Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

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

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

Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time
9.00 am                                Blomefield Room

Agenda

Date
Wednesday 4 January 2017

Time
10.00 am

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

Contact
Sue Elliott tel (01508) 533869
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.
A G E N D A

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

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

3. To receive Declarations of Interest from Members;
   (Please see flowchart and guidance attached, page 7)

4. Minutes of the Meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 7 December 2016;  (attached – page 9)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;  (attached – page 22)
To consider the items as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Planning Ref No.</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2016/1566/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Land North Of Frenze Hall Lane Diss Norfolk</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2016/0627/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land West Of School Lane Spooner Row Norfolk</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2016/1824</td>
<td>CARLETON RODE</td>
<td>Church Of All Saints Church Road Carleton Rode NR16 1RN</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2016/2165/O</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Land At Beccles Road Beccles Road Loddon Norfolk</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2016/2535/F</td>
<td>CHEDGRAVE</td>
<td>Land South Of Norwich Road Chedgrave Norfolk</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2016/2607/F</td>
<td>PULHAM MARKET</td>
<td>Hannahs Barn Barnes Road Pulham Market Norfolk</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2016/2635/O</td>
<td>TACOLNESTON</td>
<td>Land West Of Norwich Road Tacolneston Norfolk</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2016/2713/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Land At Costessey Park Parklands Costessey Norfolk</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2016/2714/LB</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Land At Costessey Park Parklands Costessey Norfolk</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2016/2781/F</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Land North Of Wild Rose Farm Ipswich Road Long Stratton Norfolk</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

7. Quarterly Enforcement Report  (attached – page 124)

8. Planning Appeals (for information)  (attached – page 128)

9. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wednesday 1 February 2017
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

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

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNDP</td>
<td>Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C.S</td>
<td>Joint Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSAAP</td>
<td>Long Stratton Area Action Plan – Pre Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.P.P.F</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.D.</td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.N.L.P</td>
<td>South Norfolk Local Plan 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Management Policies Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAP</td>
<td>Wymondham Area Action Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you declared the interest in the register of interests as a pecuniary interest? If Yes, you will need to withdraw from the room when it is discussed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the interest directly:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. affect yours, or your spouse / partner’s financial position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or your spouse / partner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relate to a contract you, or your spouse / partner have with the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Affect land you or your spouse / partner own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affect a company that you or your partner own, or have a shareholding in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the answer is “yes” to any of the above, it is likely to be pecuniary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, you need to inform the meeting. When it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you made any statements or undertaken any actions that would indicate that you have a closed mind on a matter under discussion? If so, you may be predetermined on the issue; you will need to inform the meeting, and when it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A  Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?

OR

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

YES

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

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

NO

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

YES

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

NO

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

YES

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

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

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

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

NO

You are unlikely to have an interest. You do not need to do anything further.
302. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/0482/F (Item 1)</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Cllr Hudson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALL (except M Gray and Y Bendle)</td>
<td>Other Interest Objector is wife of Local MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/1627/O (Item 2)</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>L Neal</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
303. MINUTES

Subject to a minor amendment, the minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 9 November 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

304. 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.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2016/0482/F (Item 1) | DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL | Mr T Blacker – Dickleburgh & Rushall Parish Council  
Ms A Blanchard – Objector  
Mrs V Bacon – Objector  
Mr C Smith – Applicant  
Cllr C Hudson – On behalf of Local Member  
Cllr B Spratt – County Councillor |
| 2016/1627/O (Item 2) | PORINGLAND | Mr J Henson – Poringland Parish Council  
Mr G Watts – Agent for Applicant |
| 2016/2153/F (Item 3) | STOKE HOLY CROSS | Mr C Bussey – Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council  
Mr R Eburne – Applicant  
Cllr T Lewis – Local Member |
| 2016/1838/F (Item 4) | ROYDON | Mrs T Allen – Applicant  
Cllr D Goldson – Local Member |
| 2016/2112/H (Item 5) | TACOLNESTON | Cllr B Spratt – Tacolneston Parish Council  
Mrs Eagling – Objector  
Mr O Read – Applicant  
Cllr B Duffin – Local Member |
| 2016/2155/CU (Item 6) | DENTON | Mr P Hill – Denton Parish Council  
Ms S Barber - Objector  
Ms H Sida-Page – Objector |
| 2016/2264/H (Item 7) | BROOKE | Mr J Jenkins – Agent for Applicant |
| 2016/2364/CU (Item 8) | ROYDON | Ms S Roberts – Agent for Applicant  
Mr D Peachey - Applicant |
| 2016/2520/F (Item 9) | NEWTON FLOTMAN | Mr C Gaze – Agent for Applicant |
305. ENFORCEMENT REPORTS

Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Long Stratton (ref:2015/8319)

It was RESOLVED that enforcement action be taken to cease the unauthorised use of the land for the storage of vehicles and vehicle parts; to remove the vehicles so that no more than six roadworthy vehicles remain on the site; and that the externally stored car parts be removed entirely.

306. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting closed at 3.25 pm)

_____________________

Chairman
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

1  Appl. No  :  2016/0482/F
Parish    :  DICKLEBURGH & RUSHALL
Applicants Name :  Mr Chris Smith
Site Address  :  Land North Of Harvey Lane Dickleburgh Norfolk
Proposal    :  Residential development of land to provide 22 dwellings, together with access, parking and associated infrastructure

Decision  :  Members voted unanimously for Deferral
Deferred

Reasons for Deferral
To allow liaison between the developer, the Highways Authority and the school to explore the options for an alternative footpath.

Updates to officer report

Additional letters of objection received (summarised):
- Further concerns over highway safety.
- Road not wide enough to accommodate extra volume of traffic or two cars to pass.
- No room for road or pavement to be widened.
- Pedestrian ‘white line margin’ not safe.
- Removal of verge outside of community centre will compound safety concerns.
- Introduction of a 20mph speed limit will not work.
- Extending the pavement on The Street will not help visibility leaving Harvey Lane.
- Marginal carriageway width improvements.
- Pedestrians forced to walk on verges.
- Maintain original objections.

Officer response covering matters raised above are addressed in the Development Management Committee report.

Additional comments from Parish Council (summarised):
- Harvey Lane is a physically constrained, heavily trafficked rural lane.
- The new development and its occupancy mix would have a significant impact, it would make an unsafe route, which doesn’t meet County Highways standards, even more hazardous for vehicles and pedestrians.
- The proposed development will account for a minimum of an additional 200 vehicle movements per day, an additional 70000 vehicle movements per year excluding traffic generation caused by goods, services and visitors.
- The impact cannot be mitigated in this location, physical restrictions along the length of Harvey Lane prevent it being widened, even if possible it would be economically unviable.
- Preventing access to Harvey Lane and routing traffic from this development via Beech Way would significantly impact Rectory Road which is also severely challenged.
- The South Norfolk local plan highlights the dependency of cars in the rural environment yet development site(s) with access to better road infrastructure in the village have been overlooked.

Officer response covering matters raised above are addressed in the Development Management Committee report.

**Corrections to report:**
- Paragraph 4.61 on page 33 of the Development Management Committee Agenda should be omitted from consideration as it has been incorrectly included in this report.
- The last sentence on page 28, paragraph 4.22 of the Development Management Committee Agenda should read *It is considered that to refuse an application on the grounds of inadequate pedestrian facilities could not be substantiated at appeal.*

**Additional highways conditions to be agreed:**
Traffic regulation order to be promoted by NCC

---

### 2 Appl. No : 2016/1627/O
Parish : PORINGLAND

Applicants Name : Mr Kittle
Site Address : Land To The North Of Heath Loke Poringland Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of 19 dwellings with access and all other matters reserved

Decision : Members voted unanimously to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to **Approve**, subject to surface water matters being adequately resolved and submission of a viability assessment to demonstrate affordable housing can be secured.

Approved with conditions

1 Outline Permission Time Limit (reduced)
2 Standard outline requiring reserved matters
3 Ecological enhancements
4 Fire hydrant
5 Contaminated land scheme
6 Implementation of approved remediation
7 Reporting of unexpected contamination
8 Construction Management Plan
9 Air source heat pumps
10 Water conservation
11 Surface water management scheme
12 Standard highways conditions

Subject to S106 agreement to secure affordable housing, open space and commuted sum for play equipment

Note: Access to Heath Loke is to be removed from the Plan.
Updates to officer report

Foul water drainage strategy condition to be added as required by Anglian Water

Landscape Architect comments on revised plans:

This is an improved scheme, offering an opportunity to create more of a positive feature of the Chet, and allows for the retention of existing trees.

Without a better survey/assessment of the existing trees it is not possible to ascertain whether or not what is shown on the indicative drawing tallies with the best trees, but this can be resolved at RM stage.

No objections.

District Member comments on revised plans:

Confirm application should only be determined by Committee as I have concerns about:

1. Access
2. Services
3. Surface water soakage? Is this a disaster waiting to happen?
4. Intrusion into the Countryside

Parish Council comments on revised plans:

Continue to object to this application. The submitted flood and drainage strategy states that flood risk is low to medium risk. Poringland is a known flood risk area and we are concerned that these proposals will create further issues downstream.

The Parish Council are also disappointed to see the plans propose clustered social housing – would prefer to see it integrated with the main development and of a similar build and quality.

NCC Highways on revised plans:

Revised plan accords with previous advice, however a plan showing the existing and proposed changes to the junction with the Norfolk Homes development is requested.

Some further comments on internal layout, though recognise that layout is not marked for consideration at this stage.

As advised previously, link to Heath Loke should be removed as this is a private road with no right to access it.

1 email from a local resident requesting a removable bollard be placed on Tubby Drive to prevent through traffic along Tubby Drive which is not a public road. Officers updated members orally that the possibility of a bollard had been explored with the Highways Authority but they did not consider it feasible.
3 Appl. No : 2016/2153/F
Parish : STOKE HOLY CROSS

Applicants Name : Mr Robert Eburne
Site Address : Land Off Broomfield Road Broomfield Road Stoke Holy Cross NR14 8FF
Proposal : (i) Construction of 53 dwellings (including 17 affordable units), access road, parking, garaging, footpaths and cycle paths walling and fencing, landscaping, public open space and associated infrastructure (ii) change of use of former agricultural land to provide extended primary school grounds and construction of 1.8 m high perimeter fence, pedestrian access, and associated hard and soft landscaping

Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval

Approved with conditions

1. Standard time limit
2. In accordance with plans
3. Material in accordance with submitted details
4. Boundary treatments in accordance with submitted details
5. 10% renewable energy measures to provided
6. Surface water drainage details to be agreed
7. Foul water drainage strategy to be agreed
8. Archaeology
9. Highways related conditions
10.Biodiversity Management Plan to be agreed
11.Open space management and maintenance arrangements to be agreed
12.Water conservation
13.Fire hydrant
14.Contaminated land assessment
15.Remediation scheme to be implemented
16.Unexpected contamination to be reported
17.Construction Management Plan to be agreed
18.Detalling of affordable dwellings i.e. porches to be agreed

Subject to S106 agreement to secure affordable housing and school site expansion.

Updates to officer report

Correction to report

Paragraph 4.8 should state total of 106 dwellings across the two (sites (53 on the existing Hopkins Homes site and 53 proposed).

Developer response to ecology query

Hopkin Homes have provided the following response to the ecological issue highlighted in paragraph 4.31 of the report:

The only trees being removed relate to the access point. These are small trees which do not have any bat roosting potential. The tree report stated… G15 and a section of H16 should be removed to facilitate proposed layout but will not have a detrimental impact to the local tree stock.
The ecologist reported that:

“Despite the sites current negligible/low value for foraging bats enhancements have been recommended within the landscaping scheme and in order for this to be effective a wildlife sensitive lighting scheme should be employed”

“Potential roost sites may be present within some of the larger, mature trees featured within the hedge and tree habitats on the site boundary (see photos in Appendix 4). Although no specific features were noted i.e. rot holes, stress fractures etc. these trees were of a size and age where they may have spaces present for roosting bats.

The larger trees which might have bat roosting potential are all retained and fenced away from the development during construction. These are photographed in plate 8 in the Ecology report. These trees are not part of G15 at the point of access. As such there is no requirement for further assessment.

This has been forwarded to the Council’s Ecologist who has confirmed that they are satisfied with this explanation and therefore they have no objection subject to the imposition of a condition (condition 10 of the suggested conditions).

SNC Senior Conservation and Design Officer has confirmed that the scheme has achieved a Building For life Score of 11 Greens and 1 Amber.

Local resident comment:
The revised layout now shows that there will now, not be a public footpath running to the rear of the gardens in Five Acres. At the moment several of the gardens (No’s 21, 23, 25 & 27) have an open aspect onto the site with no high fencing. We would ask that should planning permission be given for the development that a 1.8 metre high fence be erected by Hopkins Homes, at the boundary of the gardens so that our privacy is protected due to loss of amenity. Also it would mean the new bungalows adjacent will have a proper safe and secure boundary. At a Parish Council meeting held on 19th October (prior to the amended plan being submitted) to discuss the development, Robert Eburne did say that a fence could be erected but this does not appear to have been put forward in the new plan.

We also have a query regarding the footpath/cycle track running through to Five Acres. Would it be possible to incorporate an area for visitor parking? At present the area is used by visitors to Five Acres which, if not replaced would mean that cars would be parked on the road causing obstruction.

Officer response:
In respect of the request for fencing, it is understood that this boundary is under the control of the residents of the individual properties on Five Acres rather than Hopkins Homes and as such it would not generally be appropriate to request a condition to undertaken works (in this case a new fence) on a boundary not under the developer’s control.

In terms of the provision of visitor parking for residents of Five acres, there is no planning requirement as a consequence of the proposal itself to provide visitor parking.

Local resident comment:
Do not want visitor parking requested in front of their property, other areas of Five Acres can be used for this purpose ie near the existing green. The buffer between my drive and the pathway/cycleway should be reinstated. A fence should be put between my drive and the footway/cycleway to protect privacy.

Officer response:
Do not believe the introduction of a fence would represent a positive feature within the streetscene, the absence of any such enclosure does not lead to an unacceptable level of intrusion given the relationship of the dwelling to the footway/cycleway.
Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council:
Concern over the issue of the need for a footpath from Lower Stoke to Upper Stoke along Long Lane. The request for this to be considered is in my response sent on behalf of Stoke PC. We would appreciate it if you could consider making this one of the conditions, when approving this application that funds are made available for the construction of this Trod path by NCC by a 106 agreement or by using part of the CIL money retained by yourselves.

Officer response:
It would not be reasonable in planning terms to require the delivery of the aforementioned footpath via either condition or S106 contribution. It should be noted that the scheme is CIL liable, and the Parish Council would receive a proportion of the payment (either 15% or 25% of the CIL payment)

Historic Environment Services
continue to have no objection.

SNC landscape Architect – No objection subject to a condition to agree updated landscape plan to reflect change in planning layout received.

SNC Community Services Env Quality Team – same comments as on original scheme (no objection subject to conditions)

4  Appl. No  :  2016/1838/F  
Parish  :  ROYDON  
Applicants Name  :  Mrs Tracey Allen  
Site Address  :  18 Tudor Avenue Roydon Norfolk IP22 5SQ  
Proposal  :  Proposed increase in childminding business from 6 to 12 children  
Decision  :  Members voted 10-0 for Approval  

Approved for 12 months temporary consent with conditions

1 12 months temporary use  
2 In accord with submitted drawings  
3 Maximum number of children  
4 Hours/days of use

5  Appl. No  :  2016/2112/H  
Parish  :  TACOLNESTON  
Applicants Name  :  Mr Oliver Read  
Site Address  :  1 Birkin Close Tacolneston Norfolk NR16 1BT  
Proposal  :  Side and rear extensions  
Decision  :  Members voted 9-0 for Refusal (contrary to officer recommendation which was lost 0-8)  

Refused
Reasons for Overturning Officer Recommendation

The design is not in-keeping with the surroundings and is unacceptable due to mass and overdevelopment.

Updates to officer report

Additional conditions
3. Landscaping/ boundary treatment N and E boundaries
4. 3 parking spaces on plot

6 Applt No : 2016/2155/CU
Parish : DENTON
Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs Greenmore
Site Address : Rainbows End Norwich Road Denton IP20 0AN
Proposal : Retention of use as dog breeding facility
Decision : Members voted 8-0 for Refusal

Members also Resolved that enforcement action be taken to reduce the number of adult dogs on site to a maximum of 6, within 6 months.

Refused

1 – Noise disturbance
2 – Highway safety
3 – Not sustainable development

Updates to officer report

One additional letter of objection raising no new issues

7 Applt No : 2016/2264/H
Parish : BROOKE
Applicants Name : Mr Gordon Mussett
Site Address : Field House Littlebeck Lane Brooke NR15 1ET
Proposal : Single storey garage built off historic raft foundation and dwarf walls.
Decision : Members voted 5-1 for Refusal

Refused

1 – Incongruous with character and appearance of surrounding area

Updates to officer report

Photographs received from agent showing other approved garages.
8 Appl. No : 2016/2364/CU
Parish : ROYDON

Applicants Name : Mr D Peachey
Site Address : Barn South Of High Road Roydon Norfolk
Proposal : Change of use of agricultural building to B1(c) Light Industrial

Decision : Members voted 6-0 for Refusal

Refused

1 – Tantamount to a new industrial unit in an unsustainable location contrary to policies DM1.3 and DM2.1
2 – Building suitable for continued agricultural use and change of use could result in a replacement being required contrary to policies DM1.3 and DM2.10

Updates to officer report

Letter from the agent

• This is an existing building and refusal on the basis that it is not an existing building is illogical
• This is an existing industrial style building with no agricultural use on the horizon
• Building is servable in its current state
• Can’t understand why cycling along the A1066 is undesirable. This is a major A road so suitable for bikes
• The site is close to Roydon, the public house, garden centre, stream museum, vets and wedding venue all accessed by cars, vans, lorries, bikes, pedestrians and bus passengers
• People do access these by the foot and bike
• Sansom Lane runs from High Road Bressingham to 150 metres from the site entrance.
• Street lighting is irrelevant when discussing rural businesses
• 50% of staff on the site come from Roydon or Bressingham
• Agricultural engineering business has two employees that cycle all year round
• Consider it is well related to a rural town as within 2 miles of Diss along an A road.
• Agricultural workers would need to travel to the site yet workers coming to an industrial use could not get there is a sustainable way.
• Cannot understand how the proposal can result in significant social and environmental harm
• The tenants pulled out of 5 year contract which had a specific intended use for the building, building no longer required.
• Storage is not required for sugar beet and grain crops
• The rest of the land is poly tunnels and grass land no interest has been found to rent this land there is a convent on this land which restricts the growing of plants for retail sales
• Applicant has a high volume water licence to enable the continued agricultural/horticultural use of the use he would not maintain this, if he did not intend to retain the agricultural used of the land.
• The land adjacent to the proposed site is owned by others which is now derelict and is no longer viable for use as shown by Meredith’s bankruptcy,
• Would provide rural jobs so people would not have to travel to Diss
• Policy DM2.7 recognises the need for agricultural contractor buildings to store equipment to serve a wider customer base.
9  Appl. No : 2016/2520/F  
Parish : NEWTON FLOTMAN

Applicants Name : Newton Flotman Parochial Church Council  
Site Address : Church Of St Mary The Virgin Church Road Newton Flotman Norfolk  
Proposal : A replacement outer door for the porch.

Decision : Members voted unanimously to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to Approve, subject to receipt of revised plan to show correct form of existing archway.

1  Full Planning permission time limit 
2  In accordance with amended drawings, once received

Updates to officer report

Parish Council : Recommend approval
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

1  Appl. No      : 2016/1566/F  
    Parish       : DISS

   Applicants Name  : Miss Sophie Waggett, Persimmon  
   Site Address    : Land North Of Frenze Hall Lane Diss Norfolk  
   Proposal        : A residential development comprising 136no. dwelling houses with associated accesses, car parking, refuse and recycling provision and landscaping

   Recommendation  : Approval with Conditions
                     1.  Standard time limit  
                     2.  In accordance with plans  
                     3.  Highway requirements  
                     4.  Detailed construction management plan  
                     5.  Retention of trees and hedgerows  
                     6.  Landscaping scheme and management plan  
                     7.  Reporting of unexpected contamination  
                     8.  Renewable energy – 10%  
                     9.  Water efficiency  
                    10.  Materials as per materials schedule  
                    11.  Surface water drainage to be agreed  
                    12.  Foul water to mains system  
                    13.  Biodiversity management plan to be agreed  
                    14.  Fire hydrant provision

   Subject to the completion of a S106 to cover provision of affordable housing, open space and play areas, and green infrastructure contributions.

1.  Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   NPPF 06 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
   NPPF 07 : Requiring good design
   NPPF 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
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
DM3.14 : Pollution, health and safety
DM3.15 Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.3 : Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design

1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
DIS 4 : Land north of Frenze Hall Lane

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2015/2496 A residential development comprising 142no. dwelling houses with associated accesses, car parking, refuse and recycling provision and landscaping
Refused

3. Consultations

3.1 Town / Parish Council Amended scheme:
The applicant has gone some way to addressing issues previously raised but there is still concern regarding:
• Surface water from existing housing site and this proposed site being discharged into the River Frenze via the existing Highways infrastructure, that there may be insufficient capacity. Concern over maintenance and management of features not being clear;
• Parking provision – insufficient visitor parking provision;
• Streetlighting – along the existing Frenze Hall Lane pavement is considered essential as a minimum especially to encourage motorists to slow down in what is now a residential area
• Construction Traffic - timings of delivery is paramount and must especially avoid school drop-off/pick up times; DTC wish to be involved in determining all appropriate locations (should the application be approved)
• Management Company – concern over accountability of management companies, seek mechanism to secure.
Continues to recommend REFUSAL.

