## Development Management Committee

**Members of the Development Management Committee:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservatives</th>
<th>Liberal Democrats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Mooney</td>
<td>Dr M Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chairman)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs L Neal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vice-Chairman)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Y Bendle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs F Ellis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Gould</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr C Kemp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr G Minshull</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr B Stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs A Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr V Thomson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pool of Substitutes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pool of Substitutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr P Broome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs V Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr L Dale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Hornby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr N Legg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr B Riches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr G Wheatley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blomefield Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Agenda

**Date**

Wednesday 30 March 2016

**Time**

10.00 am

**Place**

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

**Contact**

Claire White  tel (01508) 533669

South Norfolk House
Cygnet Court
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

THEREFORE we will:

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

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

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

- Districts look to ‘wider’ policies, and national, regional and county planning strategy.
- Other consultation responses may have affected our recommendation.
- There is an honest difference of opinion.
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
   2 March 2016
   (attached – page 10)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 29)
   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>2015/2082/O</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Land South Of Village Hall Stocks Hill Bawburgh Norfolk</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2015/2463/RVC</td>
<td>HINGHAM</td>
<td>Land South Of Norwich Road Hingham Norfolk</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2015/2496/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Land North Of Frenze Hall Lane Diss Norfolk</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2016/0165/O</td>
<td>SCOLE</td>
<td>Land West Of Norwich Road Scole Norfolk</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2014/2435/F</td>
<td>GILLINGHAM</td>
<td>Land to North of Hill Farm House Yarmouth Road Gillingham Norfolk</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2016/0331/F</td>
<td>TASBURGH</td>
<td>Sub-division Of The Garden Of Chamusca Low Road Tasburgh Norfolk</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2016/0408/O</td>
<td>SAXLINGHAM</td>
<td>Land West Of Sandpit Lane Saxlingham Nethergate Norfolk</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2016/0498/RVC</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Land South Of 40 The Street Poringland Norfolk</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2015/2893/RVC</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Land North Of Shotesham Road Poringland Norfolk</td>
<td>108</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 112)
8. Planning Appeals (for information) (attached – page 118)

9. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wednesday 27 April 2016
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

(i) The particular details of a proposal are complex and/or the intended site layout or relationships between site boundaries/existing buildings are difficult to envisage other than by site assessment;

(ii) The impacts of new proposals on neighbour amenity e.g. shadowing, loss of light, physical impact of structure, visual amenity, adjacent land uses, wider landscape impacts can only be fully appreciated by site assessment/access to adjacent land uses/property;

(iii) The material planning considerations raised are finely balanced and Member assessment and judgement can only be concluded by assessing the issues directly on site;

(iv) It is expedient in the interests of local decision making to demonstrate that all aspects of a proposal have been considered on site.

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

Member consideration/decision.

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

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

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

3. FILMING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS: GUIDANCE

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

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

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

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

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A  Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?

OR

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

YES

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

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

NO

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

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

YES

NO

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

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

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

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

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

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 2 March 2016 at 10.00 am.

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

Apologies: Councillor B Stone

Substitute Member: Councillor C Easton

(Cllr C Gould left the meeting for planning applications 3-9, 14 and 17-21)
(Cllr L Neal left the meeting for planning applications 14-21)
(Cllr A Thomas left the meeting for planning applications 9-21)
(Cllr Y Bendle left the meeting for planning applications 14 and 18-21)

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

(The press and 70 members of the public were also in attendance)

253. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/2495/O</td>
<td>WYMONDONHAM</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2222/F</td>
<td>THURLTON</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1428/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G Minshull</td>
<td>Predetermined – Member considered he was predetermined as he was a member of the Diss Heritage Triangle. He removed himself from the Committee for the item and did not take part in the vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2630/F</td>
<td>LITTLE MELTON</td>
<td>C Kemp</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
254. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 3 February 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

255. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

The Committee considered the report (circulated) of the Director of Growth and Localism, which was presented by the officers. The following speakers addressed the meeting with regard to the applications listed below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2014/2495/O     | WYMONDHAM               | Ms C Riccardi – Objector  
| (Item 1)        |                         | Mrs M Mawson – Objector  
|                 |                         | Mrs J Raynsford – Objector  
|                 |                         | Ms S Adlen – Applicant                                                            |
| 2014/2222/F     | THURLTON                | Mrs H Longman – Thurlton Parish Council  
| (Item 2)        |                         | Mr R Smith – Objector  
|                 |                         | Mr H Lampp – Agent for Applicant                                                        |
| 2015/1428/F     | DISS                    | Mrs D Sarson – Clerk of Diss Town Council  
| (Item 3)        |                         | Mr B Faulk – Objector  
|                 |                         | Mr P Hyde – Objector  
|                 |                         | Mr M Robson – Agent for Applicant  
|                 |                         | Cllr K Kiddie – Local Member  
|                 |                         | Cllr G Minshull – Local Member  
|                 |                         | Cllr A Palmer – Local Member                                                        |
| 2015/2406/O     | STOKE HOLY CROSS        | Ms J Hunting – Agent for Applicant                                         |
| (Item 4)        |                         |                                                                         |
| 2015/2630/F     | LITTLE MELTON           | Mr T Abel - Applicant                                                   |
| (Item 5)        |                         |                                                                         |
| 2015/2836/F     | BERGH APTON             | Mr D Sketch – Objector  
| (Item 6)        |                         | Mr M Hendry – Agent for Objector  
|                 |                         | Mr A Waters – Objector  
|                 |                         | Mr J Wells - Applicant                                                            |
| 2015/0833/O     | PORINGLAND              | Mr R Smith – Agent for Applicant                                         |
| (Item 7)        |                         |                                                                         |
| 2015/1735/H     | PULHAM MARKET           | Mrs C Crane – Applicant  
| (Item 8)        |                         | Cllr C Hudson – Local Member  
| 2015/2078/F     | BURSTON AND SHIMPLING   | Ms L Bilston – Burston and Shimpling Parish Council  
| (Item 9)        |                         | Ms J Whiteside – Objector  
|                 |                         | Mr G Collier - Applicant  
| 2015/2175/B     | REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON| Mr R Bragg – Objector  
| (Item 10)       |                         | Mr P Childs – Agent for Applicant                                                              |
| 2015/2176/H     | REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON| Mr R Bragg – Objector  
| (Item 11)       |                         | Mr P Childs – Agent for Applicant                                                              |
| 2015/2344/F     | TIVETSHALL ST MARGARET  | Mrs D Pennellier – Objector  
| (Item 12)       |                         | Mr S Rolley - Applicant  
| 2015/2874/H     | COSTESSEY               | Mr J Flowerdew – Applicant  
| (Item 15)       |                         | Cllr V Bell – Local Member  
|                 |                         |                                                                         |
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.

256. ENFORCEMENT REPORTS

Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Surlingham (ref 2015/8008)

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

257. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting closed at 6:15pm)

______________________________
Chairman
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

Major applications referred back to Committee

1  Appl. No  :  2014/2495/O
Parish     :  WYMONDHAM
Applicants Name : Hallam Land Management
Site Address : Land between London Road and Suton Lane, London Road, Wymondham Norfolk
Proposal : Outline application for up to 375 dwellings and associated infrastructure, new cemetery and 1.2 ha of land for neighbourhood centre comprising A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and/or B1 and/or D1 uses
Decision : Members voted 10 – 0 (with 1 abstention) to AUTHORISE officers to confirm to the Planning Inspectorate that the Council does not wish to contest the appeal
Subject to the completion of a S106 agreement and to undertake further discussions with the applicant in respect of viability

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

2  Appl. No  :  2014/2222/F
Parish     :  THURLTON
Applicants Name : Mr Geoff Collen
Site Address : Land north of College Road Beccles Road Thurlton Norfolk
Proposal : Residential Development consisting of 27 dwelling houses
Decision : Members voted unanimously for APPROVAL
Approved with conditions

1. Full permission time limit
2. In accordance with submitted details
3. Visibility splays to be provided
4. Construction traffic management and worker parking
5. Retention of trees and hedgerows
6. Landscaping scheme and management plan, including maintenance details of open space and play areas
7. Tree and hedgerow protection
8. Contaminated land
9. Remediation scheme
10. Unexpected contamination
11. Renewable energy
12. Water efficiency
13. Materials to be agreed
14. Surface water drainage
15. Fire hydrant provision
Subject to the completion of a S106 to cover provision of affordable housing and green infrastructure contributions.

Updates

1 further objection which raises no new substantive planning issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>:</th>
<th>2015/1428/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants Name</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>Marstons Estates Limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>Thatchers Needle 33 Park Road Diss Norfolk IP22 4AS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>Erection of 4no non-food retail units (Use Class A1) comprising a total of 3948sqm with access from Park Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>Members voted 7 - 1 (with 1 abstention) for REFUSAL (contrary to officer recommendation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refused

Reasons for Overturning Officer Recommendation

The application has been refused on the following grounds:

1. Inappropriate design and scale having regard to the adjacent conservation area

Updates

Petition from local shop owners (63 businesses) objecting on the basis that it will seriously affect the town centre and result in closure of many independent shops, concern surrounding extra traffic.

13 further letters of objection referring to matters already highlighted in the committee report.

Agent has confirmed that the gross floor space figure of 3948sqm referred to in the committee report equates to a net figure of 31584sqm which equates to 80% of the gross figure. Condition 8 of the suggested condition referring to non-food retail only will also make reference to this figure as a maximum figure for the development.

SNC Conservation and Design Officer:

No objection, with the following observations:

Previous comments suggested relocating unit 4 and breaking up the massing of the rear building, for example through staggering. The footprint and size of the units has not been changed because of commercial considerations, which is disappointing, however the elevations have been broken up to some extent 'with feature entrances'. I would suggest that these elements are conditioned for detail – particularly as they will also involve elements of advertising.

Also, although the elevation of unit 4 facing north remain unrelieved without any fenestration, additional glazing and the canopy feature has now been carried around the west side as well as the south side on the south west corner, which makes building less inward looking towards the car park and better addressing the main pedestrian access route from The Park to the North and town beyond. Ideally the canopy would be carried through and around the North east corner – and the entrance provided on the west elevation rather than the south elevation.
Previously it was suggested that the service yard is moved away from the SW to the SE corner so that this allows for connections through to neighbouring development if this comes forward. This has been changed, which is welcomed.

In terms of materials, the white cream brick for the ground floor is a good match to the local white gault brick, with the slight tinge of pink. The panelling is light in colour, and matches the tonal colour of the white brick, so should have the effect of making the building appear ‘lighter’ in terms of the perception of bulk rather than the use of a heavier/darker material. I am however concerned at the galvanised handrail, which could stand out on the roofline. As a consequence of this, it is suggested that the handrail be recessed back into the roof to minimise its impact.

Because of its lighter colour, the building may stand out a little in long distance views from across the Mere due to its overall size and bulk. However, it will be seen at some distance, which diminishes the size and scale of the building in views. Also, being mainly seen in long distance views from the conservation area to the north, it will not be quite as reflective of light. Numerous trees are also in the foreground associated with the Park and Park Road. Although the view is more permeable in winter months, in full foliage these should help to effectively screen the building in these long distance views.

There is some additional planting proposed within the site. At present these are shown to be relatively small specimens….it is important that these are not ‘token trees’ but are specimens that can become mature and established – particularly those planted either side of the access – in order to provide effective green links -landscape officer to advise. These should further help to soften the impact of the large bulk and relatively unrelieved form of the building, both within the immediate setting and in views from Park Field and further away across the mere.

SNC Landscape Officer:  
Has received and assessed the arboricultural assessment and confirmed that the service yard to Unit 4 needs to be re-designed in order to fully protect the adjacent TPO tree. The Landscape Officer has discussed the issues with the developer’s arboriculturalist, and together they are confident that a solution can be provided subject to suitable revision of the layout. Furthermore, the landscaping scheme as submitted cannot be agreed and therefore a planning condition is required to agree a suitable one.

Officer response to the above:  
In light of this it is suggested that the resolution to approve be subject to the Council’s landscape officer being satisfied with the layout and arrangements for the service yard to unit 4.

River Waveney Trust has objected on the following grounds:  
Does not comply with the approved development plan policies that require development to enhance the environment.
Site is in a key position between the mere and the river which could contribute to linking town to the river. The proposal is for a generic retail warehouse park of the type usually found at the edge of centre or out of town location. The proposal is for intensive development with only modest landscaping. It does not appear consistent with the emphasis of DM policies on respecting the individual character of the area. Policies go beyond protection and preservation to require positive enhancement and improvement of the environment and therefore the applicant should be required to provide a landscaped walkway down the eastern side of the site to facilitate future linkages.
DIS6 requires contributions towards green infrastructure provision at DIS2. Can it be assured that CIL purposes will be reserved for this purpose. Can CIL contributions be released earlier for riverside habitat creation.

Diss Heritage Partnership:  
Scheme is in breach of the NPPF, and specifically paragraphs 23 and 26. We have requested that a social and impact analysis be undertaken, but told that this will not be done.
The Council are using economic impact evidence from 2007 linked to the JCS. This states that for Diss in 2016 the capacity for comparison goods should be 2361sqm and this is 3949sqm (67% greater).

As it was undertaken 9 years ago it cannot take into account subsequent development other areas of town and should not be considered robust evidence. For example the report notes 140 retailers in town, now there are 65 in the heritage triangle alone and about 200 in total in the town.

Para 23 of the NPPF states that LPA’s must “retain and enhance existing markets and, where appropriate, re-introduce or create new ones, ensuring markets remain attractive and competitive” and

Para 26 states “When assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres, which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:

• the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and

• the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made.

This development is much larger than the 2500sqm threshold, yet there is no documentation of any assessment. There is however, clear evidence of adverse impact on the town centre by looking at the damage that the supermarkets have caused to the food trade, only one pre-existing food retailer has remained, and the weekly market has contracted by 30%.

In terms of the impact on “existing, committed and planned public and private investment in the town centre, the targeted investment in the Heritage Triangle, and the above growth in retailers has not been considered by the development and must be taken into account by the LPA.

The significant adverse impact on existing trade undermining and placing at considerable risk Diss’ “established character and diversity”, would prevent approval, particularly as there is no evidence of ‘overtrading’ to justify the need for extension of comparison goods floorspace in the town.

Any claim of beneficial impact from additional footfall to the new site cannot be justified: even the applicant’s traffic experts claim that people will be able to use this new site and leave with no impact on, or visit to, the remainder of the town. This is clear evidence that the “adverse impacts [of presumption in favour of sustainable development] would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits” for the town.

It is clear that this development is not of an appropriate scale, in terms of gross floorspace in relation to the size of Diss town centre, it contradicts the LPA's own strategic assessment for the development capacity of Diss, and it contravenes the guidance for sustainable development contained in NPPF.

Officer response to the above concerns:
In terms of the reference to using out of date information, the retail study in question was used to inform the policies contained within the JCS, this document is envisaged to be applicable up to 2026 for decision making purposes. Policy 13 of the JCS identifies significant expansion in or adjacent to the town centre for town centre uses (which would include retail) and also states that;

“Diss is an attractive market town with the largest number of shops and services outside Norwich. It serves a large rural catchment covering parts of South Norfolk and northern Suffolk and has the development potential for significant new shopping floorspace which be
accommodated on the existing retail allocation adjacent to the town centre. Smaller scale opportunities will be sought to strengthen the town centre’s non-food and leisure offer.”

The Council’s recently adopted Local Plan, which again is envisaged to run to 2026, builds on this strategic aim through policies DIS6 and DIS7 which both provide for flexible allocations to potentially provide a range of uses including no-food retail. For the avoidance of doubt DIS6 covers the application site with DIS7 the site immediately adjacent to DIS6.

The retail survey has been used to make informed choices about allocations for retail in Diss across the lifetime of the plan (to 2026), and it is clear that these have led to restrictions being contained within the policies namely (must be non-food due to the recognition that the food market is already well catered for in Diss and by making reference to net floorspace quotas in the Services and community facilities section of the Diss overview contained within the site specific allocations policies document (new comparison goods shopping floor space 2600m² net to 2016 and 4500m² net to 2021) and it is therefore considered that it would be unreasonable to request an updated/new retail survey to be produced now. Officers would also wish to highlight that reference is made to the JCS and retail study in paras 4.13 and 4.14 of the committee report.

In terms of the reference to para 23 of the NPPF, this sets out 10 criterion to be considered in the formation of planning policies for promoting competitive town centre environments and cater for the management and growth of centres over a plan period. The letter copies one of these criterion, which the officers believe has been fulfilled in the drawing up of its allocation DIS6 and DIS7 and in its Policy DM2.4.

In terms of paragraph 26 of the NPPF, paragraph 4.20 of the committee report highlights that the reason that an impact assessment has not been sought in this instance despite it being over the Council’s adopted threshold of 1000m² for Diss in DM2.4 is on the basis that it is allocated for non-food retail as part of the adopted allocation DIS6 which is an up-to-date Local Plan policy. As an observation it would be illogical to ask for an impact assessment to be undertaken for a use which has been agreed as being acceptable under an allocation within its Local Plan and which proposes a level of non-food retail within the figures recognised within the supporting text of the plan (4500sqm net to 2021).

There is reference to evidence that the “adverse impacts (of presumption in favour of sustainable development) would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits for the town”. The aforementioned wording is largely taken from paragraph 14 of the NPPF, and in particular from the section relating to decision-taking. However, it should be noted that it should be read in the context of decision-taking “where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date”. As set out above, and in the committee report, it is evident that the development plan in respect of this site and retail development is neither absent, silent or out-of-date.

Richard Bacon MP has objected to the scheme.

4  
Appl. No : 2015/2406/O
Parish : STOKE HOLY CROSS
Applicants Name : Mr D Bales and Miss D Leggett
Site Address : Land west of Chandler Road Stoke Holy Cross Norfolk
Proposal : Outline application for 12 dwellings with new associated accesses
Decision : Members voted 10 - 0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

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

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

Updates

SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager:
Update to comments in their consultation response that the requirement is now for four affordable dwellings now scheme has been reduced to 12 dwellings

Anglian Water:
Stoke Holy Cross Water Recycling Centre has capacity for these flows
Sewerage system has capacity for flows from this development
Unable to provide comments on proposed surface water management as do not relate to Anglian Water assets

SNC Community Services – Environmental Quality Team:
No Comments to make

4 additional letters stating that they are still opposed to the development for the reasons highlighted in our original objection (prominent site, outside development boundary, need to retain rural character, highways impact given development to come forward in Poringland)

5  Appl. No : 2015/2630/F
Parish : LITTLE MELTON
Applicants Name : Abel Homes Ltd
Site Address : Land south east of The Gardens Mill Road Little Melton Norfolk
Proposal : Residential Development for 8no. dwellings, car parking and amenity space including 2no. affordable dwellings which form part of planning reference 2015/0253

Decision : Members voted 10 - 0 to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to APPROVE

Approved with conditions

1. Time limit
2. In accordance with plans
3. External materials to be agreed
4. Boundary treatments to be agreed
5. Surface water drainage system including maintenance and management details to be agreed
6. Foul water into mains sewer
7. Ecology mitigation to be followed
8. Tree protection
Subject to receipt of additional viability information to demonstrate affordable dwellings can be delivered and subject to completion of a Section 106.

Updates

Highway Authority (NCC):
No objections subject to conditions.

