Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

Conservatives: Mr V Thomson (Chairman), Mrs L Neal (Vice-Chairman), Mr P Broome, Mrs F Ellis, Mr C Gould, Dr C Kemp, Mr G Minshull, Mr J Mooney, Mr B Stone, Mrs A Thomas

Liberal Democrats: Dr M Gray

Please note that planning application Item Nos 1-2 will be heard from 10am

Planning application Item Nos 3-7 will be heard from 1.30pm onwards

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

The order of the agenda may change at the discretion of the Chairman, so it is advisable to arrive at the commencement of the meeting if you are intending to speak on items 1 & 2, and arrive at 1:30pm if you intend to speak on items 3-7.

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

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

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

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

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

THEREFORE we will:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Minutes of the Meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 12 October 2016
   (attached – page 9)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 19)
   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>2016/1447/F</td>
<td>BRESSINGHAM</td>
<td>Harvest House Low Road Bressingham IP22 2DB</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2016/0233/F</td>
<td>COLNEY</td>
<td>UEA Sports Facility Colney Lane Colney Norfolk</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2016/1669/H</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>9A Lynch Green Hethersett NR9 3JU</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2016/1915/F</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL</td>
<td>Land West of Cantara Burston Road Dickleburgh Norfolk</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2016/1916/O</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL</td>
<td>Land East of Bangala Rectory Road Dickleburgh Norfolk</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2016/2198/F</td>
<td>BROOKE</td>
<td>Highfield Stables Highfield Lane Brooke Norfolk</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2016/2228/RVC</td>
<td>STOKE HOLY CROSS</td>
<td>Whiteford House Chandler Road Stoke Holy Cross NR17 8RQ</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

7. Enforcement Reports
   (attached – page 143)

8. Planning Appeals (for information)
   (attached – page 149)

9. Date of next scheduled meeting – Wednesday 7 December 2016
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

- Member consideration/decision.

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

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

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

3. FILMING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS: GUIDANCE

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

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

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

| 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you declared the interest in the register of interests as a pecuniary interest? If Yes, you will need to withdraw from the room when it is discussed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the interest directly:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. affect yours, or your spouse / partner’s financial position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or your spouse / partner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relate to a contract you, or your spouse / partner have with the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Affect land you or your spouse / partner own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affect a company that you or your partner own, or have a shareholding in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If yes, you need to inform the meeting. When it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to an interest I have?

A. Have I declared it as a pecuniary interest?

OR

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

YES

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

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

NO

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

YES

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

NO

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

YES

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

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

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

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

NO

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

Minutes of a meeting of the Development Management Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton, on Wednesday 12 October 2016 at 10.00 am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: V Thomson (Chairman), L Neal, P Broome, F Ellis, M Gray, C Kemp, G Minshull, J Mooney and B Stone.


Substitute Members: Councillors: N Legg for C Gould and B Duffin for A Thomas.

Officers in Attendance: The Director of Growth and Localism (T Horspole), the Development Manager (H Mellors), the Planning Decisions Team Leader (C Trett) the Senior Planning Officers (C Raine and E Thomas) and the Planning Officer (T Barker)

(18 members of the public were in attendance)

292. 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</td>
<td>BRESSINGHAM</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Objectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/1741/F</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Local MP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

293. MINUTES

The minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 14 September 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
294. 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>2016/0662/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Cllr L Dale – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/1741/F</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Mr M Davey – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr B Barrow – On behalf of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr A Parnham – On behalf of Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr D Fulcher – 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.

295. QUARTERLY ENFORCEMENT REPORT

Members noted the report of the Director of Growth and Localism. In response to members’ questions, the Development Manager updated the Committee on the progress of various ongoing enforcement cases.

296. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting closed at 11.35 am)

__________________________
Chairman
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Applicants Name : Openfield
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 and 6 bulk out load hoppers. New permanent and temporary access for construction vehicles and upgrading of on-site roadways.

Decision : Members voted unanimously to DEFER (to a future meeting of the Development Management Committee) for a Sites Sub-Committee visit.

Note: The Committee indicated the reason for the Sites Sub-Committee visit was to assess all the issues raised concerning the application.

Updates to officer report

For the avoidance of doubt the site notice expires on the day of the committee (12th October) and as such any formal decision will not be issued until after this date.

As envisaged in paragraph 1.6 of the committee report, further additional comments have been received.

Parish Council
Rescinds comments of the 3rd of August and now recommends refusal.

Feels it is appropriate to make a formal objection on the grounds that information that should have been available to it was not available within the time scale then required for a response. It is evident that the noise assessment was available to the parish Council in advance of their recent meeting and as it is considered that they could have made observations on the proposal, as has been the case by local residents as set out below.

Additional letters of objection received from local residents relating to procedural and administration matters, summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public comments (summarised, in no particular order)</th>
<th>Councils response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is EIA development and no Environmental Statement has been prepared</td>
<td>The Council consider that the proposal does not require an environmental statement having regard to the requirements of Schedule 2 of the EIA regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>See paragraph 1.19 of committee report 12th October. It should also be noted that health and safety issues can be covered by other legislative powers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognised area of exceptional landscape quality</td>
<td>None of the buildings/structures proposed are within any identified landscape quality area as set out in the South Norfolk Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>Heritage impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The present facility does not need to be demolished it is in a good state of repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No support from local farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation flawed; householders affected not informed, site notices difficult to see.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original site notice gave no date for comments. No community meeting held.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical documents not available for the public before the Planning Committee considered the application, including the landscape, air and noise reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inaccuracies in Planning Statement and supporting information submitted by the applicant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devaluation of property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Damage the increased and continuous background noise will have on our Autistic teenage son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs will be lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed structures will radically alter the character of the rural landscape of the River Waveney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual effects will be ‘major’ on some receptors and as such there is harm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence to justify the need for additional grain storage facilities within the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 existing screening trees, 30 years old, specifically planted to screen previous building to be cut down and replaced by new young planting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acoustic report not available to members when making their decision, neither had officers the opportunity to consider it. Report reveals that night-time plant noise emissions will be 51dB and thus 25dB over assessed current background sound, causing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Management Committee</strong></td>
<td>12 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘significant adverse impact’. No proper assessment of noise currently or to be generated.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise levels at unsociable hours are extremely likely to exceed acceptable levels.</strong></td>
<td><strong>SNC Community Protection consider that conditional approval is acceptable.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application restricts its assessment on impacts to the few properties immediately adjacent. Noise assessment should be carried out over a wider area.</strong></td>
<td><strong>See previous comment.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not all of the land needed for the offsite road works appears to be in the control of the Highways Authority.</strong></td>
<td><strong>It is evident that the recommended condition for the agreement of the full design details for the off-site highway improvements are to be agreed and as such this can ensure that land under the control of Paul Rackham Limited is not required.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waveney House Appeal. The Planning Committee was informed that the nearest bus stop was 1km distant with no footpath serving the site and that approval would make the development reliant on the use of private vehicles conflicting with (NPPF) aims of achieving sustainable development. This factor seems to be ignored in the report to Committee for this much larger development.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The provision of a footpath network to serve the proposed development is not considered to be a key issue in the consideration of the scheme, given that the use exists at present and this is an expansion of the existing enterprise. Likewise, the nature of the scheme would be unlikely to rely on public footpath provision to support the scheme ie predominantly large commercial vehicles.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contrary to National Planning Policy Framework, Joint Core Strategy and the SN Local Plan Policies.</strong></td>
<td><strong>See both committee reports as to why scheme is not considered to be contrary to any of these.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposals will overshadow nearby properties and will be totally out of keeping with the village.</strong></td>
<td><strong>It is not considered that significant overshadowing would occur given the separation distances to neighbouring properties and acknowledging the position of these and the proposal in relation to the movement of the sun.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dirt and noise caused during the demolition of the old buildings and construction of the new ones will be considerable. The noise and pollution from the operation of the new facility with its increased capacity will also be highly intrusive.</strong></td>
<td><strong>See recommended conditions 16 to 19 of the committee report 12th October</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fox Covert and Fen Farm Barn does not currently have significant planting within or adjacent to the boundaries, as implied in para 4.21 by the Conservation &amp; Design Officer.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Paragraph 4.21 states &quot;it is noted that many of the listed buildings have significant planting within their curtilage or adjacent to their boundaries which will soften the impact&quot;. It does not specifically refer to planting at either of these properties.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on near neighbours and their businesses (including B&amp;B’s) do not appear to have been given adequate consideration.</strong></td>
<td><strong>It is considered that both committee reports in combination cover all of the issues raised which would influence the impact of the scheme upon the neighbouring residents.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photomontages/viewpoints deceptive and do not show several important viewpoints.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The photomontages show a number of views, and it has never been claimed that they cover all views. They have been used to assist officers in reaching their views on the scheme and in indicating to the committee the impacts of the scheme as part of the presentation.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree planting will not screen silos which will result in detrimental visual impact.</td>
<td>It has not been suggested that tree planting would screen the development, both reports acknowledge that some adverse visual impact would occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic impacts including noise and disturbance from HGV movements and tail backs on Fen Street.</td>
<td>The Highway Authority has assessed the impacts of the scheme and concluded that they have no objections subject to conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans fail to show any of the surrounding residential properties and their close proximity to the grain store.</td>
<td>Officers are fully aware of the position of neighbours in relation to the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not realised the height and revised number of silos. Information impossible for the layman to ascertain.</td>
<td>The submitted information does confirm accurately the description of the development and the key elements of the proposal including heights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weigh bridges will cause stopping and starting of engines and dust. There will be nothing to shield the noise and the visual impact.</td>
<td>SNC Community Protection Team has confirmed that they have no objections subject to conditions including noise and air quality mitigation measures to be agreed and implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will only be possible for less than half the trees shown to be planted on land owned by Openfield. The others will have to be planted on land owned by another party. Report states the development will cause visual harm, not reflected in the report summary.</td>
<td>The submitted landscaping scheme indicates that the new planting scheme can be accommodated within land under the control of the applicant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans show at committee failed to show any of the surrounding residential properties and their close proximity to the grain store.</td>
<td>This is not true. Please see first slide from the presentation which for the avoidance of doubt is the same as that used last month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in allergens from the grain dust which, with the removal of the screening trees, will also cause an increase in allergies already suffered.</td>
<td>Recommended condition 16 is proposed to secure air mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed road layout by BSP Consulting does not show or take into account two houses opposite the grain store.</td>
<td>The Highway Authority has reached its recommendation on the implementation of the off-site highway works in full acknowledgement of the existence of neighbouring properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed highways scheme will increase danger when turning into and out of site.</td>
<td>The Highway Authority has assessed the impacts of the scheme and concluded that they have no objections subject to conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorry movements will not be evenly spaced and will probably cause congestion (one at least every 4 minutes).</td>
<td>See above response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse impact on tourism as the harvest peak coincides with the tourist season.</td>
<td>It is evident that the existing lawful use is influenced by harvesting now, it is not considered that the increase in the operation would significantly compromise tourism in the locality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe negative visual impact.</td>
<td>The reports clearly highlight an adverse negative impact but it is not considered that the visual harm is severe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly reduce the viability of local businesses and value of assets.</td>
<td>It is clear from both reports that officers do not consider that the scheme would present a level of harm that would contribute to a significant reduction in the viability of other local businesses and the value of assets. In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
terms of the impact upon local businesses it should be noted that in relation to increased competition affecting viability this would not be a reason to refuse the scheme.

