Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

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

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

Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time
9.00 am            Blomefield Room

Agenda

Date
Wednesday 6 January 2016

Time
10.00 am

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

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

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

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

The order of the agenda may change at the discretion of the Chairman, so it is advisable to arrive at the commencement of the meeting.

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

21/12/2015
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 Local Plan Documents 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 to the JCS being adopted in January 2014). It is the starting point in the determination of planning applications and as it is adopted, policies within the plan can be given full weight when determining planning applications.

The remaining ‘saved’ policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003) also carry full weight in the determination process, unless officers specifically advise otherwise.

South Norfolk Council is also in the process of preparing various Local Plan Documents: the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document, Area Action Plans for Wymondham and Long Stratton and the Development Management Policies Document. These documents will allocate specific areas of land for development, define settlement boundaries and provide criteria based policies giving a framework for assessing planning applications. None of these emerging Local Plan documents have yet been submitted for independent examination, and so the weight to be afforded to emerging policies and allocations is assessed on a case-by-case basis.

A further document which also forms part of the South Norfolk Development Plan is the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan. The CNDP was formally ‘made’ (adopted) on 24 February 2014, and full weight can now be given to the policies of the CNDP when determining planning applications in Cringleford parish.

In a number of instances the Council has produced Supplementary Planning Documents which expand upon the policies of the Development Plan; these documents do not change policy or create new policy, but they are a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

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 which contradict policy will be recorded in detail, to explain and justify the decision, and the strength of the material planning reasons for doing so.

**LOCAL COUNCILS**

**OCCASIONALLY, THERE ARE CONFLICTS WITH THE VIEWS OF THE PARISH OR TOWN COUNCIL. WHY IS THIS?**

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

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

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

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

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

   (attached – page 9 and 11)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 18)

   To consider the items as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Planning Ref No.</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2015/1697</td>
<td>LITTLE MELTON</td>
<td>Land north of Gibbs Close, Little Melton</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2015/1760/D</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land north of the A11 Silfield Road Wymondham Norfolk</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2015/2172/F</td>
<td>BRACON ASH</td>
<td>Team Lotus International Hethel Industrial Estate Potash Lane Hethel Norfolk NR14 8EY</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2015/2348/CU</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Loddon Business Centre 2B High Street Loddon Norfolk NR14 6AH</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2015/2858/RVC</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Cygnet House Swan Lane Long Stratton Norfolk</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2015/2356/TPO</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>11 Greenfield Way Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2WP</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Please note that Appendix 3 of application1 to this report is NOT FOR PUBLICATION by virtue of paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972)

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. Planning Appeals (for information) 
   (attached – page 76)

8. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wednesday 3 February 2016
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

3. FILMING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS: GUIDANCE

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

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

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

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>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Advert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Certificate of Alternative Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGF</td>
<td>Agricultural Determination – approval of details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Application to be determined by County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Change of Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Reserved Matters (Detail following outline consent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment – Screening Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment – Scoping Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Full (details included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Proposal by Government Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Householder – Full application relating to residential property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HZ</td>
<td>Hazardous Substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Existing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Proposed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Outline (details reserved for later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVC</td>
<td>Removal/Variation of Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Proposal by Statutory Undertaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAP</td>
<td>Wymondham Area Action Plan – Pre Submission</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

NO

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

YES

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

YES

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

NO

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

YES

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

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

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

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

NO

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

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton, on Wednesday 2 December 2015 at 10.00 am.

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

Apologies: Councillor V Thomson

Substitutes: Councillor N Legg

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors), Place-Shaping & Majors Team Leader (J Hobbs), the Planning Policy Manager (A Nicholls) and the Senior Planning Officer (C Raine)

(32 members of the public were also in attendance)

235. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/1482/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>J Mooney &amp; N Legg</td>
<td>Members have attended social events and a public consultation event at Wymondham RFC Local Planning Code of Practice – Lobbied by Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>L Neal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

236. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/1482/O</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Mr T Williamson, Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr A Wilford, Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr L Dale, Local Member for Hethersett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(The meeting closed at 10:45 am)

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.

Applications referred back to Committee

1  Appl. No  :  2015/1482/O  
Parish         :  WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Wymondham Rugby Football Club, Landstock Estates Ltd & 
                  Landowners Group Ltd
Site Address    : Wymondham Rugby Club and Land West of Elm Farm Norwich 
                  Common Wymondham Norfolk
Proposal        : Outline application with all matters reserved (except for access) for 
                  up to 90 dwellings at Tuttles Lane, including the demolition of existing 
                  Wymondham Rugby Club buildings and sports pitches, closure of 
                  existing access and creation of vehicular access from Lavender 
                  Road; up to 300 residential dwellings at Norwich Common with 
                  multiple access points, including the demolition of 63 Norwich 
                  Common; a replacement rugby club (use class D1) with sports 
                  pitches including an artificial pitch, floodlighting, clubhouse, car 
                  parking and accesses including an emergency only access from 
                  Melton Road; and associated works including open space, 
                  sustainable urban drainage systems, landscaping, infrastructure and 
                  earthworks.

Decision         : Members voted unanimously for REFUSAL

Refused
1. Development within strategic gap
2. Unsustainable development

Members voted unanimously to authorise officers to defend the appealed application 2014/0799 on the grounds outlined in the report.

Updates

A further letter of support has been received by officers.
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton, on Wednesday 9 December 2015 at 10.00 am.

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

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors), Planning Decisions Team Leader (C Trett) and the Senior Planning Officers (T Lincoln and C Raine)

(17 members of the public were also in attendance)

237. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/1059/D</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Local member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1594/D</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Local member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1697/F</td>
<td>LITTLE MELTON</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1642/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>G Minshull</td>
<td>‘Other’ interest – member knows the land owner. He stood down from Committee for this item, did not take part in discussion and did not vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2397/H</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>J Mooney</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2069/F</td>
<td>THURLTON</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>‘Other’ interest – application is on land owned by South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Cabinet member – stood down from Committee for this item, did not take part in discussion and did not vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2533/CU</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>‘Other’ interest – application is on land owned by South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Cabinet member – stood down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
238. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/1059/D</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Ms L Townes – On behalf of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1594/D</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Mr A Roberts – On behalf of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr D Humphreys – On behalf of applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1697/F</td>
<td>LITTLE MELTON</td>
<td>Mr J Heaser – Chairman Little Melton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr C Starr – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs A Payne – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr A Presslee – On behalf of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr G Wheatley – Local member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2240/F</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Mr M Davey – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/1642/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Mr D Ward – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr K Kiddie – Local member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

239. ENFORCEMENT REPORTS

Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Hingham (ref 2014/8233)

It was RESOLVED to authorise enforcement action to secure the removal of the caravan.

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

It was RESOLVED to authorise enforcement action requiring the fence to be painted a dark recessive green or brown colour with a compliance period of one month.

Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Carleton Rode (ref 2015/8236)

It was RESOLVED that no further action be taken in respect of the following items:

1. CCTV camera on the outbuilding
2. CCTV cameras on the house
3. Light fittings on the house
4. Alarm box on the house
5. Electric Vehicle Charger on the house

Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Carleton Rode (re 2014/8295)

It was RESOLVED that no further action be taken at present but that the need for action should be reviewed should circumstances change.

Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Hedenham (ref 2015/8242)

It was RESOLVED that no further action be taken.

240. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting closed at 1:00pm)

________________________

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.

Applications referred back to Committee

1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/1059/D</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Persimmons Homes Anglia and Taylor Wimpey East Anglia</td>
<td>Land North of Hethersett Village Centre Little Melton Road including Extension to Thickthorn Park and Ride Hethersett</td>
<td>Reserved matters application following outline planning permission 2011/1804/O for road layout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decision: Members voted unanimously for **APPROVAL**

Approved with conditions
1. In accordance with approved plans
2. Tree species, locations and pit details required
3. Highways – technical highway design to be approved
4. Highways – roads built to binder course prior to occupation

2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/1594/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Taylor Wimpey East Anglia</td>
<td>Phase A1-A Land North of Hethersett Village Centre Little Melton Road Hethersett Norfolk</td>
<td>Residential development of 95no dwellings with associated open space and infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Approved with conditions
1. In accordance with amended plans
2. Water efficiency

Subject to resolving the outstanding matters in terms of highways, landscaping and design

Updates

Additional landscape details have been submitted by the applicant in response to the Landscape Officers comments (which were detailed on page 35 of the report). The matters are largely addressed however there are a number of minor matters that still need agreement. Officers would not consider however that the further matters would have any significant impact on the proposed design and layout. Authority to delegate approval subject
Major application or applications raising issues of significant precedent

3  
**Appl. No**: 2015/1697/F  
**Parish**: LITTLE MELTON  
Applicants Name: Vello Ltd  
Site Address: Land North of Gibbs Close Little Melton Norfolk  
Proposal: Erection of 27 dwellings, access, roads, open space, parking areas and associated works  
Decision: Members voted unanimously for DEFERRAL  
Deferred

**Reasons for Deferral**

The item was deferred to enable members to view financial information regarding the application on confidential papers and to provide members with further information on surface water.

**Updates**

2015/2510 as referred to in the Planning History section of the report has now been determined with no affordable housing to be provided if the development is completed within 3 years. For clarification purposes, this does not directly affect the proposed number of affordable units offered as part of this application (2015/1697) which continues to offer 4 affordable units.

The Council’s Water Management Officer has confirmed that the technical views of the LLFA should be sought and a condition is required to agree a detailed surface water drainage strategy for the scheme, such a condition was imposed on the extant permission for the site (2012/1836). LLFA has re-iterated that it does not wish to comment further on surface water drainage matters on site.

Additional condition required to agree external materials.

4  
**Appl. No**: 2015/2240/F  
**Parish**: LONG STRATTON  
Applicants Name: Mr M Davey  
Site Address: Wild Rose Farm Ipswich Road Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2XA  
Proposal: Erection of energy building (dual fuel bio-mass) to provide heating and energy to poultry units  
Decision: Members voted unanimously to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to APPROVE  

Approved with conditions

1. Full planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
3. Full details of external lighting  
4. Programme of archaeological works  
5. Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
6. Provision of parking, service  
7. Waste material from site only
Updates

Given that the preparatory work has been undertaken for the extant permission, Historic Environment Services has confirmed that the archaeological related condition included in the report is no longer required.

5  
Appl. No : 2015/1642/F  
Parish : DISS  
Applicants Name : Danny Ward Builders  
Site Address : Land North of 14 and 16 Roydon Road Diss Norfolk  
Proposal : Proposed 1 x 4 Bedroom and 1 x 3 Bedroom Single Storey Bungalows with 3 x Garages  
Decision : Members voted 8 – 2 (with 1 abstention) for REFUSAL  
Refused  
1. Substandard form of development

6  
Appl. No : 2015/2397/H  
Parish : WYMONDHAM  
Applicants Name : Mr Glen Hammond  
Site Address : 50 St Leonards Close Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0JF  
Proposal : Retention of a 4ft fence with 2ft trellis above with concrete posts to the boundary, replacing a 7ft hedge  
Decision : Members voted unanimously for REFUSAL  
Refused  
1. Adverse impact on character of area contrary to policy JCS 2 SNLP DM3.8  
Members also RESOLVED that enforcement action be taken

Updates

Further letter of support from neighbour to the rear

7  
Appl. No : 2015/2069/F  
Parish : THURLTON  
Applicants Name : Mr B Rivett  
Site Address : Highland Church Road Thurlton Norfolk NR14 6RN  
Proposal : Change of use of land from freehold open space to garden land
Development Management Committee  
9 December 2015

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

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

---

8 **Appl. No**: 2015/2533/CU  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: Mrs G Bray  
Site Address: Car and Lorry Park Ayton Road Wymondham Norfolk  
Proposal: Change of use from grassed area at existing car/lorry park to a trading pitch for hot food takeaway

**Decision**: Members voted 10 – 0 for **APPROVAL**

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

---

**Updates**

**SNC Community Services**
- No objection from Food Team provided site is registered before trading.
- No objection from Environmental Quality Team subject to advice regarding drainage.
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

Applications referred back to Committee

1. Appl. No : 2015/1697
   Parish : LITTLE MELTON
   Applicants Name : Vello Ltd
   Site Address : Land north of Gibbs Close, Little Melton
   Proposal : Application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 27 dwellings, access, roads, open space, parking areas and associated works

Recommendation : Approval with conditions:

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

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

Introduction

This report updates the position in respect of the viability and surface water drainage for the above application following deferral of the planning application by the Development Management Committee on 9th December 2015. This report updates members on the further information received from the applicant since the deferral and officer observations on this further information.

Planning Policies and Planning History

1.1 The planning policies and planning history are as previously presented in the committee report on the 9th December 2015 (Appendix 2).