6  
Appl. No : 2015/2836/F  
Parish : BERGH APTON  
Applicants Name : FW Properties on behalf of Bergh Apton Developments  
Site Address : Land South of Cookes Road Bergh Apton Norfolk  
Proposal : Erection of 11 dwellings plus associated roads, landscaping and drainage infrastructure  
Decision : Members voted 10 - 0 for APPROVAL  
Approved with conditions

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

Subject to the completion of a S106 to cover affordable housing

7  
Appl. No : 2015/0833/O  
Parish : PORINGLAND  
Applicants Name : Rev. R W Scorey  
Site Address : Evangelical Free Church Carr Lane Poringland Norfolk NR14 7JZ  
Proposal : Follow up on Outline Application 2014/2651 – Proposed demolition of church and erection of dwelling and garage  
Decision : Members voted 10 - 0 for APPROVAL  
Approved with conditions

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

8  Appl. No  : 2015/1735/H
  Parish   : PULHAM MARKET
  Applicants Name   : Mr & Mrs Crane
  Site Address   : Sixmill Green  Colegate End Road Pulham Market Norfolk IP21 4XG
  Proposal   : Front 2 storey extension to existing property
  Decision   : Members voted 6 - 4 for REFUSAL

Refused

1. Character and impact on existing dwelling and street scene
2. Impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property

9  Appl. No  : 2015/2078/F
  Parish   : BURSTON AND SHIMPLING
  Applicants Name   : Mr Gary Collier
  Site Address   : Land East of Green Lane Diss Road Burston Norfolk
  Proposal   : Erection of building for the storage and processing of apples and for the processing of honey from the bee apiary
  Decision   : Members voted 9 - 0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

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

Updates

1 further letter of objection on grounds of access and building not being justified (both are addressed in the committee report)

10  Appl. No  : 2015/2175/B
  Parish   : REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON
  Applicants Name   : Mr and Mrs J Oberhoffer
  Site Address   : 21 Broad Street Harleston Norfolk IP20 9AZ
  Proposal   : Proposed first floor extension
Decision : Members voted 8 – 0 (with 2 abstentions) for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Listed Building Time Limit
2. In accordance with submitted plans

Updates

Further objection statement presented by neighbour

11 Appl. No : 2015/2176/H
Parish : REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON
Applicants Name : Mr and Mrs J Oberhoffer
Site Address : 21 Broad Street Harleston Norfolk IP20 9AZ
Proposal : Proposed first floor extension

Decision : Members voted 8 – 1 (with 1 abstention) for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Full Planning Permission Time Limit
2. In accordance with submitted plans

Updates

Further objection statement presented by neighbour.
North point error on plan noted.

12 Appl. No : 2015/2344/F
Parish : TIVETSHALL ST MARGARET
Applicants Name : Mr Don Smith
Site Address : The Maltings Moulton Road Tivetshall St Margaret Norfolk NR15 2AJ
Proposal : Conversion of old Maltings Building to New Site Office, Installation of New Steeping Silos, Installation of Germination Vessel, Installation of conveying system, Relocation of Engineering Workshop, Malt Dressing and outloading, Additional Malt storage, Water Treatment and Switch room demolition

Decision : Members voted 10 – 0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

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

Environmental Quality Team:
Have agreed with applicant that a further noise report will be carried out and required mitigation implemented additional condition required on noise attenuation scheme for engineering workshop and no generators/air handling plant without consent on this basis they are happy that any impact on neighbouring properties can be mitigated against.

13  Appl. No : 2015/2362/RVC  
Parish : WYMONDHAM

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

Decision : This item was DEFERRED to a future meeting of the Development Management Committee

14 Appl. No : 2015/2856/F  
Parish : BRESSINGHAM

Applicants Name : Paul Rackham Ltd  
Site Address : Land North of Waveney House Low Road Bressingham Norfolk IP22 2AG  
Proposal : Erection of industrial unit

Decision : Members voted 7 – 0 for REFUSAL

Refused

Reasons for refusal:
1. Corridors of Movement
2. Inadequate Turning Facilities

Updates

Note: Agenda Plan not accurate. Correct version displayed

Email from agent suggesting highway objection is unfounded. Increase in traffic only slight on established commercial access. Also applicant does not own the access

15  Appl. No : 2015/2874/H  
Parish : COSTESSEY

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

Decision : Members voted 7 – 2 for REFUSAL
Refused

1. Impact on residential amenity

Updates

2 additional letters of support

16 Appl. No : 2015/2896/F
Parish : SHOTESHAM

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

Decision : Members voted 9 – 0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

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

Updates

Final decision have not been made regarding surface water drainage and foul drainage it is proposed the condition the details of these.

Parish Council comments on amended drawings
- Positive changes to cladding and roof tiles
- No change to size of dwelling
- No application for change of use to include part of the neighbouring file d
- Concern change in practice which has been required for other properties and will set a precedent detrimental to the village
- If permission is granted then it should be sited on footprint of existing building thus making minimal impact and local scene, will reduce impact on local landscape
- Prospective owners wish to live on the site, a short term need should not take precedence over the accepted understood planning rules of using a properties existing footprint

17 Appl. No : 2016/0158/O
Parish : CAISTOR ST EDMUND

Applicants Name : Mr Daniel Skinner
Site Address: Land South of High Ash Farm High Ash Lane Caistor St Edmund Norfolk
Proposal: Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved) for one detached, four bedroom self-build dwelling, double garage and gardens
Decision: Members voted 6 – 0 (with 2 abstention) for APPROVAL (contrary to officer recommendations) (officers authorised to decide conditions)

Reasons for overturning officer recommendations:

1. Particular circumstances of applicant and his historical link to management of the holding for significant public benefit.

Updates

Water Management Officer Comments:
Support subject to condition for disposal of foul drainage and surface water.

Caistor St Edmunds Parish Council: 2 letters with the following comments:

Caistor St Edmund Parish Council fully supports this application for the reasons as stated below:

“The applicant was born, brought up and now works full time in the village. Together with his father, he farms the land on which the proposed self-build will be situated. The farm is a unique local amenity which provides many miles of permissive footpaths giving excellent walking and unspoilt views. It is not only used extensively by residents from this and surrounding villages, but by visitors from Norwich and further afield in Norfolk. The proposed self-build will better enable the applicant to maintain his business to the benefit of the wider community, and to enjoy a reasonable family life. In light of recent decisions to allow developments despite strong local opposition and with no obvious benefits to the local community, if there is any natural justice in the planning process, this application should be approved”.

2nd letter states:
“The Parish Council has seen the Development Management Committee Report, and notes the officer recommendation to refuse the application. However, we remain strongly of the view that this application should be approved.

There has been a substantial (perhaps unprecedented) level of support both from within the Parish and further afield. Indeed we are not aware that a single objection has been lodged.

Officers have concluded that there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate there is a functional need for a 4th dwelling on the site. Apart from a desire to support a parishioner born and brought up in the village, our primary concern is to ensure that the unique and widely valued community facilities offered under the existing regime at High Ash, can be sustained into the future.

Whilst we accept that nothing can be guaranteed going forward, we believe that this application, which will provide the sort of family accommodation which doesn't currently exist on the site, does offer an opportunity to secure those facilities.

We are also not persuaded that “the development would erode the open countryside and its predominant rural character”. The location is unquestionably rural, but arguably not in open countryside. We feel that a suitably appropriate and sympathetic final design, would not be detrimental to the existing rural view.
We urge the Committee to consider the wider benefits which this application might afford, to take account of the widespread level of support for the application, and to approve the application.”
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| Appl. No | : 2016/0174/H |
| Parish   | : SHOTESHAM   |
| Applicants Name | : Mr and Mrs J Parnell |
| Site Address | : Highfield Hawes Green Shotesham Norfolk NR15 1UL |
| Proposal | : Proposed extension and improvement of existing dwelling |

Decision : Members voted 6 – 1 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accordance with submitted drawings
3. Materials to be agreed
4. Details to be agreed

Updates

6 letters from 4 households
Concern in change in Conservation Officer’s comments between withdrawn and current application.

The proposed building ‘...would have a dramatic impact on views along the lane becoming a very prominent building.’ He recommended that it ‘...needs to be smaller in scale and height and designed so that it does not dominate over the lane and adjacent building...the current design will have a considerable and harmful impact on the character of the settlement...’

A slight amendment to the projecting bay will not make the building more recessive surprised at changed view of Conservation Officer

Despite drawing attention to negative elements features of the proposal report is recommended for refusal

No clear understanding of historical importance of complex of building.

Designer states that it offers views across the valley these could only be dealt with by felling neighbours trees

Designer states property is not suitable for modern family life, but what about affordable homes.

Although footprint is quite small extensively floor space is being created by raising the height of the roof resulting in 3 fold increase in floor spaces

Due to elevated position existing roof heights are in line with Ardenne and Havelock House.

Statement says most properties are two storey only Archers House is two storey other properties are one and half storeys

Not been designed to fit in with surrounding buildings

Overlooking only considered in relation to Ardenne not two bungalows opposite, windows facing these properties.

Bungalow now more exposed by cutting back vegetation

Feature of area is hipped roof and first floor windows tucked under the eaves and large chimney stacks these features have been ignored do not considered that it is in accordance with Place Making Guide

Render will make the house even more prominent
### Applications submitted by South Norfolk Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/0019/F</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Mr Trevor Haystead</td>
<td>Cygnet House Swan Lane, Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2XE</td>
<td>Construction of a temporary access to show homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0043/RVC</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Big Sky Developments Ltd</td>
<td>Land North of Shotesham Road Poringland Norfolk</td>
<td>Variation of Condition 2 of permission 2014/0393/D – Revisions to plot house types, parking and materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0216/RVC</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>South Norfolk District Council</td>
<td>Wymondham Leisure Centre Norwich Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0NT</td>
<td>Variation of condition 2 of permission 2015/0581 - Fire escape stairs have been added and the fire escape door has been moved into the new cladding panel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decision**

- **2016/0019/F**
  - Members voted 7 – 0 for **APPROVAL**
  - Approved with conditions
    1. In accordance with submitted drawings
    2. Temporary access
    3. Access as shown on plan
    4. Access is to serve block 25 only (no through road)
    5. Visibility splay provision
    6. Construction hours
    7. Reporting of unexpected contamination

- **2016/0043/RVC**
  - Members voted 7 – 0 for **APPROVAL**
  - Approved with conditions
    1. Conditions on previous permission
    2. In accordance with submitted drawings
    3. Reporting of unexpected contamination
    4. Ecological management plan
    5. Provision of Bat and Bird boxes (discharged under 2014/1772)
    6. Tree protection
    7. No dig in root protection (discharged under 2014/1772)
    8. Implement landscaping scheme
    9. Retention trees and hedges
    10. New Water Efficiency
    11. Slab levels to accord (discharged under 2014/1772)
    12. Restrict office use to B1 use only

- **2016/0216/RVC**
  - Approved with conditions
    1. Conditions on previous permission
    2. In accordance with submitted drawings
    3. Reporting of unexpected contamination
    4. Ecological management plan
    5. Provision of Bat and Bird boxes (discharged under 2014/1772)
    6. Tree protection
    7. No dig in root protection (discharged under 2014/1772)
    8. Implement landscaping scheme
    9. Retention trees and hedges
    10. New Water Efficiency
    11. Slab levels to accord (discharged under 2014/1772)
    12. Restrict office use to B1 use only
Decision : Members voted 7 – 0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Conditions on previous permission
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. Materials to accord with agreed
4. Hours of use
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

Major applications

1. Appl. No : 2015/2082/O
   Parish : BAWBURGH

Applicants Name : Mr Julian Darling
Site Address : Land South Of Village Hall Stocks Hill Bawburgh Norfolk
Proposal : Outline application for the residential development 10 dwellings

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions

1 Outline Permission Time Limit
2 In accord with submitted drawings
3 Standard outline requiring Reserve Matters
4 Single storey dwellings only
5 External materials to be agreed
6 Surface Water drainage to be agreed
7 Foul drainage to main sewer
8 Reporting of unexpected contamination
9 Archaeological work to be agreed
10 Water Efficiency
11 Ecology Mitigation
12 Hedge planting and pond work/maintenance to be agreed
13 Slab level to be agreed
14 Boundary treatment to be agreed
15 Retention trees and hedges
16 Provision of fire hydrant
17 Details of roads, footways, foul and surface water drainage to be agreed
18 Estate Road to accord with agreed details
19 Road and footways to be constructed to binder course before first occupation
20 Construction traffic management plan to be agreed
21 Accord with Construction Traffic Management plan
22 Highway Improvements - Offsite

Subject to the completion of a S106 to cover affordable housing

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 06 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design
NPPF 10 : Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF 12 : Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 6: Access and Transportation
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4: Housing delivery
Policy 16: Other 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
DM1.2: Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.10: Promotion of sustainable transport
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM4.5: Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.8: Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.10: Heritage Assets

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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

2. Planning History
None

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council
To first amended scheme
- This proposal would be a major development (10 dwellings proposed); Bawburgh has been declared as an other village
- South Norfolk Council has now been judged to have a 5 year land supply and therefore further development on this scale is not required.
- The site has a history of poor drainage.
- There would be an unacceptable increase in traffic onto Stocks Hill.
- Loss of agricultural land.
- Shared access with the village hall is unacceptable.

To second amendment
Bawburgh Parish Council feels that this application goes completely against principles laid out in the recently adopted (Oct 15) SN Plan, as to the scale of development within Bawburgh parish, if only for the fact this would be a major development in what we are as unequivocally stated another village.
Recommend refusal:

- This proposal would be a major development (10 dwellings proposed);
- Bawburgh has been declared as an other village.
- South Norfolk Council has now been judged to have a 5 year land supply and therefore further development on this scale is not required.
- The site has a history of poor drainage.
- There would be an unacceptable increase in traffic onto Stocks Hill.
- This is agricultural land, a green belt not an infill and is outside the village envelope.
- Shared access with the village hall is unacceptable.
- The site has proven historical interest.

3.2 District Member
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager
To the original submission
- Proposal for 9 dwellings however site area is 1.13 hectares, therefore 3 affordable units required
To amended scheme
- No objections subject to the provision of 3 affordable dwellings

3.4 NCC Ecologist
To the original submission
- Ecological report required
Following submission of an ecological report
- Survey found that the site has low overall ecological value and with mitigation, it is unlikely that any impact on ecology will be significant.
- No objection subject to condition

3.5 SNC Conservation And Design officer
To original submission
- Concerns raised re the layout of the proposal
To amended scheme
- Considers that for outline approval with reserved matters, the proposals are acceptable in principle.

3.6 Planning Policy
Bawburgh is an Other Village in the NPA, and has an allocation of five dwellings in the emerging Local Plan. The NPA does not have a five year supply of deliverable housing sites.

3.7 SNC Water Management Officer
No objections subject to conditions

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

3.9 NCC Highways
No objections subject to conditions

3.10 Norfolk Fire Service
No objections subject to condition
3.11 Norfolk Police
The cul de sac design shown is good for crime prevention providing good surveillance of the dwellings at the location. The western boundary adjacent to the hammer head turning point appears to be open with no barrier shown. Leaving this space open with no physical boundary in situ encourages the passage of people through the middle of this residential area. The benefits of a cul de sac design have been weakened by its permeability at this point.

3.12 Anglian Water Services Ltd
No comments received

3.13 SNC Landscape Officer
No objections subject to conditions

3.14 Historic Environment Service
- Previous archaeological investigations at the proposed site have recorded artefacts ranging from the prehistoric to medieval periods. Consequently there is potential that heritage assets with archaeological interest may be present at the site and that their significance will be affected by the proposed development.
- Therefore if minded to approve no objections subject to archaeological written scheme of investigation.

3.15 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority
No comments received

3.16 Other Representations
To first amendment
17 letters of objection
- Increase in traffic on Stocks Hill
- Narrow, busy road which is already dangerous
- Impact on highway safety
- Hazard to users of the village hall and children’s playground
- Inadequate provision for management of ground waters
- Development’s hard surfacing would create a greater likelihood of flooding
- Need for traffic management plan which could include speed cameras and traffic calming measures
- Few pavements and high proportion of elderly residents-additional traffic could lead to an injury or fatality
- Harm to the conservation area and historic centre of the village
- Already adversely affected by new build known as the Warren
- Elevated site
- Could lead to further development of the remainder of the site/land
- Charmed tranquillity of Bawburgh will be ruined forever
- Overdevelopment
- Detrimental impact on neighbouring dwellings
- Noise and disturbance, light pollution
- Loss of view
- Detrimental impact on landscape
- In conflict with landowners agreement with village hall
- Outside the development boundary
- Loss of old footpath-but not a legal public footpath
- Impact on archaeological interest
- Field was used by villages to walk their dogs
- Develops Green Belt land
Owner and developer not local
Loss of agricultural land
3 one bed bungalows do not help families
Looks like a phase 2 is likely

To second amendment
4 letters of objection
Original objections still stand
Reiterate concerns already raised
Changes to layout do not change our objections
Comparison between Brundall and Bawburgh is invalid

2 Letters of objection from Trustees of Bawburgh Village Hall:
To the first amendment
Drainage: Serious concerns this summer, when several gardens flooded, causing overflowing into the road via drainage ditch
Traffic/Highways: Increase in traffic onto Stocks Hill. Village hall and proposed site would share an entrance, hall extremely busy and in use every day, there is a children's play area to rear, safe pushchair/wheelchair access must be available for this
Dwellings must be bungalows
Is not an archaeological survey not necessary

To the second amendment
Drainage: There is a history of poor drainage, but this aspect of concern has been placed with the Lead Local Flood Authority who "will respond". When? The concern re the SUDS pond was not addressed at all.
Traffic/Highways: The conditions and informative's to be attached to any consent notice, are accepted, but all would take issue concerning the assessment of speeding through the village and especially on Stocks Hill, in both directions. A vehicle activated sign might mitigate this a little. However, the development will only add to an existing problem, i.e. constant "rat-running" through the village and apparent complete dismissal by drivers of heavy goods vehicles of the 7.5 ton limitation on Bawburgh Bridge.
Type of dwellings: Comment as before.
Land Survey: Will there be an archaeological survey?
The Committee is aware that this is outline planning permission only, but there is great concern that the Conservation status of the village should be maintained, hence the anxiety about the type of dwellings, and all concerning this. Bawburgh is a valley village - a rare thing in South Norfolk. This development will be at one of the highest points in approaching it, and will be highly visible. In addition, we are aware that South Norfolk Council already has fulfilled its 5 year land supply requirement, until the next review, so would ask whether this proposed development is appropriate at this time.
4 Assessment

4.1 This outline application seeks consent for erection of 10 dwellings, located to the south of the existing village hall, Stocks Hill, Bawburgh. The site is outside the existing Development Boundary and the conservation area.

4.2 The site is presently an arable field with hedgerows and trees to the east together with a pond on the northeast corner; hedging to the south with open countryside beyond and an open boundary to the west as the site former part of a larger field. To the north is the existing village hall together with its car park, amenity space which includes children’s play areas. Residential properties are located to the east of the site.

4.3 The application proposes affordable housing provision to be in line with the requirements of Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy. As the site is over 0.6 hectares the requirement is for 33% of dwellings to be affordable which works out at three affordable dwellings.

4.4 The main issues in this case are: the principle of the development in this location; the character and appearance of the area; affordable housing; highway safety, flooding and residential amenity.

Principle of development

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

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

Economic Role

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

4.8 The construction of 10 dwellings in a location adjacent to an Other Village would help enhance the economic viability through local spending from future occupants of the dwellings.

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

Social Role

4.10 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."
4.11 The principle social benefit of the scheme is that it provides housing within a location where a 5-year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated. In addition, and as noted above, the proposal includes the provision of affordable housing to the requirements of Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy. This will help meet an identified need within the district for affordable housing. This is a significant benefit when weighing the benefits against the harm of a proposal such as this and a viability assessment has been submitted in support of the application, which demonstrates that it is viable to provide the affordable housing on the site as part of the scheme.

Environmental Role

4.12 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."

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

4.14 The site is currently bounded by residential properties to the east and the village hall to the north, the access will be via the existing access to the village hall. The proposal is for 10 single storey properties, which it is considered can be designed as to not create a detrimental impact to an unacceptable degree and therefore whilst there is an infringement into the open countryside, it is considered that any harm will be outweighed by the benefits of the scheme.

4.15 Having due regard to the above assessment made in the context of not being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, it is considered that the benefits of providing additional housing is sufficiently high that the concerns regard encroachment into the countryside are outweighed by the benefits. It is not considered that the visual impact would cause such harm as to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits as set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

Design, layout and impact on the character of the area

4.16 Both JCS Policy 2 Section 7 of the NPPF require high quality design with importance being attached to the design of the built environment, with it seen as a key aspect of sustainable development.

4.17 The application site is separated from the conservation area by the village hall. The historic development is very much nestled lower down in the Valley, with this site being on a raised level, and therefore of more prominence. However, the village hall playing field separates the development from views at the back of houses on Church Street and from the current construction of bungalows in-between. Also, the layout is quite sensitive in terms of the buildings being close to the rear of the village hall, and therefore retaining views of open space. The choice of a cul-de-sac of bungalows fits in with the more modern development at this end of the village, and will mitigate the impact of the development in terms of size and bulk of the dwellings.