Notes conditions and comments regarding historic planning permissions for the site. Reference to 1988 conditions imposed on the height of the permitted development on the site at 15.5 metres.

It should be noted that a significant period of time has lapsed since these decisions were made and the relevant planning policies affecting the current proposal are not the same as those used at that time. It is necessary to determine the scheme in accordance with current relevant policies and any other material considerations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>: 2016/0662/F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>: HETHERSETT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants Name</td>
<td>: McDonalds Restaurants Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Address</td>
<td>: Land At Thickthorn Roundabout Norwich Hethersett Norfolk NR9 3AU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>: Drive Thru Restaurant, Car parking, Landscaping, 2no Customer Order Displays with Associated Canopies, Remote Refuse Store, Covered Cycle Parking, Play Space, Patio Furniture and Fencing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval

Approved with conditions

1. Full time limit
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. Access Gradient
4. Access Gates - Configuration
5. Provision of parking, service
6. Construction Traffic (Parking)
7. Wheel Cleaning Facilities
8. Surface Water
9. Details of foul water disposal
10. Archaeological work to be agreed
11. Fire hydrant
12. Biodiversity Management Plan
13. In accordance with noise management scheme
14. Contamination scheme to be submitted
15. Implementation of approved remediation scheme
16. Reporting of unexpected contamination
17. Implementation of landscaping scheme
18. Odour control
19. External materials to be agreed
20. Waste arrangements

Updates to officer report

County Councillor
Raises concerns about extra traffic generation at a very busy roundabout
Development Management Committee  12 October 2016

3  Appl. No : 2016/1741/F
Parish : LONG STRATTON

Applicants Name : Mr Matthew Davey
Site Address : Land North of Wild Rose Farm Ipswich Road Long Stratton Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of 2no 2 storey dwellings with attached garages

Decision : Members voted 8-3 for Refusal.

Refused
1. Contrary to policy DM2.11
2. Poor design and harm to landscape
3. Insufficient and lack of information (amenity)
4. Harm outweighs benefits of development

Updates to officer report

e-mail from agent

- New dwellings will be similar distance from muck pad as existing dwellings
- Prevailing wind will blow odour away from dwellings
- Occupants will be agricultural workers, used to sight and smell of muck heaps
- Any traffic noise disturbance from use of the layby will be no worse than for existing dwellings.
- New dwellings will be better insulated against noise from A140 in accordance with Building Regulations and better than existing dwellings.

Summary of email received from applicant on the 10th October 2016:

- The applicant wished to express, the applicant’s role in the farm is landlord/MD and has no day-to-day operational management of the site.

- HS2 are contracted to farm manage the site and are the reason for wanting two additional dwellings.

- The applicant has offered in the email the option of agricultural occupancy restriction on the existing and proposed dwellings.

Summary of letter received from Richard Bacon MP on the 11th October 2016:

- Claiming the council’s committee report is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of the business.

- The applicant is a landlord.

- No discussion has been had regarding rural exception site.

4  Appl. No : 2016/1824/A
Parish : CARLETON RODE

Applicants Name : Mrs Joan Hocking
Site Address : Church Of All Saints Church Road Carleton Rode NR16 1RN
Proposal : Church and Community Notice Board

Decision : This item was deferred to a future meeting of the Development Management Committee.
5 Appl. No : 2016/1870/O
Parish : EASTON

Applicants Name : Father Shishoy
Site Address : St Athanasius Coptic Church  Marlingford Road Easton NR9 5AD
Proposal : Outline application to extend existing church facilities to provide entrance, altar, baptistery, kitchen, toilets & hall/dining area

Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval

Approved with conditions

1. Outline Planning permission time limit
2. Reserved Matters to be agreed
3. In accord with submitted drawings
4.External materials to be agreed
5. Reporting of unexpected contamination
6. Surface water drainage to accord with submitted details
7. Details of foul water disposal
8. Retention trees and hedges
9. Tree surveys and tree protection to be submitted
10. Specific Use – Church only no other uses within D1
11. Parking and turning area to be provided
12. Scheme of sound installation to be agreed

6 Appl. No : 2016/1871/F
Parish : COLNEY

Applicants Name : Mr Les Burr
Site Address : Land North West of Old Watton Road Colney Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of 2 detached barn style houses

Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval

Approved with conditions

1. Full planning permission time limit
2. Levels to accord with submitted details
3. Materials and details to be agreed
4. Landscaping scheme to be agreed
5. Ecological mitigation to be accord with submitted report
6. Contamination – precautionary advice
7. Foul drainage details to be agreed
8. Boundary treatments to be agreed
9. Archaeological investigation
10. Water efficiency requirements
11. Access and vision splays
12. Parking and turning areas

Updates to officer report
- Further e-mail from Colney Parish Meeting. Note objections from neighbour, please take these into consideration.
- NCC Highways – no objection subject to conditions, clearance of 11m frontage and cutting back vegetation.
7  Appl. No  :  2016/2207/CAN  
Parish  :  WACTON

Applicants Name  :  Mrs Philippa Agent
Site Address  :  Yeoman Cottage  Church Road Wacton NR15 2UG
Proposal  :  Removal of five field poplars trees.

Decision  :  Members voted unanimously for Approval

No Objections

Updates to officer report

Corrections:
Recommendation should be ‘No objections’ (i.e., we will not be serving a TPO to prevent the works.) We cannot impose conditions on Conservation Area tree works notifications.

- Para 4.3 – Trees 1, 2 & 3 are actually on the boundary of the Conservation Area (not “well outside” as stated). Trees 4 & 5 are not within the CA, so should not be part of this proposal. Impact of tree loss is still considered acceptable.

It is also worth noting that originally the applicant applied to reduce the trees (2016/2170) This proposal was withdrawn as a result of the arboriculturalist’s suggestion to the applicant that felling would be a better option.
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

Major applications referred to Site Inspection Panel

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.

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

   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

   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

Introduction

Having resolved to approve the application at the Development Management Committee on the 14 September 2016, prior to issuing its decision, the Council was subsequently made aware that the site notice posted adjacent to the site may not have been dated.
To ensure compliance with the regulations a new site notice has been dated and posted adjacent to the site. This was done on the 21 September 2016 and consequently the 21 day period expired on the 12 October 2016. The original report and update sheet is attached as Appendix 2.

Since the committee resolution, the Council agreed to take the application back to Development Management Committee on the 12 October 2016 to take account of the new site notice and additional comments received. The Development Management Committee subsequently resolved to defer consideration of the planning application to enable a site panel visit to take place on the 1 November 2016. A copy of the site panel's notes will be added to the upcoming update sheet.

Given the volume of comments received in response to the new site notice being erected, coupled with the fact that there have been two previous committee reports in relation to this application it is considered beneficial to produce a new consolidated report to address all matters rather than requiring cross referencing to the previous reports. It should be noted that the previous reports and updates, are attached as appendices to this report.

1. **Planning Policies**

   1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
   - NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
   - NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport
   - NPPF 07: Requiring good design
   - NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change
   - NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
   - NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

   1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**
   - Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
   - Policy 2: Promoting good design
   - Policy 3: Promoting good design
   - Policy 5: The Economy
   - Policy 6: Access and Transportation
   - Policy 20: Implementation

   1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**
   - Development Management Policies
   - DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
   - DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development
   - DM1.4: Environmental Quality
   - DM2.1: Employment and business development
   - DM2.7: Agricultural and forestry development
   - DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development
   - DM3.10: Promotion of sustainable transport
   - DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic
   - DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking
   - DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
   - DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety
   - DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management
   - DM4.5: Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
   - DM4.8: Protection of trees and hedgerows
   - DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design
   - DM4.10: Heritage Assets
1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD 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 2015/2364 Demolition of 2x buildings and construction of 7 Storage Silos, 3 Intake Silos, 1 Bunker Storage Area, 1 Machinery Building, 2 Grain Driers and associated infrastructure, plant and machinery
Withdrawn

2.2 1997/0930 Demolition of existing shed & erection of replacement using former steel framed storage building
Approved

2.3 1996/0124 Siting of mobile offices & toilets to replace existing
Approved

2.4 1995/1461 Two grain silos
Approved

2.5 1994/1111 Erection of radio dish antenna mounted on w 12.5m high pole
Approved

2.6 1994/0530 Erection of 2no hopper grain silos and grain dryer (amendment to permission 07/88/0832/F)
Approved

2.7 1993/1022 Storage of 2000 tonnes of fertilizer
Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Original comments (received 3/10/16)
• Recommends approval.