2. Consultations

2.1 Given that no amended information has been received since the previous deferral no re-consultations have been undertaken by the Council. However, officers have sought to clarify the position of the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in respect of this matter following on from the concerns expressed by the committee at the possible drainage implications of the scheme. The
LLFA have provided some observations, but raise no objection. It is considered reasonable to secure final details through condition, as per previous approval on this site.

3 Assessment

3.1 The application was considered at the Development Management Committee on the 9th December 2015 and the item was deferred to allow Members to consider in greater detail the financial viability implications of the proposal and also to seek further information on the surface water drainage strategy for the site. On this basis each will be considered in turn.

Viability

3.2 The viability information submitted in support of this application is provided as separate exempt papers (appendix 2). In response to the deferral, the applicant has requested that clarification be provided insofar as confirming the following:

- 2012/1836 can be taken forward with no affordable housing being provided as a result of the consented S106 BA application to remove all of the affordable housing provision, subject to a reserved matters application being submitted and granted.
- The agent has reiterated that the current developer was not the applicant on 2012/1836 and therefore not responsible for entering into a S106 at the time which indicated that 33% could be viably provided.
- The approved scheme for 20 dwellings had contributions of approximately £160,000 via the S106. The current scheme for 27 would generate in the region of £230,000 in CIL contributions.
- It should be highlighted that a scheme which provides 15% affordable housing bears comparisons with others within the District, examples of which include Hethersett North 20% (greenfield site with economies of scale) and Cygnet House, Long Stratton 10%.
- Reference is drawn to government guidance relating to S106BA matters, and the recent ministerial statement of the 9th November 2015 which include the following statements:

  “Stalled schemes due to economically unviable affordable housing requirements result in no development, no regeneration and no community benefit. Reviewing such agreements will result in more housing and more affordable housing than would otherwise be the case.”

  “We would urge planning authorities to respond constructively, rapidly and positively to requests for such renegotiations and to take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to viability.”

3.3 Paras 4.13 to 4.18 of the original committee report (attached as Appendix 2) confirm the officer’s position in respect of the viability implication for this scheme of 27 dwellings, and how the viability information submitted has been the subject of assessment from the Council’s Property Consultant. Whilst it is unfortunate that the scheme does not secure the 33% affordable housing which is the start point for all residential developments of 16 dwellings and over, it is evident that this is not always achievable, and indeed Policy 4 of the JCS does include particular reference to the possibility of this occurring in stating:

  “The proportion of affordable housing sought may be reduced and the balance of tenures amended where it can be demonstrated that site characteristics, including infrastructure provision, together with the requirement for affordable housing would render the site unviable in prevailing market conditions, taking account of the availability of public subsidy to support affordable housing.”
Surface water drainage

3.4 The agent has confirmed that they do not consider it necessary or reasonable to provide further information on this matter in light of the following points:

- The LLFA responded after 16 weeks with some comments, but raising the application can be determined by the local authority.
- The Council’s Water Management Officer confirmed that as well as seeking the views of the LLFA a condition relating to the agreement of a detailed SUDS scheme would be acceptable.
- The outline planning permission for 20 dwellings on the site had a condition to agree a detailed SUDS scheme.
- Other schemes granted in Little Melton have similarly worded planning conditions in relation to surface water drainage matters.

3.5 Whilst it would be beneficial to have a detailed surface water drainage strategy as part of the application prior to determination, the absence of one does prevent the matter being fully and properly considered via a formal discharge of condition application, as is often the case on residential schemes.

4 Conclusion

4.1 The proposed development is considered to comply with policies within the Joint Core Strategy (2011, amendments adopted 2014), the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003) and the relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) identified in the list of policies in the previous committee report (Appendix 2).

4.2 The application represents a sustainable development, whereby the benefits of the scheme outweigh any harm, having due regard to the absence of a 5-year housing land supply within the Norwich Policy Area.

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

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Raine 01508 533841 Lynn Armes 01508 533968 craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3  

**Appl. No** : 2015/1697/F  
**Parish** : LITTLE MELTON

Applicants Name : Vello Ltd  
Site Address : Land North Of Gibbs Close Little Melton Norfolk  
Proposal : Erection of 27 dwellings, access, roads, open space, parking areas and associated works

Recommendation : Authorise Director of Growth and Localism to Approve with Conditions

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

Subject to resolution of any surface water disposal matters and completion of Section 106 agreement relating to affordable housing and open space provision and management.

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.1 : Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
DM3.2 : Meeting rural housing needs  
DM3.9 : Advertisements and signs  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2012/1836 Outline application for residential development (20 Dwellings) and associated infrastructure works, including highway improvement works at the Mill Road/School Lane/Burnthouse Lane junction

2015/2510 Modification of S106 Agreement for permission 2012/1836/O, dated 29 April 2014 - Removal of Affordable Housing provision of 7 dwellings

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council
Object
40% of site is outside area approved in outline application doubling the number of existing properties to be affected
Nearby roads are not suitable for increased traffic
Drainage has changed to be reliant on existing drainage network. However no evidence there is a network and area has long history of drainage problems
Not complying with required percentage of affordable housing.

3.2 District Members
Cllr Wheatley and Cllr Kemp
Application can be delegated

3.3 SNC Landscape Officer
Cannot support the scheme due to landscape proposals not according with the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment and current proposal does not offer best and most practical landscape approach. The scheme would result in the loss of two birch trees and plot 25 would partly encroach on a root protection area. Contrary to policies JCS 2 and DM4.9 of the local plan.
Revised scheme does little to address previous concerns.

3.4 NCC Planning Obligations Co-ordinator
No comments received

3.5 Historic Environment Service
No recommendation for archaeological work

3.6 SNC Play and Amenities Manager
To be reported if appropriate
3.7 Norfolk And Waveney Local Medical Council
No comments received

3.8 Anglian Water Services Ltd
If Council minded to approve condition requiring Surface water management strategy

3.9 SNC Design Officer
Affordable housing compressed in corner with dominant parking court. Open space bordered on two sides by access roads, open space located more centrally with housing fronting on to it, could be carried through to drainage area to open up views to the countryside. Open space associated with larger dwellings is wasteful, unlikely to be used by larger dwellings as they have large private gardens. Larger units should be spaced out throughout the development. Medium size properties may be better located to the south of the site in a position with similar existing plots. Meeting required as points would result in red in the Building for Life assessment.

Revised plans
Revisions address some concerns. Resulting Building for Life assessment as follows:
7 Greens
5 Ambers
No reds

3.10 NCC Ecologist
If minded to approve impose condition preventing the development proceeding without receiving a copy of European Protected Species licence identifying mitigation measures

3.11 SNC Community Services - Protection
No objection subject to condition

Revised Plans
No further comments

3.12 NCC Highways
Revised off site highways work plan required
Footways should wrap around instead of stopping at ends of highway
Plot 17 only has 2 useable spaces
Radii of junction adjacent plots 19 and 20 could be reduced
Surface water disposal
little if no access for maintaining ditches

After further information highways are content with all points apart from surface water which can be conditioned.

3.13 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager
Concern at the scheme not providing a policy compliant level of affordable housing. The Council must be fully satisfied by the viability case provided. The developer has purchased land knowing that there was a requirement to provide 7 affordable units.

3.14 NHS England
No comments received

3.15 NHS Clinical Commissioning Group
No comments received

3.16 Hethersett Surgery
No comments received
3.17 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority

Full comments awaited, to be updated to committee.

3.18 Police Architectural Liaison Officer

Parking court adjacent play area. This could cause anti social behaviour
Concerns regarding fencing to rear of properties.

Following revised plans
Still concerned about boundary treatments

3.19 Other Representations

10 objection letters covering the following issues:

- Seen together with 2 other applications in area already overload traffic on Mill Road, any increase adds to overloading
- 7 additional dwellings will exacerbate the traffic and safety problems
- Mill Road unsuitable for amount of traffic, foot path is only distinguished by type of surface no raised kerb
- Greater risk to people walking to village hall
- Increase in traffic will result in terms of dangerous fumes
- Very limited bus service so virtually all traffic from village is by private car
- Refuse collection lorry when in Mill Road makes it virtually impossible for traffic to pass, has to reverse into Gibbs Close due to lack of turning space
- Gibbs Close has 20mph speed limit which is often broken, potential of more young children in the area is an accident waiting to happen
- Unsafe junctions and introduction of minimal raised roundabout will result in traffic going over the top of so called roundabout
- Access opposite property so resident will be unable to park outside front of their property
- Another access should be discussed for safety reasons
- Residents of Homecroft pay a service charge to maintain road as it has not been adopted
- Subsidence in Gibbs Close and Homecroft is due to collapsed drains
- Water table high and often surface water flooding, more development with impervious surfaces will exacerbate problem
- No acceptable or feasible drainage plan
- Only part of land is within area set aside for development
- Outside the approved development boundary
- Over development of site
- Plans used are out of date, objectors house has been extended which is not shown indicating the planning application has not been completed with suitable rigour
- Land north of Gibbs Close is inhabited by a range of wildlife
- Insufficient research done to protected the Great Crested Newts
- Incorrect and inaccurate exclusion zone around pond
- Woodland Trust urging us to get out in our countryside, soon "countryside" might have to be in inverted commas
- Harm the rural feel of the village
- Overlooking
- Loss of privacy
- Longer waits for GP appointments
- Closeness of dwellings could result in emotional and nervous problems caused by pressure of lack of space, also caused when drivers have to wait in queue to access School Lane
4. Assessment

Site history and proposal

4.1 The site is approximately 2.7 hectares and is located to the north of Gibbs Close on the edge of the existing built up area of Little Melton. To the south of the site are the existing dwellings at Homecroft and Gibbs Close which comprise of a mix of detached bungalows and two storey dwellings. To the east is open countryside with a pond adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. To the north and west is open countryside.

4.2 Outline planning permission was granted on the western portion of the site (1.3 hectares) in 2012 for 20 dwellings seven of which were affordable (2012/1836). This current application seeks full planning permission on an enlarged site which includes the approved site. The enlarged site results in an additional 7 dwellings, and therefore 27 in total. These consist of:

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

Affordable housing
Two storey
3 x 2 bedroom
1 x 1 bedroom

Key planning issues

4.3 The area of land approved for 20 dwellings (2012/1836) which forms part of the current application site lies within the adopted development boundary in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD and as such the principle of new residential development on this part of the site is consistent with the aims of policy DM1.3 which seeks to permit new housing within a development boundary. However, the remainder of the application site lies outside of the development boundary and is therefore designated as open countryside.

4.4 On this basis part 2 of Policy DM1.3 is directly relevant. This states that:

“2) Permission for development in the countryside outside of any defined development boundaries of settlements will only be granted if:

c) Where specific Development Management Policies allow for development outside of development boundaries or
d) Otherwise demonstrates overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environmental dimensions as addressed in Policy 1.1.”

4.5 The scheme proposed is not considered to meet 2 c) as set out above. However, 2 d) highlights the need to have regard for overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environmental dimensions which replicate the three roles set out in the NPPF for determining whether a scheme represents a sustainable development.
4.6 It is also necessary to acknowledge that when considering residential applications Policy DM1.3 cannot be considered up-to-date as the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year land supply of deliverable housing sites within the Norwich Policy Area. Policy DM1.1 of the South Norfolk Plan as referred to in 2 d) also highlights that where “the relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision, then the Council will consider the impact of the proposal in each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions jointly and simultaneously”.

4.7 In light of the contents of 2 d) of Policy DM1.3 and the presumption in favour of sustainable development within the NPPF, it is considered appropriate to determine whether the current scheme represents a sustainable development having regard to the contents of the NPPF.

4.8 The assessment is undertaken having regard to the three roles expressed within the NPPF, and which have also been reiterated in Policies DM1.1 and DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, namely the economic, social and environmental roles.

Economic Role

4.9 The NPPF highlights the economic role as:

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

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

Social Role

4.11 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."

4.12 As the development will provide additional housing where there is a recognised need (there is not a demonstrable 5 year housing land supply) then this would help to make a positive contribution albeit this would be modest given the limited overall number proposed having regard to the level of shortfall.

4.13 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 4 of the 27 units would be affordable (15%) and therefore the applicant has submitted a viability appraisal to confirm that it is only viable to provide 4 units as affordable properties. This has been assessed by the Council’s Property Consultant who has concluded that in overall terms the case made in support of the delivery of 4 affordable units is not unreasonable.

4.14 It is evident that the previously consented scheme for 20 dwellings on part of this site (2012/1836) did secure 33% as affordable units (7 units). Given this point, the applicant has also provided a viability appraisal to confirm why this is now not achievable/viable. This matter is now being pursued through a S106BA application (as highlighted at para 2.2 of this report). This process allows for:
"An application may be made to the local planning authority for a revised affordable housing obligation. This application should contain a revised affordable housing proposal, based on prevailing viability, and should be supported by relevant viability evidence. The local planning authority may prepare its own viability evidence or provide commentary on the evidence submitted in support of the application. Further guidance on procedures for applications, including the Mayor of London’s role, is given in Annex B."