Original scheme:

Refusal on the grounds of density, number of dwellings too high resulting in an inadequate vehicular parking including for visitors. Surface water concerns.

However, should this application be approved, the Town Council would ask for consideration of the following

1. Construction Traffic – route and timings of delivery is paramount and must especially avoid school drop-off/pick up times; the Walcot Rise estate must not be used; wording regarding offsite parking should explicitly state that it is generally prohibited on all roads in the vicinity; DTC insist that restrictions signage, which will be very necessary, are located not just on the construction route but on other potential routes and wish to be involved in determining all appropriate locations.

2. Highways Issues – work to improve the junction at Walcot Green, install drainage requirements (for the existing development and planned new one on Frenze Hall Lane) and install cabling for the electricity supply for future traffic lights is scheduled to be completed prior to start of the development and is welcomed.

3. Flooding – current and future ownership/responsibility for ditches remains a concern; the ditch banks need stabilising and restructuring for water disposal; concern lagoon inadequate.

4. Parking – the issues raised by the Highways Authority must be addressed to their satisfaction.

5. Access - the site access location remains a concern; alternatives should be explored that have less of an impact on the amenity of existing dwellings; review siting of pedestrian crossings.

6. Landscaping – the landscaping plan attempts to address resident’s concerns.

7. Street lighting – the lack of street lighting remains a concern; the developer is requested to install the infrastructure to allow potential for future delivery; street lighting along the existing Frenze Hall Lane pavement is considered essential as a minimum especially to encourage motorists to slow down in what is now a residential area.

8. Overlooking – concern remains about the grouping of affordable housing to the rear of the bungalows on Hawk Crescent and the potential for overlooking, although it is acknowledged that boundary landscaping should help to address this.

Conclusion

Whilst Diss Town Council is generally in favour of this revised application which goes a long way toward addressing many of the issues, it continues to have concerns about the impact of this development on the existing local community and the future enjoyment of those who will live on it.

3.2 District Members
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd
To be reported.
3.4 SNC Conservation And Design

Amended scheme:

The change in the layout to a loop road created enhanced and more legible connection to the NW part of the site, although the drawback will be that vehicle speeds and road type will mean pedestrian movement will be via footpaths rather than what would be more pedestrian friendly cul-de-sacs combined with pedestrian links. The POS are also less integrated – although still visibly connected – to the east of the development. The pedestrian link negotiated for the linear central cul-de-sac is welcomed and is well overlooked and secure, although it is unfortunate that the road itself is not slightly sinuous like the loop road.

In terms of layout, the curving loop road will create some interest – it is unfortunate that buildings do not change their orientation to follow the road – and are rather uniform in their planning, although the variation in set-backs does at least create some variety.

There is a lot of frontage parking. Within cul-de-sacs this likely. On the principal roads it will be more visible – but there is at least some planting to screen it in places. It will be important that this planting is mature enough to get established.

The housing and materials are fairly generic, being national Persimmon house types. It will be important to condition exact materials.

Some refuse collection points some distance from properties (particularly the one nearest Frenze Hall Lane), which appear quite small – and also in the case of the one mentioned, without any screening landscaping such as shrubberies – this could be looked at in terms of perhaps separating them into two and/or screen shrub planting to soften their obtrusive appearance in the landscaping?

Building for Life Assessment 9 Greens and 3 Ambers

Original scheme:

Discuss revisions which would improve the scheme with applicant

3.5 NCC Ecologist

Amended scheme and original scheme:

Condition required for a Biodiversity Management Plan to be agreed which shall include compensation for the loss of a section hedgerow along the southern boundary of the site.

3.6 Historic England

Amended and original scheme:

Do not wish to make any comments.

3.7 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team

Amended scheme:

Comments to be reported.

Original scheme:

No Objection subject to conditions relating to construction management plan to be agreed, noise levels and precautionary ground contamination.
3.8 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager

Comments to be reported

3.9 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority

Amended scheme:
No objection subject to condition.

Original scheme:
Object as flood risk assessment and drainage strategy not adequate because:
- Site layout does not correspond to drainage strategy layout
- Risk of flooding from all sources not identified
- Further detail needed on location of proposed lagoon
- Climate change calculations do not comply with Environment Agency guidance

3.10 NCC Highways

Amended scheme:
No objection.

Original scheme
No objection to principle, revisions/amendments suggested.

3.11 NHS Clinical Commissioning Group

Both Diss GP Practices (Parish Fields and The Lawns) confirm that their comments from the previous proposal still stand. These are:

The Lawns Medical Practice

Our practice list size has increased by approximately 2000 patients over the last 10 years, a 45% increase. Over the past 13 years we have proposed three separate schemes to develop our centre but been refused funding each time. We are currently negotiating a fourth scheme with NHS England. SNC should take into consideration the increasing demands that we are coping with in a space that is inadequate for our practice list size.

Parish Fields Practice

Concern on the grounds of lack of health infrastructure. Diss has experienced rapid growth and we are seeing higher than predicted growth at our practice. The addition of these dwellings at either practice is not reasonable and will dilute the service we are able to offer. As you are aware no money comes to health in planning applications. Diss Health Centre has been unsuccessful in gaining funding to extend from, the NHS as it has its own financial limitations. We are suffering from increased demand from existing patients and new ones could be catastrophic for our ability to deliver services. Please consider health within your deliberations.

3.12 NHS England

- Identified that the development will give rise to a need for additional primary healthcare provision to mitigate impacts arising from the development.
- The capital required through developer contribution would form a proportion of the required funding for the provision of capacity to absorb the patient growth generated by 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.

3.13 Norfolk And Waveney Local Medical Council
No comments received

3.14 Norfolk Fire Service Station Master
This development will require 3 fire hydrants which should be dealt with through condition.

3.15 NCC Planning Obligations Co Ordinator
No objections.

3.16 NCC Minerals And Waste Planning Officer
No objection. The application site is not on a Mineral Safeguarding Area, nor does it fall within the consultation area of any existing mineral site or waste management facility, or the consultation area of any allocated mineral extraction site.

3.17 Other Representations
R Bacon MP

This revised application came forward following a period of engagement between me, local residents, Diss Town Council, and Persimmon East Anglia, together with local highways and planning authorities. Persimmon representatives have latterly shown themselves to be open and candid with residents and prepared to adapt their plans where necessary. It is regrettable that such an approach was not used on the previous application (2015/2496) and the applicant should bear this in mind for future developments, especially when further sites come forward in Diss.

Unfortunately, one of the areas where local concerns do not appear to have been accommodated is in the provision of car parking. It is my understanding that Diss Town Council has recommended that the above application be refused, partly due to the number of car parking spaces provided per dwelling. I also note that the Norfolk County Council’s Estate Development Engineer, Andrew Willeard, has said in his letter to Planning Officer Chris Raine dated 9 August 2016 that Persimmon’s ‘Chedworth’ and ‘Rosebery’ house types must be provided with three parking spaces per dwelling. One need only visit the ‘Churchfields’ development in Long Stratton to see how the failure to provide the appropriate number of spaces can blight a development and make roads impassable. I would be very grateful if South Norfolk Council could ensure that the applicant provides the appropriate number of car parking spaces, through the use of conditions if necessary.
Notwithstanding the above, my principal concern is that this application misses a much-needed opportunity to provide serviced plots for self-build and/or custom housebuilding opportunities in South Norfolk. Under the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015, local authorities now have an obligation to keep a register of individuals and associations of individuals who are seeking to acquire serviced plots of land in the authority’s area. Very recent amendments to this Act (contained in the Housing and Planning Act 2016) place a further obligation on local authorities to give suitable development permissions in respect of enough serviced plots of land to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding as evidenced by the register. Plainly, this is an area to which South Norfolk Council is likely to devote more attention in the months and years ahead. It seems to me that a sensible first step would be to encourage developers such as Persimmon in the present application to include a proportion of serviced plots for people who want to design and build their own homes or have a builder create a home to their own personal design.

Diss-Organised Residents Group

Amended scheme:

No further comments to those already stated.

Original scheme:

Without prejudice to any other issues from neighbours, no further comments to add, Reiterate points 1-9 from their last 14/07/16 meeting.

Pleased with continued discussion with developer. Not all in agreement but majority more content with current proposals than previously refused one.

Matters raised by NCC Highways and identified to be conditioned should be so if the District Council are so minded to grant any planning consent.

19 objections have been received, with a further 6 received in respect of the amendments, a summary of these are as follows:

- surface water flooding concerns,
- lack of common sense,
- local highway network is insufficient to deal with traffic implications,
- Greenfield sites should not be developed when brownfield sites are available,
- will highway works be undertaken at the same time as outstanding works linked to adjacent development,
- generally in favour, however, concerns at density of properties, parking provisions and landscape management arrangements,
- concern at the location of the access and that it will be detrimental to resident's amenities particularly via headlights shining into properties, persimmon did not consult us on the change of access point, alternative locations for the access point are available in less intrusive locations i.e. between 18 and 20 Frenze Hall Lane
- overlooking of neighbouring properties, replacing houses with bungalows would remove this issue,
- why is the open green space next to the road,
• development should not happen in this area,
• this number of properties is not sustainable, the infrastructure and facilities of the town cannot cope i.e. schools, dentists, surgeries,
• local highway network is not able to cope with the development, road is too narrow and congested,
• should be looking at brownfield sites,
• urgent review of hedges and grass verges is required,
• access is dangerously located,
• access should go onto Walcot Green,
• too many houses
• accidents have occurred in the area,
• losing vehicular access to Falcon Avenue is an improvement,
• Walcot Lane is a country road with no pavements,
• unacceptable removal of ecologically important hedge.

1 letter of support

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 136 dwellings with accompanying garaging and parking consisting of the following mix of properties:

Open market housing
15 x 2 bedroom houses 49 x 3 bedroom houses
18 x 4 bedroom houses 9 x 5 bedroom houses

Affordable housing
Social Rented
16 x 1 bedroom houses 13 x 2 bedroom houses
6 x 3 bedroom houses 1 x 5 bedroom house
2 x 1 bedroom bungalows

Shared Equity
4 x 2 bedroom houses 3 x 3 bedroom houses

4.3 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.

4.4 It should be noted that this is an amended submission following the refusal of a scheme for 142 dwellings under application 2015/2496.
4.5 The reason for refusal was:

“The proposed development contains an overly linear and urban style of layout and form of development, particularly in the northern part of the site. The tight grain and lack of separation between properties across some parts of the site, coupled with the lack of variety of house types in these areas and the prevalence of much of the parking to the front of properties, results in a scheme of low design quality that will appear unattractive and cramped and which will not successfully integrate into the surrounding character of the area. Furthermore, it is considered that insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate how existing vegetation and new landscaping will integrate itself into the layout.


4.6 Reference will made to this scheme in the assessment as appropriate.

Key planning issues

4.7 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.

4.8 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.

The development proposes 136 houses on the site (6 fewer than the previously refused scheme). It should be noted that this is greater than the approximate figure quoted in the DIS4 allocation.

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.”
The scheme proposed meets the requirements of criterion a) as it is an allocated site and the 136 dwellings proposed is considered appropriate given the town's 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).

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;"

In terms of para 58, providing 136 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 parking located adjacent to or in close proximity to the dwelling it serves. The scheme has 240 parking spaces of which 47 are garage spaces. On this basis it is considered that the scheme does make efficient use of land whilst still securing a layout which provides the necessary public and private space and parking levels.

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 136 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:

The first criterion within the allocation requires

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

The proposed layout makes provision for footpath links throughout it allowing easy movement across the entire site, as well as making provision for footpath links into the adjacent residential development via Falcon Avenue. A new section of footpath to the site frontage onto Frenze Hall Lane and two crossing points across the carriageway are also proposed which assist with positively linking the scheme to the existing footpath provision which allows for access into the town centre.

The second criterion requires:

- two separate points of road access;

The previously refused scheme provided two accesses, one connecting into the adjacent Falcon Avenue and a new access onto Frenze Hall Lane. There was considerable concern at the access arrangements, and in particular, to the provision of a link to Falcon Avenue. With this in mind, and following on from discussions between the developer and key stakeholders it has been agreed that Falcon Avenue does not provide vehicular access to the development, other than for emergency vehicles, this would be enforced via the imposition of bollards.

This has resulted in an amended scheme that will have one access for use by vehicles onto Frenze Hall Lane, rather than two as envisaged within the allocation. It is evident that this arrangement is acceptable in highway safety and traffic terms to the Highway Authority and as such it is not considered necessary in planning terms to secure a further access into the site from an additional secondary location.
There have been requests for a further access onto Walcot Green. This has been considered by the developer, however the existence of a gas pipeline is a clear constraint to pursuing this.

In summary, it is considered that the access arrangements of the scheme as revised from the previous scheme are acceptable.

The third criterion:
- approximately 10m landscape belt along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site

As with the previous scheme, the layout as proposed makes provision for a 10m landscape buffer to be provided along the northern boundary of the site. It is evident that the change in layout from the refused scheme has assisted in there being fewer properties that back onto the landscaping belt thereby limiting potential issues between future occupants and adjacent vegetation. This satisfactorily addresses the requirement of the allocation.

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, and as with the previous scheme, 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. The proposed layout seeks to retain existing vegetation on this boundary. This will also feed into the tree belt to the north of the site which would benefit ecology.

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;

The position of the open space coupled with the vegetation to be provided and retained 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.

The fifth criterion:
- Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place;

Anglian Water has been consulted and comments are to be reported. It should be noted that they confirmed that they had no objection to the previous application for more dwellings.

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 the north 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. It has been observed by the Council’s Senior Conservation and Design Officer that there is a lot of frontage parking. Whilst this is noted, it has also been highlighted that this is likely within cul-de-sacs and where it is on principal roads it will be broken up by new planting. Landscaping is the subject of a condition and will be able to agree suitably mature specimens to ensure that they can establish themselves. The scheme has been amended in line with a number of suggestions made by the Council’s Senior Conservation and Design Officer and they have confirmed that it achieves a score of 9 green and 3 ambers within the Building for Life assessment. This is considered to be an acceptable score.

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.

4.39 As was the case with the previous application, concern has been expressed in respect of the lack of infrastructure available within the town including schools, and medical facilities.

4.40 NCC Children's Services has been consulted through the NCC Planning Obligations Co-Ordinator to ascertain the up to date view on school places, given their position as local education authority. Again they have confirmed that they have no objection in respect of education matters.

4.41 Concern at the capacity of GP surgeries has been raised. This is a matter which is to be considered by the practice itself. The same points as expressed previously remain valid insofar as 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.

4.42 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.

4.43 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 45 of the 136 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.

4.44 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 the report, and are 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 DM3.13 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

The NPPF confirms the environmental role as:

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

The application is supported by ecological information and Norfolk County Council's Natural Environment Team subject to a condition on biodiversity management have no objection.

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

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

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.

Concern has been expressed at the potential surface water drainage implications of the scheme. The Council has consulted the LLFA on the amended plans, having been made aware of the LLFA’s initial concerns. They have subsequently confirmed that they have no objection.

Access and Highways

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.

As was previously the case, concern has been raised surrounding resultant traffic from the development and the impacts this would have on the local highway network.
In terms of the traffic impacts of the scheme, the Highway Authority are satisfied that the revised single access arrangement as proposed is acceptable in terms of both visibility and capacity so as to not compromise the functioning of the local highway network. Concern has also been expressed at parking levels, the amended scheme is considered to provide sufficient parking levels to support the scheme, with the Highway Authority confirming they have no objections.

In terms of construction traffic management, it is envisaged that a construction traffic management document will control this matter and this will be agreed via planning condition with the necessary technical input from the Highway Authority.

There has also been concern expressed at the potentially detrimental impact of car lights shining into an existing dwelling to the south immediately opposite the proposed new access onto Frenze Hall Lane. Whilst this is noted, it is evident that the junction is positioned in such a way that vehicles turning right out of the proposed access would be immediately opposite an existing garage and it would be vehicles turning left only that would be likely to have an impact. It is considered that the level of nuisance caused by this would not be so significant as to justify a reason for refusal on amenity grounds.

Attention has been drawn to the need for streetlighting. It is understood that there is no technical requirement for this to be implemented in this particular case.

Fire hydrants have been requested by Norfolk Fire Service and would be secured through a condition to any consent issued.

Self-build

Concern has been expressed at the lack of self-build opportunities put forward as part of the scheme. The issue of self-build provision has been discussed with the applicant who have confirmed that they are not looking to provide self-build plots. In considering this it is evident that the Council has granted consent for a number of plots throughout the District which can meet the demands contained within the Council’s self-build register. On this basis it would not be considered reasonable to refuse the application on the basis of a lack of self-build plots.

Contamination

Policy DM3.14 has regard to development and contamination. The Environmental Protection Officer has confirmed that subject to a condition this matter has been satisfactorily addressed.

Sustainable construction/renewable energy

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

Section 106 Agreement and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

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

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

5 Conclusion

5.1 This amended application, is considered to represent an improvement on the previously refused scheme and addresses the reason for refusal previously expressed. It is considered that the scheme complies with the relevant policies outlined in section 1 of this report and if approved would bring forward development on an allocated site. On this basis the scheme is recommended for approval subject to conditions and a S106 legal agreement being entered into.

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

2  Appl. No : 2016/0627/F  
Parish : WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Trustees Of J M Greetham No. 2 Settlement  
Site Address : Land West Of School Lane Spooner Row Norfolk  
Proposal : Proposed erection of 7 residential dwellings  

Recommendation : Authorise Director of Growth and Localism to approve with conditions  
1  Full Planning permission time limit  
2  In accordance with amendments  
3  External materials to be agreed  
4  Ecology Mitigation  
5  Slab level to be agreed  
6  New Water Efficiency  
7  Hedge planting  
8  Retention trees and hedges  
9  Drainage to accord with submitted details  
10  Boundary treatment to be agreed  
11  No PD for fences, walls etc.  
12  Highway Conditions  

Subject to resolution of the alternative provision to the pedestrian refuge and a 106 agreement to secure the funding for a Trod path or a contribution to an extension of the existing car park

1. Planning Policies

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.1 : Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
DM3.8 : 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  
DM4.4 : Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space  
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows  
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design

1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
1.5 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2015/0644 Erection 16 dwellings and associated roads Withdrawn
and open space.

3. Consultations

3.1 Town / Parish Council To the original submission
• Approve
To amended design and layout
Refuse:
To be resolved
• 1 Provision of footpath
• 2 Scheme to address flooding issues
Concerns
• 1 Loss of hedging and effect on habitat
• 2 Safety of attenuation pond in view of close proximity to school
To additional drainage information and alternative to refuge
• No comments received at the time of writing the report

3.2 District Member To be determined by committee
• Due to Local residents concerns re the number of dwelling (7
instead of the allocated 5) and local drainage issues

3.3 SNC Conservation And Design To the original submission
• Concerns regarding the layout and design
To amended design and layout
• The general design approach is acceptable and conditions need
to cover materials, windows and external hard surface
treatments etc.

3.4 SNC Water Management Officer To the original submission
• It is important that the applicant is able to demonstrate that the
flood risk and surface water drainage aspects of this application
can be satisfactorily addressed at this outline stage so as to
ensure that the layout and landscaping proposals can be
achieved. We would not recommend conditioning these aspects
until such times as it can be demonstrated that a satisfactory
solution can be achieved.
• Wish to place a holding objection.
To amended design and layout
• Wish to re-iterate my previous concerns
To additional drainage information
• Further clarification regarding future management of surface
water drainage system, including the attenuation basin, flow
control and outfall and also boundary ditches. But no objections
in principle.
3.5 NCC Highways

To the original submission
- I note that this site is an allocated site for residential development in Spooner Row and is covered by Policy SPO 2 in the Local Plan. The principle of the development of this site has therefore been accepted. The policy suggests that the development could accommodate approximately five dwellings.
- With the current Status of School Lane, from a highways perspective limited frontage development is preferred as opposed to a potentially larger estate development.