Revised comments (received 4/10/16)
• Rescinds comments of the 3rd of August and now recommends refusal.
• Feels it is appropriate to make a formal objection on the grounds that information that should have been available to it was not available within the time scale then required for a response.
• It is evident that the noise assessment was available to the Parish Council in advance of their recent meeting and as it is considered that they could have made observations on the proposal, as has been the case by local residents as set out below.

Further comments (received 24/10/16) summarised
• We could possibly accept development provided the 15.5 metre height limit and tree screen were retained along with strict
controls on noise, traffic and time use.

- The two applications 2015/2364 & 2016/1447 aided slow realisation of the amended scheme for 17 silos reaching 26m high. Few residents aware or received notification of amendments.
- Officer pre-application advice for 7 silos on website for the 17 silos has misled us and the public.
- Remain concerned at the scale and impacts the development would have on landscape and life quality.
- No provision for pedestrian access from bus stop to site and no specific mitigation measures imposed.
- No reference to probable adverse effects on the local tourist and hospitality trade.
- Development will reduce aggregated value of adjacent real estate.
- Net loss of jobs when considered over a wide area.
- Site is in open countryside contrary to policy.
- Demolition of structures prior to approval negates ‘land use rights’.

3.2 District Member

Requests that the application is determined by Development Management Committee.

3.3 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team

No objection in principle.

- further noise impact related information should be submitted and approved as part of one of the suggested conditions. Other conditions relating to noise mitigation, hours of deliveries, no generators/air handling without consent, construction management plan, external lighting, contaminated land, air quality shall also be included.

3.4 SNC Water Management Officer

No objection

- Suggests conditions for a detailed scheme for surface water scheme prior to commencement of development; and that foul water is disposed by a sealed system or private treatment plant, as indicated on the application details.

3.5 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority

No comments as it falls below their current threshold for providing detailed comment.

3.6 SNC Landscape Architect

- No significant existing trees will be lost. If the trees were to decline as a result of root disturbance/damage caused by construction, then this would provide an opportunity for renewal with species more suited to the landscape character.
- A LVIA (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) has been provided. Broadly I concur with the findings of the LVIA for most of the viewpoints analysed. However, as there is an element of judgement in the process, my own assessment is marginally different for some of the viewpoint locations; for some of those with residential receptors (especially from the valley) my own judgement would be Moderate/Major Moderate.
- My assessment, based on site observations and also using the montages is that the significance of visual effects for these is: Moderate (i & ii), Major (iii) and Major/Moderate (iv). Viewpoint iii considers the situation in the vicinity of ‘Wayside’ the dwelling on Halford Lane. In light of this it can be concluded that there is visual harm.
Ideally planting should be further away to give the best visual effect for mitigation screening, but this is not possible in this case due to the limited ownership. The opportunity appears to exist for the new planting to be extended along the northern land-ownership boundary, possibly even the western one too.

In summary, agree with much in the LVIA, with the majority of the visual effects being ‘moderate’ a note of caution should be sounded on the significance of effects for some of the residential receptors. Most notably, is the property ‘Wayside’ for which my own assessment of the situation is that the significance of visual effects will be ‘major’ and as such there is harm. The mitigation effect of the new planting proposed as part of this development will be unable to reduce this harm in the long term due to the height of the proposed silos.

3.7 Anglian Water Services Ltd

No comments received

3.8 SNC Conservation And Design

No objection

- There are a number of heritage assets to the south of the site along Fen Street. Although the site will be visible due to its size and scale when moving along Fen Street, I do not consider that it will have a direct impact on the setting of the heritage assets, which can be considered to be relatively confined and immediate to the buildings.
- The design is appropriate for the context, but I would suggest conditioning materials and details to ensure a quality in the final design.

3.9 NCC Ecologist

No objection

3.10 NCC Highways

No objection

- Subject to detail design, the proposals are considered as acceptable. Recommend conditions relating to providing visibility splays, access / on-site and HGV parking, off-site highways improvement works.

3.11 Health And Safety Executive

No objection

- Do not advise on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission in this case.

3.12 Other Representations

Letters of objection received from local residents and comments relating to procedural and administration matters, summarised as follows:

- Recognised area of exceptional landscape quality
- Heritage impacts
- The present facility does not need to be demolished it is in a good state of repair
- No support from local farmers
- Consultation flawed; householders affected not informed, site notices difficult to see.
- Original site notice gave no date for comments. No community meeting held.
- Technical documents not available for the public before the Planning Committee considered the application, including the landscape, air and noise reports.
- Inaccuracies in Planning Statement and supporting information
• submitted by the applicant.
• Devaluation of property values.
• Damage the increased and continuous background noise will have on our Autistic teenage son.
• Jobs will be lost.
• Proposed structures will radically alter the character of the rural landscape of the River Waveney.
• No evidence to justify the need for additional grain storage facilities within the region.
• Visual effects will be ‘major’ on some receptors and as such there is harm.
• 40 existing screening trees, 30 years old, specifically planted to screen previous building to be cut down and replaced by new young planting.
• Acoustic report not available to members when making their decision, neither had officers the opportunity to consider it. Report reveals that night-time plant noise emissions will be 51dB and thus 25dB over assessed current background sound, causing ‘significant adverse impact’. No proper assessment of noise currently or to be generated.
• Noise levels at unsociable hours are extremely likely to exceed acceptable levels.
• Application restricts its assessment on impacts to the few properties immediately adjacent. Noise assessment should be carried out over a wider area.
• Not all of the land needed for the offsite road works appears to be in the control of the Highways Authority.
• Waveney House Appeal. The Planning Committee was informed that the nearest bus stop was 1km distant with no footpath serving the site and that approval would make the development reliant on the use of private vehicles conflicting with (NPPF) aims of achieving sustainable development. This factor seems to be ignored in the report to Committee for this much larger development.
• Contrary to National Planning Policy Framework, Joint Core Strategy and the SN Local Plan Policies.
• Proposals will overshadow nearby properties and will be totally out of keeping with the village.
• Dirt and noise caused during the demolition of the old buildings and construction of the new ones will be considerable. The noise and pollution from the operation of the new facility with its increased capacity will also be highly intrusive.
• Fox Covert and Fen Farm Barn does not currently have significant planting within or adjacent to the boundaries, as implied in para 4.21 by the Conservation & Design Officer.
• Impact on near neighbours and their businesses (including B&B’s) do not appear to have been given adequate consideration.
• Photomontages/viewpoints deceptive and do not show several important viewpoints.
• Tree planting will not screen silos which will result in detrimental visual impact.
• Increased traffic impacts including noise and disturbance from HGV movements and tail backs on Fen Street.
• Plans fail to show any of the surrounding residential properties and their close proximity to the grain store.
• Not realised the height and revised number of silos. Information impossible for the layman to ascertain.
• Weigh bridges will cause stopping and starting of engines and dust.
• There will be nothing to shield the noise and the visual impact.
• It will only be possible for less than half the trees shown to be planted on land owned by Openfield. The others will have to be planted on land owned by another party.
• Report states the development will cause visual harm, not reflected in the report summary.
• Plans show at committee failed to show any of the surrounding residential properties and their close proximity to the grain store.
• Increase in allergens from the grain dust which, with the removal of the screening trees, will also cause an increase in allergies already suffered.
• Proposed road layout by BSP Consulting does not show or take into account two houses opposite the grain store.
• Proposed highways scheme will increase danger when turning into and out of site.
• Adverse impact on tourism as the harvest peak coincides with the tourist season.
• Lorry movements will not be evenly spaced and will probably cause congestion (one at least every 4 minutes).
• Severe negative visual impact.
• Significantly reduce the viability of local businesses and value of assets.
• Notes conditions and comments regarding historic planning permissions for the site. Reference to 1988 conditions imposed on the height of the permitted development on the site at 15.5 metres.
• Increase in vehicle movements on and off the site. At the moment heavy goods movement start at around 04.30am and continue all day. Increasing this by 170% would be a massive intrusion on my life and the business.
• If the site entrance could be moved 500 metres west of its current location then it would exit opposite an open field and not disturb the five neighbours that live so close.
• Junction to site very likely to result in another serious accident or fatality due to slow moving traffic and turning across high speed road.
• The 3 grain driers make a lot of noise and could be located to the rear of the site where they would be onto open field and not disturb anyone.
• Represents a major industrial development in a quiet rural location.
• Will cause a loss of visual amenity.
• 117 meters away from our home, Grade II Listed Building.
• New on site roads indicate an increase in traffic, which will create noise and disturbance, impacting negatively on all nearby residents.
• Demolition of existing buildings will release hazardous materials into the air (asbestos).
• If planning permission is given strict attention should be given to managing asbestos, appearance of new structures, lighting and the restricting the proximity of the access roads to residents at the east end of Wilney Green.
• Pre-application from 5th August 2015 on website for this application, this is misleading. Incorrectly lodged on applications by Openfield.
• The development requires an Environmental Impact Assessment.
• Eastern visibility splays not deliverable without taking out Paul Rackham Limited’s hedge at Four Winds.
• Questions if the internal site area provides sufficient parking space for queuing HGVs.
• Not enough stopping distance and parking for one vehicle in the central waiting lane.
• Misleading and contradictory information on planning application.
• Civil Aviation Authority should be consulted due to the height of structures. This is the height at which red lights will have to be attached that will be visible from a considerable distance.
• Height of proposals not accurately represented in original report or Planning Statement. They are at least 29m high, 10% higher than suggested in Officers documents.
• Scale of development, two thirds of size as terminal at Tilbury and larger than Ipswich port terminal.
• Application predicts 2174 inward movements during August. Equates to 9 deliveries per hour
• Drawings misleading. Appear partly clad in a block type manner whereas structures proposed will be stainless steel, which can cause glare from sunlight and could be a road hazard.
• Tree planting shown on east side of proposals are partly within 3rd party land.