4.15 The above being taken from the Government’s guidance document entitled “Section 106 affordable housing requirements Review and appeal April 2013”

4.16 Having due regard for the guidance contained within the Government’s guidance document entitled “Section 106 affordable housing requirements Review and appeal April 2013”. The application has been considered by the Council’s Property Consultant and it is considered that the submission has proven that the scheme could not be delivered if affordable housing was provided.

4.17 As highlighted through the consultation process, it is apparent that the developer acquired the site knowing what contributions were required as part of the planning permission (2012/1836), namely 7 of the 20 units are to be affordable, and therefore this should have been taken into account in purchasing the site. In response to this point, the applicant contends in their viability case for the site that the land price paid is consistent with benchmarked land values elsewhere in Norfolk. It is evident that government guidance (DCLG Section 106 affordable housing requirements, Review and Appeal April 2013) confirms the option of using benchmark values is acceptable in the absence of an original viability appraisal, as is the case here. Therefore, in terms of assessing a viability case, the purchase price is considered to be reasonable.

4.18 On this basis, whilst it is unfortunate that the Council will not obtain the 7 dwellings anticipated from the previous approval, or 9 across the expanded site (9 being 33% of 27) it has been satisfactorily that neither is viable and as such the 4 proposed on the current 27 dwellings is an acceptable proposition having regard to the viability assessment submitted.

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

4.20 In summary, it is considered that as the scheme would contribute additional housing where there is a need and provides an attractive scheme for future residents.

Environmental Role

4.21 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."

4.22 There have been a number of ecology surveys carried out in association with both this application and the previous outline application. This application is supported by an ecological assessment which is regarded as fit for purpose by Norfolk County Council Natural Environment Team. There is the presence of Great Crested Newts in the pond adjacent to the application site and an European Protected Species Licence (EPS) licence will be required for the proposed development to proceed.
A condition is required on the approval notice to prevent the development proceeding without the Council receiving a copy of the EPS licence which will identify appropriate mitigation measures. It is also apparent that a condition would be required for the future management maintenance of the ecological protection zone, such a condition was attached to the outline approval and is recommended to be re-imposed here.

4.23 It is evident that the outline approval on the site also sought to introduce a specific ecological mitigation arrangement, with condition 19 of 2012/1836 requiring an ecological buffer zone. Whilst it is evident that the buffer zone does not fully follow that suggested through condition 19, the alternative proposed is considered acceptable by the Council's ecologist.

4.24 In terms of landscape impact, concern has been expressed at the reduced landscape buffer from the 20m buffer presented in the illustrative layout plan submitted as part of 2012/1836 which was led by the findings of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment that had been prepared as part of that submission. It is evident that the buffer has been reduced from that indicated on the illustrative plan submitted with the outline approval, however, it is evident that the planning condition attached to the outline approval (condition 19 of 2012/1836), and its accompanying reason, made provision for this buffer to be provided in the interests of primarily safeguarding ecology rather than as a landscape protection condition, albeit it would have contributed towards limiting the landscape impact.

4.25 With this in mind it is evident that the proposed ecological buffer zone to the northern and western boundaries of the site within the submitted scheme achieves its aim of safeguarding ecology as is demonstrated by the Council's ecologist confirming that they have no objection subject to a condition as set out above in paragraphs 4.21 and 4.22.

4.26 It is also considered that the landscape impact of the current scheme could be further reduced by appropriate planting being undertaking in the ecology zone and as such it is considered appropriate to attach a condition to agree a landscaping scheme for the site. It is also evident that the proposed layout does keep the proposed dwellings away from the site boundaries which does also help to limit landscape impact.

4.27 In summary, whilst the concerns are acknowledged in respect of landscape, and the indications provided in the approved scheme 2012/1836, it is considered that the current scheme does not lead to significant harm in terms of landscape impact.

4.28 The Council's landscape officer has also raised concerns regarding the lack of accessibility to the ecological zone for the purposes of maintenance and management. The developer has confirmed that two access points for maintenance would be provided, one adjacent to plot 7 on the western boundary of the site, and another adjacent to the SuDS feature in the public open space on the northern boundary of the site.

4.29 Reference has been made to the loss of two birch trees on plot 19. It is evident that the revised plan means that only one of these would be lost. In terms of the tree that would need to be removed, it is evident that this is not presently the subject of any formal protection and it would not be an appropriate tree in this instance to seek to protect it formally now, and whilst it is regrettable that the tree would be lost, it is retention could not be insisted upon as it would not represent a sufficiently robust reason to refuse the application. It should also be noted that the indicative plan in the previously approved scheme 2012/1836 would have been likely to result in the loss of both of these trees.

4.30 In terms of encroachment into the RPA of plot 25, it is evident that this is a very modest encroachment, which is acknowledged by the developer in their arboricultural impact assessment. This document highlights what tree protection measures should be put in place throughout the development, including plot 25. The protection measures outlined would be a condition of any approval.
4.31 The environmental role also seeks to secure high quality built environment, the site layout has been subject to revision during the application process following discussions with the agent regarding the positioning of the open space and car parking within the site. In particular there were concerns about the size of the open space and the lack of surveillance of it. The amended scheme has addressed these issues with the parking in the western part of the site now including greater levels of parking within the plot and the open space now being a larger centrally located space with improved natural surveillance.

4.32 The Council's Senior Conservation and Design officer has undertaken a Building for Life assessment which has concluded a score of 7 greens and 5 amber, and no red scores.

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

4.34 Having due regard to the above assessment in relation to sustainable development it is considered that there are benefits to the scheme through the creation of housing where this an acknowledged need, sufficient open space is provided and the scheme satisfies requirements in relation to highway safety ecology etc and as such these outweigh the negative impacts in terms of limited surveillance, landscape impact and as such, when considered as a whole, the scheme represents a sustainable development. The scheme is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of the NPPF and also 2 d) of Policy DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Other issues

Drainage

4.35 The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) full comments are still awaited at the time of writing this report. It is evident that the previous scheme including a condition to secure a SuDS scheme and this has been given due regard in this instance. An update will be made orally to the committee on this matter.

Highways

4.36 Access to the site was agreed as part of the outline approval which included a number of offsite highway improvements including a roundabout at the junction of Mill Lane and School land and road calming measures along Mill road which will be delivered by condition. The proposed scheme does not compromise the ability to deliver these and they will be a requirement of this full approval through suitably worded conditions.

4.37 The layout within the site provides a scheme that is acceptable in highway safety terms including the provision of acceptable on-site parking levels and therefore the proposal is in accordance with DM 3.12. The Highway Authority require details of the surface water drainage arrangements to be secured by condition.

Environmental Impact Assessment

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

Other considerations

4.39 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 a greater significance.
4.40 The application is liable for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of the relevant local planning policies and guidance and the requirements of the NPPF in providing a residential development that meets an acknowledged need in a sustainable location.

5.2 The proposed layout and design of the units would relate satisfactorily to its surroundings and not compromise neighbour amenity, highway safety, ecology or drainage. It is noted that the social benefits are reduced to some degree through the lower provision of affordable housing than the policy requirement of 33%. However a viability assessment has been provided which adequately demonstrates the level provided is appropriate given the costs of the site, and it is not considered reasonable to refuse the planning application on this basis.

The overall social benefit of additional housing in this location on the edge of a service village in the Norwich Policy Area where there is not a sufficient five year housing land supply is considered to be greater than the limited environmental harm caused by the small extent of further development outside development boundaries in the open countryside in this instance.

5.3 For this reason the application is recommended for approval subject to resolution of any surface water matters and the completion of S106 legal agreement to secure affordable housing provision and open space management/maintenance sums.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:
Chris Raine 01508 53381
craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Lynn Armes 01508 533968
larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

2.  
   **Appl. No** : 2015/1760/D  
   **Parish** : WYMONDHAM

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

   Recommendation : Authorise Director for Growth and Localism to approve with conditions.

   1. In accordance with submitted drawings

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

1. Planning Policies

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
   Policy 2: Promoting good design
   Policy 3: Energy and water
   Policy 4: Housing delivery
   Policy 6: Access and Transportation
   Policy 7: Supporting Communities
   Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment
   Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
   Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area
   Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   Development Management Policies
   DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
   DM1.3 The sustainable location of new development
   DM1.4 Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
   DM3.1 Meeting housing requirements and needs
   DM3.8 Design principles
   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
   DM4.3 Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
   DM4.2 Sustainable drainage and water management
   DM4.8 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
   DM4.9 Incorporating landscape into design
   DM4.10 Heritage Assets
1.4 Wymondham Area Action Plan
   WYM3 Land at South Wymondham
   WYM10 General Green Infrastructure requirements for new developments in South
   Wymondham
   WYM13 New recreation provision in South Wymondham

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document
   South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

**Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings:**

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 2015/1115 Discharge of condition 5 of planning application 2011/0505/O - Design code Approved

2.2 2015/1280 Phase 1 development for 10 dwellings including site Infrastructure, drainage and green infrastructure following outline planning permission 2011/0505. under consideration

2.3 2015/1572 Proposed road infrastructure, phasing plans and drainage following approved outline planning permission 2011/0505/O Under consideration

2.4 2015/1649 Residential development of 129 dwellings with details for Appearance, Landscape, Layout and Scale. under consideration

2.5 2015/1725 Discharge of conditions 4 - Phasing Scheme, 7 - Green Infrastructure Management Plan, 10 - Foul Water Strategy and 11 - Surface Water Strategy of permission 2011/0505/O. under consideration

2.6 2015/1766 Reserved matters application following outline planning permission 2011/0505/O for road layout under consideration

2.7 2015/2380 Proposed development for 150 new dwellings including parking, garages, road infrastructure and green infrastructure. under consideration

2.8 2015/2480 Discharge of Condition 15 - Construction Environmental Management Plan of permission 2011/0505/O under consideration

2.9 2011/0505 Proposed development to include up to 500 dwellings, Community facilities, site infrastructure including new access roads, public rights of way and drainage, green infrastructure including public open spaces and structural landscape planting Approved
3. **Consultations**

3.1 Town Council  
Consider the application should be approved

3.2 District Member  
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 SNC Water Management Officer  
No comment. The LLFA are the statutory consultee and so they will provide comments in respect of drainage and flooding.

3.4 Housing Strategy Officer  
No objection

Note that this application includes 18 affordable homes, 20% of the total. This number is acceptable as, when combined with other Reserved Matters applications, it means that the overall affordable housing total is on course to deliver the 15% required by the S106 Agreement.

The property types provide a good mix. Although the applicants have not specified the tenure proposed for each plot, the 13 two and three bedroom houses can deliver the necessary mix of homes for rent and low cost ownership.

The space standards and internal layout of the affordable homes are acceptable.

3.5 Anglian Water Services Ltd  
No objection

3.6 NCC Highways  
No objection in principle however further plans to address detailed comments are awaited.

Comments on amended plans (summarised):

- The developer has failed to address the majority of my earlier comments, of particular concern is a lack of visibility at road junctions and the design of road types.
- The developer will need to demonstrate on the layout plan that appropriate visibility splays are designed into the layout of the site.
- The junction adjacent plot 17 remain unacceptable.
- The priority at the junctions adjacent plots 36-39 & 45 need to be altered to follow the priority route through the site.
- The speed table at the junction with road 2 (as per 2015/1766) has not been included.
- The road serving plots 47-64 should be designed to adopted standard.
- Alternative means of traffic calming area are required to what has been proposed.
- Turning head to plots 1 & 2 required.
- Access to plots 40 and 41 is too close to a junction and needs amending.

Comments on original plans (summarised):

- The red line site boundary does not link to the red line for the adjoining site (20152168). It is essential the red lines site boundaries joins, otherwise the roads within the respective sites will not link.
• It has been agreed under 2015/1766 that the junction at the southern extremity of this site (linking to road 2 of the roads considered under 201766) would have 10m radii. This will need to be shown on the current layout plan. A speed table is also being provided at this junction and this should also be shown.

• To help facilitate access between this development and the proposed community facilities to the south of the site a footway should be added to the west side of the 25m length of road leading to plots 36-39.

• The roads serving plots 17-34 and 65-68/73-90 are proposed to be type 5 roads. The layout of these roads adjacent plots 17 & 65 is unacceptable, there will need to be a suitable area of transition between road types.

• Notwithstanding point 4 it is recommended the road serving plots 17-34 and 65-68/73-90 be type 6 roads. Such roads can be served via dropped kerb crossings meaning the junctions adjacent plots 9 & 17 would give greater priority to pedestrians. In turn this is likely to discourage use of the road serving plots 17-34 as a shortcut and direct drivers to remain on the type 3 road to drive through the development.