4.18 The application has no details as it is an outline with all matters reserved, the original indicative layout has been amended in response to comments made by the Senior Conservation and Design officer, who considers the proposal is acceptable as it has been demonstrated that the site can accommodate the development without negatively impacting on the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area. Notwithstanding the objections raised as set out above the site is of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed and would not be overdevelopment. The development therefore accords with policy 2 of the JCS and NPPF.
Affordable housing

4.19 Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy states that sites for 16 dwellings or over 0.6ha are required to provide 33% affordable housing. The applicant has proposed a mix of 2 one bed and 1 two bed units which would comply with the affordable housing requirements. As such, the Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager has raised no objection to the scheme on the grounds that it would meet the requirements of Policy 4 subject to this provision being secured through a condition or S106 agreement. Financial evidence has been submitted to justify the proposed provision which has been reviewed by the Council's Property Consultant to his satisfaction.

Highway Safety

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

4.21 The application proposes to provide a new estate road off the existing access which serves the village hall. Concerns have been raised by Parish Council and local residents as set out above, at the impact the proposal will have on highway safety. The Highways Authority have assessed the proposal and are aware of the concerns raised, however they consider that the site has acceptable visibility splays and there is sufficient capacity in the local road network to cater for the development. Therefore, subject to the imposition of conditions they have raised no objections, as such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Policies DM3.11 and DM3.12. The concerns raised by the Parish Council and local residents as set out above are full appreciated however as the Highway officer has raised no objections to the proposal I do not consider the application can be refused on highway safety issues. The Highway officer has requested a condition requiring off-site highway improvement works, to include footway/pedestrian crossing improvements and the installation of a vehicular activated sign on Stock Hill.

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.

4.23 Local residents have raised concerns regarding light pollution, loss of privacy, noise and disturbance as set out above. I fully appreciate the concerns raised, however, the proposal is for single storey properties and with careful consideration in terms of the siting and design, together with appropriate conditions, I do not consider the application can be refused on the grounds raised. As such, the scheme would accord with the requirements of Policy DM3.13

Impact on the Conservation Area

4.24 The impact on Conservation Areas requires consideration under the development management policies and S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. The application has been assessed by the Senior Conservation and Design Officer who has raised no objection to the scheme. It is considered that the proposal will not have any harmful impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with section 12 of the NPPF, Policy DM4.10 of the SNLP. Equally in consideration of the Council's duties under the Act it is considered that for the reasons set out above that the proposal would not adversely affect the Conservation Area.
Flooding

4.25 The site is located in flood zone 1 and the Council has no record of historical flooding on the site. It is fully appreciated however, that through the consultation process, local residents and Parish Council have raised concerns regarding flooding in the area, with the last occasion being in August 2015. The Water Management officer has raised no objections to the 9 dwellings originally proposed subject to a surface water condition. Comments from the Lead Local Flood Authority have not yet been received however for 1 additional dwelling I do not anticipate any objections being raised. In view of the above I do not consider the application can be refused on drainage/flooding issues and an appropriately worded condition requiring surface water drainage details to be agreed will be imposed on any consent granted.

4.26 Other concerns have been raised in relation to impact on archaeological interests, loss of footpath (which is not a legal public right of way), loss of agricultural land, loss of view, precedent and future development. Full consideration has been given to all the concerns raised however as the Historic Environment Services has raised no objections, I do not consider the application could be refused on archaeological issues and the consent has been conditioned in respect of archaeology. I fully appreciate the concern regarding potential future development however these would be assessed on their individual merits, should applications come forward. Some of the other issues raised are not material planning considerations.

Financial matters

4.27 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. This can be a material consideration but in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance. The development will be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) at the reserved matters stage.

4.28 This application will be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) under the reserved matters application.

Conclusion

5 The level of harm identified is not sufficient to present significant and demonstrable harm that outweighs the benefit of providing additional housing in a location where it is not possible to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. As such, the land supply policies are out of date and the development proposed is considered sustainable development and is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 cc Curtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2. **App. No**: 2015/2463/RVC  
**Parish**: HINGHAM

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

Recommendation: Authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to Approve with conditions

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

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

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management
Site Specific Allocations and Policies
HIN 1: Land south of Norwich Road

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide

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

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

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2014/1791  
Screening opinion for proposed residential development  
EIA Not Required

2.2 2014/2322  
Erection of 88 new homes plus associated roads and landscaping  
Approved
Variation of condition 2 - amended plans and removal of condition 9 - Eastern pedestrian refuge and electronic sign of permission 2014/2322/F - Erection of 88 new homes plus associated roads and landscaping. Approved

Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 8, 9 (Part A only) (Highways), 12 (Materials), 16 (Landscape), 17 (Renewable Energy) & 24 (WSI) of planning consent 2014/2322 under consideration

Display of 3 x display boards and 4 x flags for a temporary period of three years. Approved

Discharge of condition 14 of permission 2014/2322 - Hard and soft landscaping scheme Approved

Consultations

Parish Council

Dec 2015 - Recommend refusal. Concerns raised about a lack of information and a lack of expert responses and guidance regarding whether the proposed variation sufficiently mitigates the increased risk of flooding to lower lying areas. The Town Council have previously raised concerns. The supplied information doesn't sufficiently explain where water would flow to on exiting the tanking system or whether the ditch has sufficient capacity. It is not explained whether the proposals are sufficient to prevent flooding to the properties to the south of the development.

Feb 2016 - Following consideration of the additional information supplied the Town Council did not agree to recommend the application be approved. Concerns raised about the future maintenance of the pond and pipe. Concerns that the permeable surfaces across the site will decrease as homeowners modify and extend properties etc thus resulting in more surface water entering the system. There appears to have been no assessment of or planned improvement to the ditch system beyond the pond and pipe. There has been no response from the LLFA therefore there is no expert opinion for guidance. The s38 has not been finalised with NCC therefore there is no guarantee that the tank system will be adopted.

March 2016 - Many of the concerns raised by the Town Council are similar to those raised by the LLFA. The Town Council did not agree to recommend that the application be approved.

District Member To be reported to committee

NCC Ecologist No objection. The application will have little potential impact on the ecology on site.

Historic Environment Service No comments received
3.5 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority

November 2015 - Insufficient information provided to consider condition 10:

- The applicant should provide details of the pond into which it is proposed to outfall; including its condition, information regarding the onward drainage from the pond, and any known maintenance regimes. This is required since the location of discharge has changed since the original proposals (Condition 10, part b)

- The site investigations undertaken encountered less favourable rates of runoff than previously used for the calculation of the depth of sub-base required beneath the proposed permeable paving. In addition, calculations have not been provided for the determination of the depths of storage beneath the permeable surfaces as shown in the submitted drainage strategy. The applicant should therefore either: a) provided amended calculations demonstrating that the storage for the permeable paving will be sufficient should the rate of infiltration be lower than previously assessed; b) increase the depth of sub-base to allow for additional storage within the permeable paving system to prevent surcharging; or c) include positive outfalls from the permeable paving and include such areas in the calculations for the wider drainage network to show there is sufficient storage to prevent flooding of the surface water network. (Condition 10, part c)

- Modelling of the conveyance system has not been provided for the 1 in 100 years plus climate change rainfall event, including plans showing where flood water originating from any flooded components of the drainage system (where appropriate) would be directed (Condition 10, part d)

- A plan showing exceedance flow routes through the site should be provided by the applicant (Condition 10, part e)

- An updated maintenance plan for the proposed drainage system should be provided to document the maintenance activities that are likely to be required, their frequency and responsibilities (Condition 10, part f)

February 2016 - Insufficient information provided.

- The applicant has undertaken a survey of the pond into which the surface water drainage system is proposed to outfall. The survey identified that there is a considerable amount of debris and sediment at the base of the pond, which is proposed to be removed to a depth of approximately 500mm over the extent of the existing pond. There is an existing outfall from an Anglian Water Services surface water sewer network into the north-western corner of the pond. The pond survey also identified that there is an outfall from the pond adjacent to the pond inlet that passes beneath Seamere Road to the south and discharges into the ditch to the south of Seamere Road. This outlet is believed to be below the current level of the sediment in the pond and is therefore not currently active.

- The applicant states that, following the initial clearance of the pond prior to connection from the proposed surface water drainage network from the development, the ongoing maintenance of the pond will be the responsibility of the landowner and will consequently be outside the control of the development or land management agent for the development.
The pond is located within a small wooded area and is consequently likely to accumulate vegetation and debris. We therefore consider that, although there is a riparian responsibility of the landowner to maintain the pond to enable the onward passage of surface water, the risk that the outfall will be blocked due to debris accumulation over the lifetime of the development is high. In addition, the ability for the landowner to access the pond to enable maintenance is considered to be restricted.

- Request that an alternative discharge location from the surface water drainage system (such as directly into the watercourse south of Seamere Road) is considered to prevent the reliance on the pond for the surface water drainage connection. Maintenance of a drainage ditch adjacent to a road is considered to be less onerous to maintain and more likely to be kept clear of debris. Concerns have been raised locally about the capacity of the existing system. Assuming the adequate design and upkeep of the system over the lifetime of the development it is considered that the proposals will reduce the runoff rate from the site for more extreme events but will result in an increase in the runoff rate for the lower more frequent return period events.

- Concerns raised about the permeability of the ground has been over-represented in the infiltration calculations. Additional information is required to address the LLFA concerns that the infiltration rate may not be appropriate to adequately store and dispose of the collected surface water runoff for the 1 in 100 years plus climate change rainfall event for the permeable paving.

- A plan has been submitted to identify the routes through which surface water would travel in the event of exceedance of the surface water drainage network. This identifies that surface water will be directed to public open space in the east of the development, and that the remainder of the development will rely on the highways to convey surface water to the termination of the adoptable highway in the centre of the southern site boundary. It should be noted that any future development to the south of this site (should an application ever be submitted) should take into consideration that there is an exceedance flow route originating offsite.

- Clarification required over the proposed mechanism for the maintenance of the shared driveway areas.

- Anglian Water may wish to be contacted as the pond into which the drainage system is proposed to discharge is the downstream connection point from the Anglian Water network from the residential properties to the south-west of the proposed development.

March 2016 – No objection but with some comments and areas of concern remaining.

- We requested that additional information be provided with respect to the surface water drainage outfall, the infiltration rates assumed for the proposed permeable paving and
maintenance of the drainage system before we could recommend that Condition 10 be discharged.

- Our concerns in relation to access for the pond into which the proposed surface water drainage network discharges has been addressed through the provision of additional information stating how the pond will be accessed for maintenance.
- Recommend a maintenance plan is provided to the landowner of the pond (pond owner has riparian responsibilities)
- We also consider that justification has now been provided for proposing to discharge from the site at a rate greater than the existing greenfield rates for the lower return period storms due to the risk of blockage of the outfall.
- The applicant has now justified that the risk of flooding will not increase as a result of the development.
- Maintain concerns of permeable paving as to whether the infiltration rates used are representative of the infiltration rate at the base of the permeable paving across the site. The infiltration testing has been relatively deep and may misrepresent the actual infiltration rate. The LPA should consider if there is a mechanism through which infiltration testing can be confirmed on site through building control procedures. The applicant has shown the expected route should the drainage system become exceeded. Should the infiltration rate be lower than used in the calculation there is the potential for exceedance to occur at lower return period events.
- In terms of maintenance of permeable paving, the proposals in this regard are noted and the LPA should determine whether these are sufficient (shared responsibility of a shared driveways by homeowners)

3.6 The Hingham Society

Original comments
Recommend refusal. No indication of where the surface water will be discharged to after it leaves the tank. We have no information about what the plans mean nor any comments from relevant experts therefore we strongly recommend the application is refused. Suggest the applicant re-applies with the relevant information. There is serious concern about the increased risk of flooding these developments will bring.

Comments on amended details
Anglia Water has not provided a solution to the current drainage problem, let alone the challenge of 90 additional houses. We support the construction of new houses in the town but drainage must be solved before the houses are allowed to be built. Do not want to be presented with a fait accompli and then have to live with the consequences.
3.7 Anglian Water Services Ltd

No comments received

3.8 Other Representations

7 letters of objection (including 3 from one household), 1 letter of support (no comment) and 2 letters comments (summarised):

- Cannot really comment as we do not understand the implications but consider that this should have been sorted before planning permission was granted
- Concern about some of the road gullies (plots 22-25) as they could surcharge and impact on existing properties - request a barrier is constructed at the lower end of the parking area adjoining properties as a protective measure against this eventuality
- No allowance has been made for Anglian Water to adopt any overflow pipework from this pond nor is any such pipework shown on the drainage plan. I consider this could place my property and others at risk of flooding
- Original plans incorrectly showed all land down to Seamere Road to be in the same ownership - this is not the case and there is no direct land link to Seamere Road
- The meeting minutes to discuss the proposals were not agreed as a correct record of the meeting
- The attenuation tank is remote from the development
- The discharge to the pond will be far more than the existing flow into the pond from natural run-off
- The multiple sources of water entering the pond will increase the volume and flow rate entering the pond compared to present
- Proposals for the on-going maintenance of the various elements of the drainage system are impractical
- I will potentially become responsible for the for the penultimate section of the drainage network because it flows beneath my land
- Relocating the outlet pipe to a lower level than before the additional volume obtained by deepening the pond will not be effective as buffer storage
- If additional buffer storage is required the attenuation tank should be larger and its outlet piped directly to the surface water network in accordance with Policy HIN1
- Have the following been investigated: the AW undertaking to upgrade the pumping station on Seamere Road, silting of the pipework into the pumping station, existing drainage issues on Bears Lane, existing inadequate drainage infrastructure and the public health, social and environmental issues associated with the above
4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The site benefits from a full planning permission as varied by reference 2015/1675 for 88 dwellings.

4.2 The application seeks to vary condition 10 of the approved consent 2015/1675 in order to allow a revised drainage strategy for the site.

4.3 The application is a variation of condition rather than a discharge of condition as the original condition was specific in that “If infiltration drainage is found not to be appropriate, modelling shall be submitted to demonstrate that the runoff will be restricted into the Anglian Water sewer at a rate of no more than 5 l/s.” Since the water is not discharged into the Anglian Water sewer, it is to the ditch network, the variation of condition is required.

4.4 Further details of the strategy are set out in the drainage section below.

4.5 The overall development site comprises approximately 3.7ha of agricultural land. It lies south of Norwich Road to the east of Hingham, immediately adjacent to existing residential development on Norwich Road to the north and Bears Lane to the west.

4.6 A ditch and public footpath mark the eastern boundary, beyond which is open farmland. The proposed southern boundary is an arbitrary line within the existing agricultural field. There is a pronounced slope across the site with the land dropping away from north-east to south-east.

4.7 Whilst not forming part of the application site, the applicant's land ownership is shown to extend to the south of the site towards Seamere Road to the south (but with the exception of a small area to the south-west of the overall parcel ownership does not reach the boundary with Seamere Road).

Drainage

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

4.9 The original surface water strategy involved all surface water to be addressed by infiltration, with houses draining to private or shared soakaways, driveways to permeable paving and highways to large soakaways in the public open space. Both the Environment Agency and the Council’s Flood Officer confirmed that this approach was acceptable subject to a condition for a detailed surface water scheme to be agreed prior to the commencement of development including further infiltration testing, modelling and details of ownership, management and maintenance of the surface water system.

4.10 Detailed infiltration testing was undertaken post decision as required by the condition, which established that ground conditions for this strategy were not suitable in all areas of the development and as such a revised strategy was required. As such the current application seeks to vary the original drainage condition to enable a revised drainage strategy to be agreed.

4.11 The revised strategy still involves the majority of surface water being dealt with by means of infiltration on site. However, surface water from 10% of the site area (being the adopted highways) will be piped to the south of the field, attenuated and subsequently discharged at a restricted rate of 5 l/s into the pond and onward to the ditch network using the riparian rights available. Appendix 2 demonstrates where this ditch network is located in relation to the site.
4.12 The pipes and attenuation system down to the pond will be formally adopted by NCC (Highways) by means of a Section 38 agreement. NCC has confirmed their agreement in principle to the adoption and drawings are currently going through technical approval prior to the legal agreement being drafted and signed.

4.13 The applicants have advised that they will desilt the pond, as currently there is very little holding capacity, as the bottom of the pond is at the same level as the outflow pipe. By desilting the pond the existing capacity will be increased.

4.14 The outfall pipe which runs from the pond into the ditch will be replaced by the applicant, as agreed with the land owner whose land the pipe runs through.

4.15 No Anglian Water assets are being affected by this proposal.

4.16 Concerns had been raised by the Lead Local Flood Authority regarding the capacity and arrangements of using the pond to discharge the surface water into. Additional information was provided which have now addressed these concerns and the LLFA has advised the strategy in this respect is acceptable.

4.17 The LLFA had requested details of the exceedance flow routes across the site which has been provided to the satisfaction of the LLFA.

4.18 Maintenance of the pond (which is a riparian responsibility of the owner of the pond) was raised by the LLFA. As the pond is to be desilted and cleared of debris and access will be maintained for the owner to keep this clear, the LLFA are satisfied in this respect.

4.19 Maintenance of the shared permeable driveways was a concern of the LLFA. They have now confirmed they are satisfied subject to the LPA being satisfied. The applicant has advised that the maintenance of the permeable paving will be included as an obligation on the home owner within the transfer. As part of the handover pack, guidance will be given on the maintenance of the permeable driveways in accordance with Environment Agency guidance. This is considered sufficient to ensure as required by the NPPF that there are suitable management and maintenance measures in place.

4.20 Overall the LLFA has confirmed that there is no objection and that the applicant has justified that the risk of flooding will not increase as a result of the development. One concern still remains that relates to the proposed permeable paving and whether there is adequate infiltration at the base of the permeable paving across the site. The LLFA advise that the infiltration testing has been relatively deep and may misrepresent the actual infiltration rate. It advises that “the LPA should consider if there is a mechanism through which infiltration testing can be confirmed on site through building control procedures. The applicant has shown the expected route should the drainage system become exceeded. Should the infiltration rate be lower than used in the calculation there is the potential for exceedance to occur at lower return period events.”

4.21 The applicants have advised that the infiltration tests were carried out at a high level, maximum depth of 1m below existing ground level. The high level infiltration test showed that the soils in the upper strata are within the parameters utilised for soakage, however they did not prove that soakage was effective at the depths a conventional soakaway would usually be installed. As this was the situation and the original strategy utilised conventional soakaways, further testing was carried out to determine infiltration was possible at depth. These later results, which gave a better coverage of the site although being slightly worse than the high level tests were utilised to size the permeable paving and ensure that sufficient capacity was allowed to contain the 1:100 year + 30% event. As such they consider that the soakage required for permeable paving at a high level would be satisfactory on this development.
4.22 Further comments from the LLFA are awaited in this respect and members will be updated at committee. The LPA should be satisfied that the infiltration rate is acceptable and officers consider that a condition requiring verification of infiltration by building control as suggested by the LLFA would not be appropriate.

4.23 Overall therefore in respect of the amended strategy, subject to the final matter of infiltration being agreed at the high level to ensure this is adequate to accommodate the permeable paving, the strategy is considered acceptable by the LLFA and the LPA and would meet the requirements of policy DM4.2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policy 1 of the JCS and NPPF section 10.

Other matters

4.24 The application seeks to vary condition 10 (drainage) only of the already varied consent 2015/1675. There have been no material changes to the site or planning policy that affect the principles and details already established by the grant of that consent and as such it is only the drainage matter that is for detailed consideration.

4.25 In respect of impact on the setting of the nearby listed buildings and conservation area, the proposal does not affect these and the council’s previous assessment of the impacts to the heritage assets is therefore unchanged.

4.26 Application 2014/2322 was the subject of an EIA screening application which concluded that the application was not EIA development and no ES was required. The amendments now sought do not warrant an ES in their own right, they do not result in any significant impacts on the environment and so neither do they alter the council’s previous conclusion that an ES is not required.

4.27 Therefore overall and on balance the proposed details are considered acceptable, to accord with the Development plan and are recommended for approval.

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

4.29 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Relevant CIL liability notices have been issued pursuant to the original full consent 2014/2322, and no further liability notice would be required as this application does not increase the floorspace of development permitted.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposed drainage strategy as amended, subject to final agreement in respect of infiltration for the permeable paving, is considered an acceptable and to accord with policy DM4.2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policy 1 of the JCS and NPPF 10.