In addition, one of the objectors has employed a noise consultant and raised a number of concerns, summarised as follows:
• Noise survey data not available before committee.
• Assessment does not include a survey of existing background noise levels, or plant types/ model numbers.
• Provides only the simplest of predictions of likely noise at some but not all noise sensitive receptors.
• Predictions use estimates and assumptions not qualified in report.
• Background noise at some receptors at night are different to own library data, which indicate significant adverse impact.
• Adverse health effects.
• Not sufficient information to make accurate assessment of noise impact on residential amenity.
• Limited data indicates that there will be a significant impact to amenity in the local community.

1 letter of support received, summarised as follows:
• Consider the development to be very positive for our business and the local community as it ensures that barley can be supplied from the local area rather than sourcing and transporting it from further afield.
• The proposals will contribute to the success of Tivetshall Maltings.

4 Assessment

Site description and proposals

4.1 The site relates to the Openfield Agriculture UK grain store located in the open countryside between Bressingham and South Lopham. The site has been used as a grain store since the 1970's by different operators with Openfield Agriculture Ltd having acquired the site in 1999. To the south of the site is a utilitarian brick office building associated with the site and there are properties located directly to the south east and south west of the application site.

4.2 Agricultural fields surround the application site with the A1066 forming the southern boundary of the site, which the site has direct access on to. There are a number of Public Rights of Way in the vicinity of the site and the site is located in the Waveney Rural River Valley Landscape Character Area. There are a number of listed buildings within the surrounding area. The site gently slopes down towards the river valley in a southerly direction.
4.3 The site has a number of existing silos, large grain store sheds and significant areas of concrete hardstanding, including car and lorry parking areas. A tree belt comprising mainly conifers is along the western boundary of the site and there is some mixed vegetation along the eastern boundary.

4.4 The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of 5 buildings and construction of 17 storage silos, 10 intake silos, 1 dust box, 1 machinery building, 3 grain driers and 6 bulk out load hoppers, an office & laboratory block and 2 weighbridges and a new permanent and temporary access for construction vehicles and upgrading of on-site roadways.

4.5 The amount of development proposed is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>FOOTPRINT M²</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storage Silos</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3308</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake silos</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dust Box</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Driers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead bulk out-loading hopper</td>
<td>2 x 3 bins</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; laboratory block</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>636 (floor area 580 m²)</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyor / elevator for crop handling</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighbridges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 The applicant has advised that the upgrade to the facility is required following modernisation of the farming industry in recent years, as well as to ensure that the grain store complies with EU food standard regulations.

4.7 The new silos will be used to store grain. The proposed development will upgrade the existing outdated facility and the silos will enable grain to be stored more efficiently. The proposed development is in line with the existing built form of the grain store complex, and will not exceed the current site boundary.

4.8 In order to support the increase in traffic movements to the site, significant access improvements are proposed as well as a temporary access for use by construction vehicles.

4.9 Additional landscape planting is also proposed along the eastern boundary to the site. This consists of a 425m² native shrub belt planting with hedgerow trees. In addition, additional trees are proposed to the west of the site.

Principle of development

4.10 The relevant policy considerations relating to the site are those contained in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015 as well as national policy guidance.

4.11 The JCS sets out the longer term vision and objectives for the area and outlines the strategic policies for shaping future development. JCS Policy 5 advises that the local economy will be developed in a sustainable way to support jobs and economic growth both in urban and rural locations. This includes the promotion of appropriate new and expanded businesses.
4.12 From an economic perspective, Openfield are one of Britain’s most successful cooperatives working with over 5000 arable farmers throughout the UK. Collaboration across the farmer member base is essential to create the required scale and the necessary investment in infrastructure to meet the needs of the farmer members at harvest time and the continuity of supply of grains to processor customers throughout the year.

4.13 The proposed investment in the Bressingham facility is £10 million spread over two years with £8 million in the first phase in readiness for harvest 2017 and the remainder in readiness for harvest 2018. The proposed upgrade will add significant added value contracts with local customers and produce approximately 6 full time equivalent new direct jobs (comprised of 3 full time employees and 6 part time employees) and many indirect jobs through the construction process, increased deliveries and maintenance of the site. The proposed upgrade will ensure that the grainstore remains profitable thus increasing the job security of the existing jobs (16 full time and 8 HGV drivers) the site provides.

4.14 It has been suggested that the proposal would actually result in job losses given the content of section 19 of the application form. However it has been clarified that those jobs indicated to be “proposed employees” are additional to those indicated as “existing employees”. This is consistent with paragraph 1.6.1 of the Planning Statement which confirms that they are “new” employees.

4.15 The proposed development will improve the efficiency of the site and make the grain store in compliance with the EU food standard regulations, this will make the site more economically sustainable. The application also suggests that the proposed grain store will act as a catalyst for the local rural economy. Several maltsters within a ten mile radius of the site have expressed interest in sourcing grain from the site.

4.16 With regards to the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2015, Policy DM1.3 supports this approach and makes provision for development in the countryside outside of the defined development boundaries or settlements providing the proposals demonstrate overriding benefits in terms of its economic, social and environmental dimensions or where specific development management policies allow for development outside of development boundaries.

4.17 With the last point in mind, Policy DM2.1 of the Local Plan is applicable to Employment and Business Development, and in particular part 6 which states that: *(6) Proposals for the expansion of existing businesses located in the Countryside should not have a significant adverse impact on the local and natural environment and character of the Countryside and should protect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.*

4.18 In considering the scheme against Policy DM2.1, firstly, it is clear that the scheme would provide for new employment opportunities, significant inward investment and the adaptation and expansion of an existing business and as such the scheme will be supported unless significant adverse impact would occur, or other material considerations dictate otherwise.

4.19 As established in part 6 of Policy DM2.1 the key issues for consideration are:
- Landscape impact
- Impact upon the natural environment
- Amenities of neighbouring occupiers

Landscape impact (including the impact on heritage assets)

4.20 As well as part 6 of Policy DM2.1, policy DM4.5 requires that development proposals should respect, conserve and where possible, enhance the landscape character of its immediate and wider environment. It also states that development proposals that would cause significant adverse impact on the distinctive landscape characteristics of an area will be refused.
4.21 With regard to the overall visual impact, the Council’s Landscape Architect has assessed the proposals and broadly agrees with the findings of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) submitted with the application. However it is acknowledged that there is a degree of judgement in the process and the Landscape Architect’s own assessment concludes that some of the viewpoint locations with residential receptors (especially from the river valley) would have major/moderate adverse and major adverse impacts (viewpoints iii and iv). These impacts are notwithstanding the proposed mitigation measures proposed (planting).

4.22 In terms of tree removal, the Council’s Landscape Architect’s has confirmed that “no significant existing trees will be lost”. This is consistent with the Officers full response dated 18th August which acknowledges the removal of trees (40 in total), but clearly articulates that the quality of those scheduled for removal as a consequence of them being “contemporary with, or more recent than, the existing site developments” are not considered to be “significant”. It should also be noted that the layout plan submitted as part of the planning application highlights the tree removal proposed.

4.23 It is considered that given the impacts of the development from the majority of directions would be moderate adverse, with more major adverse landscape impacts limited to only a couple of viewpoints, on balance, whilst clearly it must be acknowledged that harm to the landscape would be caused, in the context of part 6 of policy DM2.1 it would not be considered to be significant adverse impact.

4.24 Members should note that concern has been expressed at how the landscape impact has been assessed. The Council’s Landscape Architect clearly acknowledges that there would be a negative impact on the landscape as a consequence of the proposal and subsequently my assessment reflects this. Furthermore, the visualisations submitted with the application and used in the previous committee presentation show the impact from four viewpoints by providing existing images and proposed images at both year 1 and year 15 of the development.

4.25 Comments have also been raised expressing concerns that part of the tree planting shown on east side of the proposals are within 3rd party land. The applicant has reviewed the plans and subsequently confirmed that the tree planting shown on the plans are within Openfield’s ownership and are deliverable. As such it is considered that the proposals remain acceptable in the context of Policy DM4.9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.26 In terms of Public Rights of Way (PROW), there is a number of PROW that traverse the surrounding land but do not enter the application site. As noted above the development will affect the wider landscape setting however I do not consider that it will directly affect any PROW to a significant degree. Whilst the visual impact from the PROWs will be altered, the form of development is typical of agricultural industrial development and is on an established site and as such it is not an inappropriate form of development to be viewed from these PROWs.

4.27 The Senior Conservation and Design Officer has also undertaken a detailed appraisal of the proposal and its likely impact on the nearby designated heritage assets. It is noted that there are a number of listed buildings within the vicinity of the site, principally located to the south and east of the site, including St Johns the Baptist Church 1km to the east which is Grade I Listed. It is noted that many of the listed buildings have significant planting within their curtilage or adjacent to their boundaries which will soften the impact of the development. Furthermore, it is also noted that none of the listed buildings are larger properties set within ‘estate land’ in which longer landscape views would be an important characteristic. Rather they are generally detached farmhouses and cottages set within smaller curtilages and as such their character may viewed in their immediate setting instead of wide expansive views. The Senior Conservation and Design Officer concludes, and I concur, that the development is therefore acceptable from the point of view of its impact on the setting of the listed buildings. It should also be noted that on the issue of
consultation requirements relating to the setting of listed buildings, it is for the Council to
determine whether it is necessary to consult other bodies ie Historic England.