• The road serving plots 47-64 should be designed to adopted standards.

• Visibility splays of 2.4m x 33m are required at all junction.

• Development should be designed such that the alignment of the road network restrains vehicle speeds to 20mph. The road in front of plots 1&14-16 continues north into the adjoining site (20152168) and the overall length of this will be long (around 200m) and straight. How will speeds be restrained on this route?

• The private drives serving plots 1-3 & 4-6 should be provided with size 5 turning heads.

• Accesses should be perpendicular to the carriageway.

• The access to plot 36 conflicts with the position of the ramp at the transition between road types.

• How will the access to plot 65 interact with the adjacent transition between roadtypes?

• Plots 67-79 should be served via a dropped kerb crossing.

• The access serving plots 40-41 is close to the adjacent bend potentially leading to conflict between vehicles exiting the plots and others manoeuvring around the bend.

On receipt of revised plans the Highway Authority will provide further comment.

3.7 SNC Landscape Officer

Comments on amended plans:

The application site includes the public open spaces around the housing, but details of these are still not provided. The development description refers to the application including green infrastructure, so it would be reasonable to expect that details be submitted before the application is determined.

I previously commented on how the planting plans submitted for the plots appear to be deviating from the lists of plants established in the Design Code and this still needs to be addressed.
A boundary treatment plan has been submitted; this indicates a low rail around the POS, but with seemingly no points of access. Referring back to my first point, we need to have details for this space in order to agree the most appropriate boundary.

There are some existing, retained trees on this site but no arboricultural information has been provided with this application. At the very least we will require a Tree Protection Plan – ideally prior to approval of RM – but if not, by condition.

To summarise, from my point of view I do not consider that the details as submitted should be approved.

Comments on original plans:
The application site includes the public open spaces around the housing, but details of these are not provided. The development description refers to the application including green infrastructure, so it would be reasonable to expect details at this stage.

The planting plans submitted for the plots appear to be deviating from the lists of plants established in the Design Code. Please request that these are reviewed/checked by the landscape architects. If there are issues with plant supply, or a change of approach to the planting, then it may be that we need to revise the Design Code.

3.8 NCC Ecologist
No objection, Green Infrastructure details are being resolved by way of the discharge of condition

3.9 Natural England
No objection but remind that the foul water strategy including management and maintenance must be approved prior to commencement to ensure no adverse impacts from water on the SSSI

3.10 Norfolk Wildlife Trust
Will comment through the Wymondham Green Infrastructure Group

3.11 Historic England
No comments received

3.12 SNC Conservation And Design
Comments on amended plans
No objection but with the following comments

Framework and Site Wide Codes
The building frontage has been varied and staggered particularly along the lakeside edge and some plots rotated to create variety and address the tertiary street. In addition to creating an informal frontage to the lake, soft bends have been introduced to the tertiary street that loops around plots 65-90. This is now considered acceptable.

Character Areas
Lakeside
As previously noted the building frontage has been varied and staggered particularly along the lakeside edge and some plots rotated to create variety and address the tertiary street. However the spaces between buildings have not been changed to help to add to the sense of informality, for example double drive ways further broken down or repositioned to vary the size and formality of gaps between buildings.
The materials have been simplified, particularly to the development edge the buff brick has been removed and the render to red brick are of a similar ratio with the majority of render facing the lake. Whilst this is a recognised improvement it is felt that the materials palette could be further simplified to avoid a situation where the same house types have different materials side by side. For example plots 83 and 84 would be better if they were both of the same materials and plots 81 and 82 both brick. Ideally plots 81 and 82 should be semi-detached to create more of a feature building fronting the lake.

Modern style canopies and revised materials have replaced previous versions to create a feature of this character area. This is now considered acceptable.

The modern style canopy details and revised materials go some way to addressing this comment. However the above comment should also be noted.

Boundary treatments to private frontages now include more railings to help define the character area reflected within the design code. This is now considered acceptable.

No 3D sketches/models of key views other than street scenes have been provided.

The garage to plots 3 & 4 has been relocated between their properties allowing it to be positioned behind the building line rather than to the front. This is now considered acceptable.

Re plots 1 and 9 on further review of the house types they both appear to have bay windows on the side elevation that help to turn the corner. Also the boundary treatments have been enhanced and now include a hedge. This is now considered acceptable.

Linked village Green
Materials should be the same where identical house types are proposed side by side or in the same street scene.

The longer terrace to plots 18-25 & 36-39 has been broken down with end gable features finished with render to add visual interest. This is now considered acceptable.

Coloured front doors have been removed from the streetscenes as requested.

To improve the ownership of the POS, a knee rail has been proposed around the parking spaces to prevent further parking on the grassed area. This is now considered acceptable.

Open Spaces
The Landscape Officer has provided separate comments in this respect. It is still felt that the application should include information on the relevant public open spaces associated within the adjacent phase of development based on the open spaces detailed in section 4 of the Design Code.
House types
Where render/timber cladding is proposed it now wraps around the whole building and doesn’t finish to the edge. This is now considered acceptable.

Building for Life
A Building for Life evaluation has been submitted alongside the application. Subject to the amendments above it is considered that this is acceptable.

Original comments:

Framework and Site Wide Codes
The north and west edges of this phase of development should be a ‘loose varied frontage’. The treatment of these edges should also integrate the development into the wider landscape and provide an appropriate response to its setting. In this context it is felt that the alignment of this edge and position of buildings should be less ‘formal’. Opportunities to vary the road alignment and re-position buildings along these edges should be explored to try and create a looser and more varied frontage as suggested in the design code. Materials used in tertiary streets should also be reviewed and seek to move away from standard highway solutions, for example block paving could be proposed to achieve a more informal and pedestrian friendly solution.

Building heights and density appear to be in accordance with the design code, although I would question whether the bungalows are positioned in the best place in terms of their relationship with the proposed POS.

Character Areas
Lakeside
- It is felt that the form, scale and mix of buildings types fronting onto the lake could be more varied. Building types should aim to create an informal sense of place around the lake as stated in the code. The spaces between buildings and spatial arrangement should also be more varied, to add to the sense of informality, for example double drive ways could be further broken down or repositioned to vary the size and formality of gaps between buildings.
- The materials palette should be simplified, particularly along the edges of the development block, for example the buff brick could be removed. There should be a similar ratio of render and red brick, the majority of render facing the lake and western edge of the site. There should be limited or no use of weather boarding in this character area.
- Buildings should have clean modern detailing. It is felt that the house types do not go far enough to reflect the design code. Modern canopies should also be a predicament feature of this character area.
- Buildings facing the lake should be high quality, using the best quality materials and detailing. The architectural detailing of these plots currently lacks interest.
- Boundary treatments along private frontages should include railings, for example railings along the north and east edges of the development block to help further define this character area. Some plots currently have railings but there are some that remain open.
• It would be useful to have some 3D sketches/models of key views from the lake as well as views of the western edge.
• The garages associated with plots 3 and 4 should not be located in front of the dwellings. Alternative arrangements should be explored that allows the garage block to be positioned behind the building line.
• Plots 1 and 9 struggle to successfully turn the corner. Alternative house types should be explored or additional windows and fenestration added.

Linked Village Green
• Clusters of housing should be relatively uniform in this character area with reduced private frontage where they face informal squares or POS. Groups or clusters of housing should be reviewed in this context and materials also revisited so that they are consistent where the same house types or groups of buildings are proposed.
• The relatively long terrace forming plots 18 to 25 currently lacks interest. Ideally this should be broken down by additional detailing, for example gable features finished in a different material to the rest of the house would help to break down the massing of the terrace and add interest. This comment also applies to plots 36 to 39.
• Not sure about the different coloured front doors shown on the street scenes.
• Timber knee rail fencing should be provided around car parking bays that intrude into POS. Parking bays should also be block paved or resin bound to achieve a more informal appearance that relates better to the POS.

Open Spaces
The reserved matters application should include information on the relevant public open spaces associated within the phase of development. The information should be based on the open spaces as detailed in section 4 of the Design Code.
It is important that these spaces are referred to and shown in this application in order to understand how the landscape proposals have informed the design and layout of the site.
Further detail of the open space/landscape proposals will need to be submitted as part of this application or a future discharge of condition application to comply with the S106 and outline condition 8. Information should also be included in the discharge of condition for phasing, which demonstrates how the relevant public open spaces will be delivered as part of that phase or sub-phase.

House types
Where render/timber cladding is proposed it should continue around the entire gable end of buildings and be finished to the edge, rather than finishing part way along the elevation. This approach should also be applied to building plinths if proposed.

Building for Life
A BfL12 evaluation should be submitted alongside the application.

3.13 Historic Environment Service
As this is a reserved matters application, our comments on the outline application (2011/0505/O) stand, and archaeological works are secured through condition 9 of the outline consent.
3.14 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority
No comments received, however comments have been made on the surface water drainage condition for the outline consent

3.15 Waveney Lower Yare & Lotingland Internal Drainage Board (IDB)
No comments received

3.16 Highways England
No objection

3.17 Police Architectural Liaison Officer
My comments concerning crime prevention are as follows:

With regards the garages allocated to the dwellings, these are set back quite deep to the rear of the house. Surveillance would be increased if the gable end of the houses concerned had an ‘active’ window overlooking the drive. Looking at the available plans for dwellings 402, 401 & 302 the floor plans do show that these rooms are kitchens or dining spaces. There is good surveillance of the 13 car parking spaces allocated adjacent to the ‘village green’, however in order to improve ownership of the space it is suggested that the timber knee rail be continued between the grass and parking area. Again, providing a barrier around the parking spaces allocated to dwellings 19 – 25 which is located next to open land will assist in demarcation and stop further parking on this grassy area which may lead to cars dominating this recreational area. Ideally, these allocated spaces would be preferred on-curtilage.

Plot 3 & 4 have a detached garage positioned at the front of their dwelling. The residents may benefit from further defensive space on their frontage to assist with privacy at the entrance of their homes - especially if pedestrians create a desire line along this path moving between the 2 proposed roads.

Finally, it is requested that the pathways shared by some plots be gated to prevent unauthorised access to the rear of these properties. Plots 21 – 22 (flush with building line); 35 – 36; 48 – 49; 56 – 57 and 62 – 63 (flush with the building line).

3.18 Wymondham Heritage Society
No comments received

3.19 Upper Yare And Tas IDB
If surface water is proposed to flow into the Norfolk Rivers IDB network further information is required. If the development does not increase discharge to the system by rate OR volume (so the greenfield rate and volume must be maintained) then there will be no contribution to pay. However if either are increased then a surface water contribution will be required.

Either way you will also need IDB consent for the works.

3.20 Norfolk Fire Service
No comments received

3.21 Norfolk And Waveney Local Medical Council
No comments received

3.22 NHS Executive, Anglia And Oxford
No comments received
Comments on amended information:

- The Green Infrastructure Management Plan (GIMP) seems to answer most of the questions but could the developer confirm that there will be silt/pollution traps to ensure the quality of the water entering the River Tiffey.
- The report refers to the Foul Water (FW) sewer crossing two tree-lined boundaries and reducing manholes, but this action does not relate to the FW drain. The comment should refer to the Surface Water (SW) drain.
- We would suggest that The Ecology Consultancy make contact with The Lizard Charity to discuss the mitigation measures and any pipe that crosses their land.
- The pumping station should be cited on the developer’s land and not in the landscape buffer.
- Please advise how ongoing maintenance of private spaces that is required to maintain the effectiveness of the SUDS scheme will be enforced.
- The group would like to thank the developer for this information which gives more clarity about the green infrastructure contribution as set out in the S106 agreement.

Original comments:

- Pleased to see that a Green Infrastructure Management Plan (GIMP) has been submitted which covers the mitigation of the adverse impacts of the development and its construction on the ecology of the area, the protection of species and habitat, green infrastructure connections and the management of greenspace areas.
- Would like to see further information on mitigation measures in connection with the formation of surface water and foul water drains in close proximity to the Lizard and Wades Pit County Wildlife Sites and the forming of the new surface water drain across the Lizard County Wildlife site towards the River Tiffey.
- Would also like to see more about the implementation, management and on-going maintenance of the green infrastructure which will be provided as part of the development. The group is concerned about the reliance on future maintenance and/or replacement of hard landscaping by private individuals to contribute to the maintenance of a site-wide SUDS scheme.

The group would be particularly interested to understand more about the green infrastructure contribution set out in the S106 agreement and how this money will be collected and spent.

The Lizard Charity has no comment to make on the design or layout, however implied by the applications is the routing of the foul water and surface water drainage beyond the application boundary and towards the Lizard pastures.

