Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

Conservatives  Liberal Democrats

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

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

Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time
9.00 am  Blomefield Room

Agenda

Date
Wednesday 7 December 2016

Time
10.00 am

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

Contact
Sue Elliott tel (01508) 533869
South Norfolk House
Cygnet Court
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE
Email: democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Website: www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

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

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

If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance
Large print version can be made available

29/11/2016
Please familiarise yourself with this information if you are not in receipt of the agenda.

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

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

THEREFORE we will:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 22)

   To consider the items as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Planning Ref No.</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2016/0482/F</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL</td>
<td>Land North Of Harvey Lane Dickleburgh Norfolk</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2016/1627/O</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Land To The North Of Heath Loke Poringland Norfolk</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2016/2153/F</td>
<td>STOKE HOLY CROSS</td>
<td>Land Off Broomfield Road Broomfield Road Stoke Holy Cross NR14 8FF</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2016/1838/F</td>
<td>ROYDON</td>
<td>18 Tudor Avenue Roydon Norfolk IP22 5SQ</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2016/2112/H</td>
<td>TACOLNESTON</td>
<td>1 Birkin Close Tacolneston Norfolk NR16 1BT</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2016/2155/CU</td>
<td>DENTON</td>
<td>Rainbows End Norwich Road Denton IP20 0AN</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2016/2264/H</td>
<td>BROOKE</td>
<td>Field House Littlebeck Lane Brooke NR15 1ET</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2016/2364/CU</td>
<td>ROYDON</td>
<td>Barn South Of High Road Roydon Norfolk</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2016/2520/F</td>
<td>NEWTON FLOTMAN</td>
<td>Church Of St Mary The Virgin Church Road Newton Fлотman Norfolk</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Sites Sub-Committee;

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

7. Enforcement Report
   (attached – page 88)

8. Planning Appeals (for information)
   (attached – page 91)

9. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wednesday 4 January 2017
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

- Member consideration/decision.

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

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

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

3. FILMING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS: GUIDANCE

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

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

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

For guidance refer to the flowchart overleaf.
Please refer any queries to the Monitoring Officer in the first instance.
What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?

OR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 9 November 2016 at 10.00 am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: V Thomson (Chairman), L Neal, P Broome, F Ellis, C Gould, M Gray, C Kemp, G Minshull, J Mooney and A Thomas (for applications 1-5).

Apologies: Councillor: B Stone.

Substitute Members: Councillor: B Duffin for B Stone.

Officers in Attendance: The Director of Growth and Localism (T Horspole), the Development Manager (H Mellors), the Head of Environmental Services (B Wade), the Planning Decisions Team Leader (C Trett), the Senior Planning Officers (C Raine, T Lincoln and C Curtis), the Planning Officer (J Jackson), the Design Officer (C Watts) and the Landscape Architect (R Taylor)

Ecologist – NCC (D White), Highways Officer – NCC (L Paul)

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

297. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/1447/F (Item 1)</td>
<td>BRESSINGHAM</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0233/F (Item 2)</td>
<td>COLNEY</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Thomas</td>
<td>Other Interest – Daughter is a committee member of an American football club which might be affected by the proposed Section 106 Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 298. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 12 October 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 299. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/1447/F (Item 1)</td>
<td>BRESSINGHAM</td>
<td>Mr R Hewitt – Bressingham &amp; Fersfield Parish Council&lt;br&gt;Mr B Falk – Objector&lt;br&gt;Mr C Smith – Agent for Applicant&lt;br&gt;Mr R Sanderson – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0233/F (Item 2)</td>
<td>COLNEY</td>
<td>Prof. T O’Riordan – Colney Parish Council&lt;br&gt;Prof. M Wagstaff – Cringleford Parish Council&lt;br&gt;Mr N Loone – Objector&lt;br&gt;Mr J Elbro – Objector&lt;br&gt;Ms C Kerrison – Objector&lt;br&gt;Mr A Pott – On behalf of Applicant&lt;br&gt;Mr P Steele – On behalf of Applicant&lt;br&gt;Mr J Long – Agent for Applicant&lt;br&gt;Cllr J Virgo – Norfolk County Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/1669/H (Item 3)</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Ms M Ford – Objector&lt;br&gt;Mr A Gibbs – Agent for Applicant&lt;br&gt;Cllr L Dale – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/1915/F (Item 4)</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH &amp; RUSHALL</td>
<td>Ms S Johnson – Dickleburgh &amp; Rushall Parish Council&lt;br&gt;Mr H Lampp – Agent for Applicant&lt;br&gt;Cllr M Wilby – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/1916/O (Item 5)</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH &amp; RUSHALL</td>
<td>Ms S Johnson – Dickleburgh &amp; Rushall Parish Council&lt;br&gt;Ms K Barker – Objector&lt;br&gt;Mr H Lampp – Agent for Applicant&lt;br&gt;Cllr M Wilby – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2198/F (Item 6)</td>
<td>BROOKE</td>
<td>Mr P Mayhew – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2228/RVC (Item 7)</td>
<td>STOKE HOLY CROSS</td>
<td>Mr G Harvey – Applicant&lt;br&gt;Cllr T Lewis – 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.

300. ENFORCEMENT REPORTS

Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Tharston and Hapton (ref:2015/8056)

It was RESOLVED that enforcement action be taken to cease the use of the land for the standing of caravans and to secure the removal of caravans from the land.

Members considered the report of the Director of Growth and Localism regarding the enforcement case at Diss (ref: 2016/8140)

It was RESOLVED that this item be deferred to a future meeting of the Development Management Committee so that consultation could take place with Diss Town Council.

301. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting closed at 3.53 pm)

_______________________
Chairman
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

1  Appl. No : 2016/1447/F  
Parish : BRESSINGHAM

Applicants Name : Mr Robert Sanderson  
Site Address : Harvest House Low Road Bressingham IP22 2DB  
Proposal : Demolition of 5 buildings and construction of 17 storage silos, 10 intake silos, 1 dust box, 1 machinery building, 3 grain driers, 6 bulk out load hoppers, an office & laboratory block and 2 weighbridges. New permanent and temporary access for construction vehicles and upgrading of on-site roadways.

Decision : Members voted 9-2 to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to approve with conditions as detailed on page 19 of the agenda subject to submission of further noise assessment information and mitigation measures to the satisfaction of the Council with advice from the Community Services Environmental Quality Team and the expiration of the consultation period (17th November 2016) associated with the amended plan expiring and no new substantive issues being raised as a consequence of this.

1. Time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted information  
3. Visibility splays to be provided  
4. Access and on-site turning and parking to be provided  
5. Agree and implement off-site highway improvements  
6. On-site parking for construction workers  
7. Vehicular access only from approved access  
8. Temporary construction access to be closed  
9. External materials to be agreed  
10. Surface water drainage scheme to be agreed  
11. Foul water disposal via sealed system or private treatment plant  
12. External lighting to be agreed  
13. Contaminated land investigation to be agreed  
14. Implement any agreed remediation agreed in relation to contamination  
15. Unexpected contamination during construction  
16. Air quality mitigation to be implemented  
17. Implementation of agreed noise mitigation measures  
18. Construction environmental management plan to be agreed  
19. Restriction on delivery times  
20. Ecological mitigation to be agreed  
21. Implementation of landscaping scheme  
22. Landscape management arrangements to be agreed  
23. Protection of trees and hedgerows  
24. Hours of operation for construction works to be agreed
Updates to officer report

Development Management Sites Sub-Committee 1\textsuperscript{st} November 2016

In attendance:

SNC Officers - C Raine, C Watts, T Horspole

Members/councillors - V Thompson, F Ellis, C Gould, P Broome, L Neal, A Thomas, G Minshull, C Kemp, J Mooney

The above members and officers attended a formal site visit and viewed the application from the following viewpoints (as denoted on the agenda papers). The applicant was in attendance on the site only.

Viewpoint 1 - Church viewed from Church and associated churchyard and also walked westwards along Church Lane. Members asked how tall church was (answer not known) and distance between church and site (officer confirmed as approx. 1km)

Viewpoint 2 Members walked along stretch of Fen Street Members asked distance from Fen Street to development to site (officers confirmed approx. 300m to nearest new building (office/lab)) Members noted the intervening vegetation

Viewpoint 3 Members looked from A1066 also highlighted that one of the submitted visualisations that was used in committee presentation (as submitted by applicant) which was taken from this direction

Viewpoint 4 members noted viewpoint

Viewpoint 5 members noted viewpoint

Viewpoint 6 members noted viewpoint

Viewpoint 7 Members noted demolition work undertaken Officer outlined location of silos in context of the remaining buildings on-site

Additional viewpoint – White House B & B/site access given request from B & B

Officer outlined the proposed access arrangements, clarified which third party land/hedge might prohibit delivery of improved access but explained amended plan received that day. Members noted visibility in both directions. Officers clarified that the speed limit on the A1066 is 60mph. Members asked whether officers could investigate possibility of reduce speed limit on road. Officer confirmed he will pass on request to NCC.
**Officer comment**

The Council has received an amended plan which proposes an option to slightly revise the proposed access arrangements to the site. This has been consulted on, and this consultation expires on the 17th November 2016, on this basis the recommendation in the committee report should be amended to read:

**Authorise Director of Growth and localism to approve with conditions as detailed on page 19 of the agenda subject to submission of further noise assessment information and mitigation measures to the satisfaction of the Council with advice from the Community Services Environmental Quality Team and the expiration of the consultation period (17th November 2016) associated with the amended plan expiring and no new substantive issues being raised as a consequence of this.**

**NCC Highway Authority**

The Highway Authority has assessed the amended plan and proposed further access arrangement and has confirmed the following:

The revised highway access drawing is virtually identical to the original scheme drawing. The proposal is again a standard Dept of Transport design for a ghost island right turn lane.

I understand that the revision is an option to the original highway access layout.

The principle of the scheme is acceptable, subject to a detailed design. We have not agreed details of signage and as with any highway scheme, accommodation works may be required and these may alter slightly as the scheme progresses.

The principle of the right turn lane was supported by the planning Inspector and is also supported by our safety engineer. We would not be able to support the additional development on the site without the highway improvements.

As far as I can see the revision shows the whole highway layout moved marginally southwards with a slight widening of the road on the southern side being the main difference between the revised and original highway layouts.

There is a lot of vegetation around the entrance to Mill House which overhangs the highway boundary. The accommodation works to the scheme could include a cutting back of the vegetation to reduce and significantly improve any safety effects that the slight change to the road line to the south will have.

The safety engineer has considered the suggestion of reducing the speed limit to 50 mph from the current 60, but does not feel that there is sufficient development along this section of the A1066 or accident record to warrant the change.

**Officer comment**

As well as considering the highway safety impacts of the revision as above, it is evident that the off-site highway works would bring the carriageway closer to neighbours to the south. On this basis it is necessary to consider the amenity impacts of this.
Whilst the carriageway, and therefore the traffic, would be brought closer to properties, it is not considered that this would not be detrimental to neighbour amenities when considering the existing position of the carriageway in relation to the neighbouring properties. Officers would also wish to clarify that in respect of part 6 of Policy DM2.1, in context of the protection of amenities of neighbouring properties in all other respects, the proposal would protect the amenities of local residents. In terms of noise, the proposed development will be required to operate at levels not higher than those that have been apparent on-site and whilst the construction work is ongoing, practices will be controlled via a construction environmental management plan. The committee report also includes a number of other suggested conditions in terms of amenity protection ie Air quality, external lighting, no generators used outside, restriction on hours of deliveries. The proposed structures and buildings are adequately distanced from all neighbours so as not to cause loss of light, privacy or be overbearing. This paragraph should be read in conjunction within the section entitled Amenities of neighbouring occupiers contained within the committee report assessment and also reflected in the conclusion within the committee report.

Representations have been received in respect of whether the proposal should be screened when considering the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. Officers believe that when considering the scheme against schedule 2 of the EIA regulations, and in particular class 13 b), it is not necessary to undertake a screening opinion. A legal opinion has now been sought given the level of comments received and in adopting a precautionary approach to this issue a screening opinion has now been undertaken. The screening opinion concludes that an Environmental Statement is not required in this case.

Further representations since publication of report

-Anglian Water confirmed that the proposal would have no impact upon their assets.

-SNC Landscape Architect confirmed no objection to revised highway proposals

- Objection from a Knights Solicitors who represents number of local residents expressing concern on the grounds of visual amenity, noise and road safety, and in particular, adverse effects on personal safety by the off-site highways works being brought closer to her home. Also submitted a letter expressing concern that the silos will not be capable of being painted for a significant period of time due to the materials to be used and them being highly reflective without being painted. This will make the council’s condition on painting undeliverable for a significant period of time (at least 2 years). In addition there will be serious aircraft safety issues associated with RF Lakenheath and RAF Mildenhall which regularly fly over the site at low altitudes.

Officer response to the points raised above

Amenity and highway impacts are addressed above. In terms of the colour of the silos, suggested condition 12 will require agreement with the Council and as such we have the ability to control the external appearance of the silos from the outset and will take into account how any finish will age.

In terms of the RAF bases, the size and nature of the proposals do not present any statutory requirement to consult with them.
Request for Deferral

There has been a request from Knights Solicitors to defer the application in order to allow the owner of the adjacent Bed & breakfast time to consider the amended plan and provide his instruction to his representative before the committee, given that he is presently in hospital. Notwithstanding this very unfortunate circumstance, officers consider the application does not need to be deferred given the relatively minor nature of the amendments and the detailed comments and concerns that have already been received.