4.28 In consideration of the Council's duties under S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990, the Council
has given special attention to the desirability of preserving the buildings or their settings. The proposal would not adversely affect the special architectural or historic interest of the
listed buildings or their setting.

4.29 The Senior Conservation and Design Officer also assessed the design merits of the
scheme within their assessment, having regard to the requirement of planning policy to
promote a high standard of design at all levels and for all forms of development with good
design expected to address connections between people and places as well as the
integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environments (NPPF,
para 61) and at a local level the Council has set out its design aspirations in Policy DM3.8.

4.30 The new structures of substantial size and height and will feature prominently within the
immediate site and wider landscape setting. However, notwithstanding this point the
proposed silos and ancillary structures are well situated within the site being located
between existing grain store sheds to the north and the existing (albeit smaller) silos to the
south. Although the buildings will be large in scale and industrial in character, they are
related to agricultural activity, and therefore not incongruous within a rural landscape
context when seen within long distance landscape views. As such it is considered that the
design and position of the silos and ancillary equipment within the site are appropriate for
the context and accord with the principles of Policy DM3.8 and the South Norfolk Place
Making Guide SPD, subject to an appropriately worded condition seeking details of
materials to ensure design quality.

4.31 Having regard to the above policies, it is acknowledged that there already is an existing
development on the site, albeit significantly smaller than the proposed development, and
whilst on balance it is acknowledged that there will be landscape harm arising from the
development, most notably at the property known as the Wayside, the proposals are
related to existing agricultural activity, and therefore not incongruous within a rural
landscape context when seen within wider landscape views. As such whilst visual harm is
acknowledged, it is not considered that this is considered to represent a significant adverse
impact in terms to the rural landscape.

Impact upon the natural environment

4.32 The County Ecologist has assessed the Ecological Assessment submitted to the support
the application and has concluded that it is fit for purpose. The report indicates that there is
little evidence of bats on the site and a licence would not be required.

4.33 The Ecologist has requested that the mitigation measures referred in the report are
conditioned and I consider this to be a reasonable requirement to mitigate any disturbance
to those bats that are present on the site.

4.34 Having regard to part 6 of Policy DM2.1 it is considered that the proposal, including the
proposed mitigation, would avoid causing significant adverse impacts in terms of the
natural environment.

Amenities of neighbouring occupiers

4.35 As well as part 6 of Policy DM2.1, Policy DM3.13 refers to residential amenity and policy
DM3.14 is concerned with minimising and reducing emissions and other forms of pollution.

4.36 The Environmental Protection Team has reviewed the proposal and has suggested a
number of conditions that would apply to both the construction and operational phases of
development. These conditions would seek to minimise the disruption caused to those
residents closest to the site, particularly during the construction phase. An ‘hours of operation’ condition during construction will also further protect these residents from the impact of development although due to the scale of development and the proximity of these dwellings to the site it is recognised that some disruption is likely to be experienced.

4.38 It is evident that one of the suggested conditions requires the submission of further information related to noise and the agreement of noise mitigation measures with the Council. Whilst this could be used, it is considered appropriate in this instance for the Council to assess this information and agree the noise mitigation prior to issuing a planning approval. On this basis the suggested condition will be amended to require the implementation of agreed mitigation measures (see suggested condition 17).

4.39 In the context of Policy DM3.13 and noise, it is evident that reference is made in part 1 criterion c to avoiding the “introduction of incompatible neighbouring uses in terms of noise………….” With this in mind it is necessary to recognise that this scheme is not introducing a use as the site is already, and has been for some time in this use. In considering this it is also necessary to take account of part 2 of DM3.13 and the fact that the character and function of the area at present has this use in it.

4.40 With regards to part 3 of Policy DM3.13, this highlights that development should not be permitted where the proposed development would generate noise which would be significantly detrimental to the amenity of nearby residents. Again in making a decision in the context of this part of the policy it is considered reasonable to take into account the fact that the lawful use of the site generates noise at present, and any assessment of impact should recognise this point. The submitted noise report uses this rationale. Furthermore, part 3 highlights that proportionate mitigation measures will be used to reduce impacts, as is being employed here.

4.41 As noted above it is likely that there will be some disruption during the construction stage of development to the local residents however this is considered to be to an acceptable level. The conditions proposed above seek to ensure that the proposed development on this site will not result in the introduction of unacceptable impacts in terms of noise, odour, vibration etc. As indicated above, it is necessary to have regard to the existing lawful use at the site which has been in operation for many years on this site when assessing the impact of this application.

4.42 As also noted above, the proposed silos are of significant scale and will be clearly visible to those residents closest to the application site, most notably the occupiers of Waveney House to the south west of the application site and Wayside to the east. Due to the existing units on this established business site, as well as the relationship between these properties and the silos, it is not considered that the standard of amenity associated with these properties will be significantly affected by development in terms loss of daylight, overshadowing or overbearing impact.

4.43 There will be a significant increase in traffic associated with the development however the proposed off-site highway improvements along with the improved site access arrangements seeks to address this in highways terms as set out above. Whilst the increased vehicle movements will have an impact on the properties closest to the site, the increase in traffic movements will occur over a relatively short period of time in the year and as such will not result in significant disruption to these occupiers to a degree which is considered to be detrimental. It should also be noted that at present large vehicles already visit the site on a regular basis for delivery and collection purposes and that the proposed off-site highways improvements along with the suggested conditions restricting hours of hours of operation, will further reduce the impacts associated with vehicle movements to and from the site.

4.44 With regards to external lighting, it is recommended that a condition is added that requires any changes or additional external lighting on site to be considered in terms of impact on nearby residential amenity and also on bats to ensure that any impacts are minimised.
Local residents concerns are acknowledged, including those of local business owners close to the site, and it is recognised that there will be some increased disturbance as a result of the development. However this would not be to a degree that results in conflict with planning policy DM3.14 and DM3.13 having regard to the existing use of the site and its scale of operations and the imposition of the suggested conditions.

4.45 In summary the scheme is considered to comply with the requirements of Policy DM3.14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan that requires development to have regard to the impacts on residential amenity and DM3.13 that seeks to ensure that development proposals take into consideration the impact on the living and working conditions of existing and future occupiers surrounding the site, subject to appropriate conditions.

4.46 A noise assessment has also been submitted received by the Council on the 6th September 2016. Whilst the assessment was not uploaded to the Councils website until 27th September 2016, it is not considered that this undermines the recommendation insofar as the previous reports acknowledge that noise is an issue which must be assessed, and consequently concludes, via the update sheet, that a condition would be required to secure measures to mitigate the impact of the development. It is considered that Members were aware of this when reaching their resolution.

4.47 Having regard to part 6 of Policy DM2.1 it is considered that the proposal, including the proposed mitigation, would avoid causing significant adverse impacts in terms of the natural environment.

4.48 Overall, in the context of the requirements of Policy DM2.1, and in particular part 6, the scheme, whilst causing some visual harm to the landscape would not result in a significant adverse impact and therefore Policy DM2.1 has been fulfilled.

Traffic impacts

4.49 Whilst not referred to in Policy DM2.1 it is evident that one of the key impacts of the scheme would be from traffic movements associated with the scheme.

4.50 The Development proposes an increase in the tonnages to be stored at the site from the present approx. 30,000 tonnes to 80,000 tonnes, with a corresponding increase in vehicle movements. According to the transport statement, vehicle movements during the months of June, July and August will increase to 122,143 and 161 movements per day respectively. From the previous submission the daily movements for those months for the current 30,000 tonnes is 50,56 and 81 movements.

4.51 The nature of these movements will be by HGV or tractors with trailers delivering grain. Some of these will be slow moving right-hand turns into the site across the A1066. Whilst it is accepted that the figures given are peak, it is necessary to consider the figures and nature of movements in highway safety terms.

4.52 This site at Bressingham is served directly from the A1066. This road has the designation as a Principal Route within the Norfolk Route Hierarchy. The route is also designated as a Corridor of Movement. In the vicinity of the application site the road is subject to the national speed limit for single carriageway roads of 60mph. Central ladder hatch markings are provided along this section of the A1066 to denote the hazards and to deter overtaking. There has been one serious personal injury accident that occurred outside of the site in 2013 where a vehicle turning right into the site was in collision with a motorcycle.

4.53 The proposal includes for a right turn lane facility to improve the A1066 and provide safe refuge for vehicles right turning into the site. This would remove the current access track, which has a single width pinch point, and allow vehicles to turn into the site without holding traffic up on the A1066. The proposal also includes for a temporary site entrance for
4.54 The work to formally design the scheme and construct the highway improvement will be carried out by Norfolk County Council at cost to the applicant under the terms of a formal section 278 agreement for off-site highway improvements.

4.55 The Highways Authority has carried out an assessment of the submitted information including the safety audit report and the highway scheme designer’s comments and considers that the proposals are acceptable, subject to the detailed design of off-site highway improvements and conditions relating to providing visibility splays, access / on-site and HGV parking loading, unloading and turning areas and provision of site parking for construction workers. As such it is considered that the scheme accords with Policy DM3.11 and 3.12 and is acceptable, subject to conditions.

4.56 Concerns have been raised that part of the eastern visibility splay is not deliverable without using third party land at Four Winds. Concerns have also been raised about whether the internal site layout provides sufficient parking spaces for queuing HGVs and if there is enough stopping distance and parking for HGVs in the proposed central turning lane. Having considered these points it is acknowledged that the off-site highway improvements are subject to conditions requiring detailed design of the improvements as noted above. The Highways Authority has confirmed that they considered an acceptable off-site highways solution can be delivered subject to the conditions noted above. If agreement to deliver highways improvements using third party land cannot be reached, then a revised plan would need to be considered by the Local Planning Authority. The approach of this condition is following the principle of a “grampian condition” which is a planning condition attached to a decision notice that prevents the start of a development until off-site works have been completed on land not controlled by the applicant ie an adjacent landowner.