The FW sewer is indicated running towards a new pumping station immediately to the south of the Lizard pastures and the SW drain is shown running across the Lizard pastures.

These routes are subject to a separate application for discharge of condition and we do not consider that these should be separate as one is dependent on the other.

We have raised specific concern in relation to that separate Discharge Condition application and therefore object to this reserved matters on the basis that it relies on a separate application to determine the drainage matters.
3.25 Representations

6 letters of objection on the following grounds:

- No formal objection but concerned loss of open fields and open space
- Where are the additional schools, doctors, dentists to accommodate this development?
- More vehicles will be on already busy roads
- The fire service has already announced cuts and so this is a further worry
- Pleased to see consideration for swales/reservoirs for water
- The development places properties in close proximity to the A11 which will be noisy
- Will exacerbate existing foul water problems
- The railway line (platform 2) is not accessible for disabled.
- New residents should be made aware of issues with access to the railway line
- The road into Wymondham is already inadequate and cannot cope with more housing
- There should be cycle lanes proposed to town
- Flooding still occurs at the bottom of Park Lane junction to Silfield Road in heavy rain
- Traffic congestion
- Inadequate road infrastructure to the town or the A11
- Will harm wildlife in the areas

4 Assessment

4.1 The application is a reserved matters application for 90 dwellings. The site relates to an area of agricultural land at South Wymondham to the east of Silfield Road, which forms part of land that has outline consent for 500 dwellings granted on the 6 February 2014 (ref 2011/0505). This application now seeks approval of reserved matters, which include appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 90 dwellings.

4.2 Following the grant of outline consent, a Design Code and parameter plans for the whole site was approved, which sets out guiding principles and a range of design parameters to ensure a high quality development at Park Farm, Wymondham.

4.3 The proposed housing development would comprise a mix of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 bed accommodation. These would include a combination of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings. The majority of the properties are two storey. Two properties are bungalows. An element of affordable housing is also proposed in accordance with the approved S106 Agreement, comprising of 18 dwellings located in a central area on the site. The mix comprises 1, 2 and 3 bed houses and 2 bed bungalows.

4.4 The site comprises of two main vehicular access points to serve the estate development on to Silfield Road, which links to a primary Spine route running through the centre of the site. The principle internal road layout forms part of a separate Reserved Matters application ref 2015/1766 for the outline consented site, for which Members approved at the November 2015 Development Management meeting.

4.5 A network of open spaces and linear green corridors are proposed that have been agreed as part of the outline consent and approved Design Code and parameter plans. The open spaces comprise of recreation and play spaces located to the west of the site along Silfield Road and to the south of the site along the A11.
A S106 legal agreement was secured with the outline consent for the site and this secured a number of obligations, including contributions for education, libraries, securing the quantum of play and recreation space and the future management and maintenance of those spaces, affordable housing at 15%, off-site highway works and a travel plan contribution.

The main issues for consideration are:

- principle of development;
- highways issues;
- open space;
- landscaping;
- layout, appearance and scale;
- ecology;
- drainage;
- residential amenity;
- affordable housing; and
- sustainable construction.

Principle of development

The principle of residential development was established by outline consent 2011/0505. The site forms part of land in the Wymondham Action Plan amounting to 68 hectares allocated for housing and associated infrastructure, landscaping and open space through policy WYM3, WYM10 and WYM13. The site also has regard to the absence of a 5 year land supply in the Norwich Policy Area and the sustainability of the development. This outline permission established the principle of up to 500 dwellings. As such the principle is established for residential development and the number of dwellings now proposed for this phase of development for 90 dwellings is acceptable. It is therefore only the details reserved at that outline that are now for consideration, which as mentioned above include appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

Highways issues

The principle of the development being served off Silfield Road was considered acceptable at outline stage subject to off-site highway works as detailed in the S106 Agreement.

The road layout currently forms part of a separate Reserved Matters application ref 2015/1766 for the outline consented site, which has been approved by committee and is shortly to be issued. The site comprises of two main vehicular access points to serve the estate development on to Silfield Road, which links to a primary Spine route running through the centre of the site.

This reserved matters application seeks to agree the precise details of highways within the residential development parcels only, which do not form part of the principle road layout.

The scheme has been amended to address comments of the Highway Authority which required a number of minor amendments including amendments to parking, driveways, junctions, visibilities and technical specifications to comply with highway standards. Further amendments are awaited in response to the Highway Authority’s latest comments and as such final comments from the Highway Authority are also awaited. However these are considered to be largely technical in nature and could require further minor revisions to the layout. Officers therefore seek delegated authority to delegate the decision subject to these final matters being resolved.
In respect of parking provision, policy compliant levels of parking have been provided across the site, totalling 195 parking spaces. Garage sizes are 7m x 3m which are sized to ensure sufficient storage space in addition to parking that comply with the Parking Standards for Norfolk Guide (2007).

Car parking is proposed in a variety of different forms throughout the development which include on-plot parking and some on-street parking. Whilst the location of parking bays within the streetscene and adjacent to the public open spaces (for the terraced properties) and small parking courts are not ideal, they are well overlooked and broken down with landscaping to help enhance the character of the street. Therefore on balance this is not considered to warrant a reason to refuse the application and does help create varied character across the site. There is also some tandem parking across the site, but this is required to remove cars from the street scene where detached and semi-detached dwellings are proposed and is considered to be acceptable in design terms. The layout of the development in respect of parking is therefore on balance considered acceptable.

The proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of policies DM3.11 and DM3.12 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Open space

The site forms part of land in the Wymondham Action Plan amounting to 68 hectares allocated for housing and associated infrastructure, landscaping and open space through policy WYM3 and WYM13. The amount of open space required was set out in the S106 which formed part of the outline planning application and was further developed in the Design Code and parameters plans.

The open space framework for the overall development creates a network of open spaces and linear green corridors which are designed to be multi-functional and respond to a number of specific design principles as set out in the Design Code. The open spaces that relate to this phase of development comprise of open space and a play area located around this block of development and which also link to the Endurance land to the north.

The design of these open spaces and how they relate to the Endurance land to the north will therefore be important. These open spaces have been included within the red line of the application; however no details of how these will be landscaped has been submitted. Information has been requested in this respect to ensure the principle are acceptable. There is also however a condition on the outline consent in addition to the S106 that requires details of these open spaces to be agreed.

The proposed network of open spaces associated with this reserved matters application demonstrates that the character of the development will be enhanced by the landscape proposals.

The future management and maintenance of the open space, play areas and green corridors is to be agreed through the S106 which was completed as part of the outline consent.

Subject to further details as set out above to enable an understanding of the proposed strategies for the landscaping, the proposal would comply with the requirements of policy WYM13 of the Wymondham Action Plan and Policy DM3.15 and DM4.9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policy JCS 1 and NPPF section 11.
Landscaping

4.21 With regards to the landscaping included within the site boundary for this site which includes the residential area and associated open space, the landscape officer has carried out an assessment of the proposals and a number of matters have been highlighted than need amendment or further information. This includes boundary treatments around the public open space, details of planting of the public open space, amendment to the proposed tree and plant species to comply with the Design Code and tree protection and arboricultural information in respect of the existing trees on the site.

4.22 Whilst there is no objection in principle in respect of landscaping, as the site has sufficient space to accommodate on plot landscaping, retains trees where required, and to landscape the areas of public open spaces included to enable compliance with the Design Code, as set out above considerable amendments and additional information is required in respect of the precise detail of these matters. Amended plans are awaited in respect of the above matters and members will be updated at committee. However, as these are matters of detail, authority to delegate the negotiations on these outstanding matters to Officers is sought.

4.23 Furthermore precise planting schedules, management and maintenance details are secured by a condition on the outline consent and so this will also need to be specifically discharged for this phase prior to the commencement of development.

4.24 Subject to these matters being satisfactorily agreed, the proposal would accord with the aims of Policy DM4.8 and DM4.9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, Policy JCS 1 and NPPF section 11.

Ecology and Green Infrastructure

4.25 Existing features such as trees and hedgerows are to be retained as part of the development and further landscaping proposed. This coupled with the use of open spaces and green corridors around the site to create linked linear parks, buffers and enhancement features such as the creation of grassland habitats and use of native species with proposed planting of shrubs and trees would help create a green infrastructure network and habitat which should result in a net enhancement to biodiversity.

4.26 As required by the outline consent a Green Infrastructure Management Plan (GIMP) sits alongside this application and has been submitted as a separate discharge of condition application ref 2015/1725, which is currently under consideration at the time of writing this report. The GIMP outlines the proposals for Green Infrastructure and broad measures across the development areas, which include measures to mitigate the adverse impacts of the development on the ecology of the area; protection of species and associated habitat; identification of the green infrastructure and provision for the management of greenspace areas.

4.27 The Committee will note that the Green Infrastructure Group have made comments in respect to the GIMP seeking further information and clarification on a number of matters relating to the discharge of conditions application ref 2015/1725. The comments regard surface water and foul water mitigation within the Lizard County Wildlife site and the maintenance of the Green Infrastructure as well as technical matters such as the position of the pumping station outside of the site boundary. At the time of writing the report further information has been provided by the Ecology Consultancy and discussions with the green infrastructure group and The Lizard Charity are ongoing in respect of the precise details relating to the discharge of conditions application. These matters are to be agreed by condition and do not form part of this application as they relate to matters of detail outside of the site.
4.28 The County Ecologist has confirmed no objection to this reserved matters application, advising that the Green Infrastructure Management Plan as submitted, and the commitments made in the plan provide sufficient information to understand the implications on ecology, water and Green Infrastructure from this development on the site.

4.29 Natural England has also confirmed no objection to this development since adequate mitigation, biodiversity enhancement measures and green infrastructure has been included in the GIMP. The outline planning consent also requires that a Construction Environmental Management Plan for protecting ecologically sensitive areas is submitted by condition.

4.30 Therefore subject to the Green Infrastructure Management Plan to be agreed by condition, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this respect and would accord with the aims the Wymondham Area Action Plan WYM10, general Green Infrastructure requirements for development in South Wymondham, NPPF section 11, conserving and enhancing the natural environment and JCS Policy 1, addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets.

Layout, appearance and scale

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

4.32 The detailed design of the site has been informed by the approved Design Code and parameters plans. The design code provides a framework in which this reserved matters application has been taken forward, ensuring a distinctive and recognisable development whilst achieving a coherent overall identity across the site as a whole.

4.33 The general layout of the site, which has been informed by the Design Code and subject to discussions with Officers following the application being submitted, is considered acceptable. It has been designed to incorporate different character areas, which assist in creating variety and interest through the development with an overall traditional concept.

4.34 This proposal aims to deliver a high quality range of dwellings that reflects the local vernacular using quality materials and appropriate elevational detailing informed by a local character assessment. Three distinct character areas are identified throughout the development from the approved Design Code and comprise of variations in elevational treatments, facing materials, individual plot layouts, and associated landscape & boundary treatments. Buildings are proposed in prominent and logical locations to reinforce the overall character and combined with landscaping with the existing boundary vegetation to provide areas of green infrastructure. The combination of these elements ensures that the local identity is positively reinforced.

4.35 An assessment of the individual house types has been undertaken and the plans amended and further developed through the course of the application, enhancing the details, proportion and character of the properties. The position of house types and building lines has also been reviewed, which has helped to further strengthen the overall design of streets and spaces, which is considered acceptable.

4.36 The height and massing of the proposed development varies across the site and helps define key spaces and focal points. Built form is predominantly 2 storeys, to reflect the existing built form and to minimise the impact of new development. The proposed building heights are in accordance with the agreed Design Code and parameters plans, which aim to create distinctive spaces, while also respecting the edges and sensitive uses of the development.
With regard to bin storage, each dwelling has sufficient space on site as a bin storage area. Where properties are terraced, adequate rear access has been provided in all cases. Travel distances between bin storage areas and the designated collection points have been carefully planned within Norfolk County Council guidelines.

Generally, all external private gardens have been carefully planned in terms of their size and shape to ensure adequate external storage can easily be accommodated. Provision for cycle storage is provided in garages and rear gardens.

A design code compliance statement has been submitted, which shows how the design code has been applied to the detailed designs of the site. Information has also been submitted that demonstrates how the proposals comply with the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide design principles as well as explaining the approach to achieving this by carrying out a Building for Life 12 evaluation.

Overall, the scheme, as amended and subject to further minor amendments is acceptable in design terms and is considered to comply with the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS, section 7 of the NPPS and policy DM1.4, DM3.8 and DM4.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD have been met.

Residential amenity

Policy IMP9 of the SNLP requires development to have regard to the impacts on residential amenity.