5.2 Delegated authority is sought to approve this variation of condition subject to resolving the final infiltration with the LLFA.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tracy Lincoln 01508 533814 tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Appendix 2
3. Appl. No: 2015/2496/F
Parish: DISS

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

Recommendation: Approval with conditions

1. Time limit
2. In accordance with plans
3. Highway requirements
4. Detailed construction management plan to be agreed & adhered to
5. Retention of trees and hedgerows
6. Landscaping scheme and management plan, including provision and maintenance details of open space and play areas
7. Reporting of unexpected contamination
8. Renewable energy – 10%
9. Water efficiency
10. Materials as in materials schedule
11. Surface water drainage to be agreed
12. Foul water to mains system
13. Ecological Assessment recommendations to be adhered to
14. Fire hydrant provision

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

1. Planning Policies

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4: Housing delivery
Policy 6: Access and Transportation
Policy 7: Supporting Communities
Policy 13: Main Towns

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development
DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.3: Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design
Site Specific Allocations and Policies
DIS 4: Land north of Frenze Hall Lane

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History
None

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council
Amended plans: Comments awaited and to be updated at Committee.
Object on grounds of Highways/traffic, medical provision, school capacity, overlooking, positioning of affordable housing, landscaping buffers, maintenance of open spaces

3.2 District Members
Cllr Kiddie
Contentious development and therefore should go to Development Management Committee, the main issues are no extra provision for infrastructure and there are concerns surrounding how construction traffic will reach the site

Cllr Palmer
Concerns on infrastructure and traffic flow and therefore should be determined by the Development Management Committee

Cllr Minshull
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd
No objection subject to a condition.

3.4 SNC Design Officer
No further comments except:

(1) The NW parking court for units 24-27 remains of some concern with regard to overlooking, although it is good that the tandem parking has been removed - although the Tiveton does appear to have a side window overlooking the space (albeit an obscure glazed one.) Also (subject to landscaping) it may feel overlooked by 101/102.

(2) I am concerned that two out of three windows in the amended Morden design will be obscure glazed - this will make the front elevation, which already has quite small windows, appear unattractive and slightly 'alienating' in the streetscene. Investigate possibility to switch the stairs and create a first floor lobby - with the bathroom along the side wall, and the left hand window moved over slightly to illuminate the stairwell. The kitchen window could also be widened to have two lights.
3.5 **NCC Ecologist**
The Ecological Appraisal is fit for purpose. I support their recommendation that the hedgerows should be retained and enhanced as far as possible. Their conclusion that with appropriate mitigation and enhancement, the proposed development could have limited impact on ecology appears to be reasonable. Given this, for a development of this size I would expect a full Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP) to be conditioned as part of the decision, should you be minded to approve this application. The Landscape Officer has made comments regarding the hedgerow, which we support, given that the Ecological Appraisal recommended that the hedgerows be retained and enhanced as far as possible.

3.6 **SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team**
To be reported if appropriate

3.7 **NCC Highways**
Amended plans: comments waited and to be reported to committee.

Previous proposal:
Further amendments and additional information required on management and maintenance, construction traffic routes and other highway details.

3.8 **SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager**
No objection

3.9 **NHS England**
Request that a financial contribution is paid towards funding expanded healthcare premises servicing the residents of this development. Assuming the above is considered in conjunction with the current application process, NHS England would not wish to raise an objection to the proposed development. Otherwise the Local Planning Authority may wish to review the development’s sustainability if such impacts are not satisfactorily mitigated. NHS England is satisfied that the basis and value of the developer contribution sought is consistent with the policy and tests for imposing planning obligations set out in the NPPF.

3.10 **Norfolk And Waveney Local Medical Council**
No comments received

3.11 **NCC Lead Local Flood Authority**
This application falls below our current threshold for providing detailed comment. This is because the proposal is for less than 250 dwellings or 5 ha in size and is not within a surface water flow path as defined by Environment Agency mapping. If you are aware of a particular surface water flooding issue at this location which requires further bespoke advice, please re-consult detailing the perceived nature of flooding or details of flooding that has occurred.

SNC should satisfy yourself that the applicant has demonstrated compliance with;
The National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") paragraph 103 by ensuring that the proposal would not increase flood risk elsewhere.

Written Ministerial Statement HCWS 161 by ensuring that Sustainable Drainage Systems for the management of run-off are put in place.

The applicant should also demonstrate how the proposal accords with national standards and relevant guidance. If the proposal does not accord with these the applicant should state their reasoning and the implications of not doing so.

3.12 Norfolk Fire Service

No objection subject to fire hydrants being provided.

3.13 SNC Landscape Officer

Amended plans: comments to be updated to committee.

Previous proposal:

Unfortunately many of my previous concerns still stand. The revised plan has more in the way of indicative planting and landscape design, but for a ‘full’ application of this scale it is still disappointing; it would be good to have a stronger concept at this stage. The large area of open space now has more of a definite function, but there is still much that could be done. The landscape buffer along the east side of the site does not conform to the requirement in policy DIS4 in that it is less than 10m wide. The addition of a path reduces scope for planting the strip also.

The arboricultural assessment has not been revised in response to my previous comments. I am still concerned about the best/most interesting existing tree - an old oak pollard (T2) at the south east corner of the site – as the proposed drainage lagoon still appears to encroach upon the identified root protection area for this tree (the scheme appears to have been designed prior to the arboricultural constraints being established). Furthermore, a footpath has been added to link to the road. We also need to be sure that this tree will not be inadvertently compromised by any consequent highways works here.

The proposed road access to Frenze Hall Lane breaches the existing hedgerow; this feature is subject to the Hedgerows Regulations but no assessment against the criteria of the Regulations appears to have been undertaken. The submitted Ecology report states that this hedge is “an intact, species-rich hedgerow”. Policy DM 4.8 presumes in favour of the retention of ‘important’ hedgerows so we need to have more information about this feature.

The required landscape buffer to the north (as required by DIS4 will have the potential to provide a visual softening of the development from Walcot Green, but we need to make sure that any planting does not become too overbearing for the dwellings that are adjacent to it. These all currently have north-facing gardens, and the combination of aspect and maturing vegetation could make the plots unduly oppressive. It is disappointing that the northern landscape buffer does not connect more to the other green space on site – currently the ‘connectivity’ is limited.
I still do not consider that the scheme should be approved as it stands. Further information is required, and it appears that a better scheme is achievable.

3.14 NCC Planning Obligations Co-Ordinator

No objection.

There is sufficient education capacity within the town. Fire hydrants per 50 dwellings are required. Library provision required via CIL. Connections into the local Green Infrastructure (GI) network, including Public Rights of Way and ecological features, should be considered alongside the potential impacts of development. Mitigation should therefore be included within the site proposal. Maintenance/mitigation for new and existing GI features may require a contribution or commuted sum in order to allow the local GI network to facilitate the development without receiving negative impact and equally, allow the development to integrate and enhance the existing network.

3.15 NCC Minerals And Waste Planning Officer

No comments received

3.16 Norfolk Police

Amended plans: comments waited and to be updated to committee.

Previous proposal:
Concerns in relation to the allocated rear car parking allocations for plots 50-53; 82 – 85 and 90-96 - positioned at the rear of the gardens will little natural or informal surveillance available. Also the parking court for plots # 23-28 and 101 -103 leaves the area quite permeable, and it is not clear if access can be gained to the parking court for 90-96 too.

3.17 Other Representations

The consultation period on the amended plans had not expired at the time of this report being written, any further comments will be updated to the committee.

Richard Bacon MP

- SNC must ensure they deliver the requirements set out in the criteria within the allocation. The proposed housing numbers are in excess of the figure in the allocation DIS4. I would urge the Council to carefully consider the reasonable concerns and points raised by the Town Council and use stringent conditions and obligation where required. I also share the concerns in respect of local GPs and the impacts this new development will have. Disappointed that the scheme does not make provision for serviced plots to facilitate self-build homes.

Diss Medical Centre

- lack of local health care provision

Parish Fields Practice Patient Participation Group

- Concerned at the lack of impact analysis on health services and infrastructure and a lack of funding to help facilitate funding to extend health centre, already aware of other housing schemes which will add further pressure.

Lawns Medical Practice

- SNC need to take into account increasing demands when existing space is inadequate
95 letters of objections and a petition received objecting against the development. A summary of the concerns raised is as follows:

- Insufficient community infrastructure within the town to cope with additional demand brought about by the proposal including health/medical facilities, dentist, schools
- Investment in the town is required
- The development is in the wrong location for the town
- Number of houses should be reduced
- Surface water drainage concerns
- Construction traffic management concerns giving limited local highway infrastructure
- Unacceptable increase in traffic
- Noise issues for existing residents from increased traffic
- Access arrangements are not acceptable.
- Road needs widening.
- Falcon avenue will be a rat run
- Overlooking of existing neighbours
- The scheme is overbearing
- Not sustainable, The scheme is out of character with the locality
- Suitable footpath provision needs to be provided to link into the wider community
- Car lights from access would shine into properties opposite

4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The site consists of a 4.7ha rectangular shaped parcel of agricultural land on the edge of Diss. The site is bordered by the Frenze Hall Lane carriageway to the south and the Walcot Green carriageway to the east. Both of these boundaries presently have existing sporadic hedging and vegetation. The north of the site is further open agricultural land. The west of the site there are existing residential dwellings on (Falcon Avenue, Hawk Crescent and Peregrine Close). There is further residential development to the south beyond the Frenze Hall Lane carriageway.

4.2 The application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 142 dwellings with accompanying garaging and parking consisting of the following mix of properties:

4.3 Open market housing
- 11 x 2 bedroom houses
- 16 x 4 bedroom houses
- 56 x 3 bedroom houses
- 12 x 5 bedroom houses

4.4 Affordable housing
- Social Rented
  - 19 x 1 bedroom houses
  - 6 x 3 bedroom houses
  - 14 x 2 bedroom houses
  - 1 x 5 bedroom house
- Shared Equity
  - 4 x 2 bedroom houses
  - 3 x 3 bedroom houses

4.5 The layout has two points of access, one via Frenze Hall Lane to the south of the site and the other onto Falcon Avenue to the west. A key feature of the layout is a large open space running from east to west along the southern part of the site. The scheme proposes a 10m landscape buffer along the northern perimeter of the site with new planting along the other three site boundaries to supplement the existing sporadic nature of vegetation in these areas.
Key planning issues

4.6 The site is covered by Policy DIS4 of the Adopted Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document and as such it is appropriate to consider the scheme in the context of this allocation.

4.7 Policy DIS4 states that:

*Land amounting to some 4.7 hectares is allocated for housing. This allocation could accommodate approximately 125 dwellings. The developers of the site will be required to provide the following:*

1. improved footpath links to local schools and the town centre;
2. two separate points of road access;
3. approximately 10m landscape belt along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site
4. Contribution towards protection and enhancement of green infrastructure along Frenze Brook, including enhancement of the County Wildlife Sites and adjacent land currently used for informal access. All green infrastructure should be integrated with that of surrounding sites;
5. Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place;
6. Appropriate layout, taking account of water mains and sewers crossing the site.

4.8 The development proposes 142 houses on the site. Members should note that this is greater than the figure quoted in the allocation (see above).

4.9 However in considering the resultant impact of this, it is necessary to have regard to the following material considerations:

4.10 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.

4.11 The scheme proposed meets the requirements of criterion a) as it is an allocated site and the 142 dwellings proposed is considered appropriate given the towns status as a main town in the plan subject to form, character and servicing constraints and therefore complies in principle with the requirements of b).

4.12 Furthermore, 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;

4.13 In terms of para 58, providing 142 dwellings on the site, with a wide range of dwelling sizes and tenure types, still affords the layout to provide a significant area of open space that would be a positive feature within the scheme and to immediate residents beyond the application site. The scheme also proposes suitably sized private amenity spaces to accompany each property and on-site parking predominantly with on-plot parking, with a total of 242 parking spaces. On this basis it is considered that the scheme does make
4.14 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 142 dwellings is not unacceptable, subject to the scheme satisfying the stated criterion set out within the allocation and all relevant planning policies in respect of matters such as design, neighbour amenity, highway safety etc. An assessment of the scheme, against the above is as follows:

4.15 The first criterion within the allocation requires

*improved footpath links to local schools and the town centre;*

4.16 The proposed layout makes provision for footpath links throughout it allowing easy movement across the entire site. The scheme also makes provision for footpath links into the adjacent residential development via Falcon Avenue and provides a new section of footpath to the site frontage onto Frenze Hall Lane and two crossing points across the carriageway allow the scheme to link positively to the existing footpath provision which allows for access into the town centre beyond.

4.17 The second criterion requires:

*two separate points of road access;*

4.18 The scheme provides for two accesses, one connecting into the adjacent Falcon Avenue and a new access onto Frenze Hall Lane. There has been considerable objection and representations made to the access arrangements for the site, including suggested alternatives for accessing the site including:

4.19 Creating an access onto Walcot Green, closing the access onto Falcon Avenue, having two accesses onto Frenze Hall Lane

4.20 It is clear that there would be a number of options available in access terms that would satisfy highway safety requirements, and the requirements of the allocation, and be acceptable to the Highway Authority. However, the Council is required to consider the merits of the scheme as submitted in planning terms. On this basis it is evident that the proposal is considered acceptable by the Highway Authority insofar as the arrangement would not compromise highway safety or the free flow of traffic.

4.21 The third criterion

*approximately 10m landscape belt along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site*

4.22 The layout as proposed makes provision for the rear gardens of the dwellings in the northern part of the site to back onto the northern boundary and as such a 10m landscape buffer is provided to provide a green edge to the extended settlement. This is considered important in that it would screen the boundary treatments that will form the rear boundary of the new properties in the northern part of the site and it would also offer a suitable transition to the countryside beyond.

4.23 The eastern boundary of the site abuts the Walcot Green carriageway which provides an opportunity to make a positive contribution in a more visible part of the site. On this basis it is considered beneficial to have a layout that faces outwards onto the carriageway in the same way that the existing properties on the development to the south of Frenze Hall Lane do, and in doing so create continuous frontage along Frenze Hall Lane and then Walcot Green. In doing so, it was considered preferable to still provide some form of green edge.
which would offer glimpses through to the houses beyond rather than creating a dense landscape buffer which entirely screens the development, and would thereby fail to provide any sense of presence onto Walcot Green. On this basis the layout makes provision for new planting to supplement the existing planting along the eastern boundary of the site. The green edge along the eastern boundary would also have ecological benefits in providing a link into the landscape buffer to the north and the open countryside beyond.

4.24 Whilst not a material consideration in the assessment of the application, reference has been made to the potential future development of the land to the north should the need arise in the future. A tree belt along the eastern boundary would potentially make this difficult given the acknowledged need to widen Walcot Green to facilitate such a scheme, however, it should be stressed that the land to the north is not allocated for any form of development in the current adopted plans and does not benefit from any extant planning permission for development.

4.25 The fourth criterion

*Contribution towards protection and enhancement of green infrastructure along Frenze Brook, including enhancement of the County Wildlife Sites and adjacent land currently used for informal access. All green infrastructure should be integrated with that of surrounding sites;*

4.26 The position of the open space coupled with the vegetation to be provided along the northern, eastern and southern boundaries would help to assist in integrating the site into the wider locality in terms of green infrastructure. In terms of contributions towards green infrastructure, it is considered that a financial contribution proportionate to the nature of the scheme can be provided as part of the S106 legal agreement.

4.27 The fifth criterion

*Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place;*

4.28 Anglian Water has been consulted and confirmed that there is sufficient capacity to deal with wastewater.

4.29 The final criterion

*Appropriate layout, taking account of water mains and sewers crossing the site.*

4.30 The proposed layout has been the subject of revisions to address concerns raised by a number of consultees and third party representations. The proposed layout establishes a large open space onto Frenze Hall Lane which is framed by dwellings facing out onto it and also relates well to the existing dwellings to the south of the Frenze Hall Lane carriageway which all face towards the open space. The open space also extends northwards into the site thereby increasing its connectivity and accessibility across the site. The scheme provides for a number of footpaths across the open space and between the north and western part of the site and to the eastern boundary so as to offer good permeability and accessibility across the site and beyond. The scheme provides for a new green edge to both the north and east of the site which make positive contributions to the rural edge of the town. The layout along the western perimeter has sought to minimise the impacts upon the adjacent existing residential estate through re-positioning and re-orientating proposed dwellings so that the majority have gable ends facing westwards. The scheme has been amended in line with a number of suggestions made by the Council’s Senior Conservation and Design Officer. There remain two outstanding points in respect of the Senior Conservation and Design Officer as set out in their comments in the consultation section of this report relating to a parking court and one of the house types. Discussions are ongoing in respect of these two points and updates will be made to the committee as
necessary, however, it is not considered that these would represent reasons for refusing the application. The linear nature of the layout of development on the northern boundary has also been considered. Whilst this does appear linear in layout there are some variations to the building line. The use of landscaping too has softened the appearance. The orientation of dwellings in the north west corner of the site were amended to address overlooking concerns, which has led to the final proposed layout as well. On balance the design of this section of the site could be improved but it is not considered that this would merit refusal of the application for the above reasons. A Building for Life score will be updated to the committee.

4.31 In terms of the six stated criterion within the allocation, it is considered that the scheme has satisfied all of these requirements.

4.32 Given the contents of paragraph 49 of the NPPF it is necessary to determine whether the scheme represents sustainable development having regards to the content of the NPPF. Sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. The NPPF goes on to stress in paragraph 8 that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.

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

**Economic Role**

4.34 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."

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

**Social Role**

4.36 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."

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

4.38 The social role highlights the need for housing to appropriate access to a range of accessible local services.
Significant concern has been expressed locally in respect of the lack of infrastructure available within the town including schools, and medical facilities.

In terms of school capacity, NCC has been consulted in their capacity as local education authority and they have confirmed that they have confirmed that there is sufficient capacity at Infant, Junior and High School levels. On this basis no request for financial assistance in the form of CIL contributions would be required towards education.

In terms of medical facilities, the capacity of GP surgeries is a matter which is to be considered by the practice itself. If any further expansion is required to GP practices the council will of course work in a positive and proactive manner to facilitate this growth where possible. However, due to the nature of GP surgeries and the funding mechanisms, monies from developers cannot directly be secured for a GP surgery as they are in effect a private company. This does not mean that the Council will not work closely with the GP surgery, but money from developers cannot be secured to run what is in effect a private company. This is an issue which is reflected nationally and a key concern for the Council, but we are working closely with GP practices to assist discussions on expansions where we can.

By way of background, the wider issue of health is of key concern to the council, and through its work the council is seeking to ensure good health is promoted for its residents. At an early stage in the planning of the strategic housing for South Norfolk, the Primary Care Trust were involved in the discussions over where significant new housing was proposed to be located. In going through these discussions the capacity of existing healthcare facilities were considered. The Council will also continue to engage with NHS England and South Norfolk Clinical Commissioning Group to allow them to coordinate their investment to ensure services can accommodate growth.

In terms of the affordable housing provision, Policy 4 of the JCS requires 33% of the total number of units to be affordable, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not viable to do so. In this instance the scheme proposes that 47 of the 142 units would be affordable (33%) and is therefore considered acceptable. The dwellings are provided in several locations integrated across the site. These would be secured as part of the S106 legal agreement. The proposed tenure split is considered to be acceptable by the Council’s Housing Enabling and Strategy Manager.

The social role also seeks to secure a high quality built environment. The site layout and house types have been subject to revisions during the application process following discussions with the applicant, as set out above in paragraph 4.30 above, and is considered to now represent an appropriate layout in planning terms.

Safeguarding residential amenity is also considered to be part of securing a high quality built environment. It is considered that following revisions to the scheme the relationship between the existing dwellings and the proposed properties, particularly those existing neighbouring properties to the west of the application site, 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. The proposed dwellings to the west predominantly face blank gable ends to the existing neighbours 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.

It is considered that the scheme does satisfy the social role as defined within the NPPF and also 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.
Environmental Role

4.47 The NPPF confirms the environmental role as:

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

Ecology and Protected Species

4.48 The application is supported by an ecological appraisal which is regarded as fit for purpose by Norfolk County Council's Natural Environment Team subject to a condition requiring compliance with the requirements of the aforementioned report.

4.49 There are no immediate heritage assets that would be affected by the proposal.

4.50 In terms of the environmental role, it is considered the scheme fulfils this role.

4.51 Having due regard to the above assessment in relation to sustainable development, it is considered that the development fulfils the three roles as defined within the NPPF and would not result in any adverse impact that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of delivering housing on this allocated site. It is therefore considered to represent a sustainable development.

Other issues

4.52 Further comments are awaited in respect of the amended layout and additional information from the SNC Landscape Officer in respect of landscaping, tree implications and hedgerow removal and as such will be reported via the update report.

4.54 Concern has been expressed at the potential surface water drainage implications of the scheme. The Council has consulted the LLFA and they indicated that as this scheme falls below the current threshold for the Lead Local Flood Authority to provide comments (although it should be noted they are the statutory consultee on such matters) and as such do not wish to provide detailed comments.

