.3 2010/2114 Two storey rear and single storey side extension & replacement of flat roof with pitched roof Approved

3.4 2010/2112 Garage/store and change of use of agricultural land to domestic use. Refused

3.5 2006/2325 Conversion of existing barn to form separate dwelling Approved

4. Consultations

4.1 Parish Council No objections have been received by the parish council since 2012. Since it was first erected its appearance has changed dramatically and has now blended extremely well with the surrounding area.

4.2 District Member The Stockton Parish Meeting are not concerned about the fence. Therefore the Council will have to make this decision without their local support.

5 Assessment

5.1 Enforcement action was not pursued at this time against the developer as it was considered more appropriate for NCC Highways, as the land owner to deal with the removal of the fence. I have been advised NCC Highways that they have been in contact with developer requesting the fence be removed but to date no action has been taken.

5.2 At the time of the planning refusal the fence had not been treated and was therefore very prominent and out of keeping with other boundary treatments the locality. It has since been dark stained and has weathered in to its surroundings. This has reduced its prominence in the street scene and its impact on the character and appearance of the locality. This view is shared by the Parish Council as they have commented that no concerns have been raised with them since 2012 and the fence blends in well with its surroundings.

5.3 In view of the above I do not consider enforcement action requiring its removal to be necessary and if NCC Highways consider it be an obstruction which requires remedying they can do so under their legislation.

5.4 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)

6 Recommendation

6.1 That no further action be taken regarding the fence.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Andy Baines 01508 533840 abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2. Enforcement Ref: 2014/8180  
Parish: LODDON  

Site Address: 11 Church Plain, Loddon, Norfolk, NR14 6LX  
Development: Unauthorised works to a listed building  
Developer: Mr Alan Cook

1. Background

1.1 It was brought to the Council’s attention that the façade of this building had been altered without the benefit of planning permission and listed building consent. Previously the opening had bi-fold doors which have now been replaced with horizontal shiplap boarding, eight-light double doors light windows. There was also an unauthorised vinyl canopy, air-conditioning unit and rush screening attached to the building without the required consents. These have subsequently been removed.

1.2 The owner of the site was invited to submit an application for planning permission and listed building consent to regularise the works to the opening but unfortunately an application has not been forthcoming.

2. Planning Policies

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

2.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
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.”

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

3. Relevant Planning History

3.1 2013/0624 Change of use from store to shop Approved

4. Consultations

4.1 Parish Council Refuse – Changes are not in keeping with the surrounding area and building is site in a prominent position in the conservation area
4.2 District Member

- The building was previously in a very poor state of repair
- The dilapidated canopy, torn canvass and bamboo screening on the roof which spoilt the aspect of the building have been removed
- The new frontage is a vast improvement and far more in keeping than the rusting roller shutter door

4.3 Local residents comments received from the District Member

- Doors are unlike any others retailers or residential front doors in Loddon
- No other buildings in Church Plain have wooden cladding or rippled glass
- Doors and glass have a 1970’s feel and are out of keeping in the middle of a row of 17th, 18th & 19th century buildings in a conservation area
- Wood cladding for buildings of this period are usually made of wider plants and painted black. This feather edged timber cladding used here is used for garden sheds
- Façade of building is totally out of character with the rest of the house and shops in Church Plain and damages the conservation area
- The original doors should be re-instated, it is believed they are still on site

4.4 SNC: Conservation and Design

- Works do not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- The design of the door and windows is more traditional in their design and appearance than the previous bi-fold doors
- Removal of the canopy is a welcomed alteration

5 Assessment

5.1 The building is a small single storey store attached to the side of 11 Church Plain which is a Grade 2 listed building and is therefore listed by virtue of the physical attachment. It is located within Loddon Conservation Area. The premises are used as a charity shop.

5.2 Concerns have been raised by the Parish Council and a local resident regarding the impact of the alterations on the character of the building and in a wider context the conservation area.

5.3 Whilst these concerns are noted they are not shared by the conservation officer or the district member who consider the alterations do not have an adverse impact on the historic interest of the building or the character of the conservation area. Furthermore the conservation officer considers the design of the doors and windows are more traditional in their design and appearance than the previous bi-fold doors.