The design and position of the properties along the boundaries of the site are located some distance away from and separated by proposed public open space to those existing dwellings along Silfield Road, which helps to minimises any direct impact on the amenity of existing properties and as such is considered acceptable. It is therefore considered that the development accords with policy DM3.13 relating to residential amenity.

In terms of the amenities of the future residents of the proposed dwellings, the relative position of the proposed dwellings is acceptable ensuring no adverse impact on amenity. Furthermore gardens of sufficient size and shape for their intended purpose are proposed and adequate space for on-site parking.

The scheme is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of Policy DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan that requires development to have regard to the impacts on residential amenity.

Drainage - Surface water

A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) was considered and approved at the outline stage, which confirmed that the site falls within Flood Zone 1 category (low risk) and is not at risk from flooding. This application is supported by a surface water strategy that builds on the recommendations of the FRA to provide details of the drainage proposed, based on the latest site layout. The strategy sets out the methods for implementing a Sustainable urban Drainage System (SuDS) using attenuation techniques, which includes a combination of attenuation lagoons, swales, permeable paving and rainwater harvesting to drain the surface water from the site.

Anglian Water have confirmed that there are no surface water sewers within the vicinity of the development and therefore have no comments in respect to surface water for this reserved matters application.
4.47 The Norfolk Rivers Internal Drainage Board (IDB) have requested that the route of any normal or exceedance discharge must be provided to confirm whether or not discharges will flow into the Norfolk Rivers IDB system. Should water flow into the Norfolk Rivers IDB system then further more detailed conditions will need to be met to let this occur. These matters are to be agreed by condition of the outline consent and do not form part of this application as they relate to matters of detail outside of the site.

4.48 A separate application has been submitted to discharge Condition 11 of the outline planning application, which requires a surface water strategy to be submitted to include details of the future adoption and maintenance of surface water. The Lead Local Flood Authority and the Lizard Charity have raised concerns about the runoff rates, volume of runoff generated from the development, location of off-site surface water routes and the management of surface water during the construction phase.

4.49 Whilst these details form part of condition 11, and whilst still awaiting comments from the Lead Local Flood Authority with specific regard to this phase, the Lead Local Flood Authority has objected to other current unissued reserved matters application on the grounds of insufficient information relating to the prevention of flooding in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 103 and 109.

4.50 Whilst comments of the Lead Local Flood Authority are required prior to the determination of the application, it is not considered that the layout of the site affects the ability of the developers to deliver the overall drainage strategy on the site which includes ponds, swales and a piped system. No development can commence until the surface water drainage strategy is approved under that discharge of condition application so there are no risks to the Local Planning Authority or flood risk to local residents in granting consent for the road layout prior to the surface water drainage condition being discharged.

4.51 On this basis it is recommended that authority be delegated to the Director for Growth and Localism to approve the application subject to receipt of comments from the Lead Local Flood Authority and on the basis that a detailed scheme can be worked up to adequately deal with surface water, and subject to no further substantive issues being raised in this respect.

Foul water

4.52 The principle of the development in relation to the foul water capacity was considered at the outline stage. The proposed strategy provides a foul water network that meets the requirements for adoption by Anglian Water. Both the Environment Agency and Anglian Water has confirmed that they have no objection to the proposed foul water strategy, including details of phasing.

4.53 The Committee should note that the Lizard Charity and Green Infrastructure Group have also made comments in respect to foul water seeking further information and clarification on a number of matters relating to the discharge of condition 10 of the outline consent. The comments relate to foul water mitigation within the Lizard County Wildlife site and The Lizard Pastures as well as matters relating to the location of off-site pipes, the pumping station and sewer requisition.

4.54 At the time of writing the report discussions with the The Lizard Charity and Green Infrastructure Group are ongoing in respect of the precise details relating to the discharge of condition 10. Therefore subject to compliance with this condition the impacts on the foul water are considered acceptable.
Affordable Housing

4.55 The Councils Affordable Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer has confirmed that the property types and sizes are acceptable, and that they meet housing need. It should be noted that the affordable housing contributions for the site were secured via the S106 agreement linked to the outline planning permission for the site.

4.56 Whilst the proposed 18 affordable dwellings in this phase are in one location, in consideration that this is one phase of a much larger development, overall the affordable housing is well distributed across the wider site and is therefore on balance acceptable.

4.57 The affordable housing is not distinguishable from other housing types in terms of design quality. Their position within the overall development, elevational treatments and detailing are considered to be acceptable in terms of the character created.

4.58 The scheme is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of Policy DM3.1 of the South Norfolk Local Plan in this respect.

Sustainable construction and renewable energy

4.59 Condition 13 of the outline application requires that the application shall demonstrate that at least 10% of the expected energy requirements shall be provided by renewable or low carbon energy sources and sustainable construction techniques in accordance with part 10 of the NPPF, policies 1 and 3 of the JCS and Policy DM4.1 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.60 Whilst no information has been submitted that sets out how it will achieve the required energy requirements, it is considered that this can be reasonably dealt with through condition rather than it being necessary to agree it through the reserved matters application.

Screening Opinion

4.61 The outline application to which this reserved matters relates was Schedule 2 development under the EIA regulations and was therefore accompanied by an Environmental Statement.

4.62 An Environmental Impact Assessment screening opinion has been undertaken through the course of the application. Consideration has been given as to whether this reserved matters application as proposed would have any adverse impact on the environment. Having taken into account the selection criteria in schedule 3 to the 2011 Regulations, it is considered that the development as proposed is not considered to give rise to any adverse impact on the environment.

4.63 Furthermore all potential impacts of the development as a whole were considered by the Environmental Statement submitted with the outline application. The main characteristics of the potential impact of the development for consideration are the physical scale of the development, increased traffic, noise, emissions to air and water. These impacts were fully considered with the submitted Environmental Statement for the outline application. There is no evidence to suggest that the delivery of this reserved matters on this particular phase of the approved outline would increase the impact of the development on the environment over and above that already identified by the Environmental Statement submitted with the outline. This reserved matters as proposed is not therefore considered to give rise to significant impacts and the reserved matters application itself is not EIA development and nor does it merit any amendments to the original Environmental Statement.
Heritage assets

4.64 It is noted that Norfolk Historic Environmental Services have requested an archaeological condition to be applied. However, it is noted that there is already a condition in place as part of the approved outline consent ref 2011/0505, which will need to be discharged as part of this application.

4.65 The Listed Buildings Officer has confirmed that there are no listed buildings located within the application site and that the site is not within a Conservation Area. The Listed Buildings that are closest to the site is Coll’s Farm House (Grade II). This is some distance from the application site and it is considered that the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on these heritage assets and is therefore considered acceptable in terms of policy DM4.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.66 S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.” The development has been assessed in accordance with this duty and the proposal for the reason outlined above will not have a detrimental impact on any listed buildings or their setting.

Other matters

4.67 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.

4.68 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as is a reserved matters application pursuant to an outline consent granted prior to the introduction of CIL.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The principle and number of dwellings have already been established by the grant of outline consent 2011/0505. The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design and layout, and is consistent with the requirements of the outline planning permission and the approved Design Code subject to further details as set out in the report. Furthermore, the development will not harm the character and appearance of the area or the amenities of neighbouring properties.

5.2 It should be noted that those conditions from the outline planning permission continue to be applicable and will be required to be satisfied separately via a formal discharge of condition application/s which the Local Planning Authority has full control over.

5.3 On the basis of the above it is recommended that authority be delegated to the Director for Growth and Localism to approve the application subject to further information being provided in respect of landscaping, highways and design and to comments being received from the Lead Local Flood Authority that they are satisfied that a detailed scheme can be worked up to adequately deal with surface water.

5.4 Subject to the satisfactory resolution of the outstanding matters it is considered that the landscape, layout, appearance and scale and other relevant issues are appropriate and that the proposed development accords with the NPPF, JCS, Wymondham Area Action Plan and South Norfolk Local Plan.
Tracy Lincoln 01508 533814
tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other Applications

3. **Appl. No**: 2015/2172/F  
   **Parish**: BRACON ASH

   **Applicants Name**: Mr David Adams  
   **Site Address**: Team Lotus International Hethel Industrial Estate Potash Lane  
                    Hethel Norfolk NR14 8EY  
   **Proposal**: New race shop to house Classic Team Lotus.

   **Recommendation**: Authorise Director of Growth and Localism to approve with conditions:

   1. Full Planning permission time limit  
   2. In accord with submitted drawings  
   3. Access construction and culvert details  
   4. Visibility splay, approved plan  
   5. Provision of parking, service  
   6. Surface water  
   7. Details of foul water disposal  
   8. External materials to be agreed  
   9. External lighting  
   10. Specific Use  
   11. No power tools outside building  
   12. Contaminated land - submit scheme  
   13. Implement approved remediation  
   14. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
   15. No generators, air handling plant  
   16. Ecology Mitigation  
   17. Additional ecology survey  
   18. Bat boxes on site  
   19. Tree protection  
   20. Landscaping scheme to be submitted

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

---

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
   Policy 2: Promoting good design  
   Policy 3: Energy and water  
   Policy 5: The Economy  
   Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
   Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   Development Management Policies  
   DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
   DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development
DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM2.1 : Employment and business development
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM3.14 : Pollution, health and safety
DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.3 : Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD

2. Planning History

2.1 2007/0739 Request for Scoping opinion for three wind turbines Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council No comments received

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Environment Agency No comments received

3.4 NCC Highways Summarised comments

(23/10/15)
On the assumption that the existing buildings occupied by Classic Team Lotus will be demolished once the proposed new buildings are available, no highways objections are raised to the principle of the development.
The submitted site plan does not show vision splays at the proposed entrance to Potash Lane although they are shown on the drawing incorporated within the transport statement. The site layout plan should be updated with the vision splays.
The tree located on the front boundary of the site currently restricts views to the west by a notable degree. Removal of the lower branches will improve matters however retaining the tree within the vision splay is not ideal, neither is the proposal to move the site entrance towards the tree.
Improvement in the vision to the east can be obtained by lowering the hedge to the front of the site.
Should you be minded to approve the application we would request conditions and notes.

(09/12/15)
Proposed site layout now includes visibility splays. Previous comments in relation to the access remain applicable.
3.5 NCC Ecologist

Summarised comments:

(10/10/15)

- The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Assessment is detailed and fit for purpose. The recommendations for mitigation and enhancements appear to be comprehensive however the authors have recommended additional surveys are undertaken for bats on 2 of the buildings and 3 mature trees if they are to be affected by the development.
- The presence of bats and the extent to which they may be affected should be established before planning permission is granted in accordance with Circular 06/2005.
- Further surveys should be undertaken and reports submitted to us before we make any recommendations for this site.

3.6 Norfolk Wildlife Trust

The site is adjacent to Hethel Wood County Wildlife Site (CWS). We have no objection subject to the measures for biodiversity enhancement and mitigation set out in section 5 of the ecology survey being in place and further protected species surveys being carried out before a planning decision is made if the buildings concerned are impacted by the development. In addition to the proposed measures to protect Hethel Wood the design of the development should minimise light spill towards the wood.

3.7 Historic Environment Service

We do not wish to make any recommendations on this application.

3.8 SNC Planning Policy

(Summarised comments)

Technically the proposal is contrary to policy as it is located predominantly outside the development boundary for Hethel. It is also within a Hazardous Installation Zone and adjacent to a CWS and Ancient Woodland. Hethel is a strategic employment location which has yet to be developed. If the case officer is satisfied it is not possible to relocate onto the allocated land then the proposal need to be assessed against relevant policies. A particular policy of relevance is DM2.1 which provides for the adaption and expansion of an existing business unless there is a significant adverse impact in terms of policies DM1.1 and DM1.3. In my opinion it is unlikely that it will result in any significant sustainability impacts as it is located adjacent to the development boundary and the existing Classic Team Lotus site in an established employment area, it will be well screened and it will employ the same staff as the existing business so will not result in any extra traffic movements.

DM Policy 2.1 also mentions that positive consideration will be given to proposals in the countryside that re-use existing hard standings. I understand from the application file that this site could be termed brownfield as the slabs and foundations of previous buildings are still in existence, so it could broadly be said to meet this criteria of the policy.

In conclusion I feel that this application can be supported from a policy perspective as it is facilitating an established local business to move to a purpose built, more fit for purpose premises and this in turn will safeguard jobs at Classic Team Lotus in Hethel and retain the link with Group Lotus and the Hethel Engineering Centre. Ideally new development in Hethel should be on the
allocated land, however from a policy perspective it is felt that this application could be supported under DM policies 1.1, 1.3 and 2.1 for the reasons given above.

3.9 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team

We do not wish to object but recommend a number of comments and notes. The application material does not include any information regarding hours of use for the proposal – this information should be submitted and agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

3.10 SNC Water Management Officer

Do not wish to object but do recommend that any approval includes a number of conditions and notes.