It should also be noted that the consultation period on the amended plan does not expire until after the 17th November and therefore any comments made within this period will be considered by officers prior to issuing any consent.

| Appl. No | 2016/0233/F |
| Parish | COLNEY |
| Applicants Name | University Of East Anglia & Norwich Rugby Football Club |
| Site Address | UEA Sports Facility Colney Lane Colney Norfolk |
| Proposal | New sports pitches (including an artificial grass pitch with fencing and floodlighting), re-profiling of existing pitches, infilling/re-profiling of area used as existing grounds maintenance facility; new pavilion/club house (GIA: 1306 sqm), incorporating a café, changing rooms, club room, bar and members lounge; associated new car/coach/cycle parking areas (168 car parking spaces and overflow parking for up to 60 cars, including 8 parking spaces for the disabled, 100 cycle spaces and 2 coach parking spaces); new freestanding grounds/sports equipment storage facility (GIA: 144 sqm) and associated compound; access road (utilising the existing access junction onto Colney Lane), new footpath/cycleways; extension of the existing Colney Lane car park (from 37 to 87 spaces and overflow parking for up to 24 cars); associated infrastructure (including utility equipment) and the temporary siting of a storage unit for sports/grounds equipment (for the period up to the opening of the grounds/sports equipment storage facility) at the UEA Sports Pitches, Colney Lane, Norwich. |
| Decision | Members voted 7-4 for Approval |
| Approved with conditions | |
| 1 Time limit |
| 2 In accordance with amended plans |
| 3 Community use agreement for the facility |
| 4 Site survey/pitch implementation scheme |
| 5 Approval of full specification of the 3G artificial pitch |
| 6 Provision of footpaths within the site |
| 7 Landscape scheme to be approved |
| 8 Landscape management strategy |
| 9 Tree protection measures |
| 10 Biodiversity management plan |
| 11 Parking management strategy |
| 12 Vehicular access to be upgraded |
| 13 Specification for the gradient of the access |
| 14 Criteria for set back of any gates from carriageway |
| 15 Access, car parking, servicing, loading, unloading to be delivered |
prior to commencement of use
16 Scheme for on-site construction parking
17 Wheel cleaning facilities
18 Off-site highway improvements
19 In accordance with Flood Risk Assessment and mitigation measures including land re-profiling
20 Submission of surface water drainage scheme including relevant treatment levels
21 Materials of the buildings to be submitted
22 Surface materials to be approved
23 Archaeological Written Scheme of investigation
24 Restrict to D2 (sport and leisure use)
25 Restrict floorspace of café and bar
26 Lighting scheme
27 Renewable energy
28 Fire hydrant
29 Fence details to be agreed

Subject to S106 to secure qualitative improvements to other Rugby facilities in the catchment area

Updates to officer report

Corrections to report:
- Paragraph 4.100 – replace ‘Policy DM4.9’ with ‘Policy DM4.8’
- Paragraph 4.138 – replace ‘JCS Policy 1’ with ‘JCS Policy 2’
- Paragraph 4.43 and 4.78 – only one pitch (the 3G pitch) will be fenced – not two as reported.

Officer clarifications on conclusions (section 5 of report):
Officers consider it important to clarify for the avoidance of doubt, as was set out earlier in the report, that in respect of the landscape policy (DM4.5), the proposal would not accord with part 1 of the policy which requires proposals to respect, conserve and where possible enhance the landscape character. However the proposal is not considered to conflict with the second part of the policy which requires refusal of applications which result in significant adverse impact. Having regard to the key characteristics, assets, sensitivities and vulnerabilities, landscape strategy and development considerations of the River Valley Landscape, harm would result however this is considered to result in moderate adverse harm which is not considered to be at a level to conflict with the second part of the policy.

Overall, it is not considered that this partial conflict with Policy DM4.5 is a fundamental failure of the proposal. The proposal overall on balance complies with the Development Plan save this departure.

Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is one such material consideration. The report carries out an assessment of the material considerations in respect of harm and benefits which include the significant public benefits of the sports facility. The report sets out officer’s view that the proposed benefits outweigh the identified harm.

8 additional letters of objection have been received including one from a UEA Arts and Humanities research Group on Environment, Space and Place. Additional grounds include: Flood risk; impacts on River Yare due to run-off; impacts on biodiversity particularly from floodlighting; changes to landscape character; pressure on roads; contrary to policy DM1.4 and 3.1; presence of such a sizeable special interest group on the UEA grounds will have an adverse impact on student experience at UEA; inadequate consultation with staff and students of UEA in conflict with Policy DM3.16; ecology surveys submitted are still inadequate to represent the ecology on the site and the data/survey results available; embankment levels
shown are not accurate – these will be considerably higher than stated in some areas; parking numbers and its intended management is still not considered appropriate and the applicant has not agreed the management.

**Officer comment in respect of community involvement:** In respect of the objection raised regarding sufficient community involvement, the pre-text to Policy DM3.16 advises that ‘views of the local community and community led plans will be an important consideration in both the case of a loss of existing facilities or one for new facilities to be located in the countryside.’ The application was submitted with a statement of community involvement which set out the pre-application public consultation including a consultation evening; hosting plans on the UEA website; discussions with the Yare Valley Society, Sport England and sports associations. It is considered that the level of pre-application community engagement carried out is reasonable given that the application seeks to intensify the use and expand the users of a facility that is already in existence for sport.

**Letter of objection from Norwich Green Party** received with main issues (summarised): impact on wildlife; impact on character and appearance of river valley; increased traffic noise and congestion (particularly the effect this has on the effectiveness of the cycle route through the site); and the function of this area as a floodplain.

**Crusaders Rugby Club request the application be deferred** for the following reasons: Sport England has made it a condition that for them to support the application they have stated ‘a Section 106 Agreement must be obliged’. Crusaders RFC have no formal/written confirmation from the applicants that they will oblige the stipulation laid down by Sport England. We would respectfully suggest this undermines the progress of the application and that it can’t be allowed to proceed at this point in time.

**Request from local resident (Mr Martin) for deferral** for the following reasons (summarised): There is incomplete and incorrect highway information and that the Highway Authority have been misled on the impacts of the development.

9 additional letters of support have been received – no new grounds raised.

A UEA Student and Staff petition in support of the application with 456 signatories also received.

**Additional letter received from applicant’s agent** to address some of additional comments raised by objectors (summarised)

- The delivery of the ‘Beyond Green’ scheme’s open space timetable would not be compatible for the timescale required for Norwich Rugby Club’s relocation.
- The GNPD Playing pitch strategy identified Colney Lane as a suitable option for the relocation of Norwich Rugby Club.
- Norwich Rugby club has offered Crusaders the use of the 3G pitch for training; to set up a schools forum with school networks to target the north of the city and not Crusader’s network; and access to rugby playing students for matches and coaching of Crusaders juniors by Crusaders coaches on the new facilities.
- Advise 1968 Flood mapping and other flood level data was used as part of the FRA in conjunction with a topographical survey of the site.
- The UEA purchased the sports pitch land at Colney Lane in the 1960’s. It is private property but UEA have always been happy to allow the public to access it freely.
- The current pitches are currently underused, one reason being the facilities are not fit for purpose and not to a standard currently to allow formal community use. Without the Rugby clubs involvement, due to University funding constraints, the UEA would not be in a position to improve the facilities to the level proposed.
- Advise an indicative cost for draining a pitch at Crusaders has been made, justifying an approximate cost of £50,000.
Development Management Committee   9 November 2016

3  Appl. No : 2016/1669/H
Parish : HETHERSETT

Applicants Name : Mr Andrew Gibbs
Site Address : 9A Lynch Green Hethersett Norfolk NR9 3JU
Proposal : Extensions and remodeling of existing dwelling to create first floor

Decision : Members voted 10-1 for Refusal (contrary to officer recommendation which was lost 0-9 with 2 abstentions)

Refused

Reasons for Overturning Officer Recommendation

Over-development of the site, scale, design and the overbearing impact on the neighbouring property.

Updates to officer report

3 Additional letters of objection
- Boundaries of 9 & 7 are still incorrect drawn in the wrong place.
- Revised plans offer no improvement on the impact on the surrounding properties, just a rehash of the existing plans and does not fit in with the surrounding buildings.
- No mention of how the access problems will be overcome as the access via Cedar Road has not been forthcoming.
- No pavement and Lynch Green is used by many people including dog walkers, young women with children and or buggies. Vehicles parked outside the bungalow block the view of the road due to a bend immediately to the north.
- Photomontage does not show accurately the front of the plots, the raised bed and a wall between the road and the parking area shown. Electricity pole by the drive of number 11 is not shown in the photomontage but will presumably supply electricity to 9A as well as to number 11.

4  Appl. No : 2016/1915/F
Parish : DICKLEBURH AND RUSHALL

Applicants Name : Draper And De Grey
Site Address : Land West Of Cantara Burston Road Dickleburgh Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of four dwellings

Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval

Approved with conditions

1 Full Planning permission time limit
2 In accordance with amendments
3 External materials to be agreed
4 Ecology Mitigation
5 Slab level to be agreed
6 Water Efficiency to be met
7 Specific details to be agreed
8 Hedge planting along the front boundary
9 Surface Water to be agreed
10 Visibility splay
11 Provision of parking, service
12 Protection of Highway Boundary
13 Access Gates - Configuration
14 New Access Construction over verge
15 Reporting of unexpected contamination
16 Boundary treatment to be agreed
17 No PD for fences, walls etc.
18 No alterations to lose garages

5 Appl. No : 2016/1916/O
Parish : DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL
Applicants Name : Mrs Croner
Site Address : Land East Of Bangala Rectory Road Dickleburgh Norfolk
Proposal : Two dwellings
Decision : Members voted 7-4 for Approval

Approved with conditions
1 Outline permission time limit
2 In accordance with submitted drawings
3 Standard outline requiring reserved matters
4 1 ½ storey dwellings only
5 No upper floor windows or openings on the west elevation
6 External materials to be agreed
7 Contaminated land during construction
8 Water efficiency
9 Parking and turning areas
10 Visibility splays 2.4m x 120m
11 Vehicular access in accordance with highway specification
12 Slab level to be agreed
13 Boundary treatment to be agreed
14 Surface water
15 Details of foul water disposal
16 Disclaimer contamination

6 Appl. No : 2016/2198/F
Parish : BROOKE
Applicants Name : Mr Peter Burton
Site Address : Highfield Stables Highfield Lane Brooke Norfolk
Proposal : Single storey timber framed modular log cabin to provide accommodation for full time groom and classroom facilities.
Decision : Members voted 10-0 for Approval

Approved with conditions
1 Temporary 3 year permission
2 Occupational restriction
3 Foul drainage sealed treatment plant

Updates to officer report

Email received from objector regarding:
- Business not currently operating from site
- Site inappropriately located away from property and driveway
7  
**Appl. No:** 2016/2228/RVC  
**Parish:** STOKE HOLY CROSS

Applicants Name : Mr G Harvey  
Site Address : Whiteford House Chandler Road Stoke Holy Cross Norfolk NR14 8RQ  
Proposal : Variation of Condition 2 of planning permission 2016/0362 - Amended drawings to raise height of house.

Decision : Members voted 10-0 for **Approval**

Approved with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Slab level to be agreed  
4. Ground levels  
5. Retention trees and hedges  
6. Access and parking  
7. No PD for Classes ABCDE & G  
8. No PD for fences, walls etc  
9. Archaeological work to be agreed  
10. Water consumption  
11. Foul drainage to sealed system
Agenda Item 5

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

1  Appl. No  :  2016/0482/F
    Parish  :  DICKLEBURGH & RUSHALL

   Applicants Name  :  Mr Chris Smith
   Site Address  :  Land North Of Harvey Lane Dickleburgh Norfolk
   Proposal  :  Residential development of land to provide 22 dwellings, together
               with access, parking and associated infrastructure

Recommendation  :  Approval with Conditions
   1. Time limit full permission
   2. In accordance with plans
   3. Standard highways conditions
   4. Future management and maintenance of roads
   5. Details of construction of roads and footways
   6. Off-site highway works for footpath
   7. Construction worker parking
   8. Materials to be agreed
   9. Surface water drainage scheme
   10. Fire hydrant to be provided
   11. Landscaping management
   12. Biodiversity management plan
   13. Contaminated land
   14. Construction management plan
   15. Renewable energy
   16. Water efficiency

Subject to completion of S106 agreement to secure affordable housing
and commuted sum for off-site play equipment improvements.

1.  Planning Policies

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

1.2  Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
   Policy 2 : Promoting good design
   Policy 3 : Energy and water
   Policy 4 : Housing delivery
   Policy 6 : Access and Transportation
   Policy 7 : Supporting Communities
   Policy 8 : Culture, leisure and entertainment
   Policy 15 : Service Villages
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.1: Ensuring development management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs
DM3.2: Meeting rural housing needs
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety
DM3.15: Outdoor play facilities and recreational space
DM3.16: Improving level of community facilities
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

1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
Policy DIC1: Land north of Langmere Road and east of Limmer Avenue

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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

2. Planning History

2.1 No relevant planning history.

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council
Object
- Site specific allocation has prevented this application being the right development
- Breaches a range of planning policies
- Harvey Lane is physically constrained, heavily trafficked rural lane
- Unsafe route that doesn’t meet County Highways Standards
- Additional 200 vehicle movements a day
- Deficiency of education provisions
- Amenity noise and quality of life

3.2 District Member
- To Committee.
- Highway issues
- Layout and density of building design and visual appearance
- Overshadowing/Loss of outlook/Loss of privacy
- Deficiencies in facilities
- Inadequate or inappropriate landscaping or means of enclosure
| 3.3 | Councillor Spratt County Councillor | • Supports the view of the Highway Officer  
• School safety considerations |
| 3.4 | SNC Landscape Architect | Comments on amendments:  
• Scheme can be approved subject to conditions  

Original comments:  
• Concerns over appropriate boundary treatment  
• Subject to revised scheme no objection |
| 3.5 | NCC Planning Obligations Co-ordinator | Comments on amendments  
• Do not alter housing number/mix so previous comments remain unchanged  

Comments on original scheme  
• Concern over capacity of primary school, funding through CIL monies.  
• One fire hydrant required  
• Library contribution sought through CIL monies  
• Impacts to green infrastructure connections should be considered, mitigation should be considered. |
| 3.6 | NCC Public Rights Of Way | No comments received |
| 3.7 | NCC Ecologist | Comments on amendments  
• Do not appear to be material to ecology – No further comment  

Original comments  
• No objection in principle  
• Condition a Biodiversity Management Plan  
• Suggest reinforcing the boundaries and erecting bat and bird boxes |
| 3.8 | Norfolk Fire Service | Comments on amendments:  
• No change from previous  

Original comments:  
• No objection subject to a condition to secure a fire hydrant. |
| 3.9 | SNC Play and Amenities Officer | No objection, a financial sum in lieu of on-site provision to be spent on improving existing facilities identified with the village is acceptable. |
| 3.10 | Historic Environment Service | No comments received |
| 3.11 | Norfolk Police | No comments received |
| 3.12 | SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team | No objection subject to conditions  
• Noise – Air source heat pumps, construction noise  
• Contaminated land  
• Advisory note – Wood burning stoves |
3.13 NCC Highways

Comments on final amendments:
- Proposed footway in front of the school measures 0.9m only and is too narrow. This could lead to safety concerns as pedestrians step off the footway into the carriageway to allow others to pass.
- Would prefer new footway on the southern side of Harvey Lane

Original comments and amendments:
- Issue a holding objection as in current form application does not address the requirements of Policy DIC1

3.14 SNC Housing

Enabling & Strategy Officer

Comments on amendments
- No further comment

Original comment
- No objection
- The affordable housing is an acceptable mix and tenure.