4.55 Anglian Water's response indicates that they are satisfied that a condition be used to secure a surface water scheme prior to the commencement of development, which includes details of management and maintenance.

4.56 The submitted scheme indicates the use of permeable surfacing where possible, and an attenuation pond in the south-eastern part of the site both of which are consistent with a SUDS approach.

4.57 It is therefore considered that subject to a condition as referred to above, that the impacts from surface water can be properly dealt with.

Access and Highways

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

4.59 Significant concern has been raised surrounding resultant traffic from the development and the impacts this would have on the local highway network and also in respect of the detrimental impact that construction traffic would have on the local highway network throughout the construction phase given the local limitation within the local highway network, for example, the adjacent railway bridge is the subject of a height restriction.
In terms of the resulting traffic, the Highway Authority are satisfied that the two access arrangement as proposed provide appropriate visibility and capacity so as to not compromise the functioning of the local highway network.

4.60 In terms of construction traffic management, the developer has produced a construction traffic management document to set out how it envisages the project to be managed from a traffic perspective. This is currently being assessed the Highway Authority and their comments will be provided to the Committee via the update report.

4.61 In summary, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable, subject to positive consideration of the construction traffic management document by the Highway Authority and the inclusion suitable worded highway conditions including off-site works relating to the creation of a traffic light system adjacent to the railway bridge which in turn complements the off-site works to provide a footpath and road widening on Frenze Hall Lane agreed under the existing development to the south of Frenze Hall Lane which are due to be started shortly.

4.62 There has also been concern expressed at the potentially detrimental impact of car lights shining into existing dwelling to the south immediately opposite the proposed new access onto Frenze Hall Lane. As a consequence of this issue, the revised layout has slightly revised the access position so that hose cars waiting at the junction to turn right would face towards the gap between the detached properties opposite rather than directly onto any property. It is considered that the level of nuisance caused by the access in terms of car headlights would not be so significant as to justify a reason for refusal on amenity grounds.

Contamination

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

4.64 Sustainable construction/renewable energy

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

4.65 Section 106 Agreement and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

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

Financial Considerations

4.66 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).
4.67 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 for this application as self-build has been identified as the method of delivering the site. Whilst an indication of self-build has been given by the applicant it should also be noted that at this stage it cannot be certain that the method of delivering this site will be self-build. In the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

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

5 Conclusion

5.1 The principle of residential development is acceptable on this site allocation (DIS4) and is considered to represent a sustainable form of development. It is considered that the proposals as amended, results in a scheme that delivers a high quality design and layout which is well considered for its rural edge location and relates satisfactorily to its surroundings. The scheme provides for safe vehicular access arrangements and would safeguard the amenities of existing residents. Subject to confirmation on the acceptability of the construction traffic route it is therefore considered that the requirements of the relevant policies of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan have been met subject to the imposition of conditions and a S106 obligation the application is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Raine 01508 533841 craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No**: 2016/0165/O  
**Parish**: SCOLE

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

**Recommendation**: Refusal

1. Outside of development boundary  
2. Unsustainable development  
3. Insufficient justification  
4. Harmful to heritage assets  
5. Unacceptable impact on trees  
6. Inadequate Flood Risk Assessment

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 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 7: Supporting Communities  
Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment  
Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM3.15: Outdoor play facilities/recreational space  
DM3.16: Improving level of community facilities  
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.8: Protection of Trees and Hedgerows  
DM4.10: Heritage Assets

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012
1.5 Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas: S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”
S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”

2. Planning History

2.1 2015/0436 Construction 18 no. dwellings and access road, village hall and parking, open space recreation and wildlife areas

Refused

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Support
- Previous comments still apply
- Any changes however small must be returned to the Parish Council

3.2 District Member To Committee
- scheme will be of huge significant benefit to the community

3.3 Police Architectural Liaison Officer
- the cul-de-sac design shown on the proposed Housing Block Plan is good for crime prevention providing good surveillance
- concern over two rear parking courts
- cycle parking for hall should be relocated and be provided as secure parking

3.4 Anglian Water Services Ltd No objection
- Diss Water Recycling Centre and local sewerage system has capacity for this development

3.5 NCC Ecologist Conditional support
- although the supporting information is barely fit for purpose due to its poor quality and a number of inconsistencies, from our own assessment it is likely that there would only be limited ecological impacts
- any approval should include a condition requiring a reptile survey and a full Ecological Management Plan to be agreed

3.6 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team Conditional support

3.7 NCC Highways Conditional support

3.8 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager Object
- no housing grounds have been raised for JCS Policy 4 not being applied to this site
- Strategic Housing cannot therefore support a development proposal that would provide no affordable housing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Department/Officer</th>
<th>Comments/Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>SNC Environmental Waste Strategy</td>
<td>To be reported if appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>SNC Water Management Officer</td>
<td>Holding objection - the submitted Flood Risk Assessment does not concur with the current proposal in the number of dwellings or the layout of the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>NHS England</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>NCC Lead Local Flood Authority</td>
<td>Standing advice on surface water management good practice and standards - Do not wish to provide detailed comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Norfolk Fire Service</td>
<td>Conditional support - fire hydrant to be provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>SNC Conservation &amp; Design Officer</td>
<td>Refuse - generally recommended not to grant outline consent if there is uncertainty with regard to any harm which may result to heritage assets - it is still uncertain as to whether a well-designed development can be achieved which is also sufficiently sensitive to the setting of the heritage assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>SNC Landscape Officer</td>
<td>Object - proposed hall building breaches the root protection area of a sycamore tree and the proposed car park also breaches the root protection area of trees on the site, which was a reason for refusal on planning application 2015/0436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>Historic England</td>
<td>- St Andrews Church is of major architectural and historical interest, the application site forms much of its immediate setting - proposed development would not reflect traditional linear development along Norwich Road and therefore would not preserve or enhance the conservation area - development would result in harm to the significance of the heritage assets in terms of paras 132 and 134 of the NPPF - as required by para 134, the Council should also weigh any public benefit from the development against this harm. If clear and convincing justification is not found then the application should be refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>Historic Environment Service</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>Norfolk County Council Flood &amp; Water Management</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>Norfolk And Waveney Local Medical Council</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.22 Other Representations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 letters of support</td>
<td>12 letters of objection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Support**:
  - will provide a place for our community to meet
  - we are an active village and this will keep the community together
  - our community needs an up to date meeting facility more than it needs social housing, and this is a once in a lifetime opportunity
  - survey of households in Scole area with 86.5% responding resulted in 482 households voting in favour and only 24 against
  - hall is proposed in a central location
  - our parish is surrounded by communities of lesser number of residents who have their adequate meeting places
  - the existing sports pavilion is not adequate for all of the village needs
  - note that the planning officer argues that the provision of a village hall is not guaranteed but this is the only viable offer
  - remaining funding can be provided by match funding
  - the parking will also be of great benefit to relieve parking problems caused by parents taking their children to school
  - it will enhance the area
  - the site has been derelict for decades and is an eyesore covered in weeds and overgrown brambles
  - the green space, wildlife area and storm water pond are an indication of a sensitive proposal and one that has resisted filling every square metre with high density housing
  - cannot believe the root protection area of a sycamore tree is an acceptable reason for refusal as this is not a valuable species
  - view that the development would be harmful to the setting of the church is the view of people who do not live in Scole
  - the benefits of the new hall far outweigh any perceived harm to the setting of the church
  - new homes opposite Scole Inn caused lots of concern initially but now seen as a good addition to the village

- **Objection**:
  - no need for village hall as there already is a community centre in the village
  - would have a negative impact on the two public houses in the village within the conservation area and directly opposite the village which will drastically change the outlook
  - concerns regarding flooding on Low Road worse
  - the geography of the land dictates any surface water from the proposed development drains onto Low Road which already cannot cope
  - Scole is one of the few beautiful little villages left in our area
  - seems like a waste of time and money to build the by-pass if development like this just brings more traffic into the village
  - lots of wildlife seen on the site
  - historic field patterns need to be taken into account
  - A140 is at higher point than the surrounding land at this point which may result in unacceptable noise and fumes to occupants of the dwellings
  - local doctors unlikely to be able to cope with the extra demand
  - strain on schools
  - no provision for first time low cost housing
  - no accessible bungalows within the development
  - concerned about noise and disturbance from village hall
  - overdevelopment of site
• overlooking from new dwellings on existing properties on Norwich Rd
• detrimental impact on users of public footpath that crosses the site

4 Assessment

Proposal and description

4.1 The application is a re-submission of a refused scheme (planning application ref: 2015/0436) for the construction of 17 dwellings with land provided for a new village hall with associated car park and recreation area and allotments. The revised scheme now submitted seeks to address some of the reasons for refusal, and also increases the number of dwellings to 18.

4.2 Vehicular access to the site is to be entirely from Norwich Road. This differs from the previously refused scheme in which two of the dwellings were to be accessed from Low Road. The access from Low Road was one of the reasons for which the previous application was refused.

4.3 The application indicates that the will be a mix of dwellings, ranging from 2x two bedroom houses, 7x three bedroom houses and 9x four or more bedroom houses. The application proposes no affordable housing. Whilst the application is an outline application with all matters reserved, an indicative layout for the site has been provided. The scheme proposes to provide an area of land to the Parish Council to facilitate the construction of a new village hall and £300,000 towards its delivery.

4.4 The site is 1.6 hectares of grassland located on the north-western edge of the village of Scole. The site falls from the north-east towards the south-west and is bordered by Norwich Road to the east and Low Road to the west. To the north-east of the site are neighbouring residential properties, whilst to the east are existing residential properties and the Grade II* St Andrew Church. To the south and south-west of the site are further residential properties. The site lies within the Scole Conservation Area and is also visible from the A140 Scole by-pass to the west.

Key planning issues

Policy background

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

4.6 The site lies outside of the development boundary for Scole. Policy DM1.3 states that permission for new development outside of defined development boundaries will only be granted if specific Development Management Policies allow for such development boundary or there are overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environmental dimensions as addressed in Policy DM1.1. There are no specific Development Management Policies that allow for open market housing outside of development boundaries.

4.7 As stated above it is also necessary to have regard for the NPPF in the decision-making process. Paragraph 49 confirms that in respect of housing proposals they:

"should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development"
4.8 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. It should be noted that Policy DM1.3 of the Local Plan referred to above also makes reference to the three roles of economic, social and environmental.

4.9 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF also confirms that:

"Relevant policies for the supply of land should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites."

4.10 Firstly, in respect of housing land supply, South Norfolk Council can demonstrate a 16.94 year supply within the rural area which is applicable to Scole, and as such its housing related policies are considered up to date.

4.11 Secondly, in terms of establishing whether the scheme represents sustainable development it is considered appropriate to assess the scheme in the context of the three roles set out in the NPPF, and this assessment should have regard to the other components of the scheme, namely the village hall land, amenity land and allotments in reaching a balanced view of whether the scheme is sustainable or not.

Economic implications

4.12 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 and innovation: and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure."

4.13 In the short term, the construction of 18 dwellings would make a contribution to the local economy through the construction work which could employ local tradesmen etc and acquisition of materials for their construction. Longer term, there would be some benefit from spending by occupants of the dwellings in local services such as the village shop.

4.14 In respect of the village hall, given that the application only proposes to deliver the site and a contribution towards the build costs the potential benefits in economic terms are unknown as there is no certainty that the hall would ultimately be delivered. The same applies to the economic benefits that the use of the hall would bring e.g. revenue from events held there. In summary, it is considered that the scheme would be of some economic benefit to the local area and meets local and national aspirations in this respect.

Social implications

4.15 The NPPF confirms the social role as:

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

4.16 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 assists with improved health. Paragraphs 47-55 highlight the need to deliver high quality housing. Paragraphs 69-78 highlight the need to promote healthy communities.
The provision of 18 dwellings would assist the supply of housing. However this is a relatively modest amount and would be delivered in an area in which the Council can demonstrate a housing land supply well in excess of 5 years. This limits the weight that can be given to the benefit of providing more housing in this location. The lack of any affordable housing within the scheme further diminishes the benefits of the scheme.

As previously stated, the scheme does not guarantee the delivery of the village hall and the associated recreation land and allotments. It would only provide the land to facilitate the village hall and proposes a moderate sum of money (£300,000) towards the scheme when seen in the context of what would be significant costs to deliver the village hall. The application does not provide any evidence that the remaining funding can be secured, stating that the proposal does however offer the ability for the village hall committee to show that the hall can be built and allows for them to go out for further sources of funding which without an outline approval would be impossible.

In addition to this uncertainty over the securing of additional funding, the Council's Property Consultant has raised some concerns about the financial viability information submitted. The appraisal appears flawed, in that it indicates that the landowner will be paying out significantly more by way of the commuted sum than will be received from the proceeds of the sale, the suggested sales values for the proposed dwellings are significantly lower than current market evidence suggests and the construction costs excessive. This adds further uncertainty to the likely delivery of the village hall. If the scheme were to be considered positively the issue of the financial viability of the site would therefore need to be investigated further to establish, firstly, whether or not the development is viable in being able to support the commuted sum proposed at the same time providing the landowner with a fair return for the sale of the land for the market housing and, secondly, to establish whether or not a more substantial commuted sum or the provision of any affordable housing can be justified.

It is therefore concluded that whilst a new village hall would make a positive social contribution within the village, the application fails to provide any certainty or likelihood that the village hall would be delivered and as such it is not considered appropriate to attach significant weight to this part of the application when seen within the context of the social role.

The Council's open space requirements are referred to in Policy DM3.15 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies and could be achieved through a reserved matters application, with the indicative scheme providing a level of open space which meets the Council's requirements. Maintenance and management arrangements for any open space could be dealt with via a section 106 legal agreement.

In summary, the scheme would present limited benefits 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."

Historic England have a number of concerns about the impact of the proposed development on the historic environment.

Firstly, as mentioned above, the site is in close proximity to St Andrews Church. The church is a building of major architectural and historical interest and is the principle historic building in the settlement. The standing building principally dates from the 14th and 15th
centuries, but there is evidence of much earlier origins. The application site forms part of the church's immediate setting and therefore any development will have a significant impact on its setting. It was partly for this reason that the site was not progressed as a potential allocation in the Local Plan process. Historic England have commented that the open ground which includes the application site makes a positive contribution to the significance of the church by reflecting its relationship of both it and the village with their agricultural setting.

4.26 In addition, Historic England notes that historically the area of Scole north of the Diss - Bungay road junction developed as a linear pattern of settlement along a main road with buildings typically one plot deep, directly accessed from the street with fields beyond. Although there have been other, more modern forms of development on the eastern side of Norwich Road much of the western side, including the area around the application site, retains much of this traditional character. Where there are recent buildings on the western side they are often detached houses, one plot deep and accessed from the street which perpetuate the essential pattern of historic development.

4.27 As well as failing to respect this traditional pattern of linear development, much of the proposed development is based around vehicular access. It does not replicate the historic pattern of development in Scole and so does not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area or contribute to the setting of the church.

4.28 The Council's Conservation Officer also has a number of concerns about the scheme. He is concerned about the application takes the form of an outline application, which is not generally recommended where an application affects a heritage setting such as a listed building or a conservation area. He also agrees with Historic England that the layout of the site is not one which reflects the pattern of development in the historic part of the village and that the development will not integrate well into the existing village. The lack of certainty over delivery of the village hall means there can be no confidence that the design of the hall as proposed would be that which would be delivered should further funding be secured. The Conservation Officer concludes that this should not be considered as a public benefit in the planning balance unless there is a commitment to build it as part of the development at the same time as the construction of housing area and we can be assured of the design quality.

4.29 Paragraph 132 of the NPPF confirms that any harm to a designated heritage asset needs "clear and convincing justification". Paragraph 134 of the NPPF requires the Council to weigh the level of harm against the public benefits of the scheme.

4.30 With the above in mind, it is evident that there remain significant concerns about the deliverability of the village hall and the delivery of a relatively small number of dwellings, with no affordable housing provision, where the Council can demonstrate a land supply significantly in excess of five years and therefore there is no clear and convincing justification for the scheme in terms of public benefit that could be considered to outweigh the acknowledged harm to the setting of St Andrews Church and the Conservation Area. Therefore, there is no “clear and convincing justification” as required by paragraph 132 of the NPPF as referred to above.

4.31 The previous application was also refused on the grounds of insufficient archaeological investigatory work. Additional work has subsequently been undertaken. Formal comments from Historic Environment Services were still to be received at the time of writing the report but it would appear this issue has been addressed. Confirmation of this will be provided as an update.

4.32 A further reason for refusal on the previous application was that the scheme failed to consider the impact on trees on the site. In the current scheme, the proposed hall building breaches the root protection area of a sycamore tree which is a B category specimen, whilst the proposed car park also breaches root protection areas. The result of this
proposal would be to potentially compromise these trees which would clearly be an adverse impact when considering the environmental implications of the scheme as well as contrary to Policy DM4.8.

4.33 In regard to the impact of the development of the ecology in the area, an ecological report has been submitted with the application. This is the same report as submitted with the previously refused scheme. Norfolk County Council's Ecologist has reiterated their previous views that whilst the report itself is deficient, their own records and assessment has led them to conclude that the development is likely to have limited ecological impacts. However, they do recommend if development were to be permitted that a reptile survey should be carried out and a full Ecological Management Plan is submitted.

4.34 In terms of the environmental role, it is therefore considered that the scheme would represent a significant harm by virtue of the impact on the setting of the Grade II* listed church and the Conservation Area and not fulfil the environmental role.

4.35 In conclusion, in reaching a decision in respect of whether a scheme represents a sustainable development or not, 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. With this in mind, it is considered that the limited economic and social benefits of the scheme are outweighed by the significant environmental harm that would be caused by the development. On this basis the scheme cannot be considered to represent a sustainable development in the context of the NPPF when taken as a whole.

Other issues

4.36 Sections 66(1) and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 require assessment of the affect upon listed buildings and its setting and the impacts of development upon Conservation Areas. As set out above it is considered that the scheme would be harmful to both the setting of St Andrews Church and the character and appearance of the Scole Conservation Area and as such is contrary to the above provisions.

4.37 In terms of highway safety, the concern previously raised was that vehicular access for two of the dwellings was to be from Low Road. This resulted in an objection from the highway authority due to the restricted visibility on the junction of Low Road and Norwich Road / The Street. In this scheme the two dwellings have been relocated to be served off the access from Norwich Road. The highway authority therefore no longer object and have recommended a series of conditions in the event approval is granted.

4.38 Policy 3 of the JCS requires major planning applications such as this to provide sources of "decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy to cover at least 10% of the scheme’s expected energy requirements and meeting the water efficiency requirements of level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. Both of these can be met through appropriately worded conditions.

4.39 Given the outline nature of the proposal it is not possible to undertake a detailed assessment of the impacts of the layout of the scheme on neighbours in respect of light, outlook, privacy etc, however it is apparent that a layout could be provided that does adequately safeguard neighbour amenity in respect of light, outlook and privacy and that this could be done via any subsequent reserved matters application in the event members are minded to approve the application. Other impacts on neighbour amenity are possible from use of the village hall, which has also been raised as a concern in responses from local residents. Whilst full consideration of this would again only be possible at the reserved matters stage, the Council’s Environmental Quality Team have suggested a number of conditions that would be needed to help ensure that use of the village hall does not result in unacceptable impacts on residential amenity.
4.40 There have been a number of concerns raised about existing surface water flooding on Low Road and the potential for the development to exacerbate these problems. This was addressed previously in a Flood Risk Assessment. The current application is supported by the same Flood Risk Assessment but this is now out of date as the number of dwellings has been increased and the layout altered significantly. As such it is not possible with the information submitted to be sure that the development would not result in an increase in flood risk and therefore as the application currently stands it is contrary to Policy DM4.2.

4.41 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.

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

5 Conclusion

5.1 The development is located outside of the development limit for Scole and as overriding economic or environmental benefits have not been demonstrated it is contrary to Policy DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies.

5.2 It is considered that the limited economic and social benefits of the scheme, having due regard to the fact that the village hall would not be directly delivered as part of the proposal, and no affordable housing provided due to funds being used as a contribution towards the proposed village hall, and that the Council can demonstrate a housing land supply significantly in excess of the 5 years, are outweighed by the significant environmental harm that would be caused by the development in respect of the detrimental impact upon the Conservation Area and the setting of St Andrews Church (Grade II*), and therefore the scheme cannot be considered to represent a sustainable development in the context of the NPPF. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the provisions of paragraph 6 of the NPPF which seeks to contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development.