3.11 SNC Conservation and Design

This is located amongst existing factory buildings on the old airfield site some distance from the former site of Hethel Hall. To the east Hethel Wood provides good screening. It is important that the building is designed for its purpose and it also appears to be designed so that it is not just an ordinary ‘commercial shed’ but does have some character with the green panelling and slightly unusual shape. I have no objection to the proposal on design grounds.

3.12 SNC Landscape Officer

I have no particular concerns about this proposal. It would have been good to have a little more to go on with regards to proposed planting at this stage; at the very least a plan concept to base a condition on. If planning permission is granted bespoke landscape and tree protection conditions will be needed.

3.13 Health And Safety Executive

To be reported if appropriate.

3.14 Representations

1x letter of support: As closest resident and owner of TML Precision Engineering I wish to give my full support to this proposed development. Apart from securing existing jobs, it would enhance Potash Lane and would help maintain the historical home of the original team.

4. Assessment

4.1 The application proposes the relocation of the Classic Team Lotus facilities from their existing site on Potash Lane to a new site immediately adjacent to their existing site boundary. The applicant seeks consent for the erection of a substantial single unit on the site with parking located to the east and west of the building and the existing access relocated further south within the site. The existing Classic Lotus buildings are to be demolished following relocation of the business to the new site although a timeframe for this demolition has not been established at this time.

4.2 The application site is approximately 625 metres north of Wymondham Road and has direct access onto Potash Lane to the west. The site is located opposite the wider Group Lotus facility. Hethel Wood County Wildlife Site (CWS) and Ancient Woodland provides a dense bank of screening to the east of the site and there are existing small scale industrial units directly to the south. The site is roughly triangular in shape, tapering to a narrow point to the north. There is a mature hedgerow along the west of the site with some mature trees present. A small stream is located along the eastern boundary adjacent to the CWS and there is a water filled ditch along the east boundary. The site is currently largely grassed over although there is evidence across the site of the concrete hardstandings that resulted from the site’s former use as a WW2 airfield.
4.3 Planning permission has previously been sought on the same site for industrial units however in both instances planning permission was refused for a number of reasons including the impact on the adjacent Hethel Wood and the wider countryside setting, development on the site adversely affecting the growth potential of the Lotus Group and insufficient information being submitted (refs: 1988/4268 and 1989/2131). Whilst these decisions are material considerations in the determination of this application it should be noted that planning policy has been updated since this time and the immediate area has been subject to additional employment growth.

4.4 Authority is sought to delegate the decision to the Director of Growth and Localism, pending the receipt of neighbour comments and no material planning issues being raised, as it was noted during the preparation of this report that a small number of neighbour consultations had not been issued when the application was validated.

Key Issues

4.5 The key issues to be assessed as part of this application include:

- policy context and the principle of the development;
- an assessment of the proposal as sustainable development;
- highways matters;
- landscape and ecology issues;
- design, visual impact and impact on heritage assets; and
- drainage.

Planning Policy

4.6 Planning policy seeks to ensure that development accords with the development framework including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and the recently adopted Development Management (DM) Policies. A presumption in favour of sustainable development is the "golden thread" running through the NPPF (para 14) and accordingly is the underlying theme within both the JCS and the DM Policies. A review of the sustainability of this proposal is included at the end of this assessment.

4.7 National planning policy promotes sustainable economic growth (para 19) whilst JCS Policy 5 states the local economy will be developed in a sustainable way to support jobs and economic growth both in urban and rural locations”. This includes the allocation of employment land for development and, within the rural economy, the promotion of appropriate new and expanded businesses.

4.8 Local plan policies accord with this approach and whilst promoting the development of allocated sites and those within the defined development limits as a key priority Policy DM1.3 makes provision for development in the Countryside if specific policies allow for that development or the proposal demonstrates overriding benefits in terms of its economic, social and environmental dimensions. Accordingly, section 7 of Policy DM2.1 sets out that positive consideration will be given to proposals that re-use redundant rural buildings and hard standings.

4.9 During the course of the application Officers have explored development options on alternative sites with the agent. In particular the relocation of the Classic Team Lotus facilities to the allocated employment land at Hethel was suggested as a reasonable alternative option. The agent has confirmed however that whilst the enterprise shares its name and heritage with the main Lotus Group, Classic Team Lotus operates as an independent business entity. Furthermore, relocation onto the main Lotus site may lead to security issues for Group Lotus due to visitor and delivery timetables to the applicant’s site and may also impact upon the future development potential for Group Lotus.
4.10 Whilst the relocation of the business onto a site that is either within the defined development limits or within a site allocation would be the Council’s preferred option the proposal does provide for the improvement and enhancement of an established business on a site which has previously been developed and benefits from existing areas of hardstandings. As such the proposal may be considered to be policy compliant with those policies set out above.

Highways

4.11 The proposal includes relocating the existing access further south along Potash Lane rather than utilising the existing access which serves the current Classic Team Lotus site. Vehicular parking is to be provided within the site adjacent to the east and west elevations of the proposed building and also along the western boundary of the site.

4.12 Planning policy requires that highway safety is not prejudiced by new development and that appropriate parking provision is provided to serve the new scheme (Policies DM3.11 and DM3.12).

4.13 The Highways Officer has assessed the proposal and whilst an objection has not been raised it has been noted that the mature tree positioned to the south of the new access point and shown to be retained may impact upon the vision splays when exiting the site. Although it was suggested by Officers that the access arrangements to the site should be reviewed, the applicant has opted to progress with the application in its original form. The Highways Officer has reiterated his initial comments and an objection has not been raised but there is a requirement to remove the lower branches of the tree to improve visibility. At this time the tree is still shown to be retained on the site. In addition, a reduction in the overall height of the hedgerow along the west boundary will be required to improve visibility in that direction.

4.14 Sufficient employee and visitor parking is provided on site to comply with the NCC Parking Standard 2007.

4.15 The relocation of the facility to the proposed site will not impact on the existing highway safety and sufficient on-site vehicular parking will be provided to ensure that the development proposal complies with the principles of those policies set out above.

Design, visual impact and impact on heritage assets

4.16 Planning policy promotes a high standard of design at all levels and for all forms of development with good design expected to address connections between people and places as well as the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environments (NPPF, para 61). At a local level the Council has set out its design aspirations in Policy DM3.8 in particular. The South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD also sets out the Council's aspirations and provides developers with appropriate guidance.

4.17 The proposed building is significant in size measuring approximately 9 metres in height along the west elevation, approximately 49 metres in overall length and 21 metres in width. The block form of the building contributes to its perceived mass, as does the simple design features set within the west elevation. The building will be clad in dark green panelling although precise colour details are still be agreed and are to be secured via planning condition.

4.18 The Design Officer has reviewed the proposal and has noted that it is important that the building has been designed to be fit for purpose. He has also noted that the building has not been designed as a standard commercial shed but has some character, achieved by the slightly unusual shape and the green panelling.
4.19 The overall scale of the development should be viewed in the context of the wider setting, including the Group Lotus site on the opposite side of Potash Lane and the Hethel Engineering Centre along Wymondham Road. Hethel Wood will also provide additional screening of the site when viewed from the east. Whilst the development may be visible within the wider landscape setting it will be seen within the context of the aforementioned developments and will appear as an addition to this site, reducing the overall impact of the development. It should be noted there are no heritage assets near the site.

4.20 On balance whilst the scale of the proposal may appear inappropriate in an alternative setting, the location of the application site and the surrounding developments, as well as the landscape screening afforded by Hethel Wood, will help reduce the overall impact of the development in the wider landscape setting. The development is therefore considered to comply with those policies set out above.

Landscape

4.21 At this time the applicant has not submitted details of the proposed landscaping of the site and has requested that a landscaping scheme is agreed via planning condition should permission be granted. The Landscape Officer suggested that the submission of a concept plan for the landscaping scheme would be of benefit at this stage in order to inform the bespoke landscape and tree protection conditions however this information has not been forthcoming. Full details of the landscaping scheme will therefore need to be secured by condition and appropriate planning conditions have been prepared by the Landscape Officer accordingly.

Ecology

4.22 Policy DM1.4 reinforces national planning policy principles and sets out that a net environmental improvement should always be sought on new development sites and that where this is not possible adequate mitigation and compensation measures should be provided. Furthermore, in accordance with Circular 06/2005 the presence (or absence) of protected species and the extent to which they may be affected by a proposed development should be established before planning permission is granted.

4.23 In recognition of the above statement and following a direct request from both the County Ecologist and the Norfolk Wildlife Trust the applicant has submitted further ecological material to support their proposal. In particular these surveys sought to ascertain the impact of the proposed development on bats within the site, concluding that with appropriate measures the impact of the development on roosting bats can be avoided.

4.24 The County Ecologist has assessed the ecological material and has concluded that the report is fit for purpose with clear recommendations on how works should proceed on the trees potentially affected by this development. This includes tree T10 which may require work or even felling to aid the visibility splay. This is considered acceptable subject to a condition to ensure compliance with Section 5 of the ecology report.

4.25 Therefore subject to condition it is considered that the proposal complies with Policy DM1.4.

Drainage

4.26 In accordance with the NPPF the preferred option for surface water drainage is to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS).

4.27 The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment in support of the application. This identifies the site as having a very low risk of surface water flooding.
The applicant has not supplied a surface water drainage strategy at this time and the Water Management Officer has therefore included relevant conditions and advisory notes to be applied to the decision notice. Similarly, details of the foul water drainage have not been submitted at this time with two options being proposed as possible solutions by the applicant. As above the Water Management Officer has requested a condition to secure the details of the foul water disposal from the site, as well as an advisory note setting out the Council’s expectations for the applicant. These conditions are considered to be necessary inclusions on the decision notice to ensure that appropriate solutions are installed for both surface and foul water disposal.

Environmental Protection

In accordance with local Policy DM3.14 all development should minimise and wherever possible reduce the adverse impact of emissions and other forms of pollution. There should also be no deterioration in water quality or water courses as a result of development.

At this time the applicant has submitted minimal information regarding the proposed plant to be installed on the site as part of the improved facilities however the Design and Access Statement sets out the works that are undertaken on the site and the processes will be relocated from the existing site.

The Community Services team have reviewed the submission and have requested clarification on the hours of operation of the site. These details have been provided and will remain the same as the existing business operations on the adjacent site (Monday - Friday 8.30am-5.00pm). A further update will be provided to committee members if appropriate. In the absence of detailed information about the plant to be installed on site the Community Services team have requested a condition restricting the installation of generators and air handling plant until such time as precise details have been agreed with the Council. Similarly, the use of machinery or power tools outside the building is to be restricted unless otherwise agreed with the Council in order to protect the amenities of the local area. Further site investigation works are also required to ensure that any on site contamination is dealt with appropriately.

Residential amenity

Planning Policy DM3.13 seeks to ensure that a reasonable standard of amenities are retained following development in a locality. In this instance the closest residential property is located a significant distance to the south of the site and is separated from the application site by various buildings. It is not considered that relocation of the existing business will have a significant impact on the amenities of those residents closest to the site therefore the development is considered to be policy compliant.

Renewable energy

At less than 1000m2 the floorspace is not of a scale that requires a decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy contribution (in accordance with Policy 3 of the JCS). The development will be required however to maximise water efficiency.

Use Class

The application seeks consent for a new race car workshop which falls within a B2 (General Industrial) use class. It is considered necessary to restrict the use to B2 only for the reasons of highway safety in addition to ensuring the adjacent employment allocation would not be unduly affected.
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 transfer of the existing business to the new site, adjacent to the existing, will have a number of economic benefits. The improved facilities will enable Classic Team Lotus to operate with greater efficiency in more appropriate surroundings that are more fitting for their company brand. The close proximity to the main Group Lotus site will also retain a connection with the group Lotus brand, albeit they operate as separate business entities. The close relationship between the existing site and the proposed site will allow for a smoother transition of operations and equipment between the sites thereby reducing the overall impact of the business operations.

4.37 At this time it is not anticipated that the number of employees on site will increase however the applicant's agent has intimated that this development would be the first phase of a wider regeneration of the existing business site and as such the relocation of this business would have the potential to help facilitate this wider economic improvement to the local area.

Social role

4.38 Planning should support "strong, vibrant and healthy communities...by creating a high quality built environment" according to the NPPF.

4.39 The development will result in an improvement to the working conditions of employees, as well as site visitors, and this should be considered as an important benefit of the scheme. The improvement in the appearance of the business premises as well as the facilities available will also help to enhance the overall Lotus brand.

Environmental role

4.40 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".