One of the requirements of the Policy is:-

2. Pedestrian refuge should be provided on the western side of School Lane to improve pedestrian access to the school

- The application as submitted does not provide for this requirement. The application will therefore need to be amended to comply with the above Policy

To amended design and layout
- No further comments made as the above not been provided

To additional drainage information and alternative to refuge
- No comments received at the time of writing the report

3.6 NCC Ecologist

To original submission
- No objections subject to conditions

To amended design and layout
- New site plan shows that the hedgerow will have 3 gaps for access along the eastern boundary and whilst the open area around the pond appears to be slightly enlarged as a result of the new design, we are uncertain whether this is sufficient to mitigate against the loss of species-rich hedgerow
- Overall feel that mitigation is possible, however at this stage we would like to see more detail which can be conditioned

To additional information re ecology
- No comments received at the time of writing the report

3.7 Other Representations

4 letters of objection
- This development if approved would take the number in Spooner Row to 59 As a service village have double the number of the plan allows
- Applicants say the application is sustainable, and says the new residents will have train and bus access.
- Bus comes once a week and train stops twice
- Add further to a dangerous school junction where recent appeal decisions have allowed new housing at both 1 & 2 Cantley Villas dead opposite
- School is full
- The widening of the road will further compromise the safe access and egress for residents
- Build-up of traffic at drop off and pick up times of the school as well as Station Road
- Shows a new footpath into the school playing field. the developer has not consulted or discussed with the Town Council
- Application fundamentally flawed
- TPO on the Oak opposite
• Only one affordable unit
• Not in keeping with the character and appearance of the area
• Detrimental to existing wildlife
• Unsuitable for development and should be removed from the Local Plan
• NCC highways recommended for this site to be refused under the recent withdrawn application, due to safety issues, inferior road surface, pedestrian safety etc. These concerns still stand but they have appeared to now accepted the principle, putting policy over public safety
• Public footpath shown to playing field where does it then go?
• School Lane too narrow to accommodate a 1.8m footpath even if grass verge is removed
• Existing flood risk and drainage issues which have not been addressed

Norfolk Living Streets Local Group
• Leave space between houses to allow future footpaths to be built to developments that will probably be built in the future
• Do not plant hedges in front of properties
• As a condition of gaining planning permission the developer should have to build a pavement from the development to the school

To amended design and layout
4 letters of objection
• Previous concerns still
• Failed to make any provision for a path as required
• Total number of new properties should be 15-20 it is now 3 times that permitted number
• Amended plans have not included nor addressed crucial issues which affect local residents flood risk and highway/public safety concerns

To additional drainage and alternative to refuse
1 letter of objection
• Now on-site water storage has been agreed is there really any need for an attenuation pond opposite our house at a low point, already suffer flooding after heavy rain If it overflows then our property will be lower than the new build, the water will rundown towards us
• If ditch dug deeper and cleaned out regularly, then there would be no need for any detention basin or attenuation pond
• How will the developer protect wildlife

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 7 dwellings with associated garages and curtilages at School Lane, Spooner Row. The site lies to the north of the playing fields. Opposite the site are existing residential properties and the school is located on the corner of School Lane and Station Road.

4.2 Spooner Row, 2 ½ miles South West of Wymondham, is a predominantly newly developed settlement and is still relatively dispersed. Prior to the C19 there was little settlement as such just a hamlet consisting of a handful of buildings at the road junction to the south and dispersed farms and cottages. The railway line and station bought some additional modest cottage development. This site is close to the Victorian School to the north of the dispersed settlement beyond the railway line. The development is now mostly C20, but is still quite modest and rural in character, generally reflecting the simple forms and materials of later
4.3 The main issues in this case are the principle of development in this location, design and layout, refuge provision, highway safety, residential amenity, drainage and ecology.

Principle of development

4.4 Policy 15 in the JCS allocate Spooner Row as a Service Village where development for approximately 10-20 dwellings can be accommodated subject to respecting the character and form of the settlement. This approach is supported the NPPF.

4.5 Policy SPO 2 sets out the requirements for the development of the site, as set out below:

Land amounting to some 0.3 hectares is allocated for housing and associated infrastructure. The allocation could accommodate approximately 5 dwellings.

- 1 Development must not restrict public access to the playing field
- 2 Pedestrian refuge should be provided on the western side of School Lane to improve pedestrian access to the school
- 3 Site layout takes account of a tree protected by a TPO adjacent to the site
- 4 A sustainable urban drainage scheme should ensure that no surface water drains off the site.

The application seeks consent for 7 dwellings which is greater than the approximate figure contained within the allocation, it is considered, that in principle, providing 7 dwellings within the village which is a service centre is acceptable, subject to the proposal satisfying the requirements of the policy and other considerations such as design, layout, residential amenity etc.

Design and layout

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

4.8 Concerns were raised in respect of the detailed design and layout of the submitted proposed dwellings and it was suggested that the materials should reflect the more traditional red brick and render and that the forms should be relatively simple C19-C20 ‘cottage’ style development. Although the hedge is of note, the development on the south east side of School Lane has already eroded to some extent the natural undeveloped rural character of the lane. It was considered that the hedge could however be retained with more than one access creating a less suburban character to the development.

Following discussions a revised scheme has been submitted, which creates a more rural layout and the buildings are more traditional in their size, scale, form and materials. The proposed dwellings are considered acceptable in terms of their design, scale and relationship to the surrounding properties. The layout demonstrates that the site is of sufficient size to comfortably accommodate the proposed dwellings, curtilages, parking and turning. On this basis, it is considered that the scheme would accord with DM3.5 of SNLP, Policy 2 of the JCS and Section 7 of the NPPF.

Pedestrian refuge

4.10 The original submitted scheme showed a footpath running from the site and stopping at the top of the playing field, there is a ditch and hedging located in this area, no information was provided of how this would connect to the existing playing field and if the Town Council (the owners) supported the access onto their land. When the amended design and layout was submitted the footpath had been removed and no alternative provided, both the Highway officer and I raised concerns that without the provision of a refuge or an alternative, the proposal would fail to meet the requirements of Policy SPO 2.
4.11 To try to resolve the issue a meeting was held on site with NCC Highways, the agents and representatives from the Town Council. It was quite clear that the existing School Lane is not wide enough to provide a refuge or a footpath along the western side linking the development with the school, within the highway. The meeting produced two alternatives (which both seem reasonable) to the requirement set out in the policy, a trod path running across the playing field or a financial contribution (the cost of the provision of a trod path) towards extending the existing car park which is owned and maintained by the Town Council.

4.12 At the time of writing the report no response had been received from the Town Council in respect of the alternatives. It is therefore recommended that the approval of the application be subject to the resolution of this issue.

Highways

4.13 Policy DM3.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would endanger highway safety or the satisfactory functioning of the highway network. The Highway officer as can be seen from above raised concerns regarding the non-compliance with Policy SPO 2 and therefore to date he has not formally commented on the proposed alternatives or provided any conditions. He has raised no objections in principle to the parking, turning, access points or visibility. It is fully appreciated also that the school related traffic, parking/dropping-off on School Lane causes a significant impact and makes highway safety a sensitive issue locally.

Residential Amenity

4.14 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. There are neighbouring properties to the east of the site separated by the road. Given the separation distances it is considered that the development will not give rise to a situation detrimental to the amenities of the nearby neighbouring properties via loss of privacy, loss of light, overbearing impacts. As such the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DM3.13.

Drainage

4.15 Policy SPO 2 requires a sustainable urban drainage scheme to ensure that no surface water drains off the site. Drainage has been subject to a number of negotiations with the Water Management officer, as the originally submitted scheme, did not address this issue. Although the information received enables the Water management officer to raise no objections in principle, further clarification regarding future management of surface water drainage system, including the attenuation basin, flow control and outfall and also boundary ditches has been requested and at the time of writing the report not yet received.

Ecology

4.16 The NCC Ecologist raised no objections to the original submitted scheme, however may have commented that ‘the new site plan shows that the hedgerow will have 3 gaps for access along the eastern boundary and whilst the open area around the pond appears to be slightly enlarged as a result of the new design, we are uncertain whether this is sufficient to mitigate against the loss of species-rich hedgerow. Overall feel that mitigation is possible, however at this stage we would like to see more detail which can be conditioned.’
4.17 The agent has responded advising that all four hedgerows around the development site were assessed as part of The Phase 2 Ecological Survey and none of them were considered to be classified as important under the Hedgerow Regulations. Furthermore, the section of hedge where the new opens will be created does not contain any significant trees. By way of mitigation the Survey recommended additional planting and management measures which will enhance the habitat value of the existing hedges. In addition, two new native species hedges are proposed around the development site. These are matters which in his opinion could be covered by way of planning conditions. In respect of birds, the Survey also recommends that hedgerow removal is timed to avoid the bird nesting season. At the time of writing the report no further comments have been received from the Ecologist.

4.18 Local residents have raised concerns as set out above, majority of which relate to the issues contained within the above report. However there are issues raised in relation to the number of dwellings being built in the village; school traffic, unsustainable location etc. and whilst these are fully appreciated, I do not consider the proposal can be refused on the grounds raised.

Other matters

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 Subject to the resolution of the pedestrian refuge and satisfactory additional information being submitted, the principle of the application is acceptable on this site and is considered to represent a sustainable form of development. The appearance and layout of the development is considered acceptable for its context and it will not adversely affect the amenities of the neighbouring properties. As such the proposal accords with the NPPF, JCS and SNLP

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788 and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3  Appl. No : 2016/1824
Parish : CARLETON RODE

Applicants Name : Mrs Joan Hocking
Site Address : Church Of All Saints Church Road Carleton Rode NR16 1RN
Proposal : Church and community notice board

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions
1  In accordance with submitted drawings

1. Planning Policies

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 2 : Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.9 : Advertisements and signs
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

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

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

2. Planning History

2.1 No relevant history

3. Consultations

3.1 Town / Parish Council Recommend approval

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 SNC Conservation And Design
Original plans
The design, size and materials of the sign would detract from the views of this setting and therefore result in a degree of harm. The proposed position is neither disabled nor elderly friendly, being located on a quite a rough grass verge – and it is not that practical to get close to the board to read notices. Would suggest keeping the two locations – the larger parish board adjacent to the parking bay – although a timber board would be preferred in this location, there would be less of an objection to this being the Diocese blue and aluminium if desired, as its impact in this location on the setting of the church will be far less.
3.4 Historic England

Original plans

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

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

3.5 NCC Highways

No objection.

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

3.6 Other Representations

1 letter of support

4 Assessment

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

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

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

4.4 The original proposal sited the sign in front of the wall on the south boundary. However, following objection, there has been negotiation to alter the position and materials of the proposal. Plans have been submitted to re-position the sign further east to be sited in front of an existing conifer tree, but the applicant is not willing to change the design and materials of the sign.

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

Design and character of the area

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

4.7 The Conservation and Design officer also raised concerns about the original plans, with regard to the location, size and design of the sign. It was considered that the picturesque composition of the wall, the churchyard and the south elevation of the church contributes to the significance of heritage assets, and that the sign would detract from this view and result in a degree of harm.
4.8 Although a change of materials to timber was requested, the amended plans received do not alter the design of the sign; however the siting of the sign has been moved in front of trees and away from the principle view of the church, and in front of the aluminium sign for the primary school, which helps to mitigate impact.

Setting of the listed building

4.9 The setting of listed buildings requires consideration under the development management policies and S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990, which requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The site lies within the setting of a grade I listed building and the application has been assessed by the Senior Conservation and Design Officer who would favour more traditional materials, but would not object to the amended plans on the grounds that it is sited away from the principle views of the church.

4.10 Although I acknowledge concern raised regarding the colour, size and choice of materials, it is considered that the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets. Weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, as suggested in paragraph 134 of the NPPF, it is considered that on balance, the proposal would accord with section 12 of the NPPF, Policy DM4.10 of the SNLP.

Residential amenity

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

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

Highway safety

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

4.14 Following consultation, the Highways Authority has raised no concerns with the proposal, however would recommend that the notice board is located as close to the wall as possible. In view of the proposed siting, I would consider that the development accords with this policy.

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

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

5.1 The appearance of the sign is acceptable in the proposed location, and there will not be a significant impact on heritage assets, visual amenities and highway safety. As such, the application has been assessed against the policies of the Local Plan as set out above, and I would consider that the proposal accords with the principles of these.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Lucy Smith 01508 533821 lsmith@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Appl. No : 2016/2165/O
Parish : LODDON

Applicants Name : Mr Reg Holmes
Site Address : Land At Beccles Road Beccles Road Loddon Norfolk
Proposal : Outline application for the erection of 4 self-build dwellings with all matters bar access reserved.

Recommendation : Refusal
1  Contrary to policy DM1.3
2  Insufficient Information – Heritage Impact
3  Not Sustainable development

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 06 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design
NPPF 11 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF 12 : Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development
DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.1 : Meeting Housing requirements and needs
DM3.11 : 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
DM4.5 : Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
DM4.4 : Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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

S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.”
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 2013/0579 Proposed housing development on land west of Express plastics, Beccles Road, Loddon. Refused

2.2 2013/1846 Variation of condition 2 & 3 of planning permission 2011/1174/F - Breach of Conditions (Construction of a 7 metre access strip for maintenance and drop kerbs longer than plans approved). Approved

Appeal History

2.3 14/00003/AGREFU Proposed housing development on land west of Express plastics, Beccles Road, Loddon. Dismissed

3. Consultations

3.1 Town / Parish Council To the original submission Refuse
- Permission refused by SNC in 2014 and an appeal to the Inspector was unsuccessful
- Reasons for refusal still remain
- Request application is determined by Committee rather than delegated to a Planning Officer
To amended plans
- No comments received

3.2 District Member To original submission To be determined by Committee
- Application for 4 self-build properties is outside development boundary for Loddon
- In Rural part of South Norfolk there is well in excess of 5 year land supply thus the proposed development would fail to meet the test under the NPPF
- Plenty of sites which could accommodate this type of development, albeit not in Loddon
- There has been an appeal against the refusal of planning permission for development on this site on a previous occasion and this application is no different, other than it is for ‘self-build’
- The Inspector ruled the development was not appropriate in this location
To amended plans
- The amended plans do not alter my original objections, which I wish to maintain
- Note the application is for self-build which there is a strong push to encourage, but it does not mean that it trumps the local plan or circumvents the development boundary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.3 SNC Conservation And Design | To original submission | • In respect of the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, the previous Inspector was judging impact from a specific design proposal and a heritage statement was included in the submission. In this case the impact cannot be assessed as no details are being sought to be approved. Recommend that an outline application is not approved.  
To the amended plans | • No further comments |
| 3.4 Environment Agency | To the original submission | • Holding objection on flood risk grounds, this can be overcome by submitting an FRA that covers the deficiencies highlighted and demonstrates that the development will not increase risk elsewhere and were possible reduce flood risk overall  
To amended plans | • The flood risk to the development site has now been modelled and shows that the proposed development is not at risk of flooding in all flood events. Therefore, remove our objection. |
| 3.5 NCC Ecologist | No objections subject to conditions |
| 3.6 SNC Water Management Officer | To the original submission | • The Environment Agency should provide advice regarding the flood zones  
• No Emergency Flood plan  
• In light of the flood risk and no specific water drainage strategy we would recommend that the applicant clarifies the means of surface water drainage for the site and that surface water arising from the proposed development can be managed sustainably. |
| 3.7 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team | No objections subject to conditions |
| 3.8 Waveney Lower Yare & Lottingland IDB | No comments received |
| 3.9 Norfolk Rivers IDB | No comments received |
| 3.10 Lower Waveney IDB | No comments received |
| 3.11 SNC Landscape Architect | To the original | • Submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment is acceptable  
• The application would cause a change in the landscape but within the published landscape character area information I cannot find anything to support or preclude the development  
• If application was to be approved, then the detailed design of the site will require particular consideration  
To amended plans | • No further comments |
3.12 NCC Highways

To the original submission
- Note that this application is similar to the previous 2013/0579 which was refused
- In outline with only the means of access as a reserved matter for which approval is being sought
- Proposal involves the demolition of part of the dwarf safety wall which runs to the rear of the footway across the watercourse on both sides of Beccles Road. This wall forms a key part of the bridge and cannot be altered, therefore the access proposal is not acceptable

To the amended plans
- Revised access design is acceptable and therefore no objections subject to conditions

3.13 NHSCCG

No comments received

3.14 Upper Yare And Tas IDB

No comments received

3.15 Waveney Valley Internal Drainage Board

No comments received

3.16 Other Representations

To the original submission
13 letters of support
- Land has been undeveloped for a long period of time
- Would prefer to have low density build
- Will help the community
- Will make the area look neater
- Already established that the site is not at risk from flooding
- Will turn a disused scrub land once used as a car park for express plastics into a desirable small estate
- Good to create more attractive housing on this site
- Nice to provide more business to local economy
- Applicant wishes to develop a brown field and properties are self-build
- Inconsistency of the planning process in Loddon is very worrying
- Would look more inviting to visitors on their approach to Loddon
- How can it be refused when the new estate next door was granted?
- Reasonable infill and will join the new development to the rest of Loddon
- Development would be entirely visible from our home and couldn’t be happier knowing it will not be high density
- Would prefer 1 house but 4 is an acceptable amount
- 10 years lived opposite it has been nothing more than scrub land, scruffy and uncared for, so development would be an improvement

9 letters of objection
- The previous application was refused and unsuccessfully appealed in 2014
• The Inspector considered housing on the appeal site would be contrary to the provisions of the development plan. Site lies within the Rural Area part of the District where there is a housing supply of some 8.3 years. Thus, even were policy ENV8 relevant to the supply; she was satisfied, given the housing land supply situation that the policy is not out of date in terms of Framework para 47. Accordingly, she concluded that; in the context of National and Local policy and guidance, residential development would not be appropriate on this site.

• Now it is suggested that Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 in some way "trumps" the Inspectors decision.

• LPA under the Bill will be under a legal duty to grant sufficient "suitable development permissions" to meet the demand for self-build/custom build in their areas. Only have to take into account consideration where areas of land for development have been identified as suitable for housing in the local development plan. This land has been deemed "unsuitable" and the Act does not give carte blanche for self-build on "unsuitable land".

• Register only came into force from 1st April, too soon to have credible data on the need, even though the applicant and his family members have registered individually.

• Both the proposed entrance and existing field entrance pose traffic issues.

• Detrimental to highway safety.

• The site has been despoiled and become an eyesore in the centre of a conservation area, whilst it may seem as an opportunity to improve the visual aspect this is not a good enough reason to grant consent.

• Enough new housing being erected in Loddon.

• Loss of view.

• Do not want to encourage other houses to be built on the Meadow.

• For last 2 years' land been rented out and used as a building site and store by Taylor Wimpey and Batemans Groundworks, and also be a commercial builder. As such large vehicles and plant have been in and out.

• Land is a marsh and very boggy, with numerous underground streams that drain into the river and ditches around the land.

• Heavy traffic has caused neighbouring houses to shudder and concerned subsequent building work could cause damage from piling and vibrations.

• Concerned the site is waterlogged, which led to it being flood listed by Anglian Water and possible flooding of houses if developed.

• Loss of privacy.

• Noise and disturbance.

• Sold as amenity land, was a section 106 applied to the land? does this mean that any amenity land can automatically obtain planning permission?

• Concerned that number of dwellings applied for will increase.

• New development is pitting strain on local schools, medical centre and facilities.

To amended plans
• No comments received.
4. Assessment

4.1 This application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of 4 self-build detached residential dwellings with associated garages/parking and curtilages with all matters reserved apart from the access. The site is located off Beccles Road, Loddon. Residential properties are located to the west of the site, to the north and the new residential development of Taylor Wimpey to the east. The boundaries of the site consist of trees and vegetation along the Beccles Road, to the west are the rear boundaries of the properties along Foxes Loke and open meadowland with a water course to the east side that follows the route of the footpath. The site frontage is within the conservation area.

4.2 The Town of Loddon is set in the attractive valley landscape of the River Chet (within B5 Chet Tributary Farmland). The valley to the east of the Town is marshland characteristic of the Broads, but to the west it is more enclosed with abundant wooded areas. Whilst the principle streets are urban in character, the Town is a place of contrasts; narrow streets with open spaces; small cottages close to elegant country houses; the open nature of the river valley and the compact, but ever changing, streets and alleyways. A small tributary valley runs southwards out of the settlement, alongside the application site, and is largely open in character. That open character allows for views out from the Conservation Area, across the site to the countryside beyond, and for views into the Conservation Area when approaching from the south.

4.3 The site is outside the development boundary for Town of Loddon which is defined by the South Norfolk Site Specific allocations 2015.

4.4 The outline planning application reference 2013/0579 was refused and dismissed at appeal. A copy of the Inspector’s decision is attached as Appendix 2 for information.

4.5 The applicant’s agents have stated that:

“Since this refusal, the planning policy has evolved at both a national and local level. This application has been prepared with this in mind."

and also:

“We would further highlight that it is our belief that the site forms brownfield land, having formally represented an area of car parking associated with the former Express Plastics. In line with Paragraph 111 of the NPPF, the effective use of brownfield land is encouraged.

4.6 Likewise, this proposal also qualifies as a self-build project. The recently adopted Housing and Planning Act introduces a new duty on local authorities to grant planning permission for serviced plots sufficient to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in their areas. This demand will be evidenced by the number of people on the registers that are to be created and maintained by local authorities under the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015. The applicant and his two children are all present on South Norfolk’s self-build register and intend to build their own homes.

4.7 Furthermore, to date, the council does not possess any specific adopted policies or land allocations in place with regards to self-build and as a result should be considered silent on the matter. Consequently, any proposal for self-build projects should be considered and assessed in line with Paragraph 14 of the NPPF."

Considerations

4.8 The main issues in the case are the Principle of development; Impact on Conservation Area and the Environment; Highways; Residential amenity; Flooding; Brownfield Land; Self-Build; and Sustainable Development.
Principle of development

4.9 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) (2004) states in that 'regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under any planning act the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material consideration indicates otherwise'.

4.10 As set out in this report there are no material considerations to outweigh, override or change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making in accordance with paragraph 12 of the NPPF. This is reinforced by paragraph 17 bullet point one of the NPPF in that the planning system/process should 'be genuinely plan-led'.

4.11 The site lies in the Rural Policy Area (RPA), which in respect of housing supply has a 16.94 years supply.

4.12 Consequently the Council's policies for the supply of housing can be considered up-to-date and applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material consideration indicates otherwise.

4.13 The site falls outside of the development boundary where there is a presumption against new residential dwellings under policy DM1.3. The proposal is considered to conflict with DM1.3, which requires all new development to be located on allocated sites or within development boundaries, unless specific DM policies allow for it or there are overriding benefits. This report identifies there are no overriding benefits this proposal would bring to outweigh the harm and policy conflict.