Other matters

4.57 It is also appropriate to confirm that since the previous committee resolution, the Council has received confirmation via the Planning Inspectorate that an appeal on an adjacent site has been allowed for the erection of a new industrial unit (our ref 2015/2856). A copy of the Inspector’s decision and approved plans are attached as Appendix 4.

4.58 In terms of the appeal decision, it is evident that the Inspector considered a condition to secure a right hand lane into the appeal site, which coincidentally is the same access as this proposed under this application, would be “necessary, relevant and reasonable given the proposed intensified use of the access” which to officers reinforces that the approach set out in the previous application to securing a right turn lane is an acceptable one in planning terms.

4.59 Also, it is evident that the Inspector recognises the existence of the existing enterprise as a material factor when considering the impact of the proposal on neighbour amenity, which is consistent with the approach taken by the Council’s Community Protection Team in assessing the application. The decision states at paragraph 11:

"While the precise use of the proposed development is not fixed, it is likely to generate additional noise from its operation as an industrial unit as well as the extra traffic movement. This would have some effect on the living conditions of occupiers of Waveney House to the south, but set against the context of existing noise from the adjoining business use and A1066, it would not result in unacceptable harm. Noise generating equipment could be controlled through appropriately worded conditions."

4.60 With regards to surface water and foul drainage, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been produced by BSP Consulting to support the application. The FRA advises that the site is at
low risk from flooding from all sources. The Environmental Team has carried out an assessment of the proposals and has no objections, subject to suitably worded conditions that require a detailed scheme for the disposal of surface water to be approved and a foul drainage assessment to determine the most appropriate treatment facility for the site. As such it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and accords with Policy 1 of the JCS and the principles of the NPPF, subject to the conditions noted above.

4.61 Policy 3 of the Joint Core Strategy requires that all development proposals of a minimum of 1,000m² of non-residential floor space will be required to include sources of ‘decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy’. Having assessed the proposals, it is considered that the only floor space created by the proposals is the office and laboratory block which has a total area of approximately 580m². As such it is not considered that JCS Policy 3 is relevant in this case.

4.62 Whilst there is no planning policy requirement to specifically explore the possible existence of alternative sites for this particular type of use, it is evident from the applicant’s submission that Openfield have carefully reviewed opportunities for alternative sites. The alternative sites were identified as broadly greenfield sites or currently designated industrial development, which were not considered appropriate due to their location and initial service infrastructure costs. The Bressingham site is favoured by the applicant as it is currently in use and is owned by Openfield so there is no additional land acquisition cost. The opportunity to upgrade existing services and road infrastructure also delivers significant investment and cost savings over alternative sites. The overall economic benefit of redeveloping the Bressingham site is estimated to be in the order of £4 million lower cost (40%) compared to alternative sites.

4.63 In terms of the consultation process, a number of concerns have been raised with regards to the requirements associated with the application process not being met as well as technical documents not being available for the public to view before the Development Management Committee considered the application on the 14th September. Officers have reviewed the comments and are satisfied that at the point of undertaking the initial consultations that there was sufficient information for interested parties to form a view on the proposal. Officer’s are also satisfied that all relevant statutory consultees have been consulted and that they have provided sufficient information to enable Officers to make an assessment of the proposals. Furthermore all technical information has been uploaded to the Council’s website since the previous committee meeting on the 14th September 2016 and concerns addressed in my report. With regards to the consultation process, the Officers confirm that it has fulfilled all of its statutory requirements as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

4.64 With regards to the consultation requirements concerning proposals where local aerodromes may be affected or involved, the Civil Aviation Authority requires notification for proposed development over 90m in height above ground level. As the proposals are well below this height it is considered that this requirement has been met. In terms of aviation warning lighting, the structures are below the height where there is a mandatory requirement for them to be equipped with aviation warning lighting.

4.65 Concerns have been raised that the pre-application response dated 5th August 2015 submitted as part of the application as appendix 2 of the Planning Statement is misleading and incorrectly attached to the planning application. Having assessed this it is considered that there is no substantive reason why to not place this on the website as part of the applicant’s submission. For the avoidance of doubt it is also noted that the Planning Statement, paragraph 1.5.2, confirms that the current scheme has been amended since the advice was given.

4.66 It has also been suggested that enforcement action against the demolition of buildings on-site be considered. In considering this, it is appropriate to acknowledge that the current proposal, if approved, would allow for the demolition, whilst this is still a “live” application it
is not considered appropriate to pursue the demolition through its enforcement powers as action is being taken to regularise the matter.

4.67 With regards to comments received regarding the devaluing of properties, whilst these concerns are acknowledged, this in itself is not considered to be a material planning consideration. In terms of the issues which could contribute to this issue i.e. noise impacts from a development the report address all the relevant material issues.

4.68 Finally, it should be noted that a significant number of concerns and objections have been raised locally over a wide range of issues summarised above and noted in appendix 2 and 3. Whilst I fully appreciate these concerns, they do not represent a reason to refuse the application for the reasons set out above. Equally all applications are assessed on their individual merits notwithstanding other developments of a similar nature. As such, the application has been assessed against the policies of the Development Plan, and I would consider that the proposal accords with the principles of these.

Financial considerations

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

This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5 Conclusion

5.1 Policy DM2.1 is directly applicable to this proposal to expand an existing commercial operation within the countryside, and in particular, part 6 of this policy. It has been concluded that, whilst some adverse landscape impact would occur as a result of this scheme, notwithstanding the proposed mitigation measures in terms of additional planting, the level of harm is not considered to represent a significant adverse impact as recognised within policy DM2.1. Likewise, it is considered that there would be no significant adverse impact in respect of the other areas recognised with part 6 of Policy DM2.1 (natural environment and neighbour amenity), nor would there be any significant adverse impact in respect of any other matter ie highway safety. Also having regard to the other matters highlighted above, it is the officer’s opinion that there are no material changes to the previous recommendations, in light of the additional comments and information received since the previous resolution. Therefore officers continue to recommend approval of the scheme based upon the previous assessment and as updated in this report. Therefore, in balancing the above impacts, including a degree of negative impact, against the clear economic benefits of the scheme it is considered that the application is, on balance, acceptable.

5.2 Therefore the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions and the satisfactory submission of further noise assessment information and mitigation measures to the satisfaction of the Council with advice from the Community Services Environmental Quality Team.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Raine 01508 533841
Chris Watts 01508 533765 craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk and cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No**: 2016/1447/F  
**Parish**: BRESSINGHAM

**Applicants Name**: Openfield  
**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 and 6 bulk out load hoppers. New permanent and temporary access for construction vehicles and upgrading of on-site roadways.

**Recommendation**: Approve subject to the imposition of conditions

1. Full planning permission time limit
2. In accordance with submitted information
3. Visibility splays to each side of access
4. Access / on-site car and HGV parking, loading, unloading and turning areas
5. Detailed scheme for the off-site highway improvement works
6. On-site parking for construction workers
7. Vehicular access from the adjoining highway limited
8. Temporary construction access to be closed
9. Materials to be agreed
10. Surface water drainage scheme
11. Foul drainage assessment
12. Environmental conditions as required

### Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
- NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
- NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
- NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
- NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
- NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
- Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
- Policy 2: Promoting good design  
- Policy 5: The Economy  
- Policy 6: Access and Transportation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
**Development Management Policies**  
- **DM1.1**: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
- **DM1.3**: The sustainable location of new development  
- **DM2.1**: Employment and business development  
- **DM2.7**: Agricultural and forestry development  
- **DM3.8**: Design Principles applying to all development  
- **DM3.10**: Promotion of sustainable transport  
- **DM3.11**: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
- **DM3.12**: Provision of vehicle parking  
- **DM3.13**: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
- **DM3.14**: Pollution, health and safety  
- **DM4.2**: Sustainable drainage and water management  
- **DM4.5**: Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys  
- **DM4.9**: Incorporating landscape into design  
- **DM4.10**: Heritage Assets
Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD

1.5 Statutory duties relating to Listed Buildings, setting of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas: S86(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990 provides: "In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses."

2. Planning History

2.1 2015/2364 Demolition of 2x buildings and construction of 7 Storage Silos, 3 Intake Silos, 1 Bunker Storage Area, 1 Machinery Building, 2 Grain Dryers and associated infrastructure, plant and machinery Withdrawn

2.2 1997/0930 Demolition of existing shed & erection of replacement using former steel framed storage building Approved

2.3 1996/0124 Siting of mobile offices & toilets to replace existing Approved

2.4 1995/1461 Two grain silos Approved

2.5 1994/1111 Erection of radio dish antenna mounted on w 12.5m high pole Approved

2.6 1994/0530 Erection of 2 no hopper grain silos and grain dryer (amendment to permission 07/88/0832/F) Approved

2.7 1993/1022 Storage of 2000 tonnes of fertilizer Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Recommends approval.

3.2 District Member Requests that the application is determined by Development Management Committee.

3.3 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team Comments to be reported.

3.4 SNC Water Management Officer No objection.

3.5 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority No objection.
3.6 SNC Landscape Architect

- No significant existing trees will be lost. If the trees were to decline as a result of root disturbance/damage caused by construction, then this would provide an opportunity for renewal with species more suited to the landscape character.

- A LVIA (Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment) has been provided. Broadly I concur with the findings of the LVIA for most of the viewpoints analysed. However, as there is an element of judgement in the process, my own assessment is marginally different for some of the viewpoint locations; for some of those with residential receptors (especially from the valley) my own judgement would be Moderate/Major Moderate.