3.15 SNC Water

Management Officer

Recommend a condition for further site investigations, details and arrangements for maintenance and management of surface water drainage scheme

3.16 Anglian Water

Services Ltd

- Water recycling centre will have capacity for flows
- Sewerage system at present has available capacity
- Surface water does not relate to AW operated assets

3.17 Lead Local flood

Authority

- Confirmed that they do not wish to make any comments.

3.18 NHS England

No comments received

3.19 SNC Senior Design

and Conservation Officer

- Although close to Conservation Area site is some distance from core of village and prevailing character is C20 estates
- Limmer Avenue has a built access which could allow for the site to be connected and integrated into surrounding neighbourhood
- Some materials are not in keeping
- Parking for plots 11 and 12 not satisfactory

3.20 Representations

51 letters of objection, a further 10 after amendments
- Concerns with Highway Safety
- No safe place for pedestrians
- 20mph not adhered to
- Car parking on highway
- Road drainage concerns
- School should be linked to village centre by a footpath
- Amendments do not improve highway safety
- Surface water flooding already in area
- Concerns about wildlife
- Destroy open space
- Spoil view of open countryside
- Loss of privacy
- Noise and dust during construction
- Concerns regarding WW2 pill box
- Other sites much better suited with better
- Insufficient facilities and infrastructure
- Social housing is covered by Saffron
1 letter of support
2 letter neither supporting or objecting on the following grounds:
- The road needs upgrading
- Footpath link between school and village centre
- Alternative parking space with walking access to the villages communal sites.
- Spaces at school being taken by more children from the village may have a beneficial impact on vehicles using Harvey Lane

4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The site is located in Dickleburgh on land north of Langmere Road and east of Limmer Avenue. The site is allocated in the adopted Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD to deliver approximately 20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

4.2 The site itself is approximately 1.1 Ha and comprises all of the land proposed for the residential allocation in Policy DIC1 of the site Specific allocations document. Policy DIC1 sets out the requirements for development of the site and this is set out below.

The application

4.3 The application is a full planning application and seeks approval for all matters including access, parking and associated infrastructure.

4.4 The application proposes the erection of 22 dwellings. These consist of:

Open market housing
- 3 x 2 bed detached bungalow (1 storey)
- 2 x 3 bed detached bungalow (1 storey)
- 3 x 3 bed detached chalet bungalow (1.5 storey)
- 4 x 3 bed detached house (2 storey)
- 3 x 4 bed detached house (2 storey)

Affordable housing
- 2 x 1 bed semi-detached house (2 storey)
- 3 x 2 bed terraced house (2 storey)
- 2 x 3 bed semi-detached house (2 storey)

4.5 The application has been amended to address the Highway Authority’s comments relating to off-site highway improvements and amendments to visibility splays and on-site parking arrangements. Further amendments include improvements to the overall site layout and landscaping, which have been negotiated throughout the course of the application.

The main issues for consideration of this application are addressed below.

Principle of development

4.6 Policy 15 of the JCS identifies Dickleburgh as a Service Village in which land has been allocated to provide for approximately 10-20 dwellings between April 2008 and March 2026, subject to form, character and servicing constraints.

Policy DIC1 sets out the requirements for development of the site and this is set out below:

4.7 Land amounting to some 1.1 hectares is allocated for housing and associated infrastructure. This allocation could accommodate approximately 20 dwellings. The policy requires the developer of the site to ensure the following:
• A small estate development
• Appropriate boundary treatment on the site’s eastern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the east
• Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place
• Local highways improvements and the provision of a safe access will need to be provided

4.8 The application site comprises of 22 dwellings on all of the land proposed within the adopted development boundary for the residential allocation in policy DIC1 of the site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD and as such the principle of new residential development on this site is consistent with the aims of policy DM1.3 which seeks to permit new housing within a development boundary.

4.9 Members should note that the 22 dwellings proposed is in excess of the 10-20 houses in Service Villages identified in the Joint Core Strategy. However in considering whether this resultant effect on total numbers of dwellings, other material considerations must also be taken into account.

4.10 Part 1 of Policy DM1.3 states that new development should be located so that it positively contributes to the sustainable development. The policy seeks development to be on allocated sites and of a scale proportionate to the level of growth planned in that location, and the role and function of the Settlement within which it is located. The scheme proposed meets the requirements of this policy.

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

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

4.12 In terms of para 58, providing 22 dwellings on the site whilst still having an average density of approximately 20dph ensuring the efficient use of land, which is reflective of the scale of the local area.

4.13 In summary, whilst the number of dwellings proposed is greater than the approximate figure contained within the allocation, it is considered, that in principle, providing 22 dwellings within the village which is a service centre is, in principle, acceptable, subject to the scheme satisfying the stated criterion set out within the allocation and all relevant planning policies in respect of matters such as design, neighbour amenity, highway safety etc. An assessment of the scheme, against the above is as follows:

4.14 The first criterion within the allocation requires:

• A small estate development

4.15 The scheme comprises all of the land proposed within the adopted development boundary from a single point of access from Harvey Lane. As such it is considered that the proposals represent a small estate development. For this reason the first criterion has been satisfied.

4.16 The second criterion requires:

• Appropriate boundary treatment on the site’s eastern boundary to minimise its impact on the open landscape to the east
4.17 The scheme proposes new planting along the east boundary the site, which is consistent with other established boundary treatments to the site and appropriate in this rural context. The Council’s Landscape Architect has confirmed that this is an acceptable approach in this locality, subject to conditions. For this reason the second criterion has been satisfied.

4.18 The third criterion requires:

- Wastewater infrastructure capacity must be confirmed prior to development taking place

4.19 A Statements and Conditions Report has been prepared by Anglian Water which confirms that the sewerage system at present has available capacity for the proposed flows. For this reason the first criterion has been satisfied.

4.20 The final criterion requires:

- Local highways improvements and the provision of a safe access will need to be provided

4.21 The Highway Authority has no objection to the access arrangements provided subject to conditions and as such the requirement of the further criterion relating to safe access is satisfied. In respect of the off-site highway improvements, they continue to be concerned at the proposed footpath adjacent to the primary school on the northern side of the Harvey Lane carriageway. This is specifically due to the proposed footway in front of the school measuring only 0.9m. A width of 0.9m is the absolute minimum width normally accepted and should ideally be used over short distances only. In this instance the 0.9m wide footway is around 70m long and adjacent a hedge which has the potential to grow out over the footway and further limit its useable width. Given the location of the proposed footway outside a school, where pedestrians are likely to congregate at school drop off and pick up times, it is our view that a 0.9m width is not appropriate in this location. The limited width of the proposed footway fronting the school is compounded by the fact Harvey Lane at this location is narrow and is not intended to be widened. A narrow footway where congestion and vulnerable pedestrians are likely to be at their highest level could lead to safety concerns as pedestrians step off the footway into the carriageway to allow others to pass.

4.22 Whilst acknowledging this concern, considering this in the context of the allocation it is necessary to acknowledge that the allocation does not specify what off-site works should be provided and it is also apparent from the Highway Officers comments that the width of the footpath does comply with the minimum width to be provided, albeit this is typically on short sections of footway. On balance it is felt that the scheme, whilst not the optimum solution available, it does provide a satisfactory arrangement in the context of the requirements of the allocation. It is considered that to refuse an application on the grounds of inadequate pedestrian facilities could be substantiated at appeal.

4.23 In terms of the four stated criterion, it is considered that the scheme has satisfied all of these requirements.

4.24 Given the contents of paragraph 49 of the NPPF it is necessary to determine whether the scheme represents sustainable development having regards to the content of the NPPF.

4.25 Sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. The NPPF goes on to stress in paragraph 8 that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.
4.26 The assessment is undertaken having regard to the three roles expressed within the NPPF, and which have been reiterated in policies DM1.1 and DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of each role also draws upon the relevant local plan policy where relevant.

Economic Role

4.27 The NPPF highlights the economic role as:

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

4.28 The scheme would 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

4.29 The NPPF confirms the social role as:

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

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

4.31 The social role highlights the need for housing to appropriate access to a range of accessible local services. Dickleburgh is identified as a Service Village and defined as having a good level of services and facilities. The site is well located in relation to the local community centre, Dickleburgh Primary School and regular bus services.

4.32 Norfolk County Council has confirmed that there is currently no spare capacity at the primary school and that 5 additional spaces would likely be generated from this development. However, it has been confirmed that additional spaces could be met by providing additional class rooms, improving/re-modelling existing class space etc and that these works would be funded through CIL as this is covered on the District Council’s Regulation 123 list. Therefore there is no objection in terms of primary school capacity.

4.33 It is evident that there is spare high school capacity provision and Dickleburgh is also a relatively short distance to Diss town centre which provides health care and a varied range of services.

4.34 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 7 of the 22 units would be affordable (33%) and is therefore considered acceptable.

4.35 In summary, Policy 15 of the JCS, Dickleburgh is identified as a Service Village and defined as having a good level of services and facilities. It is considered that the lack of available primary school places within Dickleburgh does not result in a scheme which does not fulfil the social role in the context of the NPPF and provides an attractive scheme for future residents. It is therefore considered that the scheme meets the social role of the NPPF.
Environmental Role

4.36 The NPPF confirms the environmental role as:

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

Layout, appearance and scale

4.37 The environmental role also seeks to secure a high quality built environment. The site layout and house types have been subject to revisions during the application process following discussions with the applicant.

4.38 In considering the overall scale of development, regard should be given to the density and form of existing development along Harvey Lane, which aims to reinforce both the cul de sac development along Harvey Lane which helps to establish and define the site. Regard should also be given to the density of development that reduces along the north and west boundaries of the site, in order to provide a transition from the built form along Limmer Avenue and Catchpole Walk. With regard to the overall density of development, this averages out at 20 houses to the hectare, which is considered a comparable average density in a rural location such as Dickleburgh, ensuring the efficient use of land, yet is reflective of the scale of the local area.

4.39 Having assessed the overall scale and form of development it is considered that the proposed scheme would respect the existing character and arrangement of development onto Harvey Lane as well as providing an acceptable transition of development to the open farmland to the east of the site, which displays a visual and physical connection to Dickleburgh.

4.40 House types have been considered in the context of the wider surroundings to help reinforce and enhance the local character of Dickleburgh. The house types use traditional forms and materials, yet have a distinctive appearance. House types fronting onto Harvey Lane have been designed to reflect the simple style of housing to the adjoining sites and pick up on the character of Dickleburgh. The height, scale and form of the proposed buildings are considered appropriate for the site and its context.

4.41 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.

4.42 Overall, it is considered that the amended scheme has been well thought out and results in a development with a locally inspired character that relates positively to its surroundings and Dickleburgh. Information has also been submitted that demonstrates how the proposals comply with the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide design.

4.43 It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS, section 7 of the NPPS and policy DM1.4, DM3.9 and DM4.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD have been met.
Public Open Space and Landscaping

4.44 In terms of landscape impact concern has been expressed about the impact of the development on the open countryside and the rural character of the site. It is evident that there is a need to ensure the development has a defined relationship to the open countryside, particularly to the eastern boundary whilst respecting housing densities and the character of surrounding existing development. The boundary itself is proposed as a new native hedgerow with trees, giving a clear and defined edge to the village in this location. A hedge to the front of the site to the east of plot no. 22 is also proposed.

4.45 In considering this the Landscape Architect has confirmed that he has no objections to the proposals and it is considered that the layout has good visual links to the surrounding countryside to the east, which provides a positive transition from build form to the countryside.

4.46 With regards to public open space, Policy DM3.15 requires new housing development to ‘provide adequate outdoor play facilities and recreational open space commensurate with the level of development proposed in order to meet the need of occupants. Paragraph 3.107 of the Local Plan states that ‘any specific local space requirements will be set out in the site allocations policy’. Policy DIC1 makes no reference to any specific open space requirement, however the Councils Recreational Open Space Standards for Residential Areas, requires a minimum amount of children’s play space to be provided unless a financial contribution in lieu of onsite provision for play space if deemed appropriate.

4.47 In this case, the Council’s Play and Amenities Officer has assessed the proposals and considers it appropriate to secure a financial sum which can be spent on improving existing facilities identified with the village. A sum has been calculated by the Play and Amenities Officer taking into account non provision of onsite play space and a sum for non-provision of toddler play equipment where the contribution would go to the local authority (SNC) to likely be used for the existing facilities at the Village Hall where there is an identified local need. This provision will be secured through the S106 Agreement.

4.48 In summary, whilst the concerns are acknowledged in respect of the impact of the development on the open countryside, it is considered that the current scheme does not lead to significant harm in terms of landscape impact. Therefore subject to a detailed landscaping scheme and management plan to be agreed by condition, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this respect and would accord with the aims of Policy DIC1, DM3.15, DM4.8 and DM4.9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, JCS Policies 1 and 2 and section 11 of the NPPF

Ecology and Protected Species

4.49 This application has been supported by an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey (Southern Ecological Solutions, March 2016) which has been assessed by Norfolk County Council Natural Environment Team. The assessment concludes that the proposed development is likely to have a limited impact on protected habitats and species. However, it does state that there is potential for biodiversity enhancement, which could be implemented. As such it is recommended that a Biodiversity Management Plan is conditioned which commits to the recommendations made in the aforementioned report, and also details biodiversity enhancements for the site. The County Ecologist has confirmed that the proposals are acceptable subject to the imposition of the above condition and as such meet the requirements of the development plan and NPPF.
Heritage assets

4.50 There are no listed buildings located within the application site and that the site is not within a Conservation Area. However there is a World War II Pill Box (type 22) located approximately 20m to east of the site. Whilst the pill box is of local interest and can be considered an undesignated heritage asset, it is considered that due to the location of the pill box outside of the site, that the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on the undesignated heritage asset and is therefore considered acceptable in terms of policy DM4.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.51 In addition to the Development Plan policies, S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In consideration of the Council’s duties under those Acts it is considered, for the reasons set out above, that the proposal would not adversely affect the special architectural or historic interest of the heritage asset, which is not listed.

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

4.53 Having due regard to the above assessment in relation to sustainable development it is considered that this higher number of dwellings proposed is acceptable in this instance and will not result in any adverse impact that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of delivering housing on this allocated site. It is therefore considered to accord with the requirements of the NPPF and also 1 b) of Policy DM1.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and JCS.

Other issues

Surface water drainage

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

4.55 The Lead Local Flood Authority has confirmed that it does not wish to make any comments on the application. A condition is considered appropriate to agree details for surface water drainage, including management and maintenance.

Foul water

4.56 The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Rectory Road Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for the proposed flows. Anglin Water has confirmed that the sewerage system at present has available capacity for this development and has raised no objections. Therefore the impacts on the foul water are considered acceptable and accords with Policy 1 of the JCS.

Access and Highways

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

4.58 A single point of access is proposed on to Harvey Lane to serve the development and this is acceptable to the Highway Authority.