Impact on the Conservation Area and the Environment

4.14 The impact on Conservation Areas requires consideration under the development management policies and S72 Listed Buildings Act 1990 which requires special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. Policy DM4.10 of the Local Plan requires that proposals must show how the significance of the heritage asset has been assessed and taken into account. It is noted that with the previous application which was dismissed at appeal (2013/0579) the Inspector considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. However, that outline application had indicative details of appearance, landscaping and scale with the application as well as a Heritage Impact Assessment. The present application has no such supporting information. The proposal is also for self-build, which means that there could be variations and diversity in the design and appearance of the properties and siting depending on what would be put forward for each plot at a later date.

4.15 Part of the site does fall into the conservation area, and the rest will directly affect its setting. There is a building identified as being of townscape significance directly opposite on the north side. It is not considered good practice to approve outlines in conservation areas or the setting of conservation areas where there is potential for harm as the degree of harm on the heritage asset cannot be judged without more specific details on design and appearance, particularly when any new development will contribute towards the street scene within the conservation area. I therefore consider that insufficient information has been submitted for the Council to fulfil its duty under S72 of the Listed Buildings Act to consider the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and to comply with Local Plan policy DM4.10.
A core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework is to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, which is reflected in Policy DM1.3 of the Development Management Policies document. Planning Practice Guidance clarifies that conservation and enhancement of the landscape, not only designated landscapes, contributes to upholding this principle.

It is considered that the site, together with the open land/countryside located to the south to the A146, provides a positive contribution to the form and character of the Town and its development would harm that character. It is considered that the development of the site would erode the rural character of the local landscape and consequent sense of place, thereby conflicting with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy DM1.3.

Highway Safety

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. Access for the dwellings forms part of this application and has been assessed by the NCC Highway Authority who following the receipt of amended plans raises no objections to the proposal. The application seeks to serve the development of 4 dwellings by an access which will run to the east of the site, there is an existing access currently used by Waveney Lower Yare and Lotingland IDB, which it is proposed to adapt to form a new access to serve the development. The existing access to the northwest is proposed to be closed. There have been concerns raised in respect of highway safety as set out above, whilst these are fully appreciated, given the Highway officer has raised no objections, I do not consider the application can be refused on highway safety grounds. In view of the above the proposal accords with Policies DM3.11 and DM3.12.

Residential amenity

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. There are neighbouring properties to the west, north and east. Given the separation distances, however, it is considered that the development, whilst in outline, could be designed so as not to give rise to a situation detrimental to the amenities of the nearby neighbouring properties via loss of privacy, loss of light, overbearing impacts. I fully appreciate the concerns raised as set out above, but I do not consider that the proposal would give rise to a situation so detrimental to the amenities of the neighbours to warrant refusal of this outline application on amenity grounds. Consequently the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DM3.13.

Flooding

The Environment Agency maps show the site lies partly within Flood Zone 2 and 3, the medium and high probability zones. The proposal is for four residential dwellings, which is classified as a 'more vulnerable' development. The Environment Agency therefore put a holding objection on flood risk grounds, advising that this can be overcome by submitting an FRA that covers the deficiencies highlighted and demonstrates that the development will not increase risk elsewhere and, where possible, reduce flood risk overall. The required additional information has been provided and now shows that the proposed development is not at risk of flooding in all flood events. Therefore, the Environment Agency has removed their objection.
4.21 The Water Management Officer has raised concerns that there is no Emergency Flood Plan and in light of the flood risk and no specific water drainage strategy, would recommend that the applicant clarifies the means of surface water drainage for the site and demonstrate how surface water arising from the proposed development can be managed sustainably. Whilst I fully appreciate the lack of information, given that the application is in outline, the above can be conditioned to be provided as part of any reserved matters application and therefore would not be a sustainable reason to refuse the application.

Brownfield Development

4.22 The applicant believes that the site forms brownfield land, having formally represented an area of car parking associated with the former Express Plastics and in line with Paragraph 111 of the NPPF, the effective use of brownfield land is encouraged. This material consideration was raised at the hearing and fully considered by the Inspector who commented ‘I saw during the site visit that the remains of that parking activity have largely, in the process of time, blended into the landscape to the extent that the site can now be reasonably be considered as part of the natural surroundings and, for the most part, it now appears congruous with the general appearance of open countryside. That historical use carries no weight, therefore, in favour of the appeal scheme’.

4.23 Annexe 2 of the NPPF defines ‘Previously Developed Land’ and excludes land that was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time, which has clearly happened in the case. I therefore do not consider that the previous use of the site as a car park should carry any significant weight in supporting the application.

Self-build

4.24 It has been put forward that the dwellings would be self-build and full consideration has been given to this. The NPPF sets out in principle support for the provision of self-build housing. Paragraph 50 includes the requirement to ‘deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create inclusive and mixed communities, Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should plan for… the needs of different groups in the community such as people wishing to build their own homes’.

4.25 Paragraph 159 of the NPPF sets out the requirement to carry out the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which includes identifying a need for people wishing to build their own home and there is also further advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.


4.27 The Acts and Regulations have given Local Authority’s a number of duties.

4.28 Firstly, local authorities have a duty to have a self - build register. The Council established one as part of its Vanguard role and continues to operate it.

4.29 Secondly the Local Authority must have regard to the register when carrying out functions relating to
   a) Planning
   b) Housing
   c) The disposal of any Local Authority Land
   d) Regeneration

4.30 In terms of the planning function as well as plan making the register is also a material consideration in decision making.
4.31 Section 10 of the Housing and Planning Act requires Local Authorities to give suitable development permission in respect of enough serviced plots of land (or plots which in the view of the LPA could be serviced within the lifetime of the permission) to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in the authority's area arising from each base period. The first base period ended on 30th October 2016. To comply with these requirements the LPA needs to give sufficient planning permissions that could be suitable for self-build or custom build properties in relation to any base period in the 3 years beginning immediately after the end of that base period. Therefore, the timescale to comply with the current requirement is between 31st October 2016 and 30th October 2019.

4.32 Given existing self-build exemptions for CIL and the Council's current record on granting planning permissions which could be suitable for self-build or custom build properties, there is no reason not to expect that this requirement will be met from sites which are in accordance with the adopted Development Plan.

4.33 In term of the Council's five year housing land supply this is defined in NPPF paragraph 47 for market and affordable housing. Self-build housing would be included in this requirement, but there is no specific requirement for a five year land supply for self-build housing.

4.34 The Regulations now make it clear that the demand for self-build housing is defined by the self-build register and there is no requirement to consider other sources of information.

4.35 These regulations are not intended to supersede the overarching principle and golden thread of the NPPF which is the delivery of sustainable development.

4.36 The JCS Policy 4 states that proposals for housing will be required to contribute to the mix of housing required to provide balanced communities and meet the needs of an area. Although there is not an individual policy for self-build developments, this policy allows consideration to be given to the provision of any identified need. Furthermore DM 3.1 focuses on meeting housing requirements and needs, specifically referencing self-build sites within the preamble. Para 159 of the NPPF goes on to instruct LPAs that their Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMA) should include the range of housing that local populations are likely to require, to include people wanting to build their own homes.

4.37 Therefore, although there is not an individual policy for self-build developments, and details of self-build delivery are expected to be drawn up through a Supplementary Planning Document now the regulations have come into force, the Council's policies allow consideration to be given to the provision of any identified need including self-build.

4.38 For the reasons set out above, the Council does not consider the development plan is silent on the matter of self-build. This view was supported by an Inspector in determining an appeal on application 2016/0526 Planning Inspectorate reference APP/L2630/W/16/3152650.

4.39 With Loddon falling within the Rural Area of South Norfolk, there is sufficient housing supply (16.94 years as set out in the December 2015 AMR), to meet the requirements in the JCS. As a result it is considered that the development plan is not out of date and can be given full weight.

4.40 As required by paragraph 50 of the NPPF consideration has been given to the benefits of providing self-build dwellings, but it is not considered to justify a departure from the Development Plan in this case.
Sustainable Development

4.41 The proposal represents a departure from the Development Plan. Policy DM 1.3 restricts new development to allocated sites or sites within development boundaries. Loddon is designated as a location for some growth in the Rural Policy Area as defined by policy 15 of the JCS. The site lies outside of the defined development boundary where policy DM1.3 restricts new residential development unless overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environment dimensions are demonstrated as set out in Policy DM1.1.

4.42 The site lies in the Rural Policy area which in respect of housing supply has a 16.94 years supply, as such the Council's policies for the supply of housing can be considered up to date and applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

4.43 The site falls outside of the development boundary where there is a presumption against new residential dwellings under DM 1.3. The proposal is considered to conflict with DM 1.3, which requires all new development to be located on allocated sites or within development boundaries, unless specific DM policies allow for it or there are overriding benefits.

4.44 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

4.45 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."

4.46 The scheme would result in some short term economic benefits as part of any construction work, which may be done by small scale builders and in the longer term by local spending from the future occupants. It is therefore considered that the scheme would bring forward a small level of economic benefit.

Social Role

4.47 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."

4.48 As the Council has a significant housing supply in the rural area the provision of four dwellings is considered to have limited benefit which may be slightly enhanced if the properties are self-build.

Environmental Role

4.49 The NPPF confirms the environmental role as "contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy."
The development would result in an infringement into an undeveloped area which is important in creating and enhancing the rural character of the settlement and would consequently cause substantial environmental harm.

Conclusion on sustainable development

Having due regard to the above assessment made in the context of having a five year land supply, it is considered that the concerns regarding encroachment into the countryside, is not outweighed by minor economic and social benefits, when considered as a whole, and as a result the scheme does not represent sustainable development.

The Council considers that the development plan is not silent on self-build and the Council has a five year land supply in the RPA, as a result it is considered to be up to date. In addition the proposed development would not result in sustainable development as a result paragraph 14 of the NPPF is not invoked and there is no need to carry out a paragraph 14 assessment.

However, for the avoidance of doubt the requirements of paragraph 14 of the NPPF in respect of the presumption in favour of development for decision-taking have been considered.

In the context of promoting sustainable development, Paragraph 14 advises this means: "Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless:
Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole; or
Specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted."

In this instance it is considered that the harm caused by the encroachment into the open countryside would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the very minor benefits to the local economy and by the provision of four houses in a location where the Council already has a significant land supply.

Other considerations

A number of concerns have been raised as set out above, which do not form a reason of refusal of the application, whilst they are fully appreciated, the fact the a site was bought as amenity land; the strain on services in the Town; impact of building vehicles and machinery; already enough housing in Loddon; the land being a marsh and boggy; and loss of view would not be reasons to refuse the applicant in this instance.

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) because they are new dwellings.

Conclusion

In conclusion the site is outside the development limit in a location where there the Council has a significant housing land supply and the development plan is considered to be up to date. There is no overriding justification for departing from policies DM1.1 and d DM1.3 in the Development Management Polices, which restricts development outside the development limit.
6. **Reasons for Refusal**

6.1 The site is located outside the development limit in an area where there is not an identified need for new dwellings. No overriding justification identified in the National Planning Policy Framework or the South Norfolk Development Management Policies 2015 has been put forward for the development. As a result the proposed development is contrary to policy and would have an urbanising effect on the rural character of the area contrary to policy DM1.3 of the Development Management Policies.

6.2 It is considered insufficient information has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority to adequately assess the merits of the scheme and possible impacts the development would have on the Conservation Area, contrary to policy DM4.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and S72 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990.

6.3 The proposed development does not represent sustainable development having regard to the three tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The adverse impact of the encroachment into the open countryside, outweighs the modest social and economic benefit of four additional dwellings in the rural policy area where there is an existing significant housing land supply (16.94 years). For this reason the scheme is contrary to the aims of the NPPF to secure sustainable development, acknowledging the advice in paragraph 49.
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- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr R Holmes against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
- The application No 2013/0579/O, dated 27 March 2013, was refused by a notice dated 5 July 2013.
- The development proposed comprises housing development on land west of Express Plastics, Beccles Road, Loddon.

Decision

1. For the reasons that follow, the appeal is dismissed.

Procedural and Background Matters

2. The application was accompanied by a layout plan showing five dwellings. At the Hearing, the appellant confirmed that the layout plan was indicative only and that outline permission was being sought for the principle of residential development on the site, as opposed to any specific quantum of development, with all matters other than access reserved for future consideration.¹

3. Although the Environment Agency’s Maps show the appeal site as lying within Flood Zones 2 and 3, the appellant’s flood risk assessment and modelling has demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency, that the site lies within Flood Zone 1, both now, and with an allowance for climate change. Whilst there is a residual risk of flooding should the downstream bridge become blocked, the evidence is that the development itself would remain dry and that future inhabitants would have safe access/egress. On that basis, although local residents express concerns in this regard, flood risk matters formed no part of the Council’s reasons for refusal.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this case relate to:

- whether, in the context of national policy and guidance and adopted and emerging local planning policy, particularly the approach to housing land supply, residential development is appropriate on this site; and,

¹ The application form is completed to the effect that all matters other than access are for consideration as part of the proposal. As access is reserved for future consideration, as confirmed at the start of the Hearing, however, the appellant had intended to indicate that access should be considered now, with all other matters reserved for future consideration. The Council confirmed that it had dealt with the application on that basis.
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• whether appropriate provision is made for affordable housing.

**Reasons for the Decision**

*Is housing appropriate on this site?*

5. The 0.58 hectare appeal site lies adjacent to, but outside, the Development Limits and Village Boundary for Loddon, as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan (March 2003). Consequently, although residential development lies to the north, east and west of the site, the appeal scheme falls to be considered as development in the open countryside for the purposes of planning policy.

6. At the heart of national policy, as stated at paragraph 14 of the Framework, is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Notwithstanding that presumption, Framework paragraph 2 reiterates the statutory position that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for the area includes the saved policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan and the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (March 2011).

7. Outside development boundaries, Local Plan policy ENV8 is only permissive of new development in particular circumstances. The appellant maintained that part ii) of the policy was supportive of the proposal, arguing that the scheme is justified to sustain economic and social activity in a rural community and demands a rural location\(^2\). However, as indicated in the explanatory text to the policy, and as confirmed by the Council at the Hearing, part ii) is aimed at development such as farm diversification schemes, or dwellings for rural enterprises - namely development that can demonstrate the necessity of its location and which would be of benefit to rural communities. Whilst the development proposed may help support economic and social activity in Loddon to a limited extent, there is no indication that it can be justified on that basis. Indeed, as acknowledged by the appellant at the Hearing, general market housing does not demand a rural location. All in all, I am satisfied that the development proposed falls outside the remit of the policy. It would, therefore, conflict with the development plan, the aim of policy ENV8 being, among other things to maintain the landscape setting of settlements and the predominantly rural character of the Plan area.

8. In addition to making clear that housing applications are to be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, Framework paragraph 49 states that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites.

9. As noted by a colleague Inspector in relation to an application for residential development in Lakenham, Norwich,\(^3\) the influence and needs of Norwich, particularly in terms of housing, stretch beyond the limits of the City of Norwich and into the neighbouring South Norfolk and Broadland Districts. As a consequence, all three local authorities, as well as the County Council and the Broads Authority, work together through the Greater Norwich Development Partnership to manage the delivery of the growth strategy for the area. In seeking to accommodate the planned level of housing growth arising from the

---

\(^2\) The other circumstances set out in policy ENV8 are not relevant to the appeal scheme.

\(^3\) APP/C2620/S/13/2195084
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Norwich urban area, the Joint Core Strategy defines what is referred to as the Norwich Policy Area (NPA), which includes all of the City of Norwich and parts of the adjacent Authorities of South Norfolk District and Broadland District. The remaining parts of South Norwich and Broadland (including Loddon) lie within what are referred to in the 2012-2013 Annual Monitoring Report for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (AMR) as the non-NPA Rural Areas (Rural Areas).

10. In order to meet the full objectively assessed needs of the different housing market areas, the trajectory for the NPA is calculated separately to that for the Rural Areas. As set out in the AMR, and following the aforementioned appeal decision, whilst the supply in the NPA applies to the entirety of that area, the trajectory for the Rural Areas is calculated for each separate authority area. It is the appellant’s case that, if the trajectory for the NPA part of South Norfolk District (which currently shows a shortfall) and that for the Rural Area part of the District (which shows an oversupply) are added together, there is an overall shortfall for the District as a whole, i.e. the local planning authority, and thus, with reference to the Framework, the housing policies should be considered as out-of-date.

11. The recent Planning Practice Guidance (planning guidance) confirms that housing needs should be assessed in relation to the relevant functional area and that establishing the assessment area may identify smaller-sub-markets with specific features. It also notes that local planning authorities can use a combination of approaches where necessary, confirming that where there is a joint plan, housing requirements, and the need to identify a five year supply of sites, can apply across the joint plan area, with the approach being taken to be set out clearly in the plan. I am also mindful that the matter of housing land supply was the subject of considerable debate in the context of the Examination into the Joint Core Strategy.

12. Whilst the Core Strategy is not explicit about how housing supply will be addressed, policy 4 makes it clear that allocations will be made to ensure that at least 36,820 new homes can be delivered between 2008 and 2016, of which approximately 33,000 will be in the NPA, distributed in accordance with the ‘Policies for Places’. At the Hearing, the Council confirmed that the most relevant of those policies is Core Strategy policy 14, which identifies key service centres settlements (which include Loddon/Chedgrave) where land will be allocated for new residential and economic development.

13. The approach, of ‘splitting’ the housing supply between the NPA and the Rural Areas, which is reflected in the AMR, is clearly collaborative, with the Council advising that the approach has been endorsed over many years - in the old Regional Spatial Strategy and in the 1993 and 1999 Norfolk Structure Plans. Given the very different needs of Norwich and its immediate hinterland, when compared with the Rural Areas beyond, I find that the Council’s approach is not out of step with the Framework. I note that, in dealing with the matter of housing land supply in Norwich and in South Norfolk, two colleague Inspectors took no issue with the approach either. Indeed, in the Lakenham case, the

---

Footnotes:

4 Paragraph 20 and 26 of the AMR
5 Paragraph 008 Reference ID: 2a-008-20140306
6 Paragraph 009 Reference ID: 2a-009-20140306
7 Paragraph 010 Reference ID: 2a-010-20140306
8 The Lakenham Decision already referred to, and APP/G2625/A/13/ 2196746 – residential development on land at Flaxlands Road, Carleton Rode, Norfolk
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Inspector specifically commented that there was a strong logic to measuring the five year housing land supply in the NPA.

14. Core Strategy Policy 14 indicates that land for 100-200 dwellings is to be allocated at Loddon/Chedgrave. Pursuant to that requirement, policy LOD1 of the Council’s emerging Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) allocates land at George Lane, Loddon for approximately 200 dwellings. At the Hearing, the appellant voiced doubt as to whether the George Lane site would be fully developed and thus, that there would be a shortfall in the supply of new housing. It was also argued that the constraints identified in relation to the appeal site, which influenced the final DPD site selection process, were no longer an issue.

15. Outline planning permission was granted in February 2014 for up to 200 dwellings on the George Lane site\(^5\). Access to that development involves realignment of the A416 and the formation of a new roundabout. Whilst the realignment is required to be begun before the occupation of any dwelling, the planning obligation secures completion of the final stage of the realignment and the roundabout before occupation of the 125th dwelling. Although the appellant argued that the financial investment required in those final works was significant and that, as a consequence, the developer would be unlikely to complete any more than 124 dwellings on the site, no substantiated evidence was submitted to support that assertion. In any event, policy LOD1 only refers to ‘approximately’ 200 dwellings for Loddon/Chedgrave, although Table 8.2 of the DPD does show the George Lane site as delivering 200 dwellings.

16. The reference to the appeal site having fewer constraints to development than the George Lane site, relates to the Council’s ‘traffic light’ scoring system which forms part of the screening assessment for potential DPD allocations. The Council confirmed, in this regard, that the system simply provides a visual guide for each of the screening questions asked of potential sites. It does not provide a method for making a quantifiable score for each site. That is done taking account of a range of matters, with the screening assessment being only one part. Whilst I understand the appellant’s concerns in this regard, this is not a matter that can be resolved through an appeal on an individual site, the merits, or otherwise of the options selected being for others as part of the emerging DPD process. In any event, the reasons for refusal do not relate to the identified constraints for the appeal site.

17. Housing on the appeal site would be contrary to the provisions of the development plan. Moreover, the site lies within the Rural Area part of the District where there is a housing land supply of some 8.3 years. Thus, even were policy ENV8 relevant to the supply of housing (and I make no judgement either way in this regard) I am satisfied, given the housing land supply situation that the policy is not out-of-date in the terms of Framework paragraph 47. Accordingly, I conclude that, in the context of national and local policy and guidance, residential development would not be appropriate on this site.

Affordable housing provision

18. It was a matter of agreement at the Hearing that the development should include 30% affordable housing provision (based on the site area) in

\(^5\) Application No 2013/1647/0
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accordance with policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy. Whilst paragraph 5.29 of the supporting text to the policy expects provision to be integrated within the site, the appellant maintained that a contribution towards off-site provision would be more appropriate in this instance.

19. It was argued that: the appeal site represents a small infill site, to be developed with a low number of exclusive, multi-bedroom executive type homes set in large plots with a high market value; the dwellings would be served via an unadopted road, and unadopted foul and surface water systems; and the scheme would include areas of communal landscaping, the maintenance of which would be overseen by a management company. The appellant had sought the views of a local affordable housing provider (Circle Housing Group) on the arrangement outlined (Document 10). The informal comments received indicated that there was a high risk that a single affordable resident on the site might potentially be excluded socially, or would not fully integrate with, or be accepted by, adjoining property occupiers. In addition, it was felt that the arrangement would have implications for the affordability of the property, irrespective of tenure.