5.4 In view of the above I consider that no further action be taken on the matter.

5.5 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)
6.1 That no further action be taken on the matter.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Andy Baines 01508 533840 abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk
### Planning Appeals
Appeals received from 18 December 2015 to 21 January 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/1782</td>
<td>Wymondham Barnabee Barn Wramplingham Road Downham Wymondham Norfolk</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals
Appeals decisions from 18 December 2015 to 21 January 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>2013/1494</td>
<td>Cringleford Land East Of A47, West Round House Way And North Of A11; And Land To The South Of A11 To The East Of A47 And West Of Cringleford, Norfolk</td>
<td>Land Fund Limited</td>
<td>Outline planning application with all matters reserved (save access) for the creation of up to 650 residential dwellings (use class C3), up to 2,500 sq mtrs of use class A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and D1 floorspace, together with highways works, landscaping, public realm, car parking and other associated works.</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2531</td>
<td>Roydon Breckland High Road Roydon Norfolk IP22 5RB</td>
<td>Mr David Feetham</td>
<td>Erection of single storey detached dwelling and garage, with improved access, alterations and refurbishment to existing bungalow.</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Parish / Site</td>
<td>Appellant</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Decision Maker</td>
<td>Final Decision</td>
<td>Appeal Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/0168</td>
<td>Diss Salisbury House 84 Victoria Road Diss Norfolk IP22 4JG</td>
<td>Mr Barry Smith</td>
<td>Division of garden space, to erect a new 4 bedroom dwelling and retention of existing garage.</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/0298</td>
<td>Kirstead Land North Of White Cottage Kirstead Green Kirstead Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr R Steffen</td>
<td>2 bedroom bungalow with double garage</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1051</td>
<td>Costessey 7 Silvo Road Costessey Norfolk NR8 5EL</td>
<td>Mr Affsor Ali</td>
<td>Retrospective conversion of car port to living accommodation.</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1543</td>
<td>Tibenham Old Chapel House The Street Tibenham Norfolk NR16 1AP</td>
<td>Mr D Gee</td>
<td>Fell Ash tree and replace with Rowen</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeches Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Road 2007/8036</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>Pevensey House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 27.01.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Street 2009/8010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing negotiations on revised scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erection of lean to structure</td>
<td>12.04.10</td>
<td>Application submitted and awaiting validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>CARLETON RODE</td>
<td>Change of use of land</td>
<td>21.07.10</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adj to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 29.12.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen Road 2006/0269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultants employed to secure mitigation scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standing and Occupation of Residential Caravan</td>
<td>04.03.15</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 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/0254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>due to change in circumstances</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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 27.10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to 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, ongoing monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/8069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAXTON</td>
<td>Change of use of stable to</td>
<td>09.10.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfly Barn</td>
<td>residential dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/8087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIVETSHALL</td>
<td>Change of use of Agricultural building</td>
<td>10.12.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST MARGARET</td>
<td>to use as a dwelling house</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddleback Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/8230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Breach of Planning Conditions</td>
<td>04.03.15</td>
<td>Complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldreds Yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Loke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longwater Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/8013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>SWAINSTHORPE</td>
<td>Construction of hardstanding/roadway</td>
<td>01.04.15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land to rear of Sugar Beat Norwich Road 2014/8218</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal submitted</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></td>
<td>Copper Beeches Crownthorpe Road 2015/8005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 4 months after the mobile home is no longer occupied by specified occupier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Breach of Condition Formation of habitable room</td>
<td>19.08.15</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Silvo Road 2015/8106</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 3.6.16</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></td>
<td>Hope Valley Low Common Road 2015/8139</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal submitted</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></td>
<td>Laynes Farm Gilderswood Lane 2015/8247</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal submitted</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></td>
<td>Ashgate House Ketteringham Lane 2015/8075</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date 05.07.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**KETTERINGHAM**
Land North of High Street 2014/8301

Change of use of land for travellers site 20.10.15
Enforcement Notice served
Appeal submitted

**HINGHAM**
Land South of New Road 2015/8116

Change of use of land for the standing of a portacabin 11.11.15
Enforcement Notices served
Compliance date 28.01.17

**HINGHAM**
Land to North of Woodrising Road 2014/8233

Change of use of land for the standing of a mobile home 09.12.15
Enforcement Notice served
Compliance date 27.04.16

---

**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>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Notices Issued</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>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>
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