5.3 The concerns regarding the deliverability of the village hall, the lack of any affordable housing provision, and given that the Council can demonstrate a housing land supply in excess of the 5 years there is no clear and convincing justification for the scheme, including in terms of public benefit, that could be considered to outweigh the acknowledged harm to the designated heritage assets, namely the Conservation Area and St Andrews Church. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to the provisions of paragraph 132 and 134 of the NPPF.

5.4 The development would be detrimental to the setting of both St Andrews Church and the Conservation Area contrary to the provisions of Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies DM4.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies and Sections 66(1) and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990.

5.5 The application has failed to demonstrate that the proposal has fully assessed the impacts of the development upon mature trees within the site which lie within the Conservation Area and as such is contrary to Policy DM4.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

5.6 The Flood Risk Assessment submitted does not relate to the current scheme and therefore is inadequate to assess whether the development will not lead to increased flood risk from surface water flooding, contrary to Policy DM4.2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies 2015.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker 01508 533848 tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other applications

5. **Appl. No**: 2014/2435/F  
**Parish**: GILLINGHAM

Applicants Name: Mr Robin Bramley  
Site Address: Land to North of Hill Farm House Yarmouth Road Gillingham  
Norfolk NR34 0EE

Proposal: To supply and install 2 x 60kw wind turbines (20m tower)

Recommendation: Refusal

1. Unacceptable impact in the landscape  
2. Harmful impact on Heritage Assets  
3. Lack of community support

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design  
NPPF 10 : Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 11 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
NPPF 12 : Conserving and enhancing the historic environment  
Planning Policy Guidance Renewable and low carbon energy. Updated 18 June 2015

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 18 : The Broads

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.8 : 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  
DM4.4 : Natural Environmental Assets – designated and locally important open spaces  
DM4.5 : Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys  
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document  
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012  
South Norfolk Wind Turbine Sensitivity Study (WTLSS). Guidance note on assessing the landscape and visual impact of large wind turbine developments (2009). (It is important to note that this guidance does not relate to turbines of less than 25m and judgement should be exercised in using the study for turbines of less than 100m
1.5 Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas: S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.” S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of [the Planning Acts], special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/1506 Screening opinion for proposed wind turbine EIA Required (24m)

2.2 2013/1528 Screening opinion for proposed EC55 small wind turbine (24m tower)

3. Consultations

3.1 Gillingham Parish Council

Refuse:
Comments to the Environmental Statement (ES):
• Out of scale with other features across the Waveney Valley
• Introduce clutter to Valley ridges and interrupt the skyline
• Quiet and tranquil landscape will be interrupted by turbine noise
• Closeness of historic buildings
• Closeness to A143 light flicker
To original consultation:
• Visual impact of a structure of this size in an area of outstanding natural beauty namely the River Waveney and the surrounding Broads
• Close proximity to listed buildings and residential dwellings is in contravention of government guidelines
• Concern about the impact on the Environment and Wildlife which in the absence of an ES is unknown

Aldeby Parish Council

Refuse:
Comments to the Environmental Statement:
• Road safety – within 70m of A143, a busy truck road that has seen 3 fatal road accidents in recent years. Blade flicker potential to be a major distraction
• Noise – noise levels will be within 1.9dB of the safety limit of 35dB
• Impact on Environment and Heritage _ Broads and Gillingham Conservation area
• Size and Scale – planning statement describes turbines full height 86.5m high, other parts puts them 34 or 35m high
To original consultation:
• Concerned that PC not consulted
• Location is in a rural area within open countryside with no similar structures within the vicinity
• Very close to the Broads Area, which is a tourist attraction and the site will spoil the visual appreciation of the surroundings
• Site located within 600m of Alder and Stanley Carrs SSSI, not acknowledged in the application
- Local community will bear the considerable impact of this development which will not generate any significant benefits

**Geldeston Parish Council**

Refuse: Comments to the Environmental Statement:
- Reiterate the concerns it submitted and its opposition to this application
To original consultation:
- Previously objected to taller installation of Barsham
- Seriously detrimental to visual impact on our unique landscape
- Advised the power output from these turbines will be very low and therefore any benefit in terms of low carbon emissions power output will not offset their detrimental effect on the landscape and local ecology
- Concern re risk to drivers by distraction
- Effect on wildlife is likely to be harmful
- Regret the current piecemeal approach to this issue, marked contrast to SNC Local Plan for new housing which appears to be proceeding in an orderly open and more coherent way

**Haddiscoe Parish Council**

Refuse
Comments to the Environmental Statement:
- Reiterate its previous objections
To original consultation:
- Too large for Waveney Valley
- Dominate the landscape
- Live in area of natural beauty and overwhelm the skyline
- Support green energy, but in this location would be detrimental to beauty of our area

**Hales and Heckingham Parish Council**

Refuse
Comments to the Environmental Statement:
- Reiterate previous concerns
To original consultation:
- Concerned at close proximity of SSSI Stanley and Alder Carrs
- Visual impact on the landscape
- Confusion relating to height of turbines and its hub
- Proximity of residential dwellings and listed buildings including St Mary’s Church

**Kirby Cane and Ellingham Parish Council**

Refuse
Comments to the Environmental Statement:
- No change in previous comments
To original consultation:
- Impact on residential amenity and listed buildings in the area
- The landscape and visual impact of these turbines (a SSSI and The broads)
- Impact it might have on traffic on important routes close by
- Precedent
- Hope ES will be carried out properly in view of a Wetland area

**Loddon Parish Council**

Refuse
Comments to the Environmental Statement:
- Reiterate its previous objections
To original consultation:
- Inappropriate for such a development due to the visual impact
- Proximity to listed buildings
• Loss of amenity to local residential (noise)
• Impact on the natural environment (birds)
• Road and aerial safety concerns
• The possibility of similar applications in the area if this were to set a precedent
• The above points outweigh any green supply benefits
• The Council is recommended to introduce guidelines on proximity of turbines to housing

Stockton Parish Council
Comments to the Environmental Statement:
• Reiterate concerns submitted plus
• Note application described as a ‘farm scale’ or ‘small’ understand should be classified as ‘medium’ which is a higher degree of sensitivity and not been addressed correctly

To original consultation:
• Benefits are outweighed by demonstrable harm to the locality, detriment to landscape and local ecology
• Dominate the skyline and be visible from the river at Beccles detracting from broads
• Detrimental to local listed buildings
• Distraction to drivers on adjacent main road

Toft Monks Parish Council
Comments to the Environmental Statement:
• Reiterate the concerns submitted previously

To original consultation:
• Too large for the Waveney Valley
• Would dominate the landscape from all directions
• Area of natural Beauty and would deflect the beauty of our land and overwhelm the skyline
• Endanger many species
• Create flicker

Wheatacre Burgh St Peter Parish Council
Comments to the Environmental Statement:
• Reiterate the concerns submitted previously

To original consultation:
• Detrimental impact on landscape and became the main focal point for the area
• Heritage and detrimental effect on surrounding listed building
• Creation of a precedence for more wind turbines in the area which is part of The Broads National park
• Disturbance to nearby residents, many properties are very close to the proposed installation
• Detrimental effect on wildlife in particular birds
• Flicker effect on traffic on A143

3.2 District Member
To be determined by committee
• As a potentially controversial matter, this will give all interested parties the chance to attend the meeting, listen to the arguments and understand the reasoning behind the decision that is made
3.3 Broads Authority

Application discussed at the Broads Authority Planning committee meeting on 8 January 2016.

Objections:
- Proposal would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape of the Broads and this impact has been underestimated in the LVIA submitted
- Would have an unacceptable impact on historic environment of the area in the vicinity of the site
- Potential adverse impact on bats and birds in the area and this impact has not been adequately addressed

3.4 NCC Ecologist

Comments to the Environmental Statement:
- No change in comments

To original consultation:
- The likely impacts on ecology are considered minimal
- From the map provided, the distance of the turbine columns appear to be 60m from the tree belt, which is the nearest feature that may be used by bats for foraging and/or commuting. As long as distance is retained there should be negligible impact on bats or bird species
- Cable route appears to pass close to a pond, but if good practice measures are followed, there should be no impact on great crested newts that might be present

3.5 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team

Comments to the Environmental Statement:
- To be reported

To original consultation:
- No objection subject to conditions

3.6 DIO-Safeguarding-Wind@mod.uk

No objections

3.7 NCC Highways

No objections

3.8 SNC Landscape Officer

Concerned that the proposed turbines will:
- affect the setting of The Broads (LCA C2)
- not conserve the sensitive open valley crest that forms the backdrop in views from The Broads (LCA2)
- affect views to St Michaels Church, Beccles (LCA2)
- Not conserve the setting of LCA 31 as the turbines will project above the skyline.

3.9 SNC Senior Conservation and Design Officer

Refuse
- Impact of the turbines on the heritage assets has not been adequately addressed in the landscape and listed impact assessment. Consider that the turbines will have less then substantial harm on the setting of Gillingham Hall and Brick Barn, and also Hill House, but their setting will not be preserved and the turbines will have a particularly harmful impact on the setting of brick barn and Grade 11* Gillingham Hall. The public benefits to be gained appear to be limited, and do not compensate for the harm caused to the heritage assets
3.10 Historic England

Objections

Comments to the Environmental Statement:
- Raised the same concerns

To original consultation:
- Proposed application proposes erection of 2 turbines in the vicinity of the Grade 11* listed Gillingham Hall and the wider setting of a number of other designated heritage assets. This includes the Grade 11 Brick Barn built for Gillingham Hall and Gillingham Conservation Area. The relationship between these heritage assets in the open landscape makes a particular contribution to their significance and concerned that the proposed development would have a harmful impact on it.

3.11 Richard Bacon MP

- From responses recorded on SNC website and the representations I have received myself, it is clear the proposal does not command the level of local support that could reasonably described as 'backing' under the ministerial statement. It is also clear that the affected local community do not regard the identified planning impacts as having been addressed.
- I would be grateful if SNC could refuse to grant planning consent.

3.12 Broads Society

Objections

Comments to the Environmental Statement:
- Does nothing to change our view that this development will be an unsightly intrusion into the Broadland Landscape

To original consultation:
- Visual impact of the development which will be detrimental to the Broadland Landscape
- Bearing in mind the recent removal of unsightly power lines to improve the landscape
- Vital that the character of this unique and fragile landscape should be protected now, rather than a precedent being set for visual intrusions into the skyline all over the region.

3.13 Waveney District Council

No comments received

3.14 Other Representations

5 letters of support:
- The development has been compared to the turbines of Kessingland, these are 4 times the size proposed.
- A143 generates a noise level from passing HGV’s, Waveney Valley is already blighted by traffic noise in the areas of both Boathouse Hill and Hill Farm.
- Actual structures are more than 500m from the river, with the base towers 18m above it, with large farm buildings and trees between, so impact from wind disturbance to sailing craft is highly unlikely.
- Will not be detrimental to surrounding of the Waveney Valley.
- Will add something of interest to not particular spectacular area of agricultural land which is outside the Broads Authority areas.
- Green energy is important in this day and age.
- Concerned if 120m turbines on my doorstep, these are 20m ones are well screened and are acceptable.
- Cannot see how turbines of this type are going to cause such ‘devastation’.
Over 132 letters of objection
Comments to the Environmental Statement:
- Report dated July why has it not been released
- No reference to the community of Waterloo at all
- Report refers to Elms Barn which is far greater distance from the proposed turbines than Waterloo
- Report doesn't address the impact on wildlife particular owls
- Reviewed the ES and remain of the view the turbines will have a detrimental impact on views, blot on the landscape, precedent, impact on tourism, damage the tranquillity and natural beauty
- Impact on local residential amenity
- No certainty that turbines will be removed and/or not replaced after 25 years
- 'local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if........ it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and the proposal has their backing'. The proposal clearly does not have the support of the local community
- Turbines appear to be anything from 34m to 60m in height
- Concern at the inability of the applicant to carry out an accurate report

To the original submission
- Spoil an outstanding view
- Note the computerised photos were created when there were leaves on the trees
- Eyesore in winter
- Set a precedent
- Blades will be seen right across the Waveney Valley completely destroying the wonderful scenic beauty and tranquillity of an area
- Damage to environment and disturb wildlife
- Apart from the main road which is partly hidden by trees, the area remains development and a very pleasant place to go
- River is main route for tourists to enter the town
- This area needs the revenue tourists bring, if damage the tranquillity and natural beauty then you damage Beccles as a whole
- Interrupt the skyline
- Live in an environmentally sensitive area within the Broads Authority
- Close proximity is an SSSI which is part of the Broadland Special Protection Area
- Incongruous within the existing landscape
- Concerned that affected PC and neighbours not consulted
- Electricity from turbines not needed by farm itself
- Purely for production of electricity to be sold to the National Grid, an industrial application that should be restricted to 'industrial' areas
- Turbines highly inefficient and the huge subsides from taxpayers are a waste of money
- Noise and disturbance
- Purchased property for peace and quiet
- The Acoustic Report is difficult to understand and seems to designed to confuse the layman
- Rattling noise
- High uncertainty of noise
- Technical measurement mentioned 94dB sounds very loud to us
- No other turbines of this type in the UK for us to assess the noise/pollution
Companies own statistics 400m = 40dB = noise of fridge. We cannot sleep with a fridge humming in the bedroom
Flicker effect
Risk of ice-shed
Damage to Heritage for miles, impact on Grade 1 listed building
Danger of collapse
Should be kept to off shore installations
Impact on horse rider
Concern the effect of additional turbulence when the wind was in that direction on all sailors and the likelihood of additional capsizes and hence the potential injuries
Fighting a similar proposal near Beccles since 2008 via an action group called Halt turbines. Proven hazards to local inhabitants, wildlife and general environment
We have seen several new solar farms being built in the region, why are we considering such a dangerous application when solar power can easily cover the same power generation requirements
Impact on a143 as a main corridor for traffic stretch of road from Gillingham Roundabout to toft Monks is extremely dangerous
Public Footpaths - considerable impact on the peace and aesthetic enjoyment of walkers and ramblers
Human Rights- Right to enjoy our home without noise pollution which would be detrimental to our health. Application in Article 1 of protocol No.1 to the European Convention of Human Rights
Environmental assessment required covering all species of birds and bats should be undertaken
After money has been spent to remove the 2 pylon towers either side of the river Waveney to enhance the visual countryside
Impact on Beccles church, church dominates the town and surrounding countryside, much of which is flat terrain of the Broads
Photomontages are very misleading
Turbines will be 340m from our property and stand 34m high including the blades, four and half times higher than our house
Impact on local aircraft
Annoying reflections of turbines blades on neighbouring windows
Department for communities and Local government given unequivocal support for local objections to such schemes, no reason for Planning committee to approve

3.15 Waveney opposes Turbines (WOT)

Objections:
Applicant failed to follow the correct procedure for submitting an ES
Documentation is inconsistent, inaccurate and misleading
Documentation fails to answer any of the concerns clearly expressed a grounds of:
Major adverse landscape and visual impacts on the Broads
Major impact on setting of listed buildings
Documentation fails to answer Historic England's objections on grounds of harm to the significance of heritage assets through inappropriate development in their setting
'No more on shore wind farm schemes will be given the go ahead unless they have the support of local people'
The local community does not support this scheme
Irrelevant and inaccurate noise assessment
Shadow flicker/road safety concerns
Impact on ecology
WOT have submitted in support of their objections their review of the applicants LVIA and heritage submissions with visualisations for the proposed turbines.

3.16 Beccles Town Council

Objections

Comments to the Environmental Statement:
- New material does nothing to change our original position
- Consider as close neighbour should have been formally consulted
- Unwanted block on the serene landscape we enjoy
- Onshore wind turbines are only 28% efficient
- Appearance, noise and flickering effect on the local community, is very disturbing
- Read in national press that these turbines have been turned off because the only benefactor from them are constructors and the owners of land
- Not a benefit to the community

3.17 Beccles Society

Objections:
- Relationship to the surroundings - turbines will be significantly at odds and 'out of keeping' with the rest of the surroundings and will have a significantly detrimental impact on the look and feel of the local area
- Impact on the Environment - tower over the river valley and its marshes and sit within 200m of broads and within 600m of Stanley and Alder Carrs SSSI
- Effect on listed buildings - will be within 200m and 1000m of 5 listed buildings and well within EU buffer zone of 2000m between any residential buildings and turbines
- Precedent - approval likely to encourage more similar proposals

3.18 Waveney Valley Canoe Club

Objections:
- Club of 120+ members based at Bungay Staithe and paddle the Waveney, Broads and rivers in the area
- Pleased money spent to remove the two pylons on either side of the Waveney River
- Impact on nature particularly birds

3.19 Norfolk & Suffolk Boating Association

Objections:

Comments to the Environmental Statement:
- Do not address concerns raised

To the original submission:
- Has 50 affiliated clubs and organisations and some 1000 personal members and therefore represents the majority of private boaters on the broads
- Concerned at time scale to comment
- No ES
- Object on grounds wind turbines are devices for extracting power from wind flux
- Flow downstream of such energy extraction devices is influenced significantly by the extraction process, i.e. the wake behind a wind turbine has a markedly lower velocity than its upstream value. There is a risk that, when the wind is in the appropriate direction, the reduced wake behind the turbines could interfere with sailing craft exercising their public right of navigation
Concerned at the timing of the submission during the holiday break, giving no time for residents to consider the massive impact on their region, the people of Beccles. A call in must be made ASAP so full due diligence is carried out, this is not a normal planning application that goes through a yes or no at a planning meeting.

4 Assessment

Site and Proposal

4.1 This application seeks planning permission for the erection of two wind turbines on land to the north of Hill Farm House, Yarmouth Road, Gillingham. The turbines will be 60kw Tozzi Victory turbines, each with a height of 22m to the hub, blade 12m in length and 34m to the blade tip. The tower and blades will be white in colour. The proposal also includes the associated cable connection with a connection point within an existing building on the site of the farm which will also house the necessary monitoring and control systems. The turbine is expected to generate in excess of 215,000kWh of electricity each year, at an average wind speed of 5.5m/s, equivalent to a saving of approximately 90 tonnes of carbon dioxide.

4.2 The site is located on the south side of Yarmouth Road (A143), to the south Hill Farm House and the farm complex and Boaters Hill House. The southern and part of the eastern boundary of the field the turbines are located within adjoins the Broad’s Authority Executive Boundary. The turbines themselves would be 150m North of the Broads Authority Area. The site is an agricultural field with hedges and blocks of established woodland

4.3 The application site lies within the C2 The Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland lies to the extreme east of the district adjoining The Broads to the east and extending to the district boundary to the south. Land rises gently from the low lying Waveney valley with areas of flatter plateau cut by narrow tributaries (Becks). Defined by the presence of large estates with their associated 18th and 19th century halls and distinctive historic parkland landscapes which include Gillingham. Relatively sparsely settled with the larger villages of Haddiscoe and Thurlton (associated with the Becks) and Gillingham. Isolated and round tower churches are key features and prominent in views. Red brick barns occur as landmark features. Open views across the marshes of The Broads.

4.4 The site is in the vicinity of the Grade II* listed Gillingham Hall and the wider setting of a number of other designated heritage assets including the Gillingham Conservation Area. The Grade II listed Brick Barn and Grade II listed Hill Farm house are located adjacent to the southern boundary of the site and are situated within the Broads.

Policy Context

4.5 A number of policies and guidance are relevant to this application. The South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policy DM4.1 relates to Renewable Energy but excludes wind energy development. The supporting text states that proposals for wind energy development will be considered against national policy in the Ministerial Statement of 18 June 2015 and guidance in the PPG.

National Planning Policy Framework

4.6 Paragraphs 97 and 98 of the NPPF specially relate to renewable energy and support the need for renewable and low carbon energy development, recognise that even the small-scale projects provide valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions; and direct Local Planning authorities to approve applications (taking into account material considerations) if its impacts are (or can be made) acceptable.
4.7 The overall approach to conserving and enhancing the natural environment is set out in Section 11 of the NPPF. It states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other things, protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and minimizing impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains where possible.

4.8 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment is set out in Section 12 of the NPPF. Para 132 states that 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. Para 133 states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. Para 134 also states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

4.9 Planning Policy Guidance Renewable and low carbon energy (Updated 18 June 2015) sets out the Government’s intention to ensure that planning decisions better reflect the balance in the NPPF, and allow for greater weight to be given to the view of local people. The recent update is quite clear that when considering applications for wind energy development, local planning authorities should (subject to the transitional arrangement) only grant planning permission if:

- the development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and
- following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing.