20. Whilst I understand those concerns, they seem to me to run contrary to the drive for integration and social inclusion. In any event, this is an outline application, the layout plan submitted being indicative only. I see no good reason therefore, were the appeal to succeed, why any final scheme could not be designed to accommodate an element of affordable housing on site successfully. In coming to this view, I note that paragraph 50 of the Framework indicates that affordable housing needs should be met on site, ‘unless off-site provision, or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified (for example to improve or make more effective use of the existing housing stock) and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities.’ To my mind, the appellant’s case for off-site provision is not sufficiently robust as to persuade me that on-site provision would be wholly inappropriate in this instance. Thus, there would be conflict with the development plan and the Framework in this regard.

Other Matters

21. In support of the appeal scheme, the appellant drew attention to the encouragement in the Framework to the re-use of previously-developed land. At the time of the Hearing, the site appeared little used and was becoming overgrown. Although planning permission was granted in 1966 (Document 13) for use of part of the site for car parking associated with the adjacent Express Plastics (which site is now being redeveloped for housing) I saw, during the site visit that the remains of that parking activity have largely, in the process of time, blended into the landscape to the extent that the site can now reasonably be considered as part of the natural surroundings and, for the most part, it now appears congruous with the general appearance of open countryside. That historical use carries no weight, therefore, in favour of the appeal scheme.

22. The front part of the appeal site lies within Loddon Conservation Area. Loddon, a small market town settlement with an historic core, is set in the attractive valley landscape of the River Chet. Whilst the principal streets are urban in character, the town is a place of contrasts: narrow streets with open spaces; small cottages close to elegant country houses; the open nature of the river
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valley and the compact, but ever changing, streets and alleyways. A small tributary valley runs southwards out of the settlement, alongside the appeal site, and is largely open in character. That open character allows for views out from the Conservation Area, across the appeal site to the countryside beyond, and for views into the Conservation Area when approaching from the south along the Wherryman’s Way recreational footpath. However, the Conservation Area Character Appraisal (Document 6) does not identify the appeal site as forming part of any important view into or out of the Conservation Area.

23. Whilst there clearly would be some change to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, were the appeal scheme to proceed, change does not, necessarily, equate to harm. There is built development along both sides of Beccles Road, the appeal site being an exception to that. I am satisfied, subject to detailed design and retention of the vegetated area on that part of the site which lies within the Conservation Area (adjacent to the road frontage), that residential development here would not harm, and would therefore preserve, the established character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

24. Local residents and the Parish Council raised a number of concerns that were not reflected in the reasons for refusal. At the Hearing, the appellant was unable to confirm that the flood risk assessment took account of surface water from the adjacent Taylor Wimpey development on the Express Plastics site. That said, given my findings on the main issues, that is not a matter I need to pursue. Whilst local residents were also concerned at the capacity of the foul water infrastructure in the area, there was no adverse comment from Anglian Water, the responsible authority for such matters.

25. The planning application was accompanied by a phase 1 habitat survey and protected species assessment. No evidence of reptiles was found and the habitat – large areas of improved grassland with tall ruderals and scrub – was of low significance. Bats use trees beyond the site to the east as a commuting/foraging route and for roosting, and the site has potential for hedgehogs. Were the proposal to be acceptable in all other regards, these interests could be protected by conditions.

26. With regard to highway safety, the development would be served by a single access off Beccles Road, in a similar position to the existing access. During the site visit I saw that visibility in both directions was good and I note that the highway authority raises no objection to the proposal.

27. In relation to concerns relating to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance, outlook, overshadowing and privacy, this is an outline application and layout is a reserved matter. I see no reason to suppose that it would not be possible to devise a layout for the site that protected those interests. The adequacy of any detailed layout would be a matter for consideration by the Council in the first instance, were the appeal to succeed.

Balancing Exercise and Conclusion

28. Paragraph 14 of the Framework states that the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be seen as the golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking. I am mindful, in this regard, of the key service centre designation of Lodden/Chedgrave in the Core Strategy. Such centres are noted as having a range of facilities enabling then to meet local
needs, as well as the needs of residents of surrounding areas. On the basis that the appeal site is located at the edge of a key service centre, future residents on the appeal site would have reasonable access to services and facilities and would not, necessarily, be overly dependent on the private car. That said, the Framework embraces a much wider definition of sustainability, referring to its economic, social and environmental dimensions.

29. With regard to the economic and social dimensions, residential development on the appeal site would contribute, in a small way, to supporting the local economy during construction and future occupiers would, to some extent, support local services, though they would also be likely to use nearby towns. Whilst the absence of any on-site affordable housing provision speaks against the social dimension, it was agreed at the Hearing that, if I were to find it necessary, a condition could secure on-site provision.

30. The environmental dimension of sustainability is concerned, among other things, with protecting and enhancing the natural and built environment. On the basis of its countryside location, outside the defined development boundaries for Lodden, the development conflicts with Local Plan policy ENV8 and policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy, and with the Council’s overall strategic approach to delivering sustainable development through the identification of suitable housing sites in the emerging Site Allocations and Policies DPD. Significantly in the balancing exercise, I have found that the Council has no shortfall in its housing land supply in its Rural Area. There would be environmental harm therefore, in allowing unjustified development in the countryside. There would also be conflict with the economic dimension in this regard, which seeks to ensure, among other things, the delivery of land in the right place.

31. Paragraph 8 of the Framework makes it clear that the dimensions to sustainable development are not to be undertaken in isolation, as they are mutually dependent. Given the conflict with the economic (in part) and environmental dimensions I conclude, overall, that the proposal would not amount to sustainable development as defined by the Framework.

32. All in all, there is insufficient to persuade me in this case, that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with development plan. Therefore, for the reasons set out above I conclude, on balance, that the appeal should not succeed.

Jennifer A Vyse
INSPECTOR
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DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED DURING THE HEARING

1 Joint Core Strategy policy 20  
2 Large scale map showing the boundary of the Conservation Area in relation to the appeal site  
3 Plan from the emerging Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD  
4 Loddon Parish Plan  
5 Officer’s report in relation to the George Lane application  
6 Loddon Conservation Area Character Appraisal  
7 Report update on the interpretation and application of the Joint Core Strategy affordable housing policy (5 February 2014)  
8 Extract from the Council’s Place Making Guide SPD  
9 Plans showing route of that part of the Wherryman’s Way footpath adjacent to the appeal site  
10 Appellant’s Planning Statement Addendum 1A and related letter from Circle Housing Group  
11 Decision Notice 2013/1846/RVC (variation of conditions 2 and 3 of the 2011 permission for construction of 7 metre access strip for maintenance and drop kerbs at the appeal site)  
12 Decision Notice and Planning Obligation I relation to the outline application for residential development at George Lane (2013/1647/O)  
13 Decision Notice L.2925 (use of part of the appeal site as car park)
5  **Appl. No**: 2016/2535/F  
**Parish**: CHEDGRAVE

Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs Frost  
Site Address: Land South Of Norwich Road Chedgrave Norfolk  
Proposal: Erection of 1 no. 4 bedroom self-build dwelling and garage

Recommendation: Refusal  
1 Contrary to policy DM1.3  
2 Harm to countryside - not sustainable development

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
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

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

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

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2015/0952 Single dwelling with detached domestic garage. Refused

2.2 2016/0039 Retention of Agricultural storage barn Approved
3. Consultations

3.1 Town / Parish Council

Approve: Will provide family accommodation for a local resident but should be limited to a single dwelling only as it is currently outside the village boundary. Councillors were disappointed that the application was previously unsuccessfully as they wish to encourage local people to build individual homes on suitable site in the village.

3.2 District Member

To committee:
1. The effect on the local community in allowing a local couple to move out of low rent accommodation thereby freeing a resource for a further family.
2. Encouraging local families to remain in the area and continue to contribute to local society as this couple manifestly have. This is endorsed by the local parish council and neighbouring properties.
3. The property is already served by major utilities including a dropped kerb.
4. The property does not extend the building line beyond that of the opposing side of the road.
5. The self-build development proposed would fit the criteria for national call for self-build projects.
6. The proposed development would not detract from the village and in fact support the local community since I understand the couple in question regularly undertake voluntary work, enhancing the locality.
7. The development is limited in scope and residential, and so would not be likely to encourage unwanted development.
8. The success of this application will contribute to the target for Housing delivery under the Joint Core Strategy. Consequently I strongly endorse this application for consideration by the Committee.

3.3 SNC Water Management Officer

No adverse comments to make but include advisory notes relating to the disposal of surface water and soakaways/infiltration devices.

3.4 NHSCCG

No comments received

3.5 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team

No objection subject to condition reporting unexpected contamination.

3.6 SNC Conservation And Design

The development is for a house outside the settlement boundary within designated open countryside. The submission is for a traditional style self-build home. The approach to the design would be considered acceptable if on allocated land, however, being outside the settlement boundary it needs to meet the requirement of paragraph 55, which it does not do, or even seek to do. It is therefore a planning policy issue.

3.7 NCC Highways Authority

Support subject to condition for parking and turning prior to occupation.

3.8 Other Representations

19 letter of support:
- Driving in and out of the village we have seen a great improvement, the land is so tidy and a family home would not affect the surroundings.
- Development might deter people from littering the land.
• A well designed property will enhance the area.
• Offer full support to a self-build family home site already benefits from pedestrian footpath, and street lighting.
• Site is within the 30mph limit with street lights, the self-build individual dwelling as very agreeable infill on the approach to the village where there area already properties on the opposite side of the road.
• No reason not to develop as buildings are already opposite the site.
• Government are encouraging affordable home ownership I see no reason why there should be any objection to this application and give full support.
• Being told there are not enough new builds so why is this planning application been refused. Property would sit well in this location.
• I would like to support Mr and Mrs Frost in building their own home I cannot believe it has been refused before. There are houses in front of his land and on his side of the road and 200 homes being built behind his land in nearby Loddon. This would also release a council house to a family in need. The big developers don’t have a problem getting planning permission I wonder why.
• It also is a bonus that a single property rather than a multiple property site is sited on the approach to the village.
• The site is within the village boundary and building line on Norwich Road.
• The applicant and his family are village people and are prepared to relinquish their local authority home to make way for another family on the housing list at no cost to the authority.
• Government statistics are showing that the UK does not have enough new builds in progress, so if there were more applications such as this one it would be a small help with no impact to the surrounding community.
• Chedgrave and Loddon are growing villages with all the amenities required for young and old. There are a number of shops, schools, bank, post office, food outlets etc and a regular bus service. The village is ideally positioned between Norwich and Beccles. There has been recent housing development with the completion of the Taylor Wimpey site, new housing under construction near the surgery and as I understand it there is a planning application being processed for 12 properties on Big Back Lane which is just a few hundred meters from this site.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application seeks full permission for the construction of a detached two storey dwelling and detached garage with associated parking. Access to the site is via an existing access off Norwich Road. The site already benefits from an agricultural style of building located to the south east corner of the site and its retention was approved under reference number 2016/0039. The main settlement of Chedgrave is located to the east of the site. With a scattering of properties to the north of the site including a Grade II listed building.

4.2 The site lies within the B5: Chet Tributary Farmland where the landscape is described as ‘flat gently undulating landscape’.

4.3 The application site is outside the Development Boundary for Chedgrave which is defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific allocations 2015.
Considerations

4.4 The matters pertinent to this application are:
- Principle of development
- Landscape impact
- Highways
- Design
- Residential amenity
- Drainage
- Self Build
- Other considerations
- Sustainable development

4.5 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) (2004) states in that 'regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under any planning act the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material consideration indicates otherwise'.

4.6 As set out in this report there are no material considerations to outweigh, override or change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making in accordance with paragraph 12 of the NPPF. This is reinforced by paragraph 17 bullet point one of the NPPF in that the planning system/process should 'be genuinely plan-led'.

4.7 The site lies in the Rural Policy Area (RPA), which in respect of housing supply has a 16.94 years supply, as such the Council's policies for the supply of housing can be considered up-to-date and applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

4.8 The site falls outside of the development boundary where there is a presumption against new residential dwellings under policy DM1.3. The proposal is considered to conflict with DM1.3, which requires all new development to be located on allocated sites or within development boundaries, unless specific DM policies allow for it or there are overriding benefits. This report identifies there are no other specific DM policies that allow for the proposal and no overriding benefits this proposal would bring to outweigh the harm and policy conflict.

Landscape impact

4.9 As mentioned above, the site is located within a Chet Tributary Farmland agricultural landscape and outside of the site to the South and West is relatively open in nature. A core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework is to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, which is reflected in Policy DM1.3 of the Development Management Policies document. Planning Practice Guidance clarifies that conservation and enhancement of the landscape, not only designated landscapes, contributes to upholding this principle. Whilst the site itself is paddock land located adjacent to a wooded area and has an agricultural building to the rear of the site and a scattering of residential properties on the opposite side of Norwich Road, development of the site would erode the rural character of the local landscape and consequently the sense of place, thereby conflicting with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy DM1.3.
Highway Safety

4.10 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. Access to the proposed dwelling is via the existing access serving the paddock and associated building which benefits from a good visibility splay, with the post and rail fencing set back to allow good visibility. Subject to the provision of on-site parking and turning prior to the occupation of the dwelling no objections are raised by the NCC Highway Authority, the scheme is considered to accord with policies DM3.11 and Dm3.12 of the SNLP 2015.

Design

4.11 The design of the proposed dwelling provides for a 4 bedroom two storey dwelling, with a front projecting wing and dormers to break the overall bulk of the dwelling. A detached pitched roof double garage is located to the west of the proposed dwelling. In terms of scale and design the scheme proposed does relate to other properties on Norwich Road which comprise a variety of sizes and styles but includes dwellings which have pitched roof dormer windows. Immediately opposite the site sits the former police station a two storey buildings which has been converted to dwellings. Further to the East (No 24) sits a large detached two storey Grade II listed building. Consideration has been given to the impact on the setting of the Listed Building, however, given the distance between the proposed dwelling and the Grade II listed Building, and that the two dwelling will not be seen in the same context, there is no harm to the setting of the listed building. In conclusion the overall scale and design of the proposed dwelling would be considered to accord with Section 7 of the NPPF, Policy 2 of the JCS and Policies DM3.8 and DM4.10 of the SNLP 2015 and S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990.

Residential amenity

4.12 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. There are no neighbouring properties adjacent to the site, the nearest neighbours are on the opposite side of Norwich Road, therefore with the position of the proposed dwelling, the intervening road and the distance between the development and the existing dwellings there will be no loss of privacy to the properties, therefore the scheme as proposed accords with policy DM3.13 of the SNLP.

Drainage

4.13 The application has been assessed by the Council's Water Management Officer who has raised no objections, but wishes an advisory note: ‘to ensure adequate provision for sustainable drainage of the site (including roofs, driveways and hard surfaced areas) so as not to adversely affect surrounding land, property or the highway and under no circumstances should contribute to flooding elsewhere and / or road safety issues. This information would be included on the decision notice in the event the application is approved.

Self-build

4.14 The scheme has been put forward for a self-build project. Full consideration has been given to this possibility. The NPPF sets out in principle support for the provision of self-build housing. Paragraph 50 includes the requirement to ‘deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create inclusive and mixed communities, Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should plan for… the needs of different groups in the community such as people wishing to build their own homes'.
4.15 Paragraph 159 of the NPPF sets out the requirement to carry out the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which includes identifying a need for people wishing to build their own home and there is also further advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.

4.16 Further support is given by the Self-build and Custom House Buildings Act 2015, the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding (Register) Regulations 2016 and Housing and Planning Act 2016 and the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Regulation 2016.

4.17 The Acts and Regulations have given Local Authority’s a number of duties.

4.18 Firstly local authorities have a duty to have a self-build register. The Council established one as part of its Vanguard role and continues to operate it.

4.19 Secondly the Local Authority must have regard to the register when carrying out functions relating to
a) Planning
b) Housing
c) The disposal of any Local Authority Land
d) Regeneration

4.20 In terms of the planning function as well as plan making the register is also a material consideration in decision making.

4.21 Section 10 of the Housing and Planning Act requires Local Authorities to give suitable development permission in respect of enough serviced plots of land (or plots which in the view of the LPA could be serviced within the lifetime of the permission) to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in the authority’s area arising from each base period. The first base period ended on 30th October 2016. To comply with these requirements the LPA needs to give sufficient planning permissions that could be suitable for self-build or custom build properties in relation to any base period in the 3 years beginning immediately after the end of that base period. Therefore the timescale to comply with the current requirement is between 31st October 2016 and 30th October 2019.

4.22 Given existing self-build exemptions for CIL and the Council’s current record on granting planning permissions which could be suitable for self-build or custom build properties, there is no reason not to expect that this requirement will be met from sites which are in accordance with the adopted Development Plan.

4.23 In terms of the Council’s five year housing land supply, this is defined in NPPF paragraph 47 for market and affordable housing. Self-build housing would be included in this requirement, but there is no specific requirement for a five year land supply for self-build housing.

4.24 The Regulations now make it clear that the demand for self-build housing is defined by the self-build register and there is no requirement to consider other sources of information.

4.25 These regulations are not intended to supersede the overarching principle and golden thread of the NPPF which is the delivery of sustainable development.

4.26 The JCS Policy 4 states that proposals for housing will be required to contribute to the mix of housing required to provide balanced communities and meet the needs of an area. Although there is not an individual policy for self-build developments, this policy allows consideration to be given to the provision of any identified need. Furthermore DM 3.1 focuses on meeting housing requirements and needs, specifically referencing self-build sites within the preamble. Para 159 of the NPPF goes on to instruct LPAs that their Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMA) should include the range of housing that local populations are likely to require, to include people wanting to build their own homes.
Therefore although there is not an individual policy for self-build developments, and details of self-build delivery are expected to be drawn up through a Supplementary Planning Document now the regulations have come into force, the Council’s policies allow consideration to be given to the provision of any identified need including self-build.

For the reasons set out above, the Council does not consider the development plan is silent on the matter of self-build.

As Chedgrave is within the Rural Area of South Norfolk, there is a sufficient housing supply (16.94 years as set out in the December 2015 AMR), to meet the requirements in the JCS. As a result it is considered that the development plan is not out of date and can be given full weight.

As required by paragraph 50 of the NPPF consideration has been given to the benefits of providing self-build dwellings, but it is not considered to outweigh other identified harm.

Sustainable Development

Sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. It goes on to stress that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole. The following is an assessment of whether the scheme can be considered to represent sustainable development.

Economic Role

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."

The scheme would result in some short term economic benefits as part of any construction work, which may be done by small scale builders and in the longer term by local spending from the future occupants. It is therefore considered that the scheme would bring forward a small level of economic benefit.

Social Role

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

As the Council has a significant housing supply in the rural area the provision of one dwelling is considered to have limited benefit which may be slightly enhanced as the property is self-build. Comments received in support of the application from local residents, the Parish Council and Local Member give reasons as to how the applicant already make a positive contribution to the social role within the of the local community and how building their own home would benefit the applicants and the community. However, it has not been demonstrated that this social benefit can only be achieved by the proposed development in conflict with the development plan.
Environmental Role

4.36 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."

4.37 The development would result in an infringement into open countryside, which would further erode the rural character of the area causing significant environmental harm.

Conclusion on sustainable development

4.38 Having due regard to the above assessment made in the context of having a five year land supply, it is considered that the concerns regarding encroachment into the countryside, is not outweighed by minor economic and social benefits from the proposed scheme, when considered as a whole, as a result the scheme does not represents sustainable development.

4.39 The Council considers that the development plan is not silent on self-build and the Council has a five year land supply in the RPA, as a result it is considered to be up to date. In addition the proposed development would not result in sustainable development as a result paragraph 14 of the NPPF is not invoked and there is no need to carry out a paragraph 14 assessment.

4.40 However, for the avoidance of doubt the requirements of paragraph 14 of the NPPF in respect of the presumption in favour of development for decision-taking have been considered.

4.41 In the context of promoting sustainable development, Paragraph 14 advises this means: "Where the development is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless: Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole; or Specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted."

4.42 In this instance it is considered that the harm caused by the encroachment into the open countryside, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the very minor benefits to the local economy in a location where the Council has a significant 5 year land supply.

Other considerations

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

4.44 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) but as the scheme is self-build a self-build exemption can be applied for.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The site is located outside the development limit in an area where there is not an identified need for new dwellings. No overriding justification identified in the National Planning Policy Framework or the South Norfolk Development Management Policies 2015 has been put forward for the development and the proposal does not comply with any other specific policy of the Local Plan which relates to allowing residential development in the countryside. As a result the proposed development is contrary to policy DM1.3 of the Development Management Policies.
5.2 The proposed development does not represent sustainable development, having regard to the three tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The adverse impact of the encroachment into the open countryside, outweighs the modest social and economic benefit of one dwelling in the rural policy area where there is an existing significant housing land supply (16.94 years). For this reason the scheme is contrary to the aims of the NPPF to secure sustainable development, acknowledging the advice in paragraph 49.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837 jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6  
**Appl. No**: 2016/2607/F  
**Parish**: PULHAM MARKET

Applicants Name: Mr Paul Schwier  
Site Address: Hannahs Barn Barnes Road Pulham Market Norfolk  
Proposal: Conversion of 2no barns to residential unit and holiday let

Recommendation: Refusal  
1. Insufficient dimensions to convert to a viable holiday let (Building A)  
2. Insufficient dimensions to convert to a dwelling without extension (Building B)  
3. Unit B Tantamount to a new dwelling in countryside  
4. Not sustainable development.  
5. Insufficient information relating to gas pipeline.