4.59 The alterations to the junction at Harvey Lane and the Street is acceptable subject to the final design being agreed with the Highway Authority which is to be secured via planning condition.
4.60 As referred to above in the report, the Highway Authority consider that the footpath on Harvey Lane adjacent to the school should be re-sited to the opposite side of Harvey Lane for the reasons set out above. In terms of determining the application as submitted officers consider that whilst not the optimum solution it is an adequate one having due regard to the wording contained within the allocation.

4.61 Other highway works include the provision of a new pedestrian footpath along the front of the site set behind the proposed open space fronting onto Beccles Road. The footpath will connect to the existing public footpath to the northwest and College Road to the southeast to enable safe access to services in the village.

4.62 Amended plans have been submitted to address the technical design amendments required by the Highway Authority. Based on these amended plans the Highway Authority indicate they have no objection to the application subject to the imposition of conditions which include details of the future management and maintenance of the streets within the development, detailed plans of the roads, footways, standard construction specification, and a scheme for onsite parking for construction workers.

Contamination

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

Sustainable construction/renewable energy

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

Other considerations

4.65 Under paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires Councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes. This can be a material planning where self-build has been identified as the method of delivering the site. As no indication of self-build has been given by the applicant it is considered that the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

Section 106 Agreement and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

4.66 The application is liable for CIL and a liability notice would be issued with any consent granted. A draft S106 Agreement has been prepared and should consent be granted the S106 would need to be entered into to cover Affordable Housing and a contribution for non-provision of onsite play space and a sum for non-provision of toddler play equipment.

Financial Considerations

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.
5 Conclusion

5.1 The principle of the application is acceptable on this site allocation and is considered to represent a sustainable form of development. It is considered that the proposals as amended, results in a scheme that delivers a high quality design and layout which is well considered for its rural edge location with its own distinctive character that relates positively to its surroundings and existing dwellings. It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 1, 2, 4 and 15 of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan Policies DM1.1, DM1.3, DM1.4, DM3.1, DM3.2, DM3.8, DM3.11, DM3.12, DM3.13, DM3.14, DM3.16, DM4.2, DM4.3, DM4.8, DM4.9, DM4.10 and Policy DIC1 of the Site Specifics Allocations and Policies Document have been met. All other matters are considered acceptable and subject to the imposition of conditions and a S106 obligation the application is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Watts 01508 533765 cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2  Appl. No  :  2016/1627/O  
Parish  :  PORINGLAND  

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

Recommendation  :  Authorise Director of Growth and Localism to approve subject to surface water matters being adequately resolved and submission of a viability assessment to demonstrate affordable housing can be secured.

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

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

1. Planning Policies  

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 3 : Energy and water  
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
Policy 14 : Key Service Centres  
Policy 17 : Small rural communities and the countryside  

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.1 : Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.1 : Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.10 : Promotion of sustainable transport  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management  
DM4.3 : Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
Development Management Committee 7 December 2016

DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 No recent planning history directly relevant to this site

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  Object
- contrary to Local Plan policies relating to development boundaries
- it exacerbates the problems well known and documented within the Poringland Urban Drainage Strategy as it does not as it does not detail how surface /flood water will be treated on a site that is known for flooding and integral to the drainage strategy
- involves the removal of a quantity of mature trees
- the site will significantly overlook the properties on Tubby Drive
- the proposed site is an overcrowded ribbon development
- the Council is concerned as about how services will get to the site, as they will need access through the Norfolk Homes development and then under the River Chet
- there is a lack of definition around the site access

3.2 District Member I have the following observations:
- it is a nice looking sketch but as the application is outline only, if the application were to include layout and siting it would carry some weight
- it is a 5 year land supply application but as things stand they have no access and no mains sewerage connection to the best of my knowledge. Surface water problems in this part of Poringland are well known.
- the crossing and piping of a stream would require NCC consent
- site measurement of 0.99ha means flood risk assessment won't need to be carried out. NCC Flood Officer should be consulted
- Heath Loke Farm had several abandoned vehicles and turned into a bit of a scrap yard by the late Mr Youngman and historically there was a wood yard which I suspect involved timber treatments. Therefore ground contamination testing may be appropriate

3.3 Anglian Water Services Ltd  To be reported

3.4 SNC Conservation And Design  Concerns with layout as originally submitted; comments on amended plans to be reported

3.5 NCC Ecologist  Conditional support

3.6 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team  Conditional support
3.7 NCC Highways
Concerns with layout as originally submitted; comments on amended plans to be reported

3.8 SNC Housing
Enabling & Strategy Manager
Conditional Support
- the mix on the indicative site layout is acceptable
- I note that the application is for 19 dwellings, with 7 affordable houses indicated. Under JCS Policy 4 the affordable housing requirement of 6 affordable dwellings is unchanged (19 x 33% = 6.27, rounded down to 6). I would suggest this is resolved now rather than a later date by retaining Plots 10-15 as affordable homes with Plot 16 no longer an affordable dwelling
- there is no mention of tenure. JCS Policy 4 specifies 85% of the affordable homes for rent, with 15% to be intermediate tenures. On this basis I wish one of the 3 bedroom houses to be for shared ownership or shared equity, with the remaining five to be for rent.

3.9 SNC Water
Management Officer
To be reported

3.10 NHS England
No comments received

3.11 NHSCCG
No comments received

3.12 NCC Lead Local
Flood Authority
Objection to original application due to lack of flood risk assessment; comments on subsequently submitted flood risk assessment to be reported.

3.13 Norfolk And
Waveney Local
Medical Council
No comments received

3.14 SNC Play and
Amenities Technical
Advisor
- Would prefer to leave the open space as a grassed area and receive an amount of money for off-site provision
- Open space close to the properties which may have potential issues in the future

3.15 NCC Planning
Obligations Co-Ordinator
Education and library contributions to be delivered through CIL
Although the schools have capacity there are three developments already permitted in Poringland equating to 310 houses meaning there are insufficient places at Poringland Primary & Nursery School

3.16 SNC Landscape
Architect
Concerns with layout as originally submitted; comments on amended plans to be reported.

3.17 Norfolk Fire Service
Station Master
Conditional support

3.18 Other
Representations
1 letter of objection to the amended plans
- Will still be a drastic effect on privacy from overlooking
- Repeat previous comments regarding misleading comments in supporting information, need for housing being met elsewhere in Poringland and loss of trees
4 letters of objection to the originally submitted plans

- acknowledge the existence and importance of the NPPF and the Government's commitment to improve the supply of housing, however there are four large developments in the local area which contribute to this commitment in accordance with the Local Plan. Approval of this scheme would call into question the validity and purpose of the Local Plan
- the proposed dwellings would ruin the view from my main living space, which currently overlooks beautiful open fields with horses
- landscaping would enclose our currently open boundary
- the statement that built-up areas effectively encircle the site is far from accurate as the land directly to the west and south is open grassland
- the noise from the building work would be disruptive when I work from home
- the proposed dwellings would overlook existing properties
- noise from traffic once the development is completed, currently only sounds of nature can be heard
- development would inevitably result in an increase in traffic through Tubby Drive which is a private drive; it will also become an obvious shortcut for pedestrians using the local park, Budgens and community facilities
- insufficient consideration has been given to the headwaters of the River Chet which runs along the eastern boundary of the site; development would require three river crossings
- in times of heavy rain a surface 'river' forms on the field, with significant areas of standing water
- removal of trees would affect the visual outlook of a large number of properties as they can be seen above existing houses
- local facilities are already overburdened
- concerned about possible effects to existing wildlife in the area - bats, woodpeckers and owls have been seen on the site

4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The site comprises partly of land used as a paddock and partly land that has been left and is now partially wooded. The site is immediately to the west of a site that is allocated for development, originally within the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and now within the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document of the Local Plan 2015 by Policy POR4. The allocation, which is being developed by Norfolk Homes, is within the Key Service Centre of Poringland and is in the process of being built out.

4.2 Adjoining the site to the south is the alignment of the private drive Heath Loke, which has been bisected by the spine road of the new development and is no longer accessible. To the west is land that currently forms part of the same portion of the land as the application site and therefore the site currently has no physical boundary on its western side.

4.3 The recently built development on the allocated site to the east consists of a mix of two storey properties. To the north of the site development of the allocation is ongoing. The entire boundary between the site and the Norfolk Homes site is defined by a watercourse that forms the headwaters of the River Chet.
The application

4.4 The application is an outline application for 19 dwellings, with all matters reserved other than access. The application proposes affordable housing to be in line with the policy requirements of Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy. This equates to 6 units.

4.5 Vehicular access is proposed from the north-east through the allocated site. This area of the allocation is still under construction and the road from which the development is to be allocated is still under construction and therefore not publicly accessible. In addition, a pedestrian access is proposed from the completed section of the allocation at Utting Close.

4.6 Both accesses will need to cross the River Chet. A further pedestrian access has been shown to the south to link up with Heath Loke.

4.7 The main issue for consideration is the principle of development along with consideration of access, the impact of the development on the character of the area and on trees on the site, its relationship with the built and being built dwellings on the Norfolk Homes site, ecology and affordable housing. Another key issue in the Poringland area is drainage and following an objection from the Lead Local Flood Authority, the applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage and Sustainable Urban Drainage Strategy (SUDS).

Principle of development

4.8 The site falls outside of the development boundary for Poringland, albeit the site is immediately adjacent to the boundary. Policy DM1.3 states that permission for development outside of development boundaries will only be granted where specific Development Management Policies allow for development outside of development boundaries or where development otherwise demonstrates overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environmental dimensions as set out in Policy DM1.1.

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

Economic Role

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

4.11 The construction of 18 dwellings in a location adjacent to a Key Service Centre would help enhance the economic viability of that service centre through local spending from future occupants of the dwellings.

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

Social Role

4.13 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."
4.14 The principle social benefit of the scheme is that it provides housing within a location where a 5-year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated. The site is dependent on completion of the allocation for access to the site which questions the speed of delivery of development on the site. However, work is well advanced on the allocation as a whole with work underway on the estate road from which the site will be accessed and the housing immediately adjacent to the access. As such, there is no reason to believe that this site will not be delivered within a short timeframe. In order to ensure a prompt delivery of the development to meet the need for new housing it is proposed that a reduced timeframe for the submission of reserved matters is included with any approval.

4.15 In addition and as noted above, the proposal includes the provision of affordable housing to the requirements of Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy. This will help meet an identified need within the district for affordable housing. This is a significant benefit when weighing the benefits against the harm of a proposal such as this. However, to reply on this as a significant benefit in the planning balance officers will seek a viability assessment for the proposed development that demonstrates that this benefit can be secured when taking into account all other costs on the site. As this is not submitted as yet, delegated authority is sought to enable this information to be submitted and assessed by officer.

4.16 As mentioned above, the site is located adjacent to the development boundary of Poringland, which is identified as a Key Service Centre within the Joint Core Strategy. This contains a wide range of services including primary and secondary education provision, healthcare, a small supermarket and other shops, and a range of community facilities. These services can be accessed on foot through the built out part of the allocation and access to services within the north of the village, which include the high school, will improve when more direct links become available through completion of development of the allocation.

4.17 Norfolk County Council have commented that there are potential capacity issues at Poringland Primary and Nursery School to accommodate children given the level of permitted development elsewhere in Poringland. However, the number of children likely to require school places from this development are two at nursery school age and five at primary school age. It is not considered that given such small numbers that this could be considered significant and demonstrable harm and therefore it is not considered to be grounds to refuse the application. There would be a Community Infrastructure Levy contribution associated with this development if approved in any case that could contribute towards such infrastructure issues.

Environmental Role

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

4.19 The development would result in an infringement into open countryside. The local landscape is flat and not subject to any specific designation that would constrain further from the fact that it is outside of the development boundary. Given that appeal decisions elsewhere have allowed development on land which is covered by specific designations due to the absence of an adequate housing land supply, there would need to be very special circumstances in which grounds for refusal based on the landscape impact of development on this site. The site is not prominent with the only public views of it being from the footpaths within the new development. If viewed at all from the open countryside to the west it would appear against a backdrop of the new development. As a consequence, it is not considered that the harm from the visual impact on the landscape of developing this site would be significant.
4.20 As originally submitted some concerns were raised about how the indicative layout related to the existing new development and landscaping features such as the watercourse on the boundary. Whilst the issue of layout will be determined at reserved matters stage, it is beneficial that the applicant demonstrates that the housing can be delivered on the site through an acceptable indicative layout. An amended indicative layout has now been provided that reduces the potential for any adverse impact on the existing properties by moving the new dwellings away from the boundary whilst also allowing for the retention of more trees than previously and providing open space alongside the watercourse to allow it to be a feature that unites the site with the Norfolk Homes development.

4.21 Concerns have also been raised the impact on the amenities of existing residential properties from disturbance during construction of the dwellings. A condition is recommended by the Council's Community Protection Team to require a construction management plan to minimise the disturbance to existing residents during the construction phase.

4.22 An Ecological Report has been submitted in support of this application. Norfolk County Council's Ecologist has commented that it appears fit for purpose. The Ecologist does recommend that enhancements should be considered and identifies that five bat boxes / tiles and five bird boxes would be appropriate for this size of development.

4.23 The site is within Flood Risk Zone 1 and therefore not considered to be at risk from fluvial flooding. However, Poringland is an area with known surface water drainage issues. As a consequence and as mentioned above, the Lead Local Flood Authority objected to the application as it was not accompanied by a flood risk assessment. An assessment has now been submitted, however the Lead Local Flood Authority's comments in response to the assessment are not yet available. As a consequence, the recommendation is subject to the assessment being acceptable to the Lead Local Flood Authority and surface water matters being adequately addressed.

4.24 Public open space is provided within the site to the level required by the Council's guidance on open space provision. The Council's Play and Amenities Technical Advisor has commented that he would prefer to see if the open space is a grassed area with money provided for off-site provision of play equipment.

4.25 Some concern has also been raised about historic uses of the site and surrounding area which may result in contamination issues. The Council's Community Protection Team have recommended conditions to be imposed on any permission to ensure that if there is any contamination it is detected and mitigated against appropriately. It is not thought likely that there is any likely contamination that would prevent development of the site.

4.26 Air source heat pumps are proposed to generate the required 10% renewable energy under policy 3 of the Joint Core Strategy. A condition is also recommended to ensure appropriate water efficiency measures are secured as required by the same policy.

4.27 The method of disposing of foul water has not been identified, and Anglian Water had at the time of writing this report not commented on the application. These comments will be reported to committee at the meeting.
Summary of sustainable development consideration

4.28 Having due regard to the above assessment made in the context of not being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, it is considered that the benefits of providing additional housing is sufficiently high that the concerns in regard to encroachment into the countryside are outweighed by the benefits as it is not considered that the visual impact would cause harm as to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits as set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF. It is also evident that there are no other planning concerns, for example neighbour amenity issues, which would result in such harm that it outweighs the benefits to the extent required in the NPPF.