Whether the proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgement for the local planning authority.

4.10 It is clear that the Government wishes Local Planning Authorities to make a more balanced approach when weighing up environmental impacts against the national needs and benefits. The advice is a material consideration in this case.

Visual impacts on the local landscape character

4.11 The application is now supported by a detailed Landscape and Visual impact Assessment (LVIA) which has been reviewed by the Council’s Landscape Officer and also by the Broads Authority Landscape Officer.

4.12 The site for these two proposed turbines is situated within South Norfolk Landscape Character Area C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland (LCA C2). The site is directly next to The Broads executive area. LCA C2 has a National/International significant role as a setting for The Broads (equivalent status to National Park); the effects on The Broads is therefore a key consideration.

4.13 The Council’s landscape Officers comments are attached as Appendix 2 for members information. In conclusion he considers that the application should be refused, states that the visual effects in some of the key views have been underestimated by the LVIA. Furthermore, in considering the sensitivities, vulnerabilities, and development considerations set out in the Landscape Character Area studies he is concerned that the proposed turbines will:

- affect the setting of The Broads (LCA C2);
- not conserve the sensitive open valley crest that forms the backdrop in views from The Broads (LCA2)
• affect views to St Michaels Church, Beccles (LCA2)
• Not conserve the setting of LCA 31 as the turbines will project above the skyline

As can be seen from the consultee responses set out above The Broads Authority have objected to the proposed development as they consider that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape of the Broads and this impact has been underestimated in the LVIA submitted.

4.14 They state “The LVIA accepts that the Broads landscape is a very highly sensitive landscape receptor. This definition is considered to aptly describe the limited scope of the Broads landscape in general to accommodate wind turbine development of the size and number being proposed. This is supported by the findings of the Broads Authority’s 2012 own Landscape Sensitivity Study which concluded that Local Character Area 3 Waveney Valley- Barsham, Gillingham and Beccles Marshes has a high sensitivity to more than one turbine with a tip height over 20m.

4.15 The impact on the landscape of the Broads falls into two distinct categories the effect on the landscape character and the effect on views. To assess the degree of impact on the landscape character of the Broads it is necessary to assess the magnitude of the effect. This assessment looks at the size or scale of change, the geographical influence and the duration and reversibility of the proposed development. The LVIA has set out assessment criteria for each of these categories.

4.16 The applicant’s assessment states that there would be a low magnitude of effects on the landscape character as a result of the size or scale of change of the proposed development. However, it is the Broads Authority’s view that the size or scale of this change would be high as it would result in a major change to the key characteristics of this area. The development would be out of scale to the existing character, the development would dominate the skyline which is relatively uninterrupted by manmade features, and the turbines would interrupt the cohesion of the existing landscape character and impact on the tranquillity of this pastoral landscape.

4.17 Having fully considered each of the assessments made by the applicant on the visual sensitivity of the development from each of the identified viewpoints the Broads Authority considers that the significance of the visual effects of the development have been much underestimated. Much of the area local to the development, land and water, is used for the quiet enjoyment of the countryside. The Broads is a landscape which has been nationally designated for its landscape value increasing its sensitivity in both landscape and visual terms to developments of this nature. The construction of two turbines would introduce two dominant features into this tranquil pastoral landscape. These structures would also be given added prominence as they would interrupt the current uncluttered treed skylines that exist on the northern valley side. Furthermore, the views assessed are only a representative selection and it is therefore, important to recognise that views of the development would be available from many other vantage points due to the extensive network of footpaths and the fully navigable River Waveney.”

4.18 I consider that the turbines would have an unacceptable impact and create significant harm which outweighs the benefit the turbines would bring.

The setting and visual amenity of nearby heritage assets

4.19 The impact of the turbines in respect of heritage assets has been assessed by the Senior Conservation and Design officer and Historic England.

4.20 The heritage assets affected within South Norfolk are Gillingham Hall, Brick Barn, and the Gillingham conservation area, and Hill Farm House. It is considered that the Landscape and Visual Impact assessment does not address the impact on the setting of grade II* Gillingham Hall and the grade II Brick Barn, or the setting of the conservation area.
These views are different to the general landscape and visual impact assessment views as agreed, although the views already identified are useful in terms of judging how the turbines may appear within the setting of the Brick Barn and Hill Farm.

4.21 Historic England sets out clearly the significance of the heritage assets in their consultation response and consider that the proposal will result in harm to the significance of the heritage assets through inappropriate development of their setting. As set out above Para132 of the NPPF states the application should only be allowed if significant public benefits override the harm resulting to the setting of the heritage assets. Recent case law has reiterated the importance of Section 66 of the Planning (Listed buildings and conservation Act 1990) and that sufficient weight should be given to preserving the setting of a listed building in the decision making process, even if the harm is considered less than substantial.

4.22 The Design and Access Statement refers to the impact on the heritage assets as follows “Listed buildings and conservation areas: The attached LVIA lists the listed buildings in the vicinity of the site. They have shown in their report what likely impact, if any, the turbines will have on these buildings.”

4.23 To the east, west and north Hill Farm House is well screened by existing vegetation. It is more open to the south in views from the river. The photomontage shows that the turbines will have an impact on views of the house from the river footpath below. This results in a degree of harm to the setting of that building, although it would be less than substantial harm as it affects the setting rather than directly impacting on the heritage asset itself.

4.24 Gillingham Hall lies approx. 700m to the west of the proposed site and is a country house listed grade II*. The house has a more agricultural setting of estate parkland beyond its immediate curtilage. Because Brick Barn is some distance from the house (in fact, closer to the turbines than the hall), the visual and historic connection between the two may at first be unexpected, particularly as the landscape has changed. In normal circumstances there would only be a very loose historic connection between such a field barn in the outlying areas of an estate and the estate house. However, the barn has a very unusual design of a ‘blind window’ with brick tracery designed with a gable end with crow stepped gable, which is designed to imitate the appearance of a chapel in views from the hall. This lifts the building above being just a simple utilitarian brick built structure. Although the barn lies outside the parkland area of the hall, there is a clearly intended visual relationship between the Hall and views of the barn in its wider setting. The inclusion of the window is a very significant characteristic of the design of this particular barn, perhaps even a unique design feature not found on any other barn of this type. It has clear link to the view from the hall means that the relationship in the setting of hall and this historic relationship therefore contributes towards the significance of both buildings. It is important to note that setting comprises of views from heritage assets as well as towards heritage assets.

4.25 There is no visual impact assessment of the impact of the turbines on this associative aspect of the setting of the hall and barn – although the photomontages do give an indication that the turbines will be very visible modern elements within the landscape close to the barn. The wider east setting of the hall is of more importance to its setting as the rear garden and rooms face in this direction, and as demonstrated by the design of the brick barn, the views were and still are to some extent, quite expansive in the valley landscape. Although no photomontage has been provided of the view, the proximity of the modern ‘industrial’ turbines to the north east of the barn are likely to result in harm to the historic relationship within the setting of the barn and hall.
4.26 Historic England consider that the erection of 2 turbines in the vicinity of the Grade 11* listed Gillingham Hall and the wider setting of a number of other designated heritage assets. This includes the Grade 11 Brick Barn built for Gillingham Hall and Gillingham Conservation Area. The relationship between these heritage assets in the open landscape makes a particular contribution to their significance and they are concerned that the proposed development would have a harmful impact on it.

4.27 The Broad’s Authority have also raised concerns that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on historic environment of the area in the vicinity of the site.

4.28 From the information that is supplied, it is considered that the turbines will have less than substantial harm on the setting of the Gillingham Hall and Brick Barn, and also Hill House, but their setting will not be preserved, and the turbines will have a particularly harmful impact on the setting of Brick Barn and grade II* Gillingham Hall. The benefits to be gained do not outweigh the considerable and significant harm caused to the heritage assets.

Community Support

4.29 As set out above under the Planning Policy Guidance, the Council should only be granting consent for the turbines if it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing. It is quite clear from the amount of objections raised and the concerns contained within those objections, that the proposal does not have the backing of the local communities and the Environmental Statement has not addressed their concerns.

The effect on living conditions (residential amenity) of neighbouring residential properties

4.30 Policy DM3.13 Residential amenity directs that development should not be approved if it would have a significant adverse impact on nearby residents amenities via overlooking, loss of light, overbearing impact and introduction of incompatible neighbouring uses in terms of noise, odour, vibration etc.

4.31 A Noise Impact Assessment has been submitted and reviewed by the Environmental Quality Team who have raised no objections. Given the nature of the proposal it will not overlook the neighbouring property and the turbines siting would not give rise to a situation so detrimental in terms of flicker effect and overbearing/dominance to warrant refusal. I fully appreciate the concerns raised by the nearest neighbours in terms of the noise nuisance and detrimental impact on their amenities, however as the Environment Officer has raised no objections subject to appropriate conditions, the scheme is considered to accord with the requirements of Policy DM3.13.

Birds, ecology and bats

4.32 The impact of the turbines on ecology has been assessed by NCC Ecologist who has advised that the likely impacts on ecology are considered minimal. From the map provided, the distance of the turbine columns appear to be 60m from the tree belt, which is the nearest feature that may be used by bats for foraging and/or commuting. As long as distance is retained there should be negligible impact on bats or bird species. Cable route appears to pass close to a pond, but if good practice measures are followed, there should be no impact on great crested newts that might be present. Therefore, whilst I fully appreciate the concerns raised as set out above, I do not consider the application could be refused on the adverse impact on wildlife and ecology.

Highways

4.33 Policy DM3.11of the South Norfolk Local Plan states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would endanger highway safety or the satisfactory functioning of the highway network.
4.34 Concerns have been raised at the impact the turbines would have on highway safety. The application has been assessed by NCC Highways who have raised no objections. In view of this whilst I fully appreciate the concerns raised I do not consider the proposal could be refused on highway safety ground. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Polices DM3.11.

Other material considerations

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

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

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is considered to conflict with the aims of the 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 1, 2 & 18 of the JCS, Policy DM4.5 and DM4.10 of SNLP and the NPPF.

6 Reasons for Refusal

6.1 The site is a field, surrounded by open agricultural land, which contributes to the characteristics this area. Its general grain and pattern comprises areas of flatter plateau cut by narrow tributaries, rising gently from low lying Waveney Valley. The introduction of the two turbines would interrupt and dominate the sensitive views across the countryside into character areas particularly the river valley landscape and The Broads. The proposal would be significantly harmful to its immediate setting and would also be demonstrably harmful to the defining characteristics of this part of South Norfolk and the Broads. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 1, 2 and 18 of the Joint Core Strategy; DM4.5 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document and the NPPF.

6.2 The siting of two wind turbines in the locality of Gillingham Hall, Brick Barn, Hill Farm and the conservation area will result in harm to the significance of the heritage assets through inappropriate development in their setting. It will also have a negative impact on the wider landscape setting, including the bell tower at Beccles. The harm is considered to be less than substantial, contrary to Para134 of NPPF. It is considered that the harm has not been justified, contrary to Para 132. Due regard has been given to the public benefit of providing additional renewable energy as required by Para 134, but the benefits do not outweigh the harm. Equally the turbines are not considered to preserve the setting of the listed buildings or the character and appearance of the conservation area. As such the two turbines are contrary to DM4.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document, S66 (1) and S72 of Listed Buildings Act 1990 and the NPPF.

6.3 The planning impacts identified by affected local communities have not been fully addressed and therefore the proposal does not have their backing, as required by the Planning Policy Guidance Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (Updated 18 June 2015).

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

From: Robin Taylor
Sent: Tue, 8 Mar 2016 13:14:30 +0000
To: Claire Curtis; Planning Idox
Subject: 2014/2435: Land To North Of Hill Farm House, Yarmouth Road, Gillingham

Landscape Officer comments

The site for these two proposed turbines is situated within South Norfolk Landscape Character Area C2 Thurlton Tributary Farmland with Parkland (LCA C2). The site is directly next to The Broads executive area. LCA C2 has a National/International significant role as a setting for The Broads (equivalent status to National Park); the effects on The Broads is therefore a key consideration.

NOTE: The LVIA refers to additional planting being undertaken as part of the scheme and some written details are given, however this is not indicated on the site plans or other illustrative information.

In relation to this proposal, and in my opinion, the most pertinent aspects from the Evaluation of LCA C2 (Land Use Consultants Final Report, 2006) are:

Principal Sensitivities and Vulnerabilities

• open views across the marshes of The Broads and vulnerability to any change within views and the effect on the setting of The Broads;

• the character of the historic parkland landscapes with their characteristic planting, boundaries and entrances;

Development Considerations

Any development in the area must respect the character of Thurlton Tributary Farmland and in particular consider the following:

• conserve the sensitive open valley crest that forms the backdrop in views from The Broads to the east. Maintain key views into and from The Broads;

• maintain the views to churches and protect and enhance the setting of these landmark features;

The Landscape Character Area immediately to the south and adjacent to the site (within The Broads) is described and assessed by the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment. LCA 31 is wooded Valley Meadowlands & Fens. Again, in relation to this proposal, and in my opinion, the most pertinent aspects from the Evaluation of LCA 31 (Suffolk County Council 2011) are:

Landscape Sensitivity & Change

-
6. **Appl. No**: 2016/0331/F
   **Parish**: TASBURGH

   **Applicants Name**: Mr Nick Coupe
   **Site Address**: Sub-division Of The Garden Of Chamusca Low Road Tasburgh Norfolk
   **Proposal**: Erection of new dwelling, garage and creation of new vehicle access to Low Road.

   **Recommendation**: Approval with conditions
   1. Full Planning permission time limit
   2. In accord with submitted drawings
   3. External materials to be agreed
   4. Levels to be agreed
   5. PD rights removed – openings in SW elevation
   6. Screening to raised deck
   7. Obscured glazing SW window
   8. New Access Construction over verge
   9. Access Gates - Configuration
   10. Visibility splay dimension in condition
   11. Retention of frontage hedge
   12. Provision of parking, service
   13. Boundary treatment to be agreed
   14. New Water Efficiency
   15. Surface Water
   16. Contamination 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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   - Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
   - Policy 2: Promoting good design
   - Policy 3: Energy and water
   - Policy 15: Service Villages
   - Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   Development Management Policies
   - DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
   - DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development
   - DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
   - DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development
   - DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic
   - DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
   - DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management

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

2.1 2014/2167 Erection of new dwelling and garage Dismissed at appeal

2.2 2012/1451 New 3 bedroom detached house. Withdrawn

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Refuse
   • It has been policy to leave gaps along Low Road to preserve the rural character of the area and retain the existing streetscene.
   • Over development of the site
   • Outside the preferred development area
   • Inside a flood plain
   • Key drainage pipe running under the site to the river.
   • If damaged by the proposed garage in that area, it would cause flooding of the amenity land (Burrfeld Park)

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Environment Agency No Objection
   • Site boundary lies with Flood zones 3b, 3a, 2 and 1
   • Parts of the site lie within high probability zone, although the majority of the site is within flood zone 1, which is where the dwelling is proposed.
   • More vulnerable use
   • Sequential test and exception test need to be passed
   • Satisfied with FRA
   • The dwelling is positioned within flood zone 1
   • Ground floor levels shall be provided above the 0.1% annual exceedance probability flood level, internal flooding would not be expected on ground floor in extreme flood events
   • Support the removal of the timber shed from flood zone
   • A dry access route to and from the development will be provided for design and extreme flood events
   • Flood Defence Consent will be required for any works within 9 metres of a main river

3.4 NCC Highways Support with conditions regarding access, parking turning and visibility splay

3.5 Landscape Officer No Objection
   • Maybe worth seeking retention of the remaining frontage hedge to retain the rural character.

3.6 SNC Water Management Officer No Objection
   • Environment Agency's fluvial and tidal flood risk map indicates that the site lies within Flood zones 1, 2 and 3.
   • Environment Agency's map shows the dwelling to be located in flood Zone 2.
   • FRA has been completed which take flood levels data obtained from Environment Agency that indicate that the proposed building will be located within flood zone 1.
   • Environment Agency does not dispute the FRA which is more accurate than the data used on their maps.
• FRA recommends use of soakaways to deal with surface water drainage

3.7 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority
Local Planning Authority responsible for assessing surface water drainage proposals

3.8 Other Representations
One letter of objection
• Application refers to self-build but the applicant is a developer
• Repeat of previous application which was refused
• Application does not show the sub division of garden and erection of garage for the Thatched cottage which was required since the double garage complex is being developed as a residence
• All the changes should be shown on the drawings
• Rural character of low road is being replaced by a more urbanising effect
• Will remove the gaps between the houses
• Site is outside the development limit
• There is sufficient land bank for foreseeable future

4 Assessment

4.1 The application is for a two storey dwelling and detached garage in the garden of Chamusa in Low Road in Tasburgh. There are residential properties either side of the plot and the river Tas is located to the north west. The site is located outside the defined development limit for Tasburgh. An appeal for a dwelling on the site was dismissed on the site last year on the principle of the development in the open countryside and flood risk (application number 2014/2167).

4.2 The DM1.3 seeks to direct development to sustainable locations within development boundaries and allocated sites. The Joint Core Strategy sets out the growth strategy for the area including designating Tasburgh as a Service Village. The site is located in the Norwich Policy Area where the Council does not have a five year land supply, as such paragraph 49 in the NPPF makes it clear that in such circumstances that the development plan policies cannot be considered up to date and housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

4.3 In terms of the presumption in favour of sustainable development under paragraph 49 of the NPPF, this confirms that sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. It goes on to stress that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.

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 proposed single dwelling will make a contribution to the delivery of the five year land supply and will make a small contribution to the economy through employment during the construction period and subsequent spending from the occupiers.
Social Role

4.6 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 The appeal Inspector in his decision referred to the fact that the proposed dwelling was located away from the main settlement and there was no footpath linking the site with the main services within the village. It is important to note that the recently adopted development limit for Tasburgh is located approximately 150 metres to the north east of the site. There are a range of services including school, shop, public house and village hall within the main village which are in reasonably easy reach. The design of the dwelling respects the character of the area and does not raise any significant amenity issues.

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 limit and will result in an encroachment on the open countryside but would not cause a significant harm to the character of the area which forms part of the river valley or harm any heritage assets, the dwelling will be located in flood zone 1 (low risk) and there is not any significant harm to biodiversity.

4.10 On balance although the proposed development is located outside the development limit and there is no direct pedestrian link to local services, it would additional dwelling in any location where there is a shortage. Paragraph 14 in the NPPF makes it clear the “where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole. In this instance there are no adverse impacts which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and the development is considered to be sustainable development in terms of the NPPF.

Flood risk

4.11 In terms of the Environment Agency flood maps the site is located within 3b, 3a, 2 and 1 and the dwelling would be located within flood zone 2 (1 in 100 to 1 in 1000 year risk). As a result the previous application was refused on flood risk grounds and this was upheld at appeal.

4.12 A site specific flood risk assessment (FRA) has now been carried out on for the site which has taken flood levels data obtained from Environment Agency which indicates that the proposed dwelling will be located within flood zone 1 (low risk). Environment Agency does not dispute the FRA which uses topographical data which is more accurate than the data used on Environment Agency in creating their flood maps.

4.13 As part of the site are at high risk from flooding it is necessary to carry out the sequential test but given that the proposed dwelling is located within flood zone 1 (low risk) and that is adequate safe means of escape in the event of the flood, it is considered that the proposed development meets the sequential test as required by the NPPF.

4.14 It is proposed that surface water drainage will be dealt with via soakaway as recommended in the FRA which accords with the advice in the NPPF and PPG.
Design and residential amenity

4.15 There are a mix of dwelling types, sizes and designs in Low Road. It is considered that the proposed dwelling and its size scale and massing is of a good quality of design responds positively to the character of the existing area, new development at Chamusca and Thatched Cottage. It is therefore considered that the proposed development accords with policy DM3.8 in the Development Management Policies, policy 2 of the JCS, section 7 of the NPPF and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide. The landscape Officer recommends the retention of the frontage hedge to retain the rural character of the area, this has been conditioned.

4.16 The change in levels raises the potential for overlooking, especially from the SW elevation and from the raised decking. Conditions are recommended to remove PD rights for new openings; obscure glaze the proposed SW window; provide screening to the side of the deck; and to agree levels. With these safeguards in place the dwelling can be arranged so as not to unacceptably harm residential amenity and comply with policy DM 3.13 of the Development Management Policies.

Highways

4.17 The Highway Officer raises no objection to the proposal subject to conditions on the provision of the access, visibility splay and parking and turning.