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: The Economy  
Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM2.10: Conversion and re-use of buildings in the Countryside for non-agricultural use  
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  
DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design  
DM4.5: Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys

2. Planning History

2.1 2016/1376 Restoration and conversion of farm buildings to form single dwelling Refused  

2.2 2016/0336 Restoration and conversion of farm buildings to residential Withdrawn
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Approve
- Would bring into use two redundant agricultural buildings and would contribute to the local economy through the creation of a unit of tourist accommodation

3.2 District Member To be determined by committee
- Traditional rural buildings make a significant contribution to the character and quality of the countryside of South Norfolk
- Application should be determined by committee if the recommendation is for refusal to give an opportunity to discuss the merits of this application in preserving an existing building in the rural landscape.
- It is my belief (maybe wrongly) that these buildings contribute positively to the character of the countryside and to avoid their loss, or them becoming derelict eyesores I am generally supportive (as is the Parish Council) of the proposal submitted for Hannah's Barn
- The proposal retains the architectural character of the buildings and their rural setting and will bring back into use and avoid their loss / becoming derelict.

3.3 NCC Highways To be reported

3.4 Health And Safety Executive No objection

3.5 National Grid Objection
- Further information required on the proposed upgrades to the track, information on the type of vehicles using it and how often

3.6 British Gas Transco No comments received

3.7 Fisher German No comments received

3.8 NCC Ecologist Support with conditions
- Satisfactory ecological report has been submitted
- Proposed development has limited potential to affect important and protected habitats and species.
- Also evidence of barn owls in the barn
- Condition mitigation and enhancements proposed
- One of the bird boxes proposed should be for barn owls

3.9 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team Support with conditions

3.10 SNC Water Management Officer
- Surface water from the proposed development will discharge to an existing watercourse.
- In the first instance the applicant should consider discharge to an infiltration system
- Advisory comments on surface water and foul drainage
3.11 Other Representations

One letter of objection

- Increased traffic on Barnes Road which is a narrow road with twists, turns and high hedges and is used by pedestrians
- Condition of road is deteriorating
- Issues with speeding traffic
- Looking to reduce speed limit and make the road access only
- Road not suitable for large construction vehicles
- Track will need significant upgrading
- How will emergency vehicles turn around
- Bins located at bottom of track a long way from dwellings
- Will become a target for dumping rubbish
- The site has never been a residential use, possibly forge and hay storage
- Given condition of barn A it is unlikely that a significant proportion of fabric would be retained
- Looking at an extended new build in the open countryside
- No need for a one bedroom property
- Concern for the impact on protected species
- Holiday let of this size would not be viable
- Understand from the Department of Communities and Local Government publication on national technical housing standards studio apartments are required to have 37/39 sq. meters depending on whether separate bathroom is provided
- Would such cramped accommodation appeal to anybody
- Limited demand for such a small unit located away from amenities
- Likely to be subsequent application to join to two units together which has already been refused
- Proposal jars with the surrounding area
- Proposed alterations are not sympathetic
- Track would need to be upgraded
- Access would be difficult to negotiate with steep approach and road quite often becomes a stream

4 Assessment

4.1 The application relates to two small redundant agricultural buildings accessed off a farm track on Barnes Lane. The site is located approximately 700 metres to the east of the main settlement of Pulham Market and outside the development limit for Pulham Market as defined by the site specific allocations. It is proposed to convert building A which is of red brick construction to holiday accommodation and extend building B which has an exposed timber frame to form a one bedroom dwelling. There is a National Grid high pressure pipe line crossing the proposed access track. This application follows a refusal of permission to convert the buildings to one dwelling by providing an extension linking between the two buildings.

4.2 The key issues are the principle and acceptability of the conversion and extension to provide residential and holiday accommodation, highway safety, safety relating to the gas pipeline and ecology.

4.3 Policy DM2.10 sets out the principles for the conversion and re-use of buildings in the countryside for non-agricultural use. It reinforces the JCS which requires a preference for re-use of appropriate redundant non-residential buildings for Employment Uses, including holiday accommodation, to support the tourism industry and local economy. This Policy elaborates on this to encourage employment uses including business class uses into more modern buildings, and the creation of holiday accommodation in older character properties. The Policy sets out a basis for identifying when conversion to another use, including community use or residential use, may be more appropriate.
4.4 The application is for two distinct proposals and they have been assessed separately.

Barn A which it is proposed to convert to holiday accommodation.

4.5 Policy DM2.1 only allows the conversion of buildings which are no longer suitable for agricultural use or which change of use would result in the need for a replacement. Given the height, scale and size of openings and poor access barn A is not particularly suitable for continued agricultural use.

4.6 Policy DM2.10 also requires the buildings to be standing and of adequate external dimensions to accommodate the proposed use, without the need for the erection of major extensions and additional outbuildings and/or significant changes in materials and appearance that would have a serious adverse impact on the rural characteristics of the original building. Barn A is brick construction with a pantile roof and appears to be in reasonable structural condition. The proposed alterations are sympathetic to the character of the building. However, although it is not proposed to extend the building, given the modest dimensions of the building approximately 7 x 4 metres, it is considered that it has not been demonstrated that the building is of an adequate size to accommodate a viable independent holiday accommodation. The proposal fails to meet the standards in the DCLG Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standards which requires a minimum space of 37 -39 square metres for a one person studio dwelling. The proposed floor plan does not demonstrate how the proposed holiday let could adequately function. As a result it fails to meet criteria b in policy DM2.10

4.7 The policy also requires the development (including associated use of external space and change of use of land) to be sympathetic to the setting; The building is relatively unassuming in the landscape. It is unclear in the application how the curtilage would be defined or where parking would be provided. However, a good quality landscaping scheme could mitigate any harmful impact on the setting of the buildings and wider landscape.

4.8 The proposal would not give rise to any commercial activity which would prejudice the vitality and viability of local rural towns and villages.

4.9 The building is traditionally constructed however the quality of the building is not significant enough to warrant departure from policy.

4.10 Although the building appears to be structurally sound and could be capable of conversion, it has not been adequately demonstrated that a viable holiday let could be provided in such a modest space and as a result is contrary to policy DM2.10 of the Development Management Policies.

Barn B which it is proposed to extend and convert to a residential dwelling.

4.11 Again, given the scale, height and size of openings and access Barn B is not considered suitable for continued agricultural use.

4.12 It is proposed to substantially extend Barn B in order to provide a one bedroom dwelling. The proposed dwelling with extension would be over three times the size of the existing building, which is a modest approximately 5.2 metres by 5 metres.

4.13 The proposed development clearly demonstrates that the building is not of adequate dimensions to accommodate a dwelling without the need for extension. The proposed extensions are relatively simple, but given their size in relation to the modest size of the original building would detract from the simple and modest rural characteristics of the building and as a result do not comply with policy DM2.10.
4.14 As with Barn A the building is relatively unassuming in the landscape. It is unclear in the application how the curtilage would be defined or where parking would be provided. However, a good quality landscaping scheme could mitigate any harmful impact on the setting of the buildings and wider landscape.

4.15 The proposal would not give rise to any commercial activity which would prejudice the vitality and viability of local rural towns and villages.

4.16 In order for a building to be considered for residential use it must be demonstrated that the building cannot be practically or viably converted for employment use. Given the size and location remote from the village and poor quality of the road network it is acknowledged that the building would not be particularly suitable for industrial or other employment uses. However, no justification has been put forward as to why the building could not be converted for holiday accommodation especially when barn A is being proposed for holiday accommodation. Notwithstanding that it would appear that building B is not of an adequate size to be viably converted to holiday accommodation without the need to extend the building.

4.17 The building itself has a timber frame with a brick plinth so is historically and traditionally constructed however the quality of the building is not significant enough to warrant departure from policy.

4.18 In conclusion, the building is not of an adequate size to accommodate the change of use without the need for extension and it has not been demonstrated the building could not be used for holiday accommodation as a result the proposal is contrary to policy DM2.10 of the Development Management Policies.

4.19 The proposal fails to comply with policy DM2.10 and is considered to be tantamount to a new dwelling by virtue of the significant amount of extension required. The proposal needs to be considered in the context of sustainable development and the presumption in favour of sustainable residential development as advocated by Paragraph 49 of the NPPF.

4.20 The site lies in the Rural Policy Area which in respect of housing supply has a 16.94 year supply as at December 2015 as such the Council’s policies for the supply of housing can be considered up to date and applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

4.21 The site falls outside of the development boundary where there is a presumption against new residential dwellings under DM 1.3. The proposal is considered to conflict with DM 1.3, which requires all new development to be located on allocated sites or within development boundaries, unless specific DM policies allow for it or there are overriding benefits. In this case the application is submitted on the basis of a conversion of a rural building under policy DM2.10 however, for the reasons set out above the Council does not consider that the proposal represents a conversion and fails to comply with Policy DM2.10. The proposal is tantamount to a new dwelling and does not demonstrate overriding benefits in terms of social, environmental or economic dimensions and fails to comply with policy DM1.3.

4.22 Paragraph 49 requires housing applications to be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, below is an assessment of whether the proposal is considered to represent a sustainable development when considering the requirements of the NPPF when taken as a whole including the Local Plan policies.

Economic Role

4.23 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.”
4.24 Construction of the extensions/conversions to create the new dwelling would provide some short term economic gain whilst over the longer term there would be economic benefit of spending by occupants of the dwelling to the local economy.

Social Role

4.25 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.”

4.26 The site is in a relatively isolated location being located approx. 700m from the edge of the development boundary of Pulham Market and being accessed by a narrow country lane with no footpath. Pulham Market is a designated service village with a range of social and community facilities however access to that settlement by means other than the private car is restricted given the nature of Barnes Road with no footways. The site is not therefore well connected by modes of transport other than private car. The proposal therefore conflicts with the social role of the NPPF which seeks to create development that is accessible to local services.

4.27 There are social benefits of delivering housing although this is limited as there is a sufficient supply of housing in the rural policy area.

Environmental Role

4.28 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.”

4.29 The proposal would utilise existing structures on the site, but these would need to be significantly extended to create the dwelling proposed and a viable holiday unit. The extensions and proposed residential use would result in harm by eroding the very rural and open character of the site.

4.30 The proposed development does not therefore represent a sustainable development, having regard to the three tests set out in the NPPF, by virtue of the negative impact on the rural character of the area, and social and environmental harm of the location of the site with poor access to facilities and services other than by the use of the private car. This identified harm outweighs the modest benefit of one additional dwelling in the rural policy area where there is an existing significant housing land supply (16.94 years) and the re-use of an existing building.

Gas pipe line

4.31 National Grid are currently objecting to the application in respect of the impact of the additional traffic and upgrading of the track on the high pressures gas main, which goes underneath the track. As it stands there is insufficient information is satisfy the objection contrary to policy DM3.14 of the Development Management Policies. Although it may be possible to overcome the objection it is not clear whether this is possible to do and as a result it is not possible to condition this. Therefore it needs to form a reason for refusal.

4.32 The HSE have not objected to the application on health and safety grounds.
Highways

4.33 It is acknowledged that Barnes road is narrow but the additional traffic generated by this development is not considered to be significant. Comments from the Highway Officer will be updated at Committee.

Residential amenity

4.34 The proposed dwelling and holiday let have been designed so they would not result in any significant amenity issues, subject to boundary treatments being agreed between the two properties.

Ecology

4.35 An ecology report has been submitted with the application and the NCC Ecologist is satisfied that the proposed development would not result in harm to protected species subject to the proposed mitigation and enhancements.

Drainage

4.36 The application form advises that surface water from the proposed development will discharge to an existing watercourse. In the first instance the applicant should consider discharge to an infiltration system. This could be dealt with via condition.

4.37 There is no mains sewer in the vicinity of the site so a package treatment plant would be acceptable.

4.38 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.

4.39 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as it includes a new dwelling and holiday unit plus additional floor space and the existing floor space has not been in use for a continuous period of six months in the last 36 months.

5 Conclusion

5.1 It has not been demonstrated that building A is of a sufficient size to accommodate a viable holiday let without the need for extension. The building is therefore not suitable without significant extension to serve the use intended and as a result is contrary to policy DM2.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Document 2015.

5.2 It has not been demonstrated that building B is of a sufficient size to accommodate a dwelling (even if as a holiday let) without the need for extension and the size of the proposed extension would detract from the simple modest characteristics of the building. The building is not suitable without significant extension to serve the use intended and as a result is contrary to policy DM2.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Document 2015.
5.3 The conversion and extension of Building B is tantamount to a new build dwelling in the countryside, with no specific justification and does not comply with Policy DM 1.3. It does not represent a sustainable development, having regard to the three tests set out in the NPPF, by virtue of the negative impact on the rural character of the area, and social and environmental harm of the location of the site with poor access to facilities and services other than by the use of the private car. This identified harm outweighs the modest benefit of one additional dwelling in the rural policy area where there is an existing significant housing land supply (16.94 years) and the re-use of an existing building.

5.4 For this reason the scheme is contrary to the aims of the NPPF to secure sustainable development, acknowledging the advice in paragraph 49.

5.5 Insufficient information has been received to establish the increased use and upgrading works to the access track would not result in harm to the high pressure gas pipeline under the access track.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman 01508 533833 and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Appl. No: 2016/2635/O
Parish: TACOLNESTON
Applicants Name: Mr J Coston
Site Address: Land West Of Norwich Road Tacolneston Norfolk
Proposal: Outline application for 3 self-build plots with details of upgraded access, all other matters reserved.
Recommendation: Refusal

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs
DM3.8: 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
DM4.5: Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.4: Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History
2.1 None relevant

3. Consultations
3.1 Town / Parish Council: No comments received
3.2 District Member: To be determined by committee
   - It is for self-build which is a strong material consideration in favour of the application
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>SNC Water Management Officer</th>
<th>No objections subject to conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team</td>
<td>No objections subject to conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>NCC Ecologist</td>
<td>Insufficient information provided to adequately assess the impact of the proposal on Protected Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>SNC Landscape Architect</td>
<td>Refuse Detrimental to the landscape character as identified in published documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NCC Highways</td>
<td>No objections subject to conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Other Representations</td>
<td>4 letters of support - 3 from 89 and 89A Norwich Road, within the ownership of the applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Look in tac with bungalows on Norwich Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not a huge amount of anything blocked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Layout presented well not overlooking anyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Privacy intact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not on top of one another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nice to see the space used to home people who obviously need it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Brilliant idea as it will bring young people back into the village who obviously need it and who are renting or living with parents and give them affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase population in the village, helping the school and other local amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can only be a good thing for the village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 letters of objection
- The applicant is making the application for a family member, as far as we are aware the 'dwelling' is for the son of Mr & Mrs M Page who live at Hill Top Farm and they are not related to the applicant
- Land considered and rejected by SNC under Site Specific Allocations and Policies - Preferred Options. Informed by the Council that it would not be considered for planning in the future. Planning Statement 3.5.5 states "the proposed allocation was dismissed by the Council due to concerns regarding TPO trees and a public concern that this would impact negatively on the setting of listed buildings."
- Consider very limited bus service, it is not a viable alternative to using a private car
- There is no post office or shop, have a Chinese takeaway and hairdressers. The Pelican PH is closed and is only a B&B, although there is the Jolly Farmers in Forncett End
- The floor area proposed is 145m2 each is excessive for a single storey 3 bedroomed dwelling. Housing standards recommends 74m2 for 4 persons and 95m2 for 6 persons. Consider that the massing of the dwellings is unacceptable and would ruin our view for the Meadow land
- Earmarked for development under LDF until chair of Parish Council stated it should be kept as a 'Green Lung'
- It would appear that this misled everyone at this stage and it should have been considered for affordable housing
• Central to village near school and all other activities and bus services
• Few houses for such a large piece of land, consistently told that houses on TAC1 has to have houses which are affordable, are terraced or at least linked, these are separate - mixed messages from the Council
• Who will be self-building? Family members to landowners?
• Where will the access be?
• Site did not pop up as it should for planning site. Cheneys Lane did so what happened?

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of 3 self-build detached residential dwellings with associated parking and curtilages with all matters reserved apart from the access. The site is located off Norwich Road, Tacolneston. To the north and east are existing residential properties, to the south is open countryside and to the west separated by a field Hill Top Farm, 89 Norwich Road. The Horse Chestnut tree to the north of the existing access to the site is subject to a TPO.

4.2 The site lies within the E1:Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland where the landscape is described in the South Norfolk Place Making Guide as being composed of 'distinctive flat elevated landform; large scale rural landscape of both openness and enclosure by woodland; and linear settlement along roads'

4.3 The Landscape Character Area E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland and the theme of open areas is within the published Landscape Character Assessment [LUC – 2006]. The following are the most pertinent extracts from the Assessment for E1:

Sensitivities and Vulnerabilities
• strong sense of openness with vast skies and long range views particularly from the plateau edge;
• the smaller field pattern associated with settlements;
• overall peaceful, rural character.

Landscape Strategy
• conserve the pattern of fields and particularly the smaller enclosures around settlements;

Development Considerations
• consider the impact of any form of development on the open character and panoramic views that can be obtained from parts of the plateau.

4.4 The site is outside the development boundary for Tacolneston which as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific allocations 2015.

4.5 The main issues in this case are the Principle of development, Landscape impact, Highways, Residential amenity, Self –Build, Ecology, Other considerations and Sustainable development

Principle of development

4.6 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) (2004) states in that 'regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under any planning act the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material consideration indicates otherwise'.
4.7 As set out in this report there are no material considerations to outweigh, override or change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making in accordance with paragraph 12 of the NPPF. This is reinforced by paragraph 17 bullet point one of the NPPF in that the planning system/process should 'be genuinely planned'.

4.8 The site lies in the Rural Policy Area (RPA), which in respect of housing supply has a 16.94 years supply. Consequently the Council's policies for the supply of housing can be considered up-to-date and applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

4.9 The site falls outside of the development boundary where there is a presumption against new residential dwellings under policy DM1.3. The proposal is considered to conflict with DM1.3, which requires all new development to be located on allocated sites or within development boundaries, unless specific DM policies allow for it or there are overriding benefits. This report identifies there are no overriding benefits this proposal would bring to outweigh the harm and policy conflict.

Landscape impact

4.10 As mentioned above, the site is located within a Plateau Farmland agricultural landscape and outside of the site is relatively open in nature. A core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework is to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, which is reflected in Policy DM1.3 of the Development Management Policies document. Planning Practice Guidance clarifies that conservation and enhancement of the landscape, not only designated landscapes, contributes to upholding this principle.

4.11 The proposal necessitates the removal of hedgerow which is subject to the Hedgerows Regulations, but a full assessment against all the 'importance' criteria has not been provided. However, information via NCC’s Historic maps, lead the Landscape Architect to be of the opinion that it is unlikely that the hedge will be important (primarily because the boundary and therefore the hedge does not feature on the 1st Edition OS map).

4.12 It appears that the existing TPO tree on adjacent land could be safeguarded sufficiently from a development such as that proposed. (Note that the TPO tree formerly on the north-east corner of this site was removed, with authorisation from the Council, in 2007).

4.13 Notwithstanding the above, the Landscape Architect’s main concern is the effect of the proposed development on the character of the village landscape. The Site-specific Allocations and Policies document offers a commentary on the character of the existing settlement: “A significant break in the built-up frontage on both sides of Norwich Road exists to the north of the Manor House buildings whose setting in spacious grounds with good tree growth contributes towards the ‘open’ nature and rural character of this part of the village.” Development on this land will undoubtedly change its character from agricultural land, and will reduce the noted significant break in the built-up frontage.

4.14 It is considered that the development of the site would erode the rural character of the local landscape and consequent sense of place, thereby conflicting with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy DM1.3.
Highway Safety

4.15 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. Access for the dwellings forms part of this application and has been assessed by the NCC Highway Authority who has raised no objections. The application seeks to serve the development of 3 dwellings by an existing access which is to be widened, this will enable two cars to pass each other and that a footpath can be created which will link to the site to the highway. In view of the above the proposal accords with Polices DM3.11 and DM3.12.

Residential amenity

4.16 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. There are neighbouring properties to the north, east and west. Given the separation distances, however, it is considered that the development, whilst in outline, could be designed to not give rise to a situation detrimental to the amenities of the nearby neighbouring properties via loss of privacy, loss of light, overbearing impacts. As such the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DM3.13.

Ecology

4.17 This application is supported by a Phase 1 Habitat Survey (East Anglia Ecology, October 2016). NCC Ecologist has commented as follows: 'The report is brief and unusually for reports of this type in Norfolk, makes no mention of the likelihood of the site being used by either bats or Great Crested Newts (GCN). There appears to be approximately 6 waterbodies within 250m of the proposed development site. Whilst the site itself consists primarily of poor, semi-improved grassland, there is connectivity to these waterbodies which means that there is a possibility that GCN could be using commuting using the site boundaries. Bats could also use the hedgerows surrounding the sites for foraging. The author conducted a Desktop Survey but this was for local designated and non-designated sites only and did not include species found in the locality. The report did not state the author, nor their qualifications and experience, or whether they are a member of a professional body such as CIEEM. Overall whilst it is likely (from looking at the block plan submitted with the application) that if the boundary features are retained any ecological impact should be minimised, there is insufficient information in this report to give us any certainty. Ideally the waterbodies should be assessed for GCN potential and also the fact that bats may use the hedgerow should be considered. If it is possible that GCN may use the site for commuting then extra mitigation measures for this species, particularly during construction should be implemented.'