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

Highway Safety

4.30 A number of comments have been raised about the suitability of the estate roads to access the site, with particular concern about Tubby Drive. Norfolk County Council's Highways Officer has been consulted about the proposal. Whilst they raised a number of technical concerns about the proposal as first submitted they have not questioned the suitability of the estate roads within the allocation to be able to safely accommodate traffic from the additional dwellings. As such, it would be difficult to substantiate a refusal on these grounds. The scheme has been revised to address these technical concerns and it is understood that the Highway Authority are not largely satisfied with the revised scheme although their final comments were not available at the time of writing the report and will be reported to committee.

Other issues

4.31 Under paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires Councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes. This can be a material planning where self-build has been identified as the method of delivering the site. As no indication of self-build has been given by the applicant it is considered that the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

4.32 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.

4.33 The development will be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) at the reserved matters stage.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The level of harm identified is not sufficient to present significant and demonstrable harm that outweighs the benefit of providing additional housing in a location where it is not possible to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. As such, the land supply policies are out of date and the development proposed considered sustainable development and recommended for approval, subject to demonstration that surface water can be adequately disposed of and that affordable housing can be provided to a level that accords with the Joint Core Strategy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker 01508 533848 tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Appl. No : 2016/2153/F
Parish : STOKE HOLY CROSS

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

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

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

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 04 : Promoting sustainable transport
NPPF 06 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.1 : Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development
DM3.1 : Meeting Housing requirements and needs
DM3.8 : Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.10 : Promotion of sustainable transport
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM3.14 : Pollution, health and safety
DM3.15 : Outdoor play facilities/recreational space
DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design

2. Planning History

2.1 2012/2034 New access to land adjacent to Long Lane, provision of 50 houses, road and car park Approved

2.2 2013/1333 Residential Development Withdrawn

2.3 2013/2209 Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 2012/2034/F - Amended house type design and layout. Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Amended scheme:
Comments awaited

Original scheme:
We are aware that this site is an allocated site in the South Norfolk Local Plan and therefore the principle of development has been established. Whilst this is accepted by the Parish Council, serious concerns have been expressed by local residents which we feel need to be taken into account when this application is determined. These primarily concern access both within the site and on the surrounding highway network. These concerns are as follows:

1. The Adequacy of Broomefield Road to Accommodate the Proposed Development

- We are also concerned, as are many residents of the Broomefield’s development, with the width of the only access road to this new development. We have checked the status of the Broomefield Road as constructed and understand that technically, it is designed for a maximum of 100 dwellings. With the application in front of you however, there will be a total number of 106 houses using the access road.
- Whilst this is only a marginal increase, the design of Broomefield Road with its twists and turns will in the opinion of many make it unsuitable for the increased traffic that will result from this application.
- There are already problems when any large vehicles enter the site it is difficult if not impossible to pass this type of vehicle. It is clear that large vehicles such as refuse trucks and emergency vehicles will not be able to gain entry due to the inevitable vehicles legally parked on the road.
- We therefore endorse the opinion of many of the residents of Broomefield Road that the road does not meet the necessary standard required for this further development, as presently constructed.
2. The Impact on Existing Village Facilities

- The amount of recent and proposed development in Lower Stoke is disproportionate to the scale of the existing village. The existing infrastructure will in our opinion become over stretched. as a result of the totally inadequate provision made in the previous applications or in this application to update infrastructure deficiencies, that are the responsibility of SNC or NCC such as roads and footpaths.

- A particular concern is the lack of a footway and cycleway between lower and upper Stoke which means that residents, who in many instances are schoolchildren have to negotiate a busy unrestricted country road with all the hazards of highway safety this inevitably causes. We therefore believe that as part of the planning process, SNC should negotiate sufficient funds by way of a 106 agreement for the construction of a Footpath/Cycleway from lower stoke to Upper Stoke, i.e. From No.1 Long Lane to St Georges Hall. In making this request, it must be borne in mind that Stoke children mainly attend Framingham High School and many of the service facilities for the village are located in Poringland. Long Lane is currently an extremely dangerous stretch of road for both cyclists and pedestrians.

- Furthermore this requirement for the village has been identified in two recent comprehensive village surveys, which have indicated that a footway/cycle path between lower and upper Stoke and the renewal of the Pavilion are the most needed items in the village.

- We therefore consider that the construction of the path funded by the developer in conjunction with Norfolk County Council, is necessary to ensure that the new development not only meets the criteria for sustainability, but also results in a safe environment for road users, and particularly the residents of the new developments.

- We are aware that we will be eligible for CIL monies from this development but this will be insufficient to fund a new link. The Parish Council cannot raise funds itself particularly as it is currently seeking funds to improve the Pavilion to cope with the additional population resulting from this and the other developments, which in total amount to 142 new houses. The increased population and the age of the Pavilion necessitate the urgent upgrade or replacement of the building, with particular concern for facilities for the Pre School that operates from the building.

- NCC is aware of our concerns over the dangerous nature of this road for cyclists and pedestrians so we believe that the provision of funds by the developer should be provided to enable the Footpath/Cycleway to be constructed.

- The amount of money that the PC will directly receive from the CIL payment by the developer is a meagre sum when compared to the monies previously granted to the PC with the previous developments, and will clearly be inadequate to fund a new footway/cycle path.

- We therefore feel that the balance of the CIL money after deducting the contribution to the PC could be used to fund the much needed infrastructure improvements such as the new footway and the replacement pavilion, that the village surveys have clearly identified.
3. Recommendation
We therefore consider that there should be further negotiations with the developer to redress the above shortcomings to the access road and village infrastructure, and that this application should not be progressed until the above concerns have been brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

Additional comment
- We understand that a Construction Traffic Plan can be included in the planning permission approval as a condition and would welcome consultation on this.
- We were also asked if Hopkins Homes had considered asking David Kidner, the owner of an adjacent field, if he would consider this area being used as an unloading areas for the duration of the build to reduce the concerns of occupiers of Broomefields.

3.2 District Member
Cllr Lewis - This application should only be determined by the committee. Reason - question of whether the access road is adequate for the total number of houses to be served by it.

3.3 NCC Planning Obligations Co-Ordinator
Amended and original scheme:
No objections, however, CIL funds will be required in respect of education and green infrastructure

3.4 Historic Environment Service
Amended scheme:
To be reported.

Original scheme:
No objection subject to conditions

3.5 Norfolk Fire Service Station Master
Amended and original scheme:
No objection subject to a condition

3.6 SNC Landscape Architect
Amended scheme:
To be reported.

3.7 Anglian Water Services Ltd
No objection subject to a condition

3.8 SNC Conservation And Design
Amended scheme:
To be reported.

Original scheme:
Revisions are needed to improve the layout.

3.9 NCC Highways
Amended scheme:
To be reported.

Original scheme:
No objection in principle, a number of detailed revisions required

3.10 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority
Amended scheme:
No objection subject to conditions

Original scheme:
Objection, further information required.
3.11 NCC Ecologist
Amended scheme:
To be reported.

Original scheme:
No objection subject to a condition and the bat roosting potential of the tree to be removed being established.

3.12 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team
Amended scheme:
To be reported.

Original scheme:
No objection subject to conditions

3.13 SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager
Amended and original scheme:
No objection.

3.14 Heathgate Surgery
No comments received

3.15 NHSCCG
No comments received

3.16 NHS England
No comments received

3.17 Other Representations
18 objections have been received. A summary of these is as follows:
- Unacceptable additional burden on the village
- Council should have regard to landowners restrictions placed upon the land
- Unacceptable increase in traffic
- Detrimental to child safety
- Broomefield Rd is too narrow
- Detrimental impact on bats and birds
- The site is an area of beauty
- Concern over drainage capacity
- Excessive noise, dust and obstruction on Broomefield Rd already the development would exacerbate these problems
- Hopkin Homes did not inform buyers on Broomefield Road that further development would happen.
- Will be detrimental to the Broomefield Rd development
- Additional noise from increased traffic
- Devaluation of homes
- Strain on local resources, including school which is oversubscribed
- Alternative access arrangements should be found
- Parking problems on the existing Hopkins scheme
- First phase should have been better planned
- Total number of houses exceeds the 100 dwellings in STO1 allocation
- Anglian water and JSM consulting traffic engineers have based their view on 47 not 53 dwellings

4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The site lies on the eastern edge of Stoke Holy Cross, a rural settlement and to the west of a development site being built out by the applicant, Hopkin Homes, which in turn will provide access to the application site.
To the north of the site is the Stoke Holy Cross Primary School and to the west are the rear boundaries of residential properties on Five Acres.

The application seeks full planning permission for 53 residential dwellings, of which 17 will be affordable.

The properties would consist of the following:

**Market Housing (36 in total)**
- 2 x 2 bedroom units including 1 bungalow
- 6 x 3 bedroom units
- 17 x 4 bedroom units
- 11 x 5 bedroom units

**Affordable Housing (17 in total)**
- 4 x 1 bedroom units (apartments)
- 10 x 2 bedroom units including 2 bungalows
- 3 x 3 bedroom units including 1 bungalow

The development would be accessed via Broomfield Road to the north-east. The development also makes provision for the expansion of the grounds of the neighbouring primary school, as well public open space including equipped areas and a cycle/pedestrian only route to the adjacent Five Acres development located to the west of the application site.

**Key planning issues**

It is evident that the site is covered by Policy STO1 of the Adopted Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document and as such it is appropriate to consider the scheme in the context of this allocation.

Policy STO1 states that:

- The site comprises of a field to the south of the school and part of a field adjoining the eastern extent of development on the southern side of Long Lane. The site immediately adjoins the school’s southern boundary and therefore allows for the extension of the school into the site. The site also adjoins existing development on Five Acres to the west in which pedestrian and cycle access is possible, as well as the potential to link to existing amenity land. Land amounting to some 6.7 hectares is allocated for housing and associated infrastructure including expanded school facilities. This allocation could accommodate approximately 100 dwellings.

The developer of the site is required to provide the following:

1. **Vehicular access to the development from Long Lane with pedestrian and cycle access also provided from Five Acres**
2. **Local highways improvements and the provision of a safe access**
3. **Open space on the southern boundary of the site to provide an expansion of the open space at the southern end of Five Acres**
4. **The development shall allow for expansion and improvement of the facilities at the adjoining Primary School to be agreed with the Education Authority**
4.8 Firstly, it should be noted that this application covers only part of the allocation site, with the remainder having been granted planning permission under 2013/2209 for 50 dwellings. On this basis the consented scheme and the proposed scheme total 104 dwellings which is considered to consistent with the aim of the allocation to deliver approximately 100 dwellings.

4.9 The first criterion within the allocation requires:

_Vehicular access to the development from Long Lane with pedestrian and cycle access also provided from Five Acres_

4.10 The site is accessed via Broomefiled Road which in turn connects to Long Lane and pedestrian and cycle access only is afforded to Five Acres. This arrangement is acceptable to the Highway Authority. For these reasons the first criterion is satisfied.

4.11 The second criterion requires:

_Local highways improvements and the provision of a safe access_

4.12 It is evident that the adjacent Hopkins Homes development (which forms part of the allocation STO1) delivered off-site highway improvements to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority under 2013/2209 and as such no further local highway improvements are required as a consequence of the current application. As above the Highway Authority has confirmed that it has no objection the proposed access to the site. For these reasons the second criterion has been met.

4.13 The third criterion requires:

_Open space on the southern boundary of the site to provide an expansion of the open space at the southern end of Five Acres._

The layout makes provision for this and as such this criterion has been met.

4.14 The fourth criterion requires:

_The development shall allow for expansion and improvement of the facilities at the adjoining Primary School to be agreed with the Education Authority_

4.15 Land has been made available to the satisfaction of the Local Education Authority and this will be secured via a S106 legal agreement. On this basis the fourth criterion has been met.

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

4.17 Given the contents of paragraph 49 of the NPPF it is necessary to determine whether the scheme represents sustainable development having regards to the content of the NPPF.

4.18 Sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. The NPPF goes on to stress in paragraph 8 that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.

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

4.20 The NPPF highlights the economic role as:

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

The scheme would result in some short term economic benefits as part of any construction work 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

4.21 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."

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

4.23 The social role highlights the need for housing to appropriate access to a range of accessible local services.

4.24 Significant concern has been expressed locally in respect of the lack of infrastructure available.

4.25 In terms of school capacity, Norfolk County Council has been consulted in their capacity as local education authority and they have confirmed that they have no objection.

4.26 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 17 of the 53 units would be affordable. It is necessary to consider this in the context of their adjacent development, which makes up the remainder of the allocation STO1 insofar as looking at the total number of affordable units across both sites. In doing so there would be 34 affordable units from 103 dwellings which equates to 33% which is policy compliant. These would be secured as part of a S106 legal agreement. The proposed mix and tenure split is considered to be acceptable by the Council’s Housing Enabling and Strategy Manager.

4.27 The social role also seeks to secure a high quality built environment. The site layout and house types have been subject to revisions during the application process and consequently the proposal is now considered to represent an appropriate layout in planning terms with appropriately designed and detailed house types. The Council’s Senior Conservation and Design Officer will complete a Building for Life Assessment on the scheme which will be reported to the Development Management Committee, however, from initial discussions with the officer it envisaged that a satisfactory score has been achieved.
4.28 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 are such that adequate separation distances are provided to safeguard light, outlook and privacy levels. 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.

4.29 It is considered that the scheme does satisfy the social role as defined within the NPPF and also the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS, section 7 of the NPPS and policy DM1.4, DM3.9 and DM4.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD have been met.

Environmental Role

4.30 The NPPF confirms the environmental role as:

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

Ecology and Protected Species

4.31 The application is supported by an extended phase 1 Habitat Survey which is regarded as fit for purpose by Norfolk County Council's Natural Environment Team and subject to a condition relating to the agreement of a biodiversity management plan is acceptable. They have raised the issue of trees to the north representing a potential habitat for protected species, and that it is unclear whether any are to be lost as a consequence of the development. If any are to be lost, their potential for bat roosting should be ascertained. It is evident that one tree and section of hedging is to be lost and the agent has been asked to provide a response to this query. This will be updated to the committee accordingly.

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

4.33 In terms of the environmental role, it is considered the scheme fulfils this role subject to the resolution of the point relating to bat roost potential in the tree to be lost being addressed.

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

Other issues

Surface water drainage

4.35 In terms of the surface water drainage implications of the scheme. The Council has consulted the LLFA and they have confirmed they have no objection.