4.18 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 for this application as self-build has been identified as the method of delivering the site. Whilst an indication of self-build has been given by the applicant it should also be noted that at this stage it cannot be certain that the method of delivering this site will be self-build. In the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

4.19 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)

5 Conclusion

5.1 Although the proposed development is the same as the one refused and dismissed at appeal last year. There has been a significant change in circumstances since those decisions, we no longer have a five year land supply, so the benefit of providing an additional dwelling now has more weight in the planning balance and the development now has to be assessed as to whether it is sustainable development on the context of the development in accordance with paragraph 14 of the NPPF. It is not considered that are any significant and demonstrable adverse effects that outweigh the benefits of the development. In addition the submitted flood risk assessment demonstrates that the proposed dwelling it is not at risk of flooding which changes the planning balance in favour of the development.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman 01508 533833 and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2016/0408/O  
**Parish**: SAXLINGHAM NETHERGATE

**Applicants Name**: Mrs Nicola Dix  
**Site Address**: Land West Of Sandpit Lane Saxlingham Nethergate Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Outline planning permission for a 3 bedroom property

**Recommendation**: Refusal

1. **Outside of development boundary**  
2. **Impact upon character of the area**

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 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  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.10: Heritage Assets  
DM4.8: Protection of Trees and Hedgerows

1.4 **Supplementary Planning Document**

2. **Planning History**  
No relevant history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council**: No response at time of writing report.  
3.2 **District Member**: To be reported if appropriate.  
3.3 **SNC Water Management Officer**: No response at time of writing report.  
3.4 **NCC Highways**: No response at time of writing report.
3.5 Other Representations

4 objections received. Issues raised;
- Site is outside of the Structure Plan, as outlined within the Saxlingham Nethergate Settlement Policy Document
- Whilst previously owned by the owners of Foxhole Lodge (formerly Windy Lane Lodge) the site is not a former garden, it is agricultural land and was purchased to be used as an orchard
- Access is proposed from Sandpits Lane but this may not be legally permitted as it is privately owned
- Access from Windy Lane would be near a blind corner and very dangerous
- Poor drainage in the area with no mains sewage
- May lead to other sites being developed nearby as the application could set a precedent
- Road is subsiding

4 Assessment

4.1 The site lies within the Parish of Saxlingham Nethergate, and is sited between the centres of Saxlingham Nethergate and Saxlingham Thorpe. A triangular plot, it is bordered to the south with Windy Lane, to the east with a private road (Sandpit Lane), and to the north and west lies an area used for agriculture. The site is bordered by trees and hedges along all sides and within the site are numerous fruit trees, with the ground laid to grass.

4.2 The application is an outline application for the siting of one dwelling, with all matters reserved. However an indicative site plan has been submitted, along with illustrations of the style of dwelling proposed. The access is proposed to be gained from an existing gate to the north of the site adjacent to Sandpit Lane.

4.3 Saxlingham Nethergate has been identified as a Service Village under Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The village has two development boundaries; both sited over 600m away to the east. Saxlingham Thorpe has no development boundary.

4.4 The application seeks permission to build a new dwelling on a site outside of the development boundary within open Countryside, and would therefore be contrary to DM 1.3. This policy requires all new development to be located on allocated sites or within development boundaries, unless specific DM policies allow for it, or there are overriding benefits.

4.5 Saxlingham Nethergate falls outside of the Norwich Policy area where there is a sufficient housing supply (16.94 years as of December 2015). As such the Local Plan is considered to be sound and new development should be plan led. Furthermore the submission does not provide any detail of any overriding benefit.

4.6 The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF. It is acknowledged that the proposed dwelling would be located within the vicinity of a Service Village and that there are some limited social and economic benefits to be had from the development. However any benefits are outweighed by the harm found to the character of the area, as detailed below. The relatively limited benefits to be had from the erection of a single dwelling are not considered to be significant enough to permit a new dwelling in the countryside in this case.

4.7 Paragraph 55 of the NPPF specifically addresses the provision of housing in rural areas. It states that housing should be located where it will enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities by avoiding isolated homes, and such homes should only be permitted in special circumstances. There is no supporting information within the application to indicate
that any of the special circumstances should be considered in this case, as such approval of the application under paragraph 55 is not considered appropriate.

Design and Amenity

4.8 The proposed dwelling would be sited on an elevated site. There are two residential properties to the west/north of Windy Lane in the immediate vicinity, with another cluster further south west. The character here is rural; Windy Lane is a single car width in places with boundary hedges and trees on both sides, dwellings represent a loose knit arrangement with no set design or setting.

4.9 Whilst the erection of a property here could be delivered with substantial screening retained and/or installed along the southern boundary, the impact of an additional dwelling would not result in a positive improvement of the local character by virtue of eroding the rural, loose knit character, contrary to DM 3.8. This is exacerbated by the elevated height of the site compared to Windy Lane, which could result in any dwelling here creating an imposing feel, having a disproportionate impact upon the local character.

4.10 Without further information it is not clear whether the proposed development of the site would lead to substantial removal of vegetation, which could be contrary to both DM 3.8 and DM 4.8. The existing vegetation contributes positively to the character of the area and appears to include some semi mature trees. DM 4.8 states that “Development will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that there exists a harmonious and sustainable relationship between trees and structures”. The application fails to demonstrate this.

Access

4.11 At the time of writing NCC Highways had not responded. The indicative site layout does indicate that there is likely to be sufficient room on site for the required parking, ensuring that DM 3.12 could be complied with. Members will be updated at the Committee meeting regarding compliance with DM 3.11 and any concerns regarding highway safety.

Local financial considerations

4.12 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 for this application. Although this has not been indicated within the application, as an individual plot it could potentially be a method of delivering the site. In the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

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

4.14 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), however this has not been sought due to the recommendation of refusal.

5 Conclusion

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

5.2 Furthermore the impact the proposal would have upon the character of the area is considered to conflict with DM 3.8.
6 Reasons for Refusal

6.1 The proposed development is outside any Development Limit as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan. In the absence of any special identified need, the proposal conflicts with Policy DM 1.3. The South Norfolk Rural Policy Area has 16.94 years residential land supply, so the overriding presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply. Because the proposed development conflicts with the Development Plan and there are no other material considerations that override it, including the criteria set out in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the proposal is refused in accordance with paragraph 12 and 14 of the NPPF.

6.2 The impact of an additional dwelling would not result in a positive improvement of the local character by virtue of eroding the rural, loose knit character, contrary to DM 3.8. This is exacerbated by the elevated height of the site compared to Windy Lane, which could result in any dwelling here creating an imposing feel upon the street scene, having a disproportionate impact upon the local character. Furthermore it is considered that the existing vegetation on the site makes a positive contribution to the local character and the development could result in removal of a significant amount, further eroding the local character. The proposal is contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk and DM 3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document 2015.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Katherine Brumpton 01508 533681 kbrumpton@s-norfolk.gov.uk
8. **Appl. No**: 2016/0498/RVC  
**Parish**: Poringland  

**Applicants Name**: Wilkinson Builders Ltd  
**Site Address**: Land South Of 40 The Street Poringland Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Variation of condition 2 of planning consent 2013/0713 - to change the materials and provide additional details on tree protection, levels boundary treatments and ecology  

**Recommendation**: Authorise DGL to Approve with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Existing access widen and improved  
5. Provision of parking, service  
6. Emergency turning area to be provided  
7. No PD for Classes ABCDE & G  
8. Surface Water  
9. New Water Efficiency  
10. Implement tree protection  
11. Implement boundary treatment  
12. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
13. No further work until protected species licence granted  

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

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 14 : Key Service Centres

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM3.4 : Residential extensions and conversions within Settlements  
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2013/0713 Conversion of barn into two dwellings and garages Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council No comments received
3.2 District Member
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways
To be reported

3.4 NCC Ecologist
Support with conditions
- European Protected Species (EPS) Licence from Natural England is required for the work as described by the previous report
- Believe some work has taken place without EPS licence taking place so may have resulted in an offence taking place.
- Since last application advice on bats has changed as a result recommend that a copy of the ESP licence is submitted prior to further work taking place.

3.5 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team
To be reported

3.6 Landscape Officer
No Objection
Submitted aborticultural information is acceptable

3.7 Other Representations
None received

4 Assessment

4.1 The application is to vary planning permission 2013/0713 to convert a barn to the south of 40 The Street Poringland to two dwellings including extensions. The approved scheme was to render the building and this application proposes to change this to oak cladding. The application also seeks to deal with conditions of the original planning permission for tree protection levels, boundary treatment and ecology. The development has commenced on site.

4.2 The site is within the development limit for Poringland, the dwelling will be accessed off the existing track, there are two bungalows being constructed at the east of the site.

4.3 The site is located well within the development limit for Poringland and is surrounded by development and as a result now has a very urban character. There is no objection to the principle of using timber cladding instead of render and consider that the development still maintains a high standard of design as required by Policy DM3.8 Development Management Policies, Policy 2 in the Joint Core Strategy and Section 7 in the NPPF.

4.4 The proposed levels and boundary treatments which is a mix of walls and timber fencing is considered acceptable.

4.5 The proposed tree protection measures are acceptable although a condition is still required to ensure that they are in place during the development.

4.6 In terms of the ecology a report was submitted with the original application and condition was imposed requiring mitigation, an EPS licence from Natural England is also required. The rear extensions of the barn have already been demolished and foundations for new extensions have also ready been done. This should not had have been done without a licence in place, however, we are obviously in a situation that the work done cannot be undone. The applicant's Ecologist has submitted a statement that further surveys are programmed for May which are required for the EPS licence and the licence will be submitted when this is completed. He has suggested that part of the roof could be removed before the licence is granted. However, the NCC Ecologist he is clear that given
the high interest in bats in the building it is not acceptable to carry out any further work on the main building until a licence has been granted. Natural England will determine the exact mitigation as part of the licence. A condition is proposed preventing any further work being carried out on the main building until an ESP licence has been granted.

4.7 As the new garages are located away from the main building, it would be possible to construct these.

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

4.9 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) because this is a S73 application and no additional floor space is proposed.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposed change in materials is acceptable and the development accords with policy DM3.6 of the Development Management Policies, Policy 2 in the JCS and section 7 in the NPPF. The Ecological mitigation however, is still to be agreed with Natural England and no further works on the main building should take place until a licence is issued by Natural England.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Helen Bowman 01508 533833 hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applications on land where South Norfolk Council has an interest

   Parish : Poringland

   Applicants Name : Mr I Jackson
   Site Address : Land North Of Shotesham Road Poringland Norfolk
   Proposal : Variation of Condition 9 of planning permission 2011/0476 - Amend condition to require off-site highway works to be completed prior to occupation of 100th dwelling instead of 50th dwelling or within nine months of the completion of the Anglian Water works.

   Recommendation : Approval with conditions

   1. In accordance with reserved matters
   2. In accordance with approved details & previous conditions
   3. Off-site highway works (amended condition)

1. Planning Policies

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 6 : Access and Transportation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   Development Management Policies
   DM3.10 : Promotion of sustainable transport
   DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
   Site Specific Allocations and Policies
   POR 6 : Land north of Shotesham Road and east of Carr Lane

2. Planning History

2.1 2014/0319 Residential layout including all house details and landscaping for next phase following planning permission 2011/0476/O
     Approved

2.2 2014/0393 Reserved Matters application for 57 dwellings and 3539m2 (GIA) office accommodation, associated parking and green spaces
     Approved

2.3 2014/0498 Variation of conditions 2 and 3 of planning permission 2011/0661/F- (Construction of Spine Road (Carr Lane to Shotesham Road), surface water lagoon and associated works) - construction in accordance with submitted drawings and construction of drainage lagoon
     Approved

2.4 2014/1967 Non material amendment to planning permission 2014/0393/D - Reposition of the electricity sub-station, amendments to commercial units 3 & 4 elevations with the
     Approved
introduction of plant room extractor grilles and amendments to the residential facing bricks schedule.

2.5 2014/2470 Revision to plot no1 - Facing bricks and roof tiles. Approved

2.6 2014/2568 Non material amendment to planning permission 2014/0393/D - Revisions to plots 11 and 16, external finishes. Approved

2.7 2015/0631 Variation of Condition 2 following planning application 2014/0393/D - Material change to windows and doors for the residential units and external changes to the materials for the commercial units Approved

2.8 2015/0973 Display of advertisements to include main development board, entrance direction boards, show home external sign, visitors car parking, external sales office sign, flag poles Approved

2.9 2016/0043 Variation of Condition 2 of permission 2014/0393/D - Revisions to plot house types, parking and materials Approved

2.10 2011/0661 Construction of Spine Road (Carr Lane to Shotesham Road), surface water lagoon and associated works Approved

2.11 2011/0476 Residential & Commercial (office) Development Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council More appropriate variation to the condition would be to state 'occupation of the 100th dwelling or completion of the Anglian Water works'.

3.2 District Member

Cllr J Overton Can be delegated

Cllr L Neal To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways No objections

3.4 Other Representations 1 letter stating no comment

4 Assessment

4.1 Planning permission 2011/0476 granted consent for residential and commercial development on an allocated site in Poringland. The consent was subject to a number of conditions and requirements which included the provision of a cycle / footway along The Street between Devlin Drive and Shotesham Road, a reduced speed limit on Shotesham Road and a speed reactive sign on The Street to the south of Shotesham Road. Condition 9 of the planning permission required that these improvements were provided by
occupation of the 50th dwelling.

4.2 The application is to vary this condition so that the highway improvements are not provided until a later stage. The reasoning behind this is that Anglian Water are carrying out works in Poringland to replace 11.4 km of pipe across the Poringland / Framingham Earl area, including works in both Shotesham Road and The Street. It is accepted that this is acceptable as otherwise this could result in a delay in delivery of the housing whilst the Anglian Water works are completed. It is also accepted that it would be illogical for a new footpath / cycleway to be constructed only for it have to be dug and up and reconstructed when Anglian Water install their new pipeline shortly afterwards.

4.3 As initially proposed, the proposed revised trigger point for the provision of the highway improvements was to be upon occupation of the 100th dwelling on the site. However, following feedback from the Parish Council the application has been amended to be at either occupation of the 100th dwelling or within nine months of completion of the Anglian Water works, whichever is later, to ensure delivery of the improvements. The applicant has agreed to this wording as a satisfactory compromise.

4.4 Norfolk County Council as the highway authority have no objection to this amendment to the timescale for the delivery of the improvement.

4.5 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) as no additional floor space is being created.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The revised timescale for the delivery of the highway improvements are acceptable as it is accepted that the Anglian Water pipeline replacement works render the previous trigger point difficult to achieve and may result in added disruption and wasteful work undertaken.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker 01508 533848 tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Enforcement

Enforcement Reports

1. Enforcement Ref : 2013/8339
Parish : DISS
Site Address : Cpl Office And Coal Yard, Station Road, Diss, Norfolk, IP22 4HN
Development : Construction of a Car Park
Developer : London Eastern Railway Ltd & Network Rail

1. Background

1.1 It was brought to the Council’s attention that a car park had been constructed on a former Coal Yard adjacent to the Diss Railway Station without the benefit of planning permission.

1.2 Certain works including the construction of a car park can be carried out by Railway Undertakers under PART 8, Class A railway or light railway undertakings of ‘The Town And Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 on their operational land without the benefit of planning permission.

1.3 It is unclear whether this site falls within the Railways operational land. The owners of the land have been invited to either submit an application for planning permission to regularise the situation or to demonstrate the site falls within their operational land. Unfortunately despite the Council’s requests no response has been received.

2. Planning Policies

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

2.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 5: The Economy
Policy 6: Access and Transportation

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
Development Management Policies
DM3.8 – Design
DM3.11 – Road safety and the free flow of traffic

3 Consultations

3.1 Town Council No comments received

3.2 District Members
- Cllr Palmers To be reported if appropriate
- Cllr Minshull To be reported if appropriate
- Cllr Kiddie To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways
- Note this forms part of the allocation Diss8 in the South Norfolk Local Plan and part (2) states access to the Coal Depot should include completion of the link road to Diss Railway Station from Nelson Road
• It is not clear how access to the former coal yard in isolation would be possible from Nelson Road as there is no intervening land. The site has been operating for last 2 and a half years without any particular problems and I do not see there are any highway issues that would warrant an objection. However we would have preferred that access be from Nelson Road as per the local plan.

5 Assessment

5.1 The site adjoins the Diss Railway Station and is under the same ownership. It is therefore quite likely the former coal yard was used in connection with the railway and has since been used as operational land. If this is the case then planning permission is not required for the construction of the car park.

5.2 Whilst no evidence has been found to suggest the site is not within the railways operational land it was considered appropriate to report this matter to committee following a consultation to decide whether any further action should be taken on the matter.

5.3 As outlined above whilst NCC Highways would prefer the car park to be accessed via Nelson Road they do not consider the development warrants a highway objection.

5.4 The site falls within land allocated for employment under Policy DIS 8 'Land at Station Road/Nelson Road' of the South Norfolk Plan and Policy 5 of the Joint Core Strategy. The use of this small part of the site for car parking in connection with the Railway is not considered to prejudice the allocation.

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.

6 Recommendation

6.1 That no further action be taken on the matter

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Andy Baines, 01508 533840, abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk and E-mail:
Enforcement Reports

2. **Enforcement Ref**: 2015/8207  
**Parish**: ROYDON  
**Site Address**: The Cottage, Manor Road, Roydon, Norfolk, IP22 5QS  
**Development**: Erection of bamboo screening  
**Developer**: Mr & Mrs Norman

1. **Background**

1.1 It was brought to the council’s attention that bamboo screening has been erected at the above site without the benefit of planning permission. The owner of the site was invited to submit a planning application to regularise the situation but no application has been submitted.

2. **Planning Policies**

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
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  
DM3.13 – Amenity, Noise and quality of life  
DM4.10 – Heritage Assets

2.4 Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas:  
S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”  
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 2005/1615 Proposed change of windows from metal frames to wood Approved

4. **Consultations**

4.1 Parish Council No comments received

4.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

4.3 Conservation Officer No objection  
- The harm resulting from the fence on the listed building is negligible.  
- It is not prominent in street views of the building.
4.4 Local Resident

One letter of objection received
- Screening causes lack of light within porch
- Unsightly
- Out of keeping with the listed building and style of the property
- Prevents maintenance, cleaning and painting of fence
- Breaches the Ancient Light Act 1832 ‘the right to light’

5 Assessment

5.1 The property is a grade 2 listed semi-detached cottage within the development boundary for Roydon. The bamboo screening measures approximately 1.8 metres in height and length and is located adjacent to the front of the property on the boundary with the adjoining property. It fills a space between the existing hedge and the front wall of the properties.

5.2 Concerns have been raised by the adjoining resident as outlined above. The screening is not considered to have a material impact on the residential amenity of the neighbour due to a reduction in the light as the screening is due north of the porch and there is a window in the south elevation of the porch. The Ancient Light Act 1832 ‘the right to light’ and concerns relating to maintenance is a civil matter and not one that can be addressed through the planning process.

5.3 The neighbours’ concerns relating to the fencing being unsightly and out of keeping with the style of the listed building are noted. However, this is a small section of screening which the Council’s Senior Conservation & Design Officer considers causes negligible harm to the listed building and therefore does not object to the development.

5.4 In view of the above I do not consider it expedient to take any further action on the matter.

6 Recommendation

6.1 That no further action be taken on the matter.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Andy Baines, 01508 533840, abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk and E-mail:
### Planning Appeals
**Appeals received from 23/02/2016 to 17/03/2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/1015</td>
<td>Morningthorpe And Fritton&lt;br&gt;Land North Of Hollies Farm Barns&lt;br&gt;Brick Kiln Lane Morningthorpe&lt;br&gt;Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr R Rafferty</td>
<td>Proposed demolition of existing poultry sheds and erection of 4 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2142</td>
<td>Costessey&lt;br&gt;Sub-division Of Garden At 33 Grove Avenue Costessey Norfolk</td>
<td>Mrs Jenny Brown</td>
<td>Proposed new dwelling and garage/workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals
**Appeals decisions from 23/02/2016 to 17/03/2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Decision Maker</th>
<th>Final Decision</th>
<th>Appeal Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/1148</td>
<td>Marlingford And Colton&lt;br&gt;Land North Of The Ugly Bug Inn High House&lt;br&gt;Farm Lane Colton&lt;br&gt;Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs T Crowland</td>
<td>Proposed erection of timeshare swimming pool building and associated residential accommodation</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>