- My assessment, based on site observations and also using the montages is that the significance of visual effects for these is: Moderate (i & ii), Major (iii) and Major/Moderate (iv). Viewpoint iii considers the situation in the vicinity of ‘Wayside’ the dwelling on Halford Lane. In light of this it can be concluded that there is visual harm.

- Ideally planting should be further away to give the best visual effect for mitigation screening, but this is not possible in this case due to the limited ownership. The opportunity appears to exist for the new planting to be extended along the northern land-ownership boundary, possibly even the western one too.

- In summary, agree with much in the LVIA, with the majority of the visual effects being ‘moderate’ a note of caution should be sounded on the significance of effects for some of the residential receptors. Most notably, is the property ‘Wayside’ for which my own assessment of the situation is that the significance of visual effects will be ‘major’ and as such there is harm. The mitigation effect of the new planting proposed as part of this development will be unable to reduce this harm in the long term due to the height of the proposed silos.

3.7 Anglian Water Services Ltd

No comments received

3.8 SNC Conservation And Design

No objection.

- There are a number of heritage assets to the south of the site along Fan Street. Although the site will be visible due to its size and scale when moving along Fan Street, I do not consider that it will have a direct impact on the setting of the heritage assets, which can be considered to be relatively confined and immediate to the buildings.

- The design is appropriate for the context, but I would suggest conditioning materials and details to ensure a quality in the final design.

3.9 NCC Ecologist

No objection

3.10 NCC Highways

No objection.

- Subject to detail design, the proposals are considered as acceptable. Recommend conditions relating to providing visibility splays, access / on-site and HGV parking, off-site highways improvement works.

3.11 Health And Safety Executive

No objection.

- Do not advise on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission in this case.
Development Management Committee 14 September 2016

3.12 Other Representations

2 letters of objection received and 1 letter of support. Comments as summarised:
- Increase in vehicle movements on and off the site. At the moment heavy goods movement start at around 04.30am and continue all day. Increasing this by 170% would be a massive intrusion on my life and the business.
- If the site entrance could be moved 500 metres west of its current location then it would exit opposite an open field and not disturb the five neighbours that live so close.
- The 3 grain driers make a lot of noise and could be located to the rear of the site where they would be onto open field and not disturb anyone.
- Represents a major industrial development in a quiet rural location.
- Will cause a loss of visual amenity.
- 117 meters away from our home, Grade II Listed Building.
- New on site roads indicate an increase in traffic, which will create noise and disturbance, impacting negatively on all nearby residents.
- Demolition of existing buildings will release hazardous materials into the air (asbestos).
- If planning permission is given strict attention should be given to managing asbestos, appearance of new structures, lighting and the restricting the proximity of the access roads to residents at the east end of Wilney Green.
- Consider the development to be very positive for our business and the local community as it ensures that barley can be supplied from the local area rather than sourcing and transporting it from further afield.
- The proposals will contribute to the success of Tivetshall Maltings.

4 Assessment

Site description and proposals

4.1 The site relates to the Openfield Agriculture UK grain store located in the open countryside between Bressingham and South Lopham. The site has been used as a grain store since the 1970’s by different operators with Openfield Agriculture Ltd having acquired the site in 1999. To the south of the site is a utilitarian brick office building associated with the site and there are properties located directly to the south east and south west of the application site.

4.2 Agricultural fields surround the application site with the A1066 forming the southern boundary of the site, which the site has direct access on to. There are a number of Public Rights of Way in the vicinity of the site and the site is located in the Waveney Rural River Valley Landscape Character Area. There are a number of listed buildings within the surrounding area. The site gently slopes down towards the river valley in a southerly direction.

4.3 The site has a number of existing silos, large grain store sheds and significant areas of concrete hardstanding, including car and lorry parking areas. A tree belt comprising mainly conifers is along the western boundary of the site and there is some mixed vegetation along the eastern boundary.

4.4 The application seeks full planning permission for the demolition of 5 buildings and construction of 17 storage silos, 10 intake silos, 1 dust box, 1 machinery building, 3 grain driers and 6 bulk out load hoppers, and a new permanent and temporary access for construction vehicles and upgrading of on-site roadways.
4.5 The amount of development proposed is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>FOOTPRINT M²</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storage Silos</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3308m²</td>
<td>26m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake Silos</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>503m²</td>
<td>17m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dust Box</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112m²</td>
<td>8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178m²</td>
<td>24.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Driers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>152m²</td>
<td>16.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead bulk out-loading hopper</td>
<td>2 x 3 bins</td>
<td>104m²</td>
<td>17.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveyor / elevator for crop handling</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 The applicant has advised that the upgrade to the facility is required following modernisation of the farming industry in recent years, as well as to ensure that the grain store complies with EU food standard regulations.

4.7 The new silos will be used to store grain. The proposed development will upgrade the existing outdated facility and the silos will enable grain to be stored more efficiently. The proposed development is in line with the existing built form of the grain store complex, and will not exceed the current site boundary.

4.8 In order to support the increase in traffic movements to the site, significant access improvements are proposed as well as a temporary access for use by construction vehicles.

4.9 Additional landscape planting is also proposed along the eastern boundary to the site. This consists of a 425m² native shrub belt planting with hedgerow trees. In addition, additional trees are proposed to the west of the site.

Principle of development

4.10 The relevant policy considerations relating to the site are those contained in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015 as well as national policy guidance.

4.11 The JCS sets out the longer term vision and objectives for the area and outlines the strategic policies for shaping future development. JCS Policy 5 advises that the local economy will be developed in a sustainable way to support jobs and economic growth both in urban and rural locations. This includes the promotion of appropriate new and expanded businesses.

4.12 From an economic perspective, Openfield are one of Britain's most successful cooperatives working with over 5000 arable farmers throughout the UK. Collaboration across the farmer member base is essential to create the required scale and the necessary investment in infrastructure to meet the needs of the farmer members at harvest time and the continuity of supply of grains to processor customers throughout the year.

4.13 The proposed investment in the Bressingham facility is £10 million spread over two years with £8 million in the first phase in readiness for harvest 2017 and the remainder in readiness for harvest 2018. The proposed upgrade will add significant added value contracts with local customers and produce approximately 6 Full time equivalent new direct jobs (comprised of 3 full time employees and 6 part time employees) and many indirect jobs through the construction process, increased deliveries and maintenance of the site. The proposed upgrade will ensure that the grainstore remains profitable thus increasing the job security of the existing jobs (16 full time and 8 HGV drivers) the site provides. The proposed development will improve the efficiency of the site and make the grain store in
compliance with the EU food standard regulations, this will make the site more economically sustainable. The application also suggests that the proposed grain store will act as a catalyst for the local rural economy. Several maltsters within a ten mile radius of the site have expressed interest in sourcing grain from the site.

4.14 With regards to the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2015, Policy DM1.3 supports this approach and makes provision for development in the countryside outside of the defined development boundaries or settlements providing the proposals demonstrate overriding benefits in terms of its economic, social and environmental dimensions or where specific development management policies allow for development outside of development boundaries.

4.15 With the last point in mind, Policy DM2.1 of the Local Plan is applicable to Employment and Business Development, and in particular part 6 which states that:

(6) Proposals for the expansion of existing businesses located in the Countryside should not have a significant adverse impact on the local and natural environment and character of the Countryside and should protect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

4.16 In considering the scheme against Policy DM2.1, firstly, it is clear that the scheme would provide for new employment opportunities, significant inward investment and the adaptation and expansion of an existing business and as such the scheme will be supported unless significant adverse impact would occur, or other material considerations dictate otherwise.

As established in part 6 of Policy DM2.1 the key issues for consideration are:
- Landscape impact
- Impact upon the natural environment
- Amenities of neighbouring occupiers

Landscape impact (including the impact on heritage assets)

4.17 As well as part 6 of Policy DM2.1, policy DM4.5 requires that development proposals should respect, conserve and where possible, enhance the landscape character of its immediate and wider environment. It also states that development proposals that would cause significant adverse impact on the distinctive landscape characteristics of an area will be refused.

4.18 With regard to the overall visual impact, the Council’s Landscape Architect has assessed the proposals and broadly agrees with the findings of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (L.VIA) submitted with the application. However it is acknowledged that there is a degree of judgement in the process and the Landscape Architect’s own assessment concludes that some of the viewpoint locations with residential receptors (especially from the river valley) would have major/moderate adverse and major adverse impacts (viewpoints iii and iv). These impacts are notwithstanding the proposed mitigation measures proposed (planting).

4.19 It is considered that given the impacts of the development from the majority of directions would be moderate adverse, with more major adverse landscape impacts limited to only a couple of viewpoints, on balance, whilst clearly it must be acknowledged that harm to the landscape would be caused, in the context of part 6 of policy DM2.1 it would not be considered to be significant adverse impact.

4.20 In terms of Public Rights of Way (PROW), there is a number of PROW that traverse the surrounding land but do not enter the application site. As noted above the development will affect the wider landscape setting however I do not consider that it will directly affect any PROW to a significant degree. Whilst the visual impact from the PROWs will be altered, the form of development is typical of agricultural industrial development and is on an established site and as such it is not an inappropriate form of development to be viewed from these PROWs.
4.21 The Conservation and Design Officer has also undertaken a detailed appraisal of the proposal and its likely impact on the nearby designated heritage assets. It is noted that there are a number of listed buildings within the vicinity of the site, principally located to the south and east of the site. It is noted that many of the listed buildings have significant planting within their curtilage or adjacent to their boundaries which will soften the impact of the development. Furthermore, it is also noted that none of the listed buildings are larger properties set within 'estate land' in which longer landscape views would be an important characteristic. Rather they are generally detached farmhouses and cottages set within smaller curtilages and as such their character may viewed in their immediate setting instead of wide expansive views. The Conservation Officer concludes, and I concur, that the development is therefore acceptable from the point of view of its impact on the setting of the listed buildings.