4.18 In view of the above, notwithstanding the submitted Ecological Report, it is considered insufficient information has been submitted to adequately assess the merits of the scheme and possible impacts the development would have on the habitat of protected species, contrary to Policy DM4.4.

Self-build

4.19 It has been put forward that the dwellings would be self-build and full consideration has been given to this. The NPPF sets out in principle support for the provision of self-build housing. Paragraph 50 includes the requirement to 'deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create inclusive and mixed communities, Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should plan for… the needs of different groups in the community such as people wishing to build their own homes'.
Paragraph 159 of the NPPF sets out the requirement to carry out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which includes identifying a need for people wishing to build their own home and there is also further advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.

Further support is given by the Self-build and Custom House Buildings Act 2015, the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding (Register) Regulations 2016 and Housing and Planning Act 2016 and the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Regulation 2016.

The Acts and Regulations have given Local Authority's a number of duties.

Firstly local authorities have a duty to have a self-build register. The Council established one as part of its Vanguard role and continues to operate it.

Secondly the Local Authority must have regard to the register when carrying out functions relating to
   a) Planning
   b) Housing
   c) The disposal of any Local Authority Land
   d) Regeneration

In terms of the planning function as well as plan making the register is also a material consideration in decision making.

Section 10 of the Housing and Planning Act requires Local Authorities to give suitable development permission in respect of enough serviced plots of land (or plots which in the view of the LPA could be serviced within the lifetime of the permission) to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in the authority's area arising from each base period. The first base period ended on 30th October 2016. To comply with these requirements the LPA needs to give sufficient planning permissions that could be suitable for self-build or custom build properties in relation to any base period in the 3 years beginning immediately after the end of that base period. Therefore the timescale to comply with the current requirement is between 31st October 2016 and 30th October 2019.

Given existing self-build exemptions for CIL and the Council's current record on granting planning permissions which could be suitable for self-build or custom build properties, there is no reason not to expect that this requirement will be met from sites which are in accordance with the adopted Development Plan.

In terms of the Council's five year housing land supply this is defined in NPPF paragraph 47 for market and affordable housing. Self-build housing would be included in this requirement, but there is no specific requirement for a five year land supply for self-build housing.

The Regulations now make it clear that the demand for self-build housing is defined by the self-build register and there is no requirement to consider other sources of information.

These regulations are not intended to supersede the overarching principle and golden thread of the NPPF which is the delivery of sustainable development.

The JCS Policy 4 states that proposals for housing will be required to contribute to the mix of housing required to provide balanced communities and meet the needs of an area. Although there is not an individual policy for self-build developments, this policy allows consideration to be given to the provision of any identified need. Furthermore DM 3.1 focuses on meeting housing requirements and needs, specifically referencing self-build sites within the preamble. Para 159 of the NPPF goes on to instruct LPAs that their Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMA) should include the range of housing that local populations are likely to require, to include people wanting to build their own homes.
4.30 Therefore although there is not an individual policy for self-build developments, and details of self-build delivery are expected to be drawn up through a Supplementary Planning Document now the regulations have come into force, the Council’s policies allow consideration to be given to the provision of any identified need including self-build.

4.31 For the reasons set out above, the Council does not consider the development plan is silent on the matter of self-build. This view was supported by a Planning Inspector in determining an appeal on application 2016/0526, Planning Inspectorate reference APP/L2630/W/16/3152650.

4.32 With Tacolneston falling within the Rural Area of South Norfolk, there is a sufficient housing supply (16.94 years as set out in the December 2015 AMR), to meet the requirements in the JCS. As a result, it is considered that the development plan is not out of date and can be given full weight.

4.33 As required by paragraph 50 of the NPPF consideration has been given to the benefits of providing self-build dwellings, but it is not considered to outweigh other identified harm.

Sustainable Development

4.34 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

4.35 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."

4.36 The scheme would result in some short term economic benefits as part of any construction work, which may be done by small scale builders and in the longer term by local spending from the future occupants. It is therefore considered that the scheme would bring forward a small level of economic benefit.

Social Role

4.37 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."

4.38 As the Council has a significant housing supply in the rural area the provision of three dwellings is considered to have limited benefit which may be slightly enhanced if the properties are self-build.

Environmental Role

4.39 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."
4.40 The development would result in an infringement into open countryside, which would further erode the rural character of the area causing significant environmental harm.

Conclusion on sustainable development

4.41 Having due regard to the above assessment made in the context of having a five year land supply, it is considered that the concerns regarding encroachment into the countryside, is not outweighed by minor economic and social benefits, when considered as a whole, as a result the scheme does not represent sustainable development.

4.42 The Council considers that the development plan is not silent on self-build and the Council has a five year land supply in the RPA, as a result it is considered to be up to date. In addition the proposed development would not result in sustainable development as a result paragraph 14 of the NPPF is not invoked and there is no need to carry out a paragraph 14 assessment.

4.43 However, for the avoidance of doubt the requirements of paragraph 14 of the NPPF in respect of the presumption in favour of development for decision-taking have been considered.

4.44 In the context of promoting sustainable development, Paragraph 14 advises this means: "Where the development is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless:
Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole; or
Specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted."

4.45 In this instance it is considered that the harm caused by the encroachment of the open countryside would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the very minor benefits to the local economy and by the provision of four houses in a location where the Council has a significant land supply.

Other considerations

4.46 A number of concerns have been raised as set out above, which do not form a reason of refusal of the application, whilst they are fully appreciated, the fact the a site was not considered acceptable under the LDF does not prevent an applicant being submitted; note the concerns relating to limited services however the village has been designated as a Service Village under the JCS; and the fact properties are not for family members is not a planning consideration nor who will be building them.

4.47 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.

4.48 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) because they are new dwellings.

5. Conclusion

5.1 In conclusion the site is outside the development limit in a location where there the Council has a significant housing land supply and the development plan is considered to be up to date. There is no overriding justification for departing from policies DM1.1 and DM1.3 in the Development Management Policies, which restricts development outside the development limit
Reasons for Refusal

6.1 The site is located outside the development limit in an area where there is not an identified need for new dwellings. No overriding justification identified in the National Planning Policy Framework or the South Norfolk Development Management Policies 2015 has been put forward for the development. As a result the proposed development in contrary to policy and would have an urbanising effect on the open rural character of the area contrary to policy DM1.3 of the Development Management Policies.

6.2 Notwithstanding the submitted Ecological Report, it is considered insufficient information has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority to adequately assess the merits of the scheme and possible impacts the development would have on the habitat of protected species, contrary to DM4.4 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

6.3 The proposed development does not represent sustainable development, having regard to the three tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. By virtue of the impact of the encroachment on the open countryside, outweighs the modest social and economic benefit of four additional dwellings in the rural policy area where there is an existing significant housing land supply (16.94 years). For this reason the scheme is contrary to the aims of the NPPF to secure sustainable development, acknowledging the advice in paragraph 49.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788
and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
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Appl. No  :  2016/2713/F  
Parish  :  COSTESSEY  

Applicants Name  :  Mr Lawrence Rowe  
Site Address  :  Land At Costessey Park Parklands Costessey Norfolk  
Proposal  :  1. Restoration and conversion of Barn and Stable buildings to four houses, including a new infill extension.  
2. Construction of three new houses adjoining the stables and barn.  

Recommendation  :  Approval with conditions  
1  Full Planning permission time limit  
2  In accord with submitted drawings  
3  Phasing of works to be agreed  
4  External materials  
5  Reporting of unexpected contamination  
6  Contaminated land - submit scheme  
7  Implement of approved remediation  
8  Provision of parking, service  
9  Ecology mitigation  
10  Archaeological report  
11  New Water Efficiency  
12  Windows/external doors  
13  Ground surfacing  
14  Boundary treatment/planting/screening  
15  No PD for Classes ABCDE & G  
16  No PD for fences, walls etc  
17  No additional windows at first floor  
18  No satellite dishes , tanks etc  
19  Domestic Microgeneration Equipment  

Subject to completion of a Section 106 agreement to prohibit the use of marquees for functions in the adjacent golf club.  

9  
Appl. No  :  2016/2714/LB  
Parish  :  COSTESSEY  

Applicants Name  :  Mr Lawrence Rowe  
Site Address  :  Land At Costessey Park Parklands Costessey Norfolk  
Proposal  :  1. Restoration and conversion of Barn and Stable buildings to four houses, including a new infill extension.  
2. Construction of three new houses adjoining the stables and barn.  

Recommendation  :  Approval with Conditions  
1  Listed Building Time Limit  
2  In accord with submitted drawings  
3  External materials  
4  Archaeological report  
5  Windows/external doors  
6  External joinery - painted/stained  
7  Mortar mix  
8  Re-pointing sample panel  

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   - NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
   - NPPF 07: Requiring good design
   - NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities
   - NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
   - NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
   - NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   - Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
   - Policy 2: Promoting good design
   - Policy 3: Energy and water
   - Policy 4: Housing delivery
   - Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
   - Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area
   - Policy 12: The remainder of the Norwich Urban area, including the fringe parishes

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   - Development Management Policies
     - DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
     - DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development
     - DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
     - DM2.10: Conversion and re-use of buildings in the Countryside for non-agricultural use
     - 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
     - DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety
     - DM4.1: Renewable Energy
     - DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management
     - DM4.3: Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
     - DM4.4: Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space
     - DM4.5: Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
     - DM4.6: Landscape Setting of Norwich
     - DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design
     - DM4.10: Heritage Assets

1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
   - Supplementary Planning Document
   - South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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

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

2. Planning History

2.1 2012/1526  
1. Conversion of Costessey Park House to two houses and two flats.  
2. Conversion of barn to multi use commercial space.  
3. Rebuild and conversion of stables to provide service facilities to barn and multi-use commercial space.  
4. Restoration of kennels for storage.  

2.2 2012/1527  
1. Conversion of Costessey Park House to two houses and two flats.  
2. Conversion of barn to multi use commercial space.  
3. Rebuild and conversion of stables to provide service facilities to barn and multi-use commercial space.  
4. Restoration of kennels for storage.  

2.3 2014/2550  
Non material amendment to planning permission 2012/1526/F - Alterations to some door head heights and window cill heights, internal re-arrangement, rebuilding chimney stacks, new roof tiles, gable brickwork and repair concrete Ground Floor where new.  

2.4 2015/0366  
Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission 2012/1527 - Internal and external alterations  

2.5 2016/0367  
Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission 2012/1526 - Internal and external alterations  

2.6 2016/0494  
Variation of condition 4 of planning consent 2015/0367 - To amend conditions for widening of access.  
1. Conversion of Costessey Park House to two houses and two flats.  
2. Conversion of barn to multi use commercial space.  
3. Rebuild and conversion of stables to provide service facilities to barn and multi-use commercial space.  
4. Restoration of kennels for storage.
### Consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>Town / Parish Council</th>
<th>Approve subject to the application being put before Development Management Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>District Member</td>
<td>To be determined by committee due to design issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>SNC Water Management Officer</td>
<td>No objection but recommended advisory notes regarding surface water drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team</td>
<td>Conditions regarding contaminated land and construction to form part of any approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>NCC Highways</td>
<td>No objection but requested a condition regarding parking/turning areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Historic Environment Service</td>
<td>The new clerestory level on the Soane stables and proposed new infill section attaching the stables to the main barn would both harm the value of the heritage asset. If permission is granted then requested a copy of the submitted heritage statement for the Historic Environment Record - this to be a condition of any approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NCC Ecologist</td>
<td>No objection but requested condition regarding mitigation measures put forward in Ecology Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>SNC Conservation And Design</td>
<td>No objection – considered that level of harm outweighed by benefits of the proposal particularly with regard to ensuring the future of listed buildings at risk. Recommended amendment to balcony detail on stable building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>SNC Landscape Architect</td>
<td>No issues with the proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team</td>
<td>Unable to support proposal as noise assessment does not address potential noise from music events in marquee. With a legal agreement in place preventing the marquee being used for music events then the proposal could be reconsidered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>SNC Property Team</td>
<td>Alternative commercial uses, such as office or holiday let as opposed to the residential scheme proposed are not considered viable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Other Representations</td>
<td>One neighbour response in support of proposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment

Site Context

4.1 The site is situated within the Norwich Policy Area, outside the development boundary on the south western edge of Costessey and is within the Costessey Park Golf course. The golf course site is in the valley of the river Tudd, the river dividing the course into two sections, the northern section hosting six buildings. The western element contains 3 late 20th century buildings associated with the golf course. Adjacent to these at the east side are 4 grade II listed buildings, Costessey Park House, Costessey Park Kennels and a barn with adjacent stable block. The barn and stable block are listed as one building.

4.2 The outbuildings originally formed part of Home Farm, the only farm to stand within the Costessey Park site. Following demolitions in the 1920’s and 30’s the farm use of the site became greatly reduced, the last agricultural use of the site being the use of the stables as a piggery until the 1970’s. After this, the creation of the golf course put an end to any further agricultural use.

4.3 Costessey Park House dates from the 17th century and was built as a Dower house to Costessey Old Hall. It is constructed in flint and brick and has a clay pantile roof with stepped gable ends. The building was much altered following refurbishment works during the 19th century and has recently been sympathetically converted to four separate residential units, the project receiving a commendation under the South Norfolk Council Design Awards.

4.4 The stables and barn are situated north of the house and date from the late 18th century. The buildings are not in use and have been on the South Norfolk Council’s Buildings at Risk register for some years. Details on the buildings include lunettes and semi-circular headed windows with brick hood moulds. Only the brick walls of the stables survive, the original roof and first floor front pediment have been destroyed by fire some years ago. The roof of the barn is in very poor condition. Originally the barn was separate to the stables but became attached in the 19th century, although they are no longer linked.

4.5 The Kennels situated immediately west of the site date from around 1830 and have an attractive south face, pilasters defining the nine bays of cells, and crenelated gable ends to the east and west sides but otherwise the structure is essentially utilitarian.

4.6 The submitted heritage statement describes the barn as being typical of many similar buildings constructed in the county during the same period and the building is not considered to be the work of Sir John Soane, who designed the adjacent stables around the same time. The barn is therefore considered to have low architectural and historic interest. Pre-Victorian Kennels are not common and therefore the Kennel building is considered to have more significance in terms of its architectural and historic interest. The stables designed by Sir John Soane are considered to have the highest significance being an example of one of Soane’s early buildings before his style had been fully developed.

4.7 Separating the house, stable and barn is a large gravelled courtyard area, part of which serves as a parking area for the recently restored Dower house.

Proposal

4.8 Applications were approved in 2012 for conversion of the barn to provide flexible accommodation for the golf club to host/events/exhibitions/conferences or to possibly cater for weddings. The restoration and conversion of the Dower House to 4 residential units formed part of these applications and this work has been completed. The stables with a new link to the barn were to be converted for office accommodation or smaller ancillary uses such as beauticians, hairdressers or physiotherapist. None of the works to the outbuildings have commenced.
4.9 These applications are an amended scheme following withdrawal of applications for the same proposal earlier this year.

4.10 This proposal is to restore and convert the existing barn and stables to four separate dwellings, including a new infill extension linking the two buildings. Three new houses are also proposed immediately to the west side of the barn, further enclosing the large courtyard area between the existing house and outbuildings. The construction of 3 new houses is also proposed immediately west of the barn. This follows the general pattern of 19th century outbuildings that were previously erected on this part of the sit but demolished in the early 20th century.

4.11 Two of the new houses have 3 bedrooms, the third house having just two bedrooms. The stables will comprise one three bedroom and one 1 bedroom dwelling. Both dwellings in the barn have two bedrooms each. No works are proposed to the existing kennel building as part of this proposal. A new bin storage enclosure is proposed immediately to the west side of the new houses.

4.12 Landscaping works including new paved areas are proposed for the large courtyard area together with new parking spaces serving the 3 new houses proposed. Parking spaces just outside the complex of buildings to the east side will serve the new dwellings in the stables and barn.

4.13 Inside the barn is open full height to the roof. The application proposes a new first floor to provide bedrooms and access to balcony areas. Much of the original main south wall of the barn is to be removed to provide the ground floor open plan and first floor balcony areas, which significantly changes the appearance of the barn from the south side. Clearly defined paved areas adjacent to the converted dwellings and in between the new houses provide outside areas for each residential unit.

4.14 Much of the internal layout of the stable building will remain but with new partitions added to provide further subdivision. The most significant changes to the stable building is the creation of a new first floor level, including first floor balcony. This requires a higher roof than the original building and alters the proportions of Soane’s original design.

4.15 The material finishes of the proposed conversion scheme will be the same traditional brick and slate finish of the original buildings. Windows are to be in timber to the original design. The new houses will have brick and timber clad external finishes with slate roof. Large glazed areas have been incorporated into the more contemporary style of the new houses in order to take advantage of attractive views across the golf course.

4.16 The application provides a Noise Impact Assessment in view of the potential conflict between the new dwellings and the existing adjacent golf business, which also holds functions on the premises, within the club house and marquee. In order to address concerns previously raised by the Environmental Quality Officer regarding noise it is proposed to cease functions in the Marquee, either through variation of the current premises licence or through formal written agreement.
Principle of Development

4.17 Conversion of existing buildings

Policy 2.10 allows for the conversion of buildings in the countryside for non-agricultural use providing the proposal does not result in the loss of a farm building (s) suitable for continued agricultural use and which, if its alternative use is permitted, would be likely to result in the construction of a replacement agricultural building. The existing building should also be standing and of adequate dimensions to accommodate the proposed use without the need for major extensions/additions or other significant changes in materials and appearance that would have a serious adverse impact on the rural characteristics of the original building. Other requirements include the buildings not being suitable for employment use; proposals being sympathetic to the existing setting and existing buildings being of historic value and worthy of protection. Proposals should enhance the building and/or the setting of other nearby buildings in the countryside.

4.18 New build housing

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

4.19 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 where they relate to the Norwich Policy Area are out-of-date.

4.20 In the absence of a 5 year housing land supply in the NPA, paragraph 49 of the NPPF confirms housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Likewise, paragraph 14 of the NPPF confirms that in terms of decision-taking where the development plan is out of date (as is the case here) permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the framework when taken as a whole.

Viability/use

4.21 In view of the adjacent golf course and new residential development within Costessay Park House the existing outbuildings are not suitable for any continued agricultural use. Although the roof of the stable building has been lost the remaining structure is substantial and what remains of the building is of historic and architectural significance and worthy of retention.

4.22 With regard to potential for B1 office or similar commercial uses of the existing buildings, the Council’s Property Consultant considers that the submitted supporting financial evidence is to some degree limited but does not wholly disagree with the assumptions and inputs used in respect of building and restoration costs as well as letting or sales values. It is considered that the return on rental values would be between 3% and 5%.

4.23 With regard to the viability of the use of the buildings as holiday accommodation it is considered that the likely level of return would be lower than that for commercial use and the capital value less than the cost of the conversion and refurbishment works.

4.24 It is therefore considered that commercial or holiday let use of the existing buildings is not financially viable.
4.25 The proposed overall scheme shows a developer return of less than 15% on cost which is below what would normally be expected as a reasonable return. Whilst using both the conversion scheme and new houses as holiday lets would help to address potential conflict in terms of noise disturbance from the adjacent golf course business, this use would reduce the developer return to an unacceptably low level so as to make the scheme unviable. It is therefore considered that under the requirements of both policies DM1.3 and DM2.10, on balance, in order to make the overall scheme viable there is justification for the proposed 7 new dwellings.

Sustainability

4.26 On the basis of the requirements of paragraphs 14 and 49 of the NPPF, the following is an assessment of the scheme in the context of the three roles that make up sustainable development as set out in the NPPF.

Economic Role

4.27 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."

4.28 The scheme would not cause economic harm but 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. The immediate Golf business on the site is likely to benefit from local spending as well as existing business within the nearby Costessey settlement. It is therefore considered that the scheme would bring forward a level of economic benefit.

Social Role

4.29 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.”

4.30 In terms harm, the proposed development is detached from the main settlement of Costessey. The proposal does, however, have a benefit of providing housing within a location where a 5-year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated. The site is in a reasonably sustainable location being in close proximity to schools, shops and services and well serviced by buses within the area and to Norwich and is accessible to employment locally and in Norwich and the surrounding area. It is therefore considered that the scheme would result in social benefits that outweigh any degree of social harm resulting from the detachment of the development from the nearby settlement.

Environmental Role

4.31 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."
4.32 Whilst the development would result in an infringement into open countryside it is acknowledged that it is likely to address a housing land shortfall. The proposal will result in some level of harm to the landscape character through the introduction of new buildings that are not wholly in keeping with the very traditional rural character of the existing arrangement. Proposed external changes to existing buildings through conversion will also have some adverse impact on what survives of their existing character and appearance. The proposed conversion works to the stable introduce a new first floor level and balcony that will result harm to the significance of the building. The stable is recognised as the most important in the group of outbuildings in terms of its historic and architectural interest. This is acknowledged in the supporting information provided in the application. The proposed works to this building will also cause some harm to the character and appearance of views of the site on approach along the entrance drive from the road.