4.41 Environmental concerns may be various but the main issues to be considered as part of this proposal are landscape and visual impact, biodiversity, highway safety and ensuring possible nuisances emanating from the site are minimised. The development would result in an existing business operation being relocated to what may be considered as a brownfield site. There is minimal vegetation within the site although the development will result in the loss of a small number of trees as well as a reduction to the overall height of the boundary hedgerow. Whilst this may be considered as a net loss resulting from the development, the landscaping scheme has yet to be agreed with the developer and as such there is potential to ensure an overall net gain on the site. Similarly, appropriate ecological mitigation measure will ensure that the development does not result in environmental harm and may result in an overall environmental benefit.

4.42 As set out above the development will not result in harm to the highway network although some additional pressures may be placed on the existing mature oak tree to the south of the proposed site access. This is unconfirmed at this time but may be considered as an environmental disbenefit of the scheme.

4.43 The agent has also confirmed that following the transition of operations a further application
is proposed for the existing site which would result in the redevelopment of the dilapidated buildings which are no longer fit for purpose. This may be considered as a long term environmental benefit of the development. Furthermore, an improvement in the standard of the business environment and the transition to a purpose built facility may ultimately result in an overall improvement to the local environment in terms of emissions and potential nuisances arising from the site. This should be considered as a benefit of the scheme.

4.44 In summary when considered as a whole, the development is considered to represent sustainable development.

4.45 Under Section 143 of the Localism Act the council is required to consider the impact on local finances. The development would be CIL liable as new floorspace is being created. 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 Regarded in the context of the planning policy framework as a whole, the benefit of the proposal being located in this location may be considered to outweigh the adverse impacts of the development. In particular, whilst the development lies outside the defined Development Limits and is not on an allocated site, it is compliant with the relevant part of Policy DM2.1 utilising existing areas of hardstanding. It is therefore considered that the development is acceptable in accordance with the provisions of Policy DM1.3 as a specific policy allows for the development and an overriding benefit in terms of economic, social and environmental dimensions can be demonstrated. All other matters such as highway safety, amenity and environmental and landscape protection also comply with those policies set out above, with some detailed matters to be secured via appropriate planning conditions.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:

Tracy Lincoln 01508 533841

tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk

Kate Fisher 01508 533960

kfisher@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applications on land owned by South Norfolk Council

4. **Appl. No**: 2015/2348/CU  
**Parish**: LODDON  

Applicants Name: Mrs Michelle Webster  
Site Address: Loddon Business Centre 2B High Street Loddon Norfolk NR14 6AH  
Proposal: Change of use of unit 9 in Loddon business centre from B1 to D1-Psychotherapy  
Recommendation: Approval with conditions  

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 02: Ensuring the vitality of town centres  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment  

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 5: The economy  
Policy 6: Access and transportation  
Policy 19: The hierarchy of centres  

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM2.5: Changes of use in town centres and local centres  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM4.10: Heritage Assets  

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

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 No relevant history  

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: Approve
3.2 District Member Can be a delegated decision

3.3 Representations None received

4 Assessment

4.1 This application relates to one of the units in Loddon Business Centre which is a listed building and located within the Conservation Area. It is proposed to change the use of these rooms to a physiotherapist (D1). No internal or external alterations are required to the building.

The building is located within the Town Centre for Loddon where policy DM2.5 in the Development Management Policies encourages main town centre uses including D1 uses. The unit’s current use is B1 office, so the development will result in no loss of retail within the town centre. The proposed use also entails a similar scale of employment to an office and so there is not considered to be a loss of employment on the site by the proposed change of use either.

Although there is no parking with the unit the site is close to public car parks. The proposed use would not result in any significant loss of amenity to existing tenants in the building or neighbouring properties in accordance with policy DM3.13 in the Development Management Policies.

No external or internal alternations are proposed to the building so the development complies with the statutory duties in 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.” and 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.”

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

This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as no new floor space is proposed.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposed development would facilitate the use of the unit for a business, without causing any significant harm to vitality and viability of the town centre, highway safety, residential amenity or the heritage assets.

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

5. **Appl. No**: 2015/2858/RVC  
**Parish**: LONG STRATTON

Applicants Name: South Norfolk Council  
Site Address: Cygnet House Swan Lane Long Stratton Norfolk  
Proposal: Variation of condition 8 of planning permission 2014/2278/RVC - Amended from a pre-commencement to a pre-occupation condition to allow the commencement of the development on site

Recommendation: Authorise Director of Growth and Localism to approve with conditions:

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

Subject to no objection from the Environment Agency

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4: Housing delivery
Policy 5: The Economy
Policy 14: Key Service Centres
Policy 6: Access and Transportation

1.3 Development Management Policies
DM1.1 Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.2 Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations
DM1.3 Sustainable location of development
DM2.1 Employment and business development
DM3.1 Housing Quality
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 and quality of life
DM3.14 Pollution, health and safety
DM3.15 Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
DM3.16 Improving the level of local community facilities
DM3.2 Meeting housing requirements and needs
DM3.8 Design Principles
DM4.9 Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.10 Heritage Assets
DM4.2 Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.3 Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.8 Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.4 Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open spaces

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/0265 Outline application for the demolition of Cygnet House and development of up to 50 residential units (class C3) and up to 800 square metres (class B1) floor space, together with associated highway works

2.2 2014/2278 Variation of conditions 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 28, 30, 31 of planning permission 2013/0265/O to enable demolition prior to commencement of development and variation of condition 29 to vary red line for alterations to access

2.3 2015/0385 Reserved Matters Application of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for 50 dwellings (Class C3), 800 sq.m. of Office (Class B1(a)), together with the discharge of conditions 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, and 30 relating to outline consent 2014/2278

Approved
Approved
under consideration
2.4 2015/1089 Proposed advertising hoarding boards. Approved

2.5 2012/0562 Screening opinion for residential development Not EIA

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council No comments received

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team Comments awaited

3.4 Environment Agency Comments awaited

3.5 Representations None received to date

4. Assessment

4.1 Outline planning permission for the redevelopment of the site to demolish the existing building and provide up to 50 residential dwellings together with up to 800sqm of B1 Office floor space was granted in April 2014 (ref 2013/0265/O). Only the principle, number and access were for consideration at that time with all other matters reserved. Subsequently a variation of condition application has been approved to enable demolition prior to the commencement of the development and also to make a minor amendment to the application red line boundary (2014/2278) and so it is this revised outline consent to which the current application seeks to vary. Still under consideration is also the proposed reserved matters application for the site. Members considered the Reserved matters application (2015/0385) at the June 2015 meeting where authority to delegate approval of the application was given to the Director of Growth and Localism to allow the final details regarding the conditions to be resolved prior to determination. That application is still outstanding with final condition matters of highways and contamination to be resolved. This has led to this current application to vary the contamination condition.

4.2 This application relates to a variation of a condition on that varied outline consent and seeks to amend condition 8 to enable the contamination condition to be discharged prior to the first occupation of the development rather than prior to commencement of development as is currently required. This would enable the development to commence whilst still resolving the final contamination matter.

4.3 The contamination on the site relates to a former above ground tank which contained oil for the central heating for the former care home on the site in addition to red diesel for vehicles associated with SNC. The contamination is in the form of floating oil (free product) and dissolved phase hydrocarbons and these are present under and around the former care home.

4.4 The main associated risks from this contamination are risk to ground water in addition to human health and property.

4.5 Reports, site investigations and risk assessments have already been undertaken for the site and some remediation work has already taken place and discussion with the Environment Agency and the Council's Environmental Services team is ongoing to reach final conclusion to enable the condition to be discharged in its previous form (i.e. pre-
commencement). However to enable the development to commence on site, the applicants have been in discussion with the Environment Agency to discuss and determine whether the final matters could be resolved prior to occupation.

4.6 The Environment Agency has given initial indications that on the basis that additional information will be provided which include the following, and the need to carry out soil remediation on site, that they would have no objection to condition 8 being amended from a pre-commencement condition to a pre-occupation condition:

- Further details of the voluntary remediation work undertaken
- Results of the additional groundwater monitoring
- The updated report and validation report detailing the remediation works undertaken

4.7 This variation of condition application has been submitted on the basis of that initial advice from the Environment Agency (EA). They have been formally consulted on the application but at the time of writing this report their formal comments are awaited. Members will be updated at committee, however Officer’s consider that on the basis of a formal comment from the Environment Agency confirming no objection to the principle of amending the condition to a pre-occupation condition, and confirmation as to what information is required before the condition is amended and what further information will be required subsequently to discharge it, that the proposed amendments are considered acceptable. On that basis authority to delegate approval subject to the EA comments is therefore sought.

4.8 Public consultation is still ongoing at the time of writing this report. Members will be updated of any comments received at Committee.

4.9 All other issues relating to the principle of the proposal (including demolition); highway and access considerations; affordable housing; ecology and landscape principles; archaeology; and potential impacts on residential amenity have not materially changed since that decision and as such are still considered acceptable in line with the original report (2013/0265) which is attached as Appendix 2. The NPPG has changed the requirement for consideration of surface water drainage on site, requiring a SUDS first approach unless it is demonstrated to be inappropriate and this is a material consideration. In this case it has been demonstrated that infiltration is not feasible and instead a piped system with attenuated flows into the surface water sewer is proposed which is fully supported by the Environment Agency. The S106 secured funding contributions towards education and library provision, provision of on-site play and open space and funding for older child recreational facilities. Affordable housing was secured by condition. No amendment to that S106 agreement is required and the obligations secured continue to apply to this varied consent.

Appropriate assessment

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

Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

4.11 The original outline was screened under the EIA Regulations 2011, this concluded that the Development was not EIA development and did not require an Environmental Statement. Consideration has been had to the amendments sought and the EIA regulations. It is not considered that the amendments now sought would give rise to significant impacts and the S73 application itself is not EIA development.
Other considerations

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

This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as is a variation of an outline which was approved prior to the implementation of CIL.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Subject to no objection from The Environment Agency and the Council’s Environmental Services Team, no substantive objection being received from local residents, the re-imposition of all previous conditions and the imposition of the amended contamination condition for pre-occupation, it is considered that the proposals to vary condition 8 are acceptable and accord with the Development Plan. Delegated Authority to approve the application is therefore sought.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tracy Lincoln 01508 533814 tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Works to Trees

6. **Appl. No**: 2015/2356/TPO  
**Parish**: LONG STRATTON

Applicants Name: Mr K Worsley  
Site Address: 11 Greenfield Way Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2WP  
Proposal: Lime Tree (T3), reduce from 24m to approximately 17m in height. Shape and remove dead wood. (amended on site as agreed with applicant, photograph sent to applicant showing approximate reduction points)

Recommendation: Approval with Conditions

1. Standard time limit  
2. In accordance with BS:3998

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies - DM4.8:

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2013/2278 Single Storey rear and side extensions Approved  
2.2 2011/0359 Remove limb for Lime Tree. Fell two Ash Trees. Approved  
2.3 2007/0978 Remove branch from Ash (T3) Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 No comments received

4. **Assessment**

4.1 This application for works to a tree subject to a Tree Preservation Order is at committee as the applicant is a Councillor at South Norfolk Council.

4.2 The height reduction is not considered harmful or excessive and will help to alleviate concerns expressed by the applicant. The applicant has amended the application which was originally to reduce the height to approximately 12m. This would have resulted in large pruning wound with a greater potential for decay. It would also have significantly reduced the amenity value of the tree. The proposed works are now considered to be acceptable.

5. **Conclusion**

5.1 The proposal is in accordance with the ‘guidance for Tree Works Applications’ and it is recommended that works are approved with conditions:  
1) Works are undertaken in accordance with BS3998 Recommendations for Tree Work.  
### Planning Appeals
**Appeals received from 01 December 2015 to 17 December 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/0529</td>
<td>Pulham St Mary Tubbys Barn North Green Pulham St Mary Norfolk IP21 4XX</td>
<td>Mr D Clutten</td>
<td>Application for prior approval determination under Class Q (a) (formerly Class MB (a)) of a proposed change of use of agricultural building to 3 dwellings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals
**Appeals decisions from 01 December 2015 to 17 December 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Decision Maker</th>
<th>Final Decision</th>
<th>Appeal Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014/1302</td>
<td>Caistor St Edmund Land North of Heath Farm Caistor Lane Caistor St Edmund Norfolk</td>
<td>Mrs Val Hope</td>
<td>Erection of 16 dwellings (5 affordable, 11 market) and proposed access to the south of Caistor Lane.</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note: referred back to DMC where agreed not to defend appeal (updated 5 yr land supply position)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/1903</td>
<td>Wymondham Little Dial Farm Station Road Spooner Row Wymondham NR18 9SP</td>
<td>Mr Julian Freeman</td>
<td>Change of use of Land for Self Storage Purposes (B8 usage) and the siting of Storage Containers</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2429</td>
<td>Hethersett Land between Queens Road and Jaguar Road Hethersett Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Jamie Bird</td>
<td>Erection of 22 new homes plus associated roads, landscaping and public open space</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76