Foul water drainage

4.36 Anglian Water has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity to deal with foul water drainage from the development.
Contamination

4.37 Policy DM3.14 has regard to development and contamination. The Environmental Protection Officer has confirmed that they have no objections to this planning application subject to a condition requiring an investigation and risk assessment being submitted and agreed with the Council and the implementation of any agreed remediation scheme as well as a condition to report any unexpected contamination that is found.

Construction Implications

4.38 The Council’s Environmental Protection Officer has requested a noise and dust management scheme be submitted and agreed with the Council in order to safeguard amenity. Likewise, given the concerns expressed in respect of construction traffic it is possible to consider requesting a construction traffic management plan. This could be confirmed in the response of the Highway Authority which will be reported to committee.

Sustainable construction/renewable energy

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

4.40 Section 106 Agreement and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
The application is liable for CIL and a liability notice would be issued with any consent granted. A draft S106 Agreement has been prepared and should consent be granted the S106 would need to be entered into to cover Affordable Housing and the transfer of land for the school site expansion.

Financial Considerations

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

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

5 Conclusion

5.1 The principle of residential development is acceptable on this site allocation (STO1) and is considered to represent a sustainable form of development. It is considered that the proposals as amended, results in a scheme that delivers a high quality design and layout which is well considered and relates satisfactorily to its surroundings. The scheme provides for safe vehicular access arrangements and would safeguard the amenities of existing residents. It is therefore considered that the requirements of the relevant policies of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan have been met subject to the imposition of conditions and a S106 obligation the application is recommended for approval.

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

4  **Appl. No**: 2016/1838/F  
**Parish**: ROYDON

Applicants Name: Mrs Tracey Allen  
Site Address: 18 Tudor Avenue Roydon Norfolk IP22 5SQ  
Proposal: Proposed increase in childminding business from 6 to 12 children

Recommendation: Approval of 12 months temporary consent with Conditions
1. 12 months temporary use  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Maximum number of children  
4. Hours/days of use

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 5: The Economy  
Policy 7: Supporting Communities  
Policy 15: Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM2.1: Employment and business development  
DM2.3: Working at home  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No recent history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
**AMENDED PROPOSAL**  
Refuse  
- The increase in children would lead to an unacceptable amount of additional traffic in narrow residential streets and disturbance to neighbours

**ORIGINAL PROPOSAL**  
No response

3.2 District Member  
**AMENDED PROPOSAL**  
To be determined by committee  
- In view of impact on neighbours

**ORIGINAL PROPOSAL**  
To be determined by committee  
- Potential for considerable disruption to the neighbours
3.3 NCC Highways

AMENDED PROPOSAL
No response received

ORIGINAL PROPOSAL
No objections
• Not considered to be a highway safety problem with the numbers of children proposed

3.4 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team

AMENDED PROPOSAL
• Recommend temporary permission

ORIGINAL PROPOSAL
• Insufficient information provided

3.5 NCC Social Services

AMENDED PROPOSAL
No response received

ORIGINAL PROPOSAL
No response received

3.6 Other Representations

AMENDED
1 letter of objection
• Still object to the increase of 6 - 12 children due to the noise, disturbance and privacy issues as stated in original objection

ORIGINAL SUBMISSION
3 letters of support
• Applicant very, very good with children
• Cannot see why anyone would object as cars do not stop, only drop off

1 letter of objection
• Object on noise, privacy, disturbance and parking issues
• Noise is just bearable now
• There is plenty of loud voices, screaming and shouting
• An increase to 16 would make this unbearable
• Privacy issue through children looking into our property over the fence from play equipment

4 Assessment

4.1 The application relates to 18 Tudor Avenue, a detached dwelling situated on a corner plot within a residential development, surrounded by dwellings. The site is within the development limits for Roydon, a Service Village as defined in the JCS.

4.2 The dwelling has been used to run an existing childminding business (not requiring planning permission) but now, due to demand, it is proposed to increase the numbers of children above the threshold for which planning permission is required. This application seeks to increase numbers to up to 12 children. The application originally proposed an increase of children to 16, however following concerns raised regarding noise and disturbance, the application was amended to 12 children.

4.3 The site is located within a sustainable location close to large local populations in Roydon and Diss and is relatively close to the village primary school. The main issues with this application are impact of the increase in numbers of children on the amenity of local residents and on highway safety.
Policy 7 and Policy 15 of the JCS promotes services and facilities within local communities and encourages small scale employment or service development appropriate to the scale and needs of the village and its immediate surroundings. The provision of child care facilities is very much part of the service provision covered by policy 7 of the JCS and the expansion of the business will provide employment for 1 full time person and 1 part time covered by Policy 15 of the JCS.

The NCC Highways officer has commented that although the applicant suggests that parents can park on the frontage of the property, it is likely that most parents will park on Tudor Avenue to drop off and pick up children. As Tudor Avenue is of a good width, and taking into account the location within a residential estate, this is not considered to be a highway safety problem with the number of children proposed, in accordance with DM3.11 of SNLP. However, the additional vehicle movements may cause noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents.

The Environmental Quality Team commented on the original proposal that, in order to assess the proposal further, details were required of how noise would be managed in connection with the operation of the business. The proposal was subsequently amended to 12 children and details of noise management submitted.

The Environmental Quality Team remain concerned that due to the nature of childminding, and that the business is surrounded by other residential properties and garden areas, there is the potential for increased levels of noise generated as a result of the increase in numbers of children, in particular, the use of outside garden play space. In addition, an immediate neighbour has raised concerns in relation to noise and privacy from the existing situation.

The noise generated from the proposed increase in numbers may not be unreasonable and may not amount to a statutory nuisance under Nuisance Legislation. However, it may have a significant impact on the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling. As such, the Environmental Quality Team considers that the only accurate way to assess the impact of the increase in the number of children is to recommend a 12 months temporary permission.

Given that the proposal falls within the provision of Policies 7 and 15 of the JCS, it is not considered a refusal on the grounds of noise could be justified due to the nature of the business and the uncertainty as to whether or not the intensification of the business will result in an unreasonable impact on the existing amenities of the neighbouring residents.

It is considered that a temporary consent will allow the applicant, with suitable noise management in place, to demonstrate that the increase in numbers of children will not result in an unreasonable impact on the existing amenities of the neighbouring occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance, and will allow this existing local business to remain and continue to provide child care facilities within the community. The applicant would be agreeable to a temporary consent.

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

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

5.1 It is considered that the proposal could accord with policy and be acceptable in this location, but there is uncertainty about the actual level of disturbance that may arise. In these circumstances it is appropriate to grant a temporary permission to provide a test period to enable the use to be re-assessed after this period.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Rachel Flaxman 01508 533985 rflaxman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Development Management Committee 7 December 2016

5  **Appl. No**: 2016/2112/H  
   **Parish**: TACOLNESTON

Applicants Name: Mr Oliver Read  
Site Address: 1 Birkin Close Tacolneston Norfolk NR16 1BT  
Proposal: Side and rear extensions

**Recommendation**: Approval with Conditions
1. Time limit full permission  
2. In accord with amended plans

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**  
   NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**  
   Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
   Development Management Policies  
   DM3.4: Residential extensions and conversions within Settlements  
   DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
   DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
   DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life

2. **Planning History**

2.1 None

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council**  
   Object - extension large in comparison to original, proposed second floor does not fit with bungalows and overshadows

   **Following first amendment**  
   No further comments submitted

3.2 **District Member** Cllr Duffin  
   To be determined by Committee - consider design too large and not in keeping with surroundings

3.3 **Anglian Water Services Ltd**  
   Development within 15 metres of pumping station. Should not permit development potentially sensitive to disturbance from the operation of the station.

3.4 **Other Representations**  
   1 letter of objection and petition containing 19 signatures;
   - Two storey development out of keeping in bungalow development  
   - External finish out of keeping  
   - Residential amenity - overshadowing and loss of light  
   - Concerns for surface water drainage  
   - Would obstruct access to pumping station

   **Following first amendment**  
   3 letters of objection and petition containing 17 signatures;
   - Proposed double gable out of keeping with existing development  
   - Loss of privacy to Dovedale Road residents
Assessment

4.1 The application site comprises a detached bungalow on a corner plot at the junction of Birkin Close and Dovedale Road and within the development boundary for Tacolneston. This property is part of a cul de sac of similar properties and is bounded to the east by a turning head at the end of Dovedale Road. There is an Anglian Water pumping station on the south eastern boundary of the site which is accessed from the turning head.

4.2 This application originally proposed a rear extension and the raising of the roof of the extended dwelling to provide first floor accommodation. A single storey extension was also proposed. Following discussions with officers, amended plans have been submitted which propose single storey extensions to the side and rear elevations.

4.3 Policies in the JCS, local plan and the requirements of the NPPF seek to ensure that proposals are for an appropriate use, are of good design and do not adversely affect the character of the existing dwelling or the street scene to a material degree, or have an adverse impact on the privacy and amenities of neighbouring properties. The alteration of the existing dwelling is acceptable in principle. As such the main considerations are design and impact upon residential amenity.

4.4 The proposed extension to the rear elevation would maintain the same eaves and overall ridge height as existing and would project to a similar depth as the extended property on the western boundary. This element of the scheme would have no visual impact within the wider street. The proposed side extension would be set back slightly from the front elevation and is designed with a gable to the front elevation and a low eaves height along the eastern side. It is considered that the scale of the proposed extensions would be appropriate and that the use of a double gable design on the front elevation would minimise the scale of the roof of the extended dwelling. It is therefore considered that the proposed extensions would have an acceptable impact on the appearance of this dwelling.

4.5 The application site is a corner plot which has a wider frontage than others within this road. The proposed side extension would maintain a distance of 3.8 metres from the eastern boundary with Dovedale Road. The proposed extension would be seen in views along Dovedale Road from the north. While this would be a significant extension, it is considered that, due to its single storey design and low eaves height along its eastern side, it would not appear unduly prominent and so, on balance, would not cause harm to the appearance of the street sufficient to warrant the refusal of planning permission.

4.6 Concern has been expressed that the proposed extensions would adversely affect residential amenity. Any new windows proposed are now at ground floor and it is considered that the proposed extension would be sufficiently separated from properties to the east to ensure that it would not harm the privacy of existing occupiers. Similarly, because of the single storey design of this proposal, it would not appear overbearing or result in any loss of light. The applicant has confirmed that the existing vehicle access on the northern boundary will be retained and that they do not intend to seek any alternative access on the eastern boundary from the turning head. Such a proposal would, in any event, require the separate consent of the Highway Authority.

4.7 The proposed extension was originally to be finished in render. The applicant has now confirmed on the revised elevations that they intend to use facing brick to match existing which is considered acceptable.
The applicant has removed fencing along the eastern boundary and partially cleared some planting. They have confirmed that fencing will be re-instated along this boundary following any development.

Anglian Water has been consulted as their pumping station is located in the south eastern corner of the application site. They have raised no objections in principle but pointed out that development close to pumping stations may be at risk of nuisance caused by the normal operation of the station and have recommended that development sensitive to this should not be permitted within 15 metres. However, this dwelling is already sited within this distance and as this proposal is to extend an existing residential use, not for new development, this is not considered a sufficient reason to refuse the application in this instance.

Concern has been expressed that the extended dwelling could be subsequently divided into two properties. This application is for extension to a single dwelling only and such a proposal would require a separate planning permission.

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)

Conclusion

It is considered that the design of the proposed extensions are in keeping with the existing property and that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the amenity of either the immediate neighbours or the wider area. As such the proposal accords with the criteria set out within policies DM3.4 and DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015 and policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Blanaid Skipper 01508 533985 bskipper@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs Greenmore
Site Address: Rainbows End Norwich Road Denton IP20 0AN
Proposal: Retention of use as dog breeding facility

Recommendation: Refuse
1 – Noise disturbance
2 – Highway safety
3 – Not sustainable development

Authorise enforcement action to reduce the number of dogs on site to 6

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development
DM2.1: Employment and business development
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.5: Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.10: Heritage assets

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

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

2. Planning History

2.1 No relevant planning history
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council

Refuse
- Noise from the dogs - loss of amenity
- Position being in a residential area of the village
- Extra traffic created
- Concerns over waste management
- Number of dogs allowed to be reduced
- How is dog waste disposed of
- Agility classes not approved

3.2 District Member

Amended plan
To be determined by committee
- Have had complaints from local residents about the noise of barking dogs
- Concern about the number of dogs on site (35) the number of puppies these will produce, the continued development of the site and traffic generation in the village

To be determined by committee
- I have had several complaints about noise from dogs barking on this site.
- Need view from Environmental Health regarding nearest residential properties.

3.3 NCC Highways

- The entrance that serves Rainbow End residential property is narrow and has poor visibility to the north owing to the siting of the cottages on the north side of the entrance.
- Would not be able support the proposed use of the site using that means of access
- Note revised layout plan that the site will be served from the existing track further to the north which will serve as a hard standing for car parking.
- Whilst the principle of using the access track is acceptable, the current situation is unsatisfactory,
- The access and track is currently unsurfaced and visibility to the south is limited due to the extent of the vegetation on the roadside.
- In order to be satisfactory need to upgrade access and track to comply with NNC construction specification and visibility needs to be provided in both directions 2.4m x 43m.
- The applicant needs to advise how they are able to achieve the splay as only the access track is shown as being under their control
- The track and parking should be suitable standard for use by visiting members of the public
- Further information is required on the agility class numbers

3.4 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team

Object
- The application site is located in close proximity to a number of dwellings
- Applicant makes reference to converting and sound proofing buildings. But no details have been submitted
- Intention to have 30 breeding dogs - number of dogs will increase with puppies
- Total number of dogs would increase with dog agility classes
• Potential for dogs to bark, whine and howl which could occur any time of day and night.
• Insufficient information of details on how the applicant could control the number and the noise from the proposal.
• Without this information it is not possible to assess the full impact.
• Whilst it would be possible to implement some noise control measures such as sound proofing where the dogs are housed internally, it may be difficult to apply reasonable and enforceable planning conditions regarding external exercise areas or agility space having regard to the number of dogs.
• No details have been provided regarding disposal of dog waste or bedding.
• Whilst noise from the business may not arise all the time and amount to a statutory nuisance actionable under nuisance legislation, there is potential for the noise to have a significant impact on the amenity of surrounding residential properties.

3.5 Other Representations

Thirty letters of objection
• Noise has been unbearable and dogs barking for considerable periods during the day and night
• Noise from dogs has increased over the past few years
• More dogs will increase the noise
• Dogs will be excited during agility courses
• Inappropriate to have dogs barking in a residential area.
• More intrusive in summer months when gardens are used more and windows are open
• Sound proofing will only work when the dogs are inside
• Increased traffic and on street car parking near busy road junction, no footpaths
• Concern about the construction of fences and new buildings
• Rats are becoming a problem
• Smells from goats and other animals
• Disposal of waste
• Visibility splay not in applicants ownership
• Construction engineering works should be removed
• Agility classes would increase traffic
• Loss of property value

4 Assessment

4.1 The application relates to Rainbow End which is a detached bungalow in the village of Denton and the agricultural land to the south east. The bungalow is within the development limit for Denton but the rest of the site is within the open countryside.