4.33 However, what also has to be considered here is that the existing buildings are in very poor condition and have been at risk for many years. Unless a viable use is found for these buildings they are likely to rapidly deteriorate further. Whilst the level of harm to heritage assets is recognised, this proposal will preserve nearly all of what remains of the stable building, the most important building on the site in terms of heritage assets as well as preserving most of what survives of the barn. Whilst a large section of the southern two-storey wall of the barn is to be removed to open up the ground floor area and provide first floor balconies, this has to be balanced with the buildings lower historic/architectural value and the need to preserve as much of the surviving fabric whilst also providing a viable use.

4.34 In view of the above, the assessment of the level of harm against benefits of the scheme is a finely balanced judgement but it is considered that the proposal will preserve the most important elements of the existing group of outbuildings on the site and that the resulting level of harm to heritage assets is outweighed by the overall social, economic and environmental benefits of the scheme. The impact on heritage assets is explained in more detail in later section of this report.

Conclusion on sustainable development

4.35 Having due regard to the above assessment made in the context of not having a demonstrable 5 year housing land supply, it is considered that the benefits of providing additional housing do sufficiently outweigh concerns regarding encroachment into the countryside and the impact on landscape character and heritage assets. On balance, the level of harm is sufficiently outweighed by the benefits of the scheme and as such, when considered as a whole with the lack of 5 year land supply, the scheme does represent a sustainable development.

Heritage and Design

4.36 Looking at the historic/architectural value of the existing listed outbuildings on the site the barn is considered to be of low significance, the Kennels medium significance and the stables of the highest significance. This application is for proposals that affect the barn and stable building only.

4.37 The key external changes to the barn are the new first floor terrace areas at the south elevation facing the courtyard. The stable building is also to have a new first floor terrace at its southern lean-to but the most significant changes to the existing arrangement are the new first floor area in the stable building and new infill section linking the stables with the barn. Taking into consideration the level of harm to existing buildings that has resulted due to the loss of historic fabric and their decline into a ruinous state it is considered that the level of harm to significance that would result from the proposed is less than substantial and therefore in accordance with paragraph 134 of the NPPF ‘this harm should be weighed against public benefits of the proposal, including its optimum viable use.’
Also, to be considered here is the very poor condition of the existing buildings which have badly deteriorated in recent years, the stable having suffered from considerable fire damage resulting in the loss of the whole roof section and central front pediment. Whilst it is acknowledged the proposed external alterations will cause some harm to the significance of existing listed buildings, the proposals at the same time will preserve and to some extent enhance what remains of the existing fabric thus ensuring its long term future. The first floor clerestory level will also be clearly identifiable as a much later addition to the structure.

In considering the above, an amendment to the proposed stable block conversion omitting the first floor balcony, would greatly improve the appearance of the scheme in key views of the site when approaching from along the driveway. It would also better retain the character and appearance of existing views through to the courtyards without significantly compromising the residential accommodation in the stable. Of all the balcony details proposed in the scheme, that on the stable looks particularly out of place with the existing lean-to parapet roof.

In view of the above and in light of the requirements of section 66 of the (1) Listed Buildings Act, whilst a level of harm to the special interest of the listed buildings is recognised, it is considered that, with the stable balcony omitted from the scheme, the social, economic and environmental benefits, which include the preservation of the existing structure for the long term, in what is a finely balanced judgement, outweigh the resulting level of harm to heritage assets. This view is supported by comments received from the Council’s Senior Conservation and Design Officer.

The proposal therefore sufficiently accords sections 7 and 12 of the NPPF regarding design and heritage assets as well as with policies DM3.8 and DM4.10 of the Local Plan.

Residential Amenity

The immediate neighbours to the proposed development are the four residential units in the Dower House. Only one neighbour response has been received in support of the application.

As previously mentioned, there is, however, a potential conflict here between the proposed new dwellings and the existing golf business, as under its current licence the premises can hold functions within both the clubhouse and marquee. Whilst a noise impact assessment has been submitted for music events being held in the clubhouse, this does not include the marquee. The submitted assessment indicates that there is the potential for disturbance from music events being held in the marquee.

The supporting information indicates that the golf business is prepared to cease functions within the marquee either through variation of the licence or through a formal written agreement. Also, the scheme for the new houses, which are closest to the existing commercial use, has been designed so that the bedroom areas are largely confined to the south eastern side (club house and marquee are to the west side). As the ground level for the new houses sits much lower than that of the club house and marquee this will further help reduce any potential noise impact.

The Environmental Quality Officer does not support the proposal but has indicated that they would be able to reconsider their position if there was a legal agreement in place preventing music events being held in the marquee. However, whilst this could address the issue of potential conflict between the new housing and the existing business, what also has to be considered here are the requirements of paragraph 123 of the NPPF with regard to existing businesses wanting to develop further. It states that they ‘should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses.’
Taking into account paragraph 123, if restriction of an existing commercial use is to be supported then the proposal needs to demonstrate some other key benefit that would justify supporting any proposed restriction. In this case, a key benefit of the proposal is the preservation of existing listed buildings on the site that are at a high level of risk from rapid deterioration. It is considered that this benefit of the proposal weighed against the potential negative impact from restricting the existing commercial use does provide some justification and again in a finely balanced judgement is considered acceptable, providing a legal agreement can be drawn up preventing functions being held in any marquees on the golf club site. This would allow the proposal to sufficiently accord with the requirements of policies DM3.13 of the Local Plan 2015.

Ecology

Having considered the submitted Ecology Report the County Council’s Ecologist has no objection to the scheme commenting that the development should cause little impact on ecology. They have requested that mitigation measures put forward in section 8 of the submitted report are covered by a condition. With a condition regarding proposed mitigation measures it is considered that the proposal accords with policy DM4.4 of the Local Plan 2015.

Environmental Protection

In terms of Environmental Protection, other than issues raised regarding potential for noise disturbance from the existing commercial use close to the site, the Environmental Quality Officer has not objected to the scheme but has requested conditions with any approval of the applications regarding contaminated land and construction. With these conditions it is considered that there are no other issues arising from the proposal with regard pollution, health and safety, which therefore accords with the requirements of policy DM3.14 of the Local Plan 2015.

Highways

The Highways Officer has no objection to the proposal but has requested a condition regarding parking/turning areas on the site. With this condition it is considered that the proposal accords with policies DM3.11 and DM3.12 of the Local Plan 2015.

Water Management

The Water Management Officer has no objection to the proposal but has requested advisory notes regarding surface water drainage. With these advisory notes it is considered that the proposal accords with the requirements of policy DM4.2 of the Local Plan 2015.

Impact on Local Finances

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.

Community Infrastructure Levy

This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
5 Conclusion application numbers 2016/2713 and 2016/2714

5.1 This proposal presents both positive and negative aspects that need to be carefully considered and which, overall, present finely balanced judgements under existing policy requirements.

5.2 The negative aspects of the scheme are that it is detached from the main settlement of Costessey; it will result in a restriction in the operation of an established leisure business that benefits the local community; result in an infringement into the countryside and cause some harm to landscape character and designated heritage assets. Positive impacts are the provision of housing in an area that cannot demonstrate a five year land supply; a reasonably sustainable location; some economic benefit to local area; the preservation of designated heritage assets that have been on the Buildings at Risk register for some years and which remain at considerable risk.

5.3 In what is therefore a finely balanced judgement, having given careful consideration to the above it is considered that, on balance and with some design amendments, the requirements of policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10 and 12 of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan policies DM1.1, DM1.3, DM1.4, DM2.10, DM3.1, DM3.8, DM3.10, DM3.11, DM3.12, DM3.13, DM3.14, DM4.1, DM4.2, DM4.4, DM4.5, DM4.6, DM4.9 and DM4.10 are met. Due consideration has also been given to section 66 (1) of the Listed Building Act. All other matters are considered acceptable and subject to the imposition of conditions and a S106 agreement obligation, the application is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Philip Whitehead 01508 533948 pwhitehead@s-norfolk.gov.uk
10 Appl. No : 2016/2781/F
Parish : LONG STRATTON

Applicants Name : Mr Matthew Davey
Site Address : Land North Of Wild Rose Farm Ipswich Road Long Stratton Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of 1 no 2 storey dwelling with attached garage.
(resubmission following refusal (2016/1741))

Recommendation : Refusal
1. Location inappropriate to fulfil the functional need
2. Impact on the undeveloped rural character
3. Inappropriate siting close to muck pad
4. Harm outweighs benefits of development

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 06 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design
NPPF 11 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF 12 : Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.1 : Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable
development in South Norfolk
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development
DM2.11 : Agricultural and other occupational dwellings in the Countryside
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM4.4 : Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space
DM4.5: 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

1.5 Long Stratton Area Action Plan
Parking Standards for Norfolk
Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas:

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

2. Planning History

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

2.1 2016/1741 Erection of 2no 2 storey dwellings with attached garages Refused

2.2 2016/1430 Proposed extension, conversion and associated alterations to annex. Approved

2.3 2015/0526 Retrospective change of use of holiday accommodation to residential annexe and erection of conservatory to extension. Approved

2.4 2010/0407 Proposed erection of single storey dwelling for poultry farm manager Refused

2.5 1989/0650 Erection of Agricultural Dwelling. Refused

Appeal History

2.6 2010/0407 Proposed erection of single storey dwelling for poultry farm manager Appeal dismissed

3. Consultations

3.1 Town / Parish Council To be reported

3.2 District Member Delegated decision unless recommended for refusal

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

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

3.5 NCC Ecologist To be reported

3.6 Historic Environment Service Recommended conditions regarding:
- Written scheme of investigation
- In accordance with the written scheme of investigation and Development not occupied until site investigation and post investigation is completed
Development Management Committee 4 January 2017

3.7 SNC Water Management Officer

Recommended advisory comments regarding:

- Foul drainage
- Surface water drainage
- Land drainage

3.8 Other Representations

No comments received to date

4 Assessment

4.1 This application is a resubmission of previously refused application 2016/1741. That application proposed two dwellings with garages within an agricultural field north east of the poultry farm. This application proposes one dwelling with an attached garage in a similar location.

4.2 The site is outside the development boundary within the Norwich Policy Area. The proposed property is considered to be isolated within an agricultural field (north of the farm) and would be accessed by vehicles via the main A140 highway route designated as a corridor of movement.

4.3 Every application must be assessed on its own merits, but it is relevant to consider whether the previous reasons for refusal under application 2016/1741 have been addressed by this resubmitted application 2016/2781.

4.4 The previous reasons for refusal (2016/1741) (in summary) were:

- There was not a functional need for two additional dwellings to serve the existing poultry farm
- The design failed to maintain or enhance the landscape character and setting
- Insufficient information regarding the impact of the adjacent muck pad in relation to insects, odour, noise and vehicle movements
- Impacts on the undeveloped rural character of the site and its setting would constitute unsustainable development

4.5 The main considerations in this case (2016/2781) are:

- Principle of development
- Impact on the character of the area (including design and paragraph 55)
- Highways
- Residential amenity
- Archaeological Importance
- Ecology
- Other matters
- Sustainable development

Principle of development

4.6 The inspector’s dismissed appeal decision in relation to appeal application 2010/0407 identified a need for two dwellings for the agricultural holding.

4.7 It is considered the existing farm house and annex on site can be considered as one planning unit, which allows for one additional new dwelling to make two agricultural worker dwellings on the site. In this case, the additional dwelling is to accommodate Hook 2 Sisters site manager.

4.8 The principle for one new additional dwelling is considered acceptable to fully address the functional need of the farm in accordance with Local Plan Policies DM2.7 and DM2.11.
4.9  The principle of development is contrary to the South Norfolk Local Plan DM 1.3 (sustainable location of development). This is because the site in question is outside the defined settlement boundary. An assessment must be made of any other material considerations, which may justify a departure from the development plan as the site is also situated within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) where a 5 year land supply cannot be demonstrated.

Impact on the character of the area (including design and paragraph 55)

4.10  The proposed dwelling is considered to be isolated. This is because the proposal would be sited in the far north/east corner of the agricultural field close to the adjacent muck pad (same location as the previous refusal application 2016/1741). The proposed dwelling would be a significant distance away from the farm, existing farm house and associated annex. This would create a very poor relationship with the farm and would create a significant impact on the undeveloped rural countryside character. The proposed siting of the dwelling is considered an unacceptable separation distance.

4.11  It has been highlighted within the submitted Design and Access Statement that, prior to the submission of this application officers have raised concerns regarding the siting of the proposed dwelling.

4.12  It has been identified through pro-active working and pre-application advice (post refusal application 2016/1741) there are two alternative appropriate and suitable locations for a new agricultural worker dwelling that would be well related to the farm and would not create any landscape or character impacts. The proposed siting of this application does not address previous refusal reasons 2 and 4 of application 2016/1741.

4.13  The proposal presents a pedestrian and bike access that would cut across the agricultural field from the proposed new dwelling to Wild Rose Farm. This is not considered an efficient or effective use of land and would unnecessarily disrupt an existing agricultural field.

4.14  The design of the proposed dwelling is considered an improvement to the previous refusal application. In this regard the proposal is considered to comply with policy DM3.8. This is because the proposed principal elevation contains more detail and character from the previous bland dwelling aesthetic.

4.15  Paragraph 55 of the NPPF promotes sustainable development where development enhances or maintains the vitality of rural communities, but suggests isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided unless there are special circumstances. As set out in this report there is an identified need for one additional rural worker dwelling. However, the proposed location does not constitute the ‘near’ relationship with the existing farm. Pre-application advice has identified two alternative suitable locations. In addition, the design of the proposed dwelling does not meet the very high standard of a Paragraph 55 proposal and would fail to significantly enhance its immediate setting; and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

4.16  In my opinion, the proposed location for the new dwelling is not suitable or appropriate in relation to the farm, it would significantly impact on the undeveloped landscape and rural character setting and impact on an existing agricultural field and does not address previous reasons for refusal. The proposal conflicts with Local Plan Policy DM4.5 and paragraph 55 of the NPPF.

Highways

4.17  The highways authority highlights that the proposed pedestrian walkway from the proposed dwellings to the poultry units, would help reduce vehicle movements between properties via the A140, which may well be the case if the future occupiers decided to walk or bike to Wild Rose Farm.
However, in visiting the site and surrounding area I am of the opinion the poor siting relationship of the proposed dwellings with the farm is not practically or suitably sited and on the balance of probabilities it is likely any future occupier(s) would travel by vehicle for work and private use, due to convenience, speed and comfort especially in winter months. This is not considered sustainable or suitable in accordance with policies DM1.1, DM1.3 and the NPPF.

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

Residential amenity

The proposed site would be isolated within the corner of an agricultural field. Therefore, the plot and proposal would be significantly separated and spaced from other surrounding properties, which would not cause overlooking or overshadowing issues and in this respect I consider the proposal complies with Local Plan Policy DM3.13. However, I have concerns there is a muck pad adjacent to the application site (north), which could cause odour issues especially in the summer to future occupiers of the new dwelling. The muck pad is not included within the blue line on the location plan, which suggests it is not in the ownership of the applicant. The Environmental Quality officer has confirmed they cannot support the proposal due to lack of information regarding the impact to future occupiers through insects, odour and noise from the large adjacent muck pad, unsocial hours of noise from HGV’s that use the lay-by to the A140 and vehicles that use the corridor or movement along the A140. Therefore, in this respect I consider the proposal would be contrary to Local Plan Policy DM3.13 and fails to address previous reason for refusal 3.

Archaeological Importance

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

Ecology

No ecology report has been submitted with the application. At the time of writing no ecology comments have been received. However, the siting of this proposal is the same as the previous refusal application (2016/1741). As part of that application the ecology officer informed; due to the existing ditch that is blocked, the lack of water bodies and the location of the site within close proximity to the A140 it is considered unlikely that it will have potential for protected species including Great Crested Newts. As part of application 2016/1741 the ecology officer recommended relevant conditions should the application be favoured. In my opinion, the proposal complies with Local Plan Policies DM4.4 subject to the imposition of suitable conditions.

Other matters

This report has been written prior to the consultation period ending due to the date of the January 2017 committee. All information available at the time of writing has been considered in this report. However, any further consultation responses submitted after this report will be considered and included on the committee update sheet in preparation for the January 2017 committee.
If this application was supported it should be subject to a S106 agreement for an agricultural occupancy restriction to tie the existing farm house, annex and new proposed dwelling to the farm.

Sustainable development

Social

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

The social benefit of the scheme is that it would provide one dwelling within a location where a 5 year land supply cannot be demonstrated. Therefore, the dwelling would be contributing to the housing shortfall.

Economic

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."

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

Environmental

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

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

The scheme represents an unsustainable development in the context of the NPPF regard to paragraphs 14 and 49.

Other considerations

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

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

In conclusion, the principle of one additional dwelling is considered acceptable. However, the proposed siting is not due to its significant distance away from the farm creating poor relationship with the existing farm and impact on the undeveloped rural countryside character. The proposed location would also not be an efficient or effective use of agricultural land. The proposal would also pose environmental quality concerns for future occupiers.

It has been identified there are two alternative suitable locations for the additional dwelling that would address the reasons for refusal in application 2016/1741.

Reasons for refusal:

Inappropriate location to fulfil the functional need: the proposed dwelling would be isolated in the corner of an agricultural field away from the poultry farm. This would create a poor relationship with the existing farm and would not be an efficient or effective use of agricultural land. The proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policies DM1.3 and DM2.11.

The proposed siting of the dwelling would create an adverse impact on the undeveloped rural character of the site and its setting due to its isolated nature, which would be at odds within the dominant rural landscape setting. Consequently, the proposed location of the dwelling would fail to maintain or enhance the landscape character and setting which would constitute significant and demonstrable harm that outweighs the benefits of the proposal, notwithstanding the lack of a 5 year housing land supply in the Norwich Policy Area. The proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policies DM4.5, DM4.8 and DM4.9 and paragraph 55 of the NPPF.

Inappropriate siting of the proposed dwelling close to the adjacent muck pad in relation to insects, odour and noise, the proposal is contrary to Local Plan Policies DM3.13 and DM4.5.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ALLEGED BREACH</th>
<th>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORTWELL</td>
<td>Standing and occupation of a residential caravan</td>
<td>20.06.2006</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served \nCompliance period extended by Committee to 25.05.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Farm</td>
<td>High Road 2004/0254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICKLEBURGH</td>
<td>Material change of use - Breach of a condition - Operational development</td>
<td>24.04.2007</td>
<td>Enforcement Notices served and initially complied with. \nOngoing negotiation to secure future of the listed building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeches Farm</td>
<td>Norwich Road 2007/8036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Unauthorised works to a listed building</td>
<td>12.04.2010</td>
<td>Listed Building Enforcement Notice served \nPlanning permission granted for new scheme to be completed by 03.04.2017 or compliance with notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey House</td>
<td>The Street 2009/8010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLETON RODE</td>
<td>Change of use of land</td>
<td>21.07.2010</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served \nCompliance date 29.12.2011 \nConsultants employed to secure mitigation scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adj. to</td>
<td>Fen Road 2006/0269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing and Occupation of Residential Caravan</td>
<td>04.03.2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Further Enforcement Notice served re caravan \nCompliance date within 3 months of first occupation of the permitted dwelling house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROWNTHORPE</td>
<td>Formation of Access</td>
<td>16.11.2011</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 27.10.13 Owner previously unable to comply due to personal circumstances but further action now underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land adjacent to The Drift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crownthorpe Rd 2011/8025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Standing of residential mobile home</td>
<td>22.07.2015</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 4 months after the mobile home is no longer occupied by specified occupier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copper Beeches Crownthorpe Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015/8005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT MOULTON</td>
<td>Change of use of land for travellers site</td>
<td>16.09.2015</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Appealed awaiting result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Common Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015/8139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the standing of a residential caravan</td>
<td>14.10.2015</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ashgate House Ketteringham Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015/8075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KETTERINGHAM</td>
<td>Change of use of land for travellers site</td>
<td>14.10.2015</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Appeal dismissed Compliance date 11.02.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land North of High Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014/8301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTON</td>
<td>Change of use of dwelling To create a second independent dwelling</td>
<td>20.07.2016</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 19.09.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Old Post Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Marlingford Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016/8165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the storage of materials used in connection with building activities</td>
<td>20.07.2016</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 17.01.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land on the South Side of Cemetery Lane 2016/1316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the storage of items not associated with agricultural/horticultural and the erection of timber sheds</td>
<td>20.07.2016</td>
<td>Enforcement Notices served x 2 Notice partially complied with Compliance date 01.03.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land to the North West of Silver Green 2016/8068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHWELLTHORPE</td>
<td>Formation of earth bank (engineering operation)</td>
<td>14.09.2016</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 22.02.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belmont Smithy Corner Wymondham Road 2016/8047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THARSTON</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the standing of caravans</td>
<td>09.11.2016</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 06.03.2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wheelers Barn Hall Lane 2015/8056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTON</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the keeping of dogs</td>
<td>07.12.2016</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice to be served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rainbows End Norwich Road 2016/8183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the storage of vehicles and parts</td>
<td>07.12.2016</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice to be served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Red House Norwich Road 2015/8319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of complaints</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Notices Issued</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of Condition Notices Issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 215 Notices Issued</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary stop notices issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Planning Appeals
Appeals received from 29th November 2016 to 19th December 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals
Appeals decisions from 29th November 2016 to 19th December 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>2015/1428</td>
<td>Diss</td>
<td>Marstons Estates Limited</td>
<td>Erection of 4no non-food retail units (Use Class A1) comprising a total of 3948sqm with access from Park Road.</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0317</td>
<td>Forncett</td>
<td>Mr Tom Nix</td>
<td>Fell London Plane Tree to front of property and replant with Apple or Ash Tree.</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>