4.2 This is a retrospective application to carry out dog breeding on the site. The applicant currently has five pet dogs and it is intended to have 30 breeding dogs (24 breeding bitches and 6 breeding stud males, split between three different breeds of dog on the site, this does not include puppies. It would appear that there has been some breeding of dogs on the site in the past on an incidental basis, but this has increased this year. At present there are around 16 adult dogs on the site plus puppies. It is proposed to use some of the existing buildings on site which are located in the residential curtilage of the dwelling and the fields to the south east. It is proposed to accommodate the dogs in existing buildings which is intended to sound proof, an exercise area has been fenced off for the dogs down the field and the statement submitted by the applicant also mentions creating bunding around the exercise area, but no details have been provided of this. It is proposed to access the site via a field access on to Norwich Road. The agility classes have been
deleted from the application. There are currently one full time and two part time employees and the applicant is looking to increase this by an additional full time and part time post.

4.3 Policy DM1.3 in the Development Management Policies seeks to locate new development in sustainable locations, the dwelling is within the development limit and the rest of the site is adjacent to it so in terms of accessibility it is not necessarily unacceptable.

4.4 A considerable number of letters of objection have been received raising concern about the amount of noise generated from the site by dogs barking. Paragraph 123 in the NPPF states planning decisions should avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on the life and quality of life which supports policy DM3.13 of the Development Management Policies which seeks to ensure a reasonable standard of amenity which includes avoiding the introduction of incompatible neighbouring uses in terms of noise and other nuisances. Development would not be permitted where the proposed development would generate noise which would be significantly detrimental to nearby residents.

4.5 There was not significant barking when I visited the site and the applicant intends to operate using a number of management techniques to mitigate the noise including sound proofing, exercising dogs in small groups and keeping the dogs away from the house during the day, however, these are not clearly defined in the application. It would be very difficult to control these by condition and sound proofing would only be effective when the dogs were locked in the buildings, which is not an ideal environment for them. Given the large number of dogs in close proximity to a large number of dwellings in the centre of the village, it is considered that there is no enforceable way of controlling noise from the site which could have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding residents in the vicinity of the site contrary to policy DM.13 of the Development Management Policies. This view is supported by the Environmental Quality Officer.

4.6 It was originally proposed to access the site via the existing access to the dwelling but the application has been amended so the access is via an existing field access further along Norwich Road.

4.7 The existing access to Rainbow End is narrow and has poor visibility and as a result any increased use of the access would not be supported by the Highway Officer. In terms of the amended access although in principle the Highway Officer does not object to the use of the access it would need to be upgraded and the hedge cut back to provide the required visibility splay of 2.4 x 43 metres. The access is however not in the applicant’s ownership and no confirmation has been provided that the upgrading of the access to the sufficient standard could be achieved. In the absence of this certainty and the fact that the use is already taking place it would not be prudent to condition this. As it stands the use of the access in its current state and substandard visibility would be detrimental to highway safety and as a result contrary to policy DM3.11 of the Development Management Policies.

4.8 There is sufficient space to provide parking within the site.

4.9 In terms of the disposal of waste the details of this could be resolved by condition.

4.10 There are a number of listed buildings within the vicinity of the site. S66 (1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: “In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.” It is considered that the change of use would not cause harm to the setting of the listed building as required by policy DM4.10 of the Development Management Policies.
4.11 Concern has been raised about building works on site. The existing buildings are subject to a separate investigation, the construction of fencing is permitted development and laying of additional hardcore on existing tracks constitutes a repair and does not need permission.

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.

4.13 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the proposed development does not create any new floor space.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The proposed development is likely to result in the amenity of surrounding properties being adversely affected to a significant degree and is consequently contrary to policy DM3.13 of the Development Management Policies. It is not possible to adequately control noise created by the dogs on site by condition. In addition, the proposed access and required visibility splay are in different ownership and there is no certainty that the access or visibility splay could be improved to the required standard. The proposal is consequently contrary to policy to DM3.11 of the Development Management Policies.

5.2 The proposal would cause social and environmental harm in terms of noise disturbance and harm to highway safety. These harms outweigh the minor benefits of the development in terms of the employment and as a result the proposal does not constitute sustainable development.

5.3 Because the keeping of dogs on site is already taking place and is giving rise to significant levels of complaint, it is recommended that enforcement action is authorised to reduce the number of dogs on the site to six, with a compliance period of 6 months.

6. Reasons for Refusal

6.1 The proposed development by reason of the number of dogs and close proximity of a large number of residential dwellings would result in the in a significant loss of amenity to nearby residential properties from noise disturbance contrary to paragraph 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies 2015.

6.2 In the absence of confirmation that the proposed access could be upgraded to the required standard in terms of construction and visibility the development would be detrimental to highway safety and would be contrary to policy DM3.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies.

6.3 The social and environmental harm in terms of noise disturbance and highway safety outweigh the minor benefits in terms of employment and as a result do not constitute sustainable development as defined by paragraph 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman 01508 533833
and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
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**Appl. No**: 2016/2264/H  
**Parish**: BROOKE

Applicants Name: Mr Gordon Mussett  
Site Address: Field House Littlebeck Lane Brooke NR15 1ET  
Proposal: Single storey garage built off historic raft foundation and dwarf walls.

Recommendation: Refusal  
1. Incongruous with character and appearance of surrounding area

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM3.6: House extensions and replacement dwellings in the Countryside  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2005/1086  
Resubmission of 2004/1984 for the proposed erection of boat store  
Refused

2.2 2005/1085  
Extension to garage with erection of garden store and greenhouse and alterations to vehicular entrance to include new gates  
Approved

2.3 2004/1984  
Proposed erection of garage & store  
Refused

2.4 2003/2556  
Proposed first floor extension to dwelling  
Approved

2.5 1997/1497  
Erection of replacement dwelling & garage  
Approved

2.6 1997/0200  
Erection of detached dwelling & garage  
Refused

2.7 1994/0983  
Erection of dwelling and double garage  
Approved

2.8 1992/1321  
Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of new dwelling  
Approved

**Appeal History**

2.9 2005/1086  
Erection of boat store  
Dismissed

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Town / Parish Council  
No comments received
3.2 District Member Committee decision

3.3 NCC Highways No objections

3.4 Arboricultural Officer No objections (there is no excavation or additional foundation requirements beyond the existing base so no requirement to remove adjacent trees)

3.5 Other Representations 1 letter of support

Based on the information available, the nature of this construction is well suited to the property and would blend in well within the existing surroundings. I fully support the planned build.

4 Assessment

4.1 The application site is a detached dwelling, set back from the highway in large grounds, located outside of the development limits of Brooke, and south of the main settlement.

4.2 This application proposes the erection of an outbuilding within the residential curtilage of the dwelling, along the south east boundary of the site, some distance away from the main dwelling. The proposal is sited behind a previously approved set of gates with brick piers, and in front of existing conifer trees. These access gates do not present the main access to the dwelling.

4.3 The outbuilding is proposed with a pitched roof, with the front gable end facing east. The proposed materials are red facing brickwork plinth and weatherboarding, with red clay pantiles.

4.4 The main considerations in this application are; principle of development, design, impact on residential amenity and highway safety.

Principle of development

4.5 As the application site is outside of the development limits of Brooke, the proposal is assessed against policy DM3.6 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015. This policy directs that the erection of outbuildings will be permitted provided that the proposal is compatible to the area’s character and appearance, and the landscape setting.

4.6 Planning permission was previously sought for an outbuilding in a similar location under application reference 2005/1086, for which the application was refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal (see appendix 2). The reason for refusal was that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the countryside. This appeal decision is a material consideration as are the current development management policies and the NPPF.

Design and impact on surrounding area

4.7 The proposal would be sited around 40m away from the main dwelling. The dwelling has open land to the north, east and south, and although there is a neighbouring property to the west of the proposal site, and a small group along the adjacent road opposite the site, the area has a distinct rural character. It is considered that the siting of the outbuilding this far away from the main dwelling would appear incongruous within the rural setting.

4.8 Although it is noted that a gate has been constructed following a previous permission, and that this would present some screening, along with the conifers around the proposal site, it is still considered that the proposal would be significantly visible from the highway, and that the development would be out of keeping with its surroundings.
Concerning the previous appeal decision; although I acknowledge that the proposal is of smaller scale and different design, with the trees being retained on site, I would still consider that the proposal would be incongruous and detract from the character of the countryside due to its siting.

In view of the above, I would not consider that the proposal accords with policy DM3.6 which directs that outbuildings must be compatible to the area’s character and appearance and landscape setting.

Residential amenity

There is not considered to be an adverse impact on residential amenity through loss of privacy, daylight, direct sunlight or outlook by virtue of the siting of the proposal, away from neighbouring properties. Therefore the proposal accords with the principles of policy DM3.13 of South Norfolk Local Plan.

Highway Safety

Policy 3.11 directs that development that endangers highway safety will not be permitted. Following consultation, NCC Highways has raised no objection to the proposal, and there is not considered to be an adverse impact on highway safety.

In conclusion, it is considered that the proposal fails to improve the character and quality of the area in accordance with paragraph 64 of the NPPF and policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and that the proposal would result in harm to the open countryside character of the area.

The outbuilding would be an incongruous addition to the site that would fail to maintain the character and appearance of the surrounding open countryside.

In view of the above, the proposal is considered to be contrary to paragraph 64 of the NPPF, policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and policy DM3.6 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Lucy Smith 01508 533821 lsmith@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2005

by Clive Tokley MRTPI Dip Env Planning
an Inspector appointed by the First Secretary of State

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/A/05/1188531
Field House, Littlebeck Lane, Brooke, Norwich, NR15 1ET.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs G Mussett against the decision of South Norfolk Council.
- The application (Ref 2005/1086/H and dated 18 May 2005) was refused by notice dated 27 June 2005.
- The development proposed is storage for boats.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. Field House is a large detached dwelling set back about 40m from Littlebeck Lane. On the opposite side of Littlebeck Lane, to the west of the appeal property, there is a small group of dwellings but the area is predominantly rural in character. The front garden of Field House is mostly laid to grass and the front boundary of the site is marked by a deciduous road-side hedge about 1.7m high. The front hedge is breached by the gravel access drive to the house and by a grassed area at a point close to a simple wooden store building. Being a relatively low and almost flat-roofed structure the store is unobtrusive and is barely visible above the hedge; however it can be seen through gaps in the hedge and through the adjacent grassed entrance.

3. The proposed boat store would be partly on the site of the wooden store but it would have about three times the floor area of the existing building. Further, at 5m, the top of the proposed pyramid roof would be more than twice the height of the store and the building would be clearly visible above the hedge and through the site entrance.

4. To my mind the size, design and materials of construction of the proposal would result in a building having the appearance of a residential double garage. Whilst it is not unusual to find outbuildings of this nature associated with rural dwellings I consider that in the location proposed, some 40m from Field House, the proposal would appear incongruous and would detract from the character of the countryside. It would therefore conflict with Policy IMP 1 of the South Norfolk Local Plan which seeks to ensure that all development is in keeping with its surroundings.

5. I have noted the appellants' indication that alternative materials could be employed and that the building could be screened by allowing the hedge to grow and by planting additional
trees. However I consider that the building would be out of place in this location and that those measures would not prevent the proposal from harming the rural character of the area.

6. Whilst I can understand that vehicular access may be needed for a building used to store a boat and gardening equipment I can see no pressing reason why the boat store should be in the location proposed. The appellants indicate that if the building were set back 20m from the highway it could be built without the need for planning permission from the Council. This is a matter for the appellants but I am not persuaded that planning permission should be granted for the appeal proposal which I consider would detract from the character and appearance of the countryside.

INPECTOR
Development Management Committee 7 December 2016

8 Appl. No : 2016/2364/CU
Parish : ROYDON

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

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

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 01 : Building a strong competitive economy
NPPF 03 : Supporting a prosperous rural economy

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.1 : Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development
DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM2.1 : Employment and business development
DM2.10 : Conversion and re-use of buildings in the Countryside for non-agricultural use
DM3.10 : Promotion of sustainable transport
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM4.5 : Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys

2. Planning History

2.1 2016/1073 Retrospective Application for Retention of Change of Use from Agricultural Storage Barn to B8 Storage & Distribution. Approved

2.2 2016/0705 Application for prior approval determination under Class R of proposed change of use of agricultural building to (B8) storage and distribution Withdrawn

2.3 2015/0559 Retrospective application for change of use of land for keeping of horses, retention of stable block with hardstanding for leisure use Approved

2.4 2013/2254 Proposed agricultural building Prior approval not required

2.5 2005/0487 Proposed erection of general purpose agricultural building Prior approval not required
### Development Management Committee 7 December 2016

#### 2.6 2002/0024
Erection of agricultural engineering workshop
Approved

#### 3. Consultations

| 3.1 Parish Council | Approve |
| 3.2 District Member | To be reported if appropriate |
| 3.3 NCC Highways | Support with conditions |
| 3.4 NCC Public Rights Of Way | No objection |
| 3.5 The Ramblers | No response |
| 3.6 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team | Support with conditions contamination during construction |
| 3.7 Other Representations | No response |

#### 4. Assessment

4.1 The building subject to this application is a general agriculture building which was given consent in 2013 application 2013/2254 under agricultural permitted development and has been substantially constructed but not completed. It has never been used for agriculture. It is proposed to change the use of the building into three B1 light industrial units. No external alterations are proposed as part of the application.

4.2 The site forms part of the former Meredith’s Horticultural Nurseries site which ceased trading in 2011. It is located south of the A1066 in Roydon and outside any of the development limits defined by the Site Specific Allocations. There are a number of existing uses on the site; an agricultural engineering business granted permission in 2002 (2002/0024); a storage and distribution business which was granted consent in a former agricultural building earlier this year 2016/1073; part of the site has permission for the keeping of horses for leisure purposes and the rest of the site is agricultural land, part of which has poly-tunnels on it.

4.3 Construction started on the building subject to this application last winter and was intended to be used by a tenant in association with the poly-tunnels, but the proposed user withdrew their tenancy in July of this year. The applicant has another tenant interested in the renting the poly-tunnels on site, but he does not wish to use the building.

4.4 Policies DM1.1 and DM1.3 in the Development Management Policies directs most new development towards identified settlements and states that development in the open countryside will only be granted where Development Management Policies allow for this or there are overriding economic, social and environmental benefits.

4.5 In terms of the principle of the change of use of the buildings this has been assessed under both policy DM2.1 as the building has not been completed or used for its authorised use and policy DM2.10 as a conversion of an existing building.

4.6 Part 6 of the General Permitted Development Order conveys specific permitted development rights for agricultural buildings. These permitted development rights only exist if the building is for agricultural use. As the building has not been completed or ever
used for agricultural purposes it is important to consider whether we would have been granted permission for it as a new light industrial building in this location.

4.7 Policy DM2.1 in the Development Management Policies gives positive consideration to new employment and business sites in the countryside, where they are located on sites well related to rural towns and it is demonstrated that there are no sequentially preferable sites and / or the proposal would create accessible jobs and business opportunities in rural areas.

4.8 The site is located remote from the development limits in Roydon and Bressingham although it may be possible to travel to the site via cycle or foot using public footpaths these are unlit and across fields which may deter their use in the winter months. Cycling or walking along the A1066 would also not be desirable. There is a limited bus services to Bressingham Gardens, but this would involve walking along the A1066 to get to the site which is likely to discourage travel to the site via this method.

4.9 It is considered the proposed development does not relate well to a rural town or village and as a result the development would not provide accessible jobs and business opportunities. In addition it has not been demonstrated that there are no sequentially preferable sites available within a reasonable catchment that would otherwise be more accessible. As a result if a new build industrial unit was proposed in this location it is considered that it would not adhere to policy DM2.1 of the Development Management Policies and not be supported.

4.10 The inaccessible location of the site would result in harm in terms of the social and environment dimensions of sustainable development and undermines the policy’s aim of locating new business in rural areas in accessible locations reducing the need to travel and associated carbon emissions.

4.11 This is supported by policy DM3.10 of the Development Management policies which requires new development to support sustainable transport objectives which requires development to maximise sustainable forms of travel.

4.12 Although there are notable economic benefits in terms of creating new jobs for the wider economy in this instance it is considered that the social and environmental harm created by the jobs in an inaccessible location would outweigh the economic benefits and as a result the development is contrary to policy DM1.3 of the Development Management Policies.

4.13 Policy DM2.10 in the Development Management Policies permits conversions of agricultural buildings to employment uses subject to a number of criteria.

4.14 The building is standing and no alterations or extensions are required, as a result of the proposed change of use. It is not considered that the proposed change of use would significantly adversely affect the setting of the building.

4.15 However, policy DM2.10 also requires that the change of use of the proposed building should not result in the loss of a farm building suitable for continued agricultural use and which, if an alternative use is permitted would result in the construction of a replacement agricultural building. With the change of use of the other agricultural building on site, the building subject to this application is the only agricultural building on site apart from the polytunnels; which by their nature are generally not suitable for general agricultural storage. It is noted that the new tenant of the poly tunnels does not wish to rent the building, but a tenant is still being sought for other pieces of agricultural land on the site. It would not be inconceivable that any tenant who may come forward to rent the rest of the agricultural site may well require the building subject of this application, so pressure for a further new replacement building would arise if it is no longer available to serve the agricultural land. As a result it is considered that the proposed change of use is contrary to policy DM2.10 and there are no overriding social, economic or environmental benefits as discussed above.
4.16 It is proposed to use the existing access onto the A1066, the Highway Officer has not raised any objection to the development in highway safety terms and as result it is considered that the proposed development accords with policy DM3.11 of the Development Management Policies. The proposed development would not adversely affect the public rights of way near the site.

4.17 In terms of other issues there are residential properties to the south and close to the entrance to the A1066 but it is considered that the distance is sufficient for the proposed change of use not to significantly adversely affect the residential amenity in terms of noise and disturbance in accordance with policy DM3.11 of the Development Management Policies.

4.18 Given that the building is a recently constructed building the proposed development would not be likely to raise any ecological issues.

4.19 The Water Management Officer has made advisory comments on surface water and foul drainage which could be dealt with by condition.

4.20 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.

4.21 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the site has never been used for its lawful use.

5 Conclusion

5.1 It is considered that, given the building has only recently been constructed and has never been used for its intended use, it is tantamount to a new industrial building in an unsustainable location which would cause social and environmental harm which outweighs any limited economic benefits in terms of employment creation and as a result does not constitute sustainable development as defined by paragraph 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition it has not been demonstrated that there are no sequentially preferable sites for a new industrial unit. As a result the proposal is contrary to policies DM1.3 and DM2.1 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies 2015.

5.2 Secondly the building is suitable for agricultural use and is the only agricultural building on the holding. Consequently its change of use would be likely to result in the need for a replacement building contrary to policies DM1.3 and DM2.10 in the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies 2015.

6 Reasons for refusal

6.1 The recently constructed building which has never been used for its authorised use is tantamount to a new industrial building in an unsustainable location which would cause social and environmental harm which outweighs any limited economic benefits in terms of employment creation and as a result does not constitute sustainable development as defined by the paragraph 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition it has not been demonstrated that there are no sequentially preferable sites for a new industrial unit. In addition and is contrary to policies DM1.3 and DM2.1 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies 2015
6.2 The building is suitable for agricultural use and is the only agricultural building on the holding. Consequently its change of use would be likely to result in the need for a replacement building contrary to policies DM1.3 and DM2.10 in the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies 2015.
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9  **Appl. No**: 2016/2520/F  
**Parish**: NEWTON FLOTMAN

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

Recommendation: Approval with Conditions
1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accord with submitted drawings

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM4.10: Heritage Assets

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

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

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2009/0429  Improvements to network of paths to church and church extension  
Approved

2.2 2000/0725  Erection of extension to provide meeting room, kitchen, disabled lavatory and storage  
Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  The Parish Council have no views or comments.

3.2 District Member  To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 Georgian Group  No comments received

3.4 Ancient Monuments Society  Agree with Historic England in opposing the proposal in that the doors "owe little or nothing to the character of an ancient church". The doors would be a practical disadvantage to disabled users and the Society would prefer carefully designed gates.

3.5 Soc. For Protection Of Ancient Buildings  No comments received

3.6 The Victorian Society  No comments received
3.7 Twentieth Century Society
No comments received

3.8 Council For British Archaeology
No comments received

3.9 Historic England
Historic England (HE) recommend refusal. While the removal of the "bird gates" is welcomed, HE considers the proposed doors would cause harm to the significance of the historic church as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). HE are not convinced the public benefit of the scheme outweighs the harm caused. HE also objects to the design of the doors which they consider not to be of a suitable quality and are unsympathetic to the building.

3.10 Other Representations
No responses received

4 Assessment

4.1 The proposal is to replace the existing outer doors of the church porch with an oak framed pair of doors with glazed panels.

4.2 The Parish Church of St Mary is listed grade 2 star. It is sited on higher ground on the west side of the main A140 on the northern edge of the village centre. It occupies a commanding position in the landscape. The church dates from the 15th century, with later additions, in flint and brick with lead roofs. The porch, in brick, is on the south side and was rebuilt in the 16th century and significantly restored in 1978. The porch has a pair of modern black painted steel framed doors with mesh shaped to fit the outer arched opening to protect against bird intrusion.

4.3 The application is for planning permission, which is required for church buildings where the works proposed materially affect the exterior of the building. Listed Building Consent does not apply in this case as places of worship are outside the scope of this legislation by virtue of Ecclesiastical Exemption introduced in 1913. With the Church of England the listed building impacts are generally assessed under the faculty system administered by the Diocese but on which the local planning authority and bodies like Historic England are consulted.

4.4 The application needs to be assessed in the context of section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 where special regard has to be given to the preservation of the building or its setting or any features of special interest. Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires proposals to enhance the significance of the heritage asset or where harm is caused, that this should only be supported where there is clear and convincing justification and where the harm can be weighed against the public benefits. DM Policy 4.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan follows this lead.

4.5 The faculty application included works proposed for the interior of the church but as part of the process, officers from the Council were consulted in respect of the porch door. No objections were raised to the removal of the existing doors or their replacement in principle, provided the doors were not totally glazed, set in a timber frame which was set back from the moulded brick arch of the porch, and that non-reflective glass was used. Further advice suggested the use of some form of decoration rather than have a plain and utilitarian design.
4.6 Historic England (HE) objected to the new doors concerned about the impact to the exterior of the church. HE suggested instead that the original porch doors could be draught proofed and an internal lobby constructed. The faculty application was also for internal alterations to create a village shop in the tower and a new room under a gallery to provide a new community facility. Other consultees, including The Church Building Council and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) did not object to the proposed outer doors. Subsequently after due consideration a faculty was granted.

4.7 The church is looking to encourage more visitors to St Marys and enhance its use as a community facility. As part of this they see the present entrance porch as a disadvantage. The outer doors are unattractive and while they keep birds and debris out of the porch, they are not secure and the furniture inside is being damaged. There have been issues with vandalism. The inner doors are solid and awkward to open inconspicuously. The new doors will be more secure, enable the porch to be put to better use, be more effective as a barrier to the elements, and significantly allow the inner doors to be kept open more often. The glazing will let light into the main church building and which would be affected by proposed internal alterations. An internal lobby would compromise these proposals.

4.8 The detailing of the doors reflect comments made by officers as above. The use of oak framing, non-reflective glass and setting the frame back behind the brick arch are considered to result in a positive effect on the porch and south side of the Church. HE consider the new doors would cause harm to the significance of the Church not mitigated by clear and convincing justification and public benefits. HE object to the design and suggest one that is timber with vision panels set into it and that the current design has a "rather modern domestic or commercial look". Their views have been supported by the Ancient Monuments Society. The applicants are unwilling to change the design, which has been devised by specialist ecclesiastical architects, which they feel reflect other comments made, and would not secure their aim of gaining light into the church.

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

4.10 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as there is no increase in floor area.

5 Conclusion

5.1 It is felt that while the proposal would cause "less than substantial harm" as identified by paragraph 134 of the NPPF (rather than "substantial harm" under para 133), there are clear and convincing arguments in favour of the scheme which would help promote the Church as a community building and encourage its use and flexibility. The proposals will help secure the future of the village's most significant historic building which is its most optimum viable use, as required under paragraph 134. The proposals would preserve the special interest of the Church and does not involve any permanent changes to the fabric. I conclude that the proposal accords with the NPPF and with Local Plan policy DM4.10.

5.2 Having weighed the harm caused by the proposal against the overall benefits, approval of the proposal would also be consistent with section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
Enforcement Reports

1. **Enforcement Ref**: 2015/8319  
**Parish**: LONG STRATTON

**Site Address**: The Red House, Norwich Road, Long Stratton, Norfolk, NR15 2PY  
**Development**: Change of use of land to a mixed use of residential and for the storage of vehicles and parts  
**Developer**: Mr Karl Douglas & Ms Joanna Taylor

1. **Background**

1.1 It was brought to the Council’s attention in 2008 that the site was being used to store motor vehicles. Since that time there have been a number of requests to the developer to reduce the number of vehicles on the site to no more than six. Whilst the developer has made efforts to reduce the numbers, this would steadily creep up and in 2010 Committee authority was given to take enforcement action to remedy the breach. It was not necessary to serve a notice as the developer reduced the number of vehicles shortly after the committee. Given that it has been six years since enforcement action was authorised it is appropriate that a fresh report be presented to the Development Management Committee.

1.2 Further concerns have been raised and when the site was visited earlier this year there were nearly 30 vehicles and vehicle parts being stored on the site. This number has gradually been reduced to around 11 but still exceeds the requested six and there are still many vehicle parts being stored.

2. **Planning Policies**

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
**NPPF 01**: Building a strong, competitive economy  
**NPPF 07**: Requiring good design  
**NPPF 12**: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003  
**Development Management Policies**  
**DM2.1**: Employment and business development  
**DM3.8**: Design Policies  
**DM3.13**: Amenity, noise and quality of life  
**DM4.10**: Heritage Assets

2.4 Long Stratton Area Action Plan

**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.”
3. Enforcement History

3.1 2015/8319 Change of use of land to a mixed use of residential and for the storage of vehicles and parts PCO

3.2 2010/8089 Storage of vehicles CLOSED – 20/01/2011

3.3 2009/8152 Storage of vehicles CLOSED – 18/08/2009

3.4 2008/8386 Storage of vehicles CLOSED - 27/01/2009

4. Assessment

4.1 The property is a grade II listed building located within the development boundary as defined by the Long Stratton Area Action Plan. The property is located in a prominent location adjacent to the A140.

4.2 The use of the site for the storage of vehicles and their associated parts to this scale goes beyond what could reasonably be regarded as incidental to the use of the dwellinghouse and therefore constitutes a material change of use.

4.3 The use of the land for this purpose has a detrimental impact on both the setting of the listed building and in a wider context the visual amenity of the area. Whilst it is acknowledged that efforts have been made to reduce the number of vehicles and parts stored on the site it still goes beyond what you would normally be considered incidental to the use of the dwellinghouse.

5. Recommendation

5.1 That enforcement action be authorised to require the unauthorised use of the land for the storage of vehicles and vehicle parts to cease; the vehicles to be removed such that there are no more than 6 motor vehicles on the site; and the externally stored car parts to be removed entirely.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Andy Baines, 01508 533840 abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Planning Appeals
Appeals received from 1st November 2016 to 28th November 2016

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

Planning Appeals
Appeals decisions from 1st November to 28th November 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Decision Maker</th>
<th>Final Decision</th>
<th>Appeal Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/2552</td>
<td>Denton Grove Farm Middle Road Denton Norfolk IP20 0AH</td>
<td>Mr Stuart Carruthers</td>
<td>1) proposed light industrial use - manufacture, repair and storage of goods used to provide services at festivals 2) proposed residential use of a lawful dwelling; 3) proposed residential use of a former dwelling; 4) proposed equine use of land 5) proposed storage of caravans, mobile homes etc. on land used to provide residential services</td>
<td>Deemed refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Parish / Site</td>
<td>Appellant</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Decision Maker</td>
<td>Final Decision</td>
<td>Appeal Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2803</td>
<td>Wicklewood Workshop Crownthorpe Road Crownthorpe Road Crownthorpe Road Norfolk NR18 9EW</td>
<td>Mr Kevin Musk</td>
<td>Convert a garage at Crownthorpe Road to Commercial Offices and build a store for light use. Replace hedges and trees to landscape and make access to office and store</td>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0864</td>
<td>Wymondham 80 - 82 London Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 9BP</td>
<td>Mr Steven Shorten</td>
<td>2 detached dwellings &amp; double garages and 2 single garages.</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/1101</td>
<td>Hethersett 8 Whitegates Close Hethersett Norfolk NR9 3JG</td>
<td>Mr Keith Ruffell</td>
<td>Fell of Fir tree</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>