4.22 In consideration of the Council's duties under S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990, the Council has given special attention to the desirability of preserving the buildings or their settings. The proposal would not adversely affect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed buildings or the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

4.23 The Conservation and Design Officer also assessed the design merits of the scheme within their assessment, having regard to the requirement of planning policy to promote a high standard of design at all levels and for all forms of development with good design expected to address connections between people and places as well as the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environments (NPPF, para 61) and at a local level the Council has set out its design aspirations in Policy DM3.8.

4.24 The new structures of substantial size and height and will feature prominently within the immediate site and wider landscape setting. However, notwithstanding this point the proposed silos and ancillary structures are well situated within the site being located between existing grain store sheds to the north and the existing (albeit smaller) silos to the south. Although the buildings will be large in scale and industrial in character, they are related to agricultural activity, and therefore not incongruous within a rural landscape context when seen within long distance landscape views. As such it is considered that the design and position of the silos and ancillary equipment within the site are appropriate for the context and accord with the principles of Policy DM3.8 and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD, subject to an appropriately worded condition seeking details of materials to ensure design quality.

4.25 Having regard to the above policies, it is acknowledged that there already is an existing development on the site, albeit significantly smaller than the proposed development, and whilst on balance it is acknowledged that there will be landscape harm arising from the development, most notably at the property known as the Wayside, the proposals are related to existing agricultural activity, and therefore not incongruous within a rural landscape context when seen within wider landscape views. As such whilst visual harm is acknowledged, it is not considered that this is considered to represent a significant adverse impact in terms to the rural landscape.

Impact upon the natural environment

4.26 The County Ecologist has assessed the Ecological Assessment submitted to the support the application and has concluded that it is fit for purpose. The report indicates that there is little evidence of bats on the site and a licence would not be required.

4.27 The Ecologist has requested that the mitigation measures referred in the report are conditioned and I consider this to be a reasonable requirement to mitigate any disturbance to those bats that are present on the site.
Having regard to part 6 of Policy DM2.1 it is considered that the proposal, including the proposed mitigation, would avoid causing significant adverse impacts in terms of the natural environment.

Amenities of neighbouring occupiers

As well as part 6 of Policy DM2.1, Policy DM3.13 refers to residential amenity and policy DM3.14 is concerned with minimising and reducing emissions and other forms of pollution.

The Environmental Protection Team has reviewed the proposal and has suggested a number of conditions that would apply to both the construction and operational phases of development. These conditions would seek to minimise the disruption caused to those residents closest to the site, particularly during the construction phase. An ‘hours of operation’ condition during construction will also further protect these residents from the impact of development although due to the scale of development and the proximity of these dwellings to the site it is recognised that some disruption is likely to be experienced. A noise assessment has also been submitted and will be assessed by the local planning authority prior to development taking place on site.

As noted above it is likely that there will be some disruption during the construction stage of development to the local residents however this is considered to be to an acceptable level. The conditions proposed above seek to ensure that the proposed development on this site will not result in the introduction of an incompatible land use in terms of noise, odour, vibration etc however it is also recognised that the application site is an established business that has been in operation for many years on this site.

As also noted above, the proposed silos are of significant scale and will be clearly visible to those residents closest to the application site, most notably the occupiers of Waveney House to the south west of the application site and Wayside to the east. Due to the existing units on this established business site, as well as the relationship between these properties and the silos, it is not considered that the standard of amenity associated with these properties will be significantly affected by development in terms of loss of daylight, overshadowing or overbearing impact.

There will be a significant increase in traffic associated with the development however the proposed off-site highway improvements along with the improved site access arrangements seeks to address this in highways terms as set out above. Whilst the increased vehicle movements will have an impact on the properties closest to the site, the increase in traffic movements will occur over a relatively short period of time in the year and as such will not result in significant disruption to these occupiers to a degree which is considered to be detrimental. It should also be noted that at present large vehicles already visit the site on a regular basis for delivery and collection purposes and that the proposed off-site highways improvements along with the suggested conditions restricting hours of hours of operation, will further reduce the impacts associated with vehicle movements to and from the site.

With regards to external lighting, it is recommended that a condition is added that requires any changes or additional external lighting on site to be considered in terms of impact on nearby residential amenity and also on bats to ensure that any impacts are minimised.

On balance, whilst local residents concerns are acknowledged and it is recognised that there will be some increased disturbance to those residents closest to the site as a result of the development, it is not considered that this will be to a degree that results in conflict with planning policy DM3.14 and DM3.13. The existing use of the site, including the scale of operations on the site, is also a consideration in assessing the impact of the development.
4.36 In summary the scheme is considered to comply with the requirements of Policy DM3.14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan that requires development to have regard to the impacts on residential amenity and DM3.13 that seeks to ensure that development proposals take into consideration the impact on the living and working conditions of existing and future occupiers surrounding the site, subject to appropriate conditions.

4.37 Having regard to part 6 of Policy DM2.1 it is considered that the proposal, including the proposed mitigation, would avoid causing significant adverse impacts in terms of the natural environment.

4.38 Overall, in the context of the requirements of Policy DM2.1, and in particular part 6, the scheme, whilst causing some visual harm to the landscape would not result in a significant adverse impact and therefore Policy DM2.1 has been fulfilled.

Other issues

4.39 Whilst no referred to in Policy DM2.1 it is evident that one of the key impacts of the scheme would be from traffic movements associated with the scheme.

4.40 The Development proposes an increase in the tonnages to be stored at the site from the present approx. 30,000 tonnes to 80,000 tonnes, with a corresponding increase in vehicle movements. According to the transport statement, vehicle movements during the months of June, July and August will increase to 122,143 and 161 movements per day respectively. From the previous submission the daily movements for those months for the current 30,000 tonnes is 50,56 and 81 movements.

4.41 The nature of these movements will be by HGV or tractors with trailers delivering grain. Some of these will be slow moving right-hand turns into the site across the A1066. Whilst it is accepted that the figures given are peak, it is necessary to consider the figures and nature of movements in highway safety terms.

4.42 This site at Bressingham is served directly from the A1066. This road has the designation as a Principal Route within the Norfolk Route Hierarchy. The route is also designated as a Corridor of Movement. In the vicinity of the application site the road is subject to the national speed limit for single carriageway roads of 60mph. Central ladder hatch markings are provided along this section of the A1066 to denote the hazards and to deter overtaking. There has been one serious personal injury accident that occurred outside of the site in 2013 where a vehicle turning right into the site was in collision with a motorcycle.

4.43 The proposal includes for a right turn lane facility to improve the A1066 and provide safe refuge for vehicles right turning into the site. This would remove the current access track, which has a single width pinch point, and allow vehicles to turn into the site without holding traffic up on the A1066. The proposal also includes for a temporary site entrance for construction traffic, which would be permanently closed after construction is completed in agreement with the Highway Authority.

4.44 The work to formally design the scheme and construct the highway improvement will be carried out by Norfolk County Council at cost to the applicant under the terms of a formal section 278 agreement for off-site highway improvements.

4.45 The Highways Authority has carried out an assessment of the submitted information including the safety audit report and the highway scheme designer’s comments and considers that the proposals are acceptable, subject to the detailed design of off-site highway improvements and conditions relating to providing visibility splays, access / on-site and HGV parking loading, unloading and turning areas and provision of site parking for construction workers. As such it is considered that the scheme accords with Policy DM3.11 and 3.12 and is acceptable, subject to conditions.
With regards to surface water and foul drainage, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been produced by BSP Consulting to support the application. The FRA advises that the site is at low risk from flooding from all sources. The Environmental Team has carried out an assessment of the proposals and has no objections, subject to suitably worded conditions that require a detailed scheme for the disposal of surface water to be approved and a foul drainage assessment to determine the most appropriate treatment facility for the site. As such it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and accords with Policy 1 of the JCS and the principles of the NPPF, subject to the conditions noted above.

Whilst there is no planning policy requirement to specifically explore the possible existence of alternative sites for this particular type of use, it is evident from the applicant’s submission that Openfield have carefully reviewed opportunities for alternative sites. The alternative sites were identified as broadly greenfield sites or currently designated industrial development, which were not considered appropriate due to their location and initial service infrastructure costs. The Bressingham site is favoured by the applicant as it is currently in use and is owned by Openfield so there is no additional land acquisition cost. The opportunity to upgrade existing services and road infrastructure also delivers significant investment and cost savings over alternative sites. The overall economic benefit of redeveloping the Bressingham site is estimated to be in the order of £4 million lower cost (40%) compared to alternative sites.

Financial considerations

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

This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Conclusion

Policy DM2.1 is directly applicable to this proposal to expand an existing commercial operation within the countryside, and in particular, part 6 of this policy. It has been concluded that, whilst some adverse landscape impact would occur as a result of this scheme, notwithstanding the proposed mitigation measures in terms of additional planting, the level of harm is not considered to represent a significant adverse impact as recognised within policy DM2.1. Likewise, it is considered that there would be no significant adverse impact in respect of the other areas recognised with part 6 of Policy DM2.1 (natural environment and neighbour amenity), nor would there be any significant adverse impact in respect of any other matter ie highway safety. Therefore, in balancing the above impacts, including a degree of negative impact, against the clear economic benefits of the scheme it is considered that the application is, on balance, acceptable. Therefore the application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Watts 01508 533765 cwatts@e-norfolk.gov.uk
### Updates for DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
**September 14 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Updates</th>
<th>Page No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2016/0803</td>
<td>No Updates</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2016/0805</td>
<td>Additional condition required for flint work sample panel to be provided.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 2014/0981 | Letter received from Norfolk Homes whilst pleased that the deferral has allowed a meeting to take place between key stakeholders, which was a positive exercise, they continue to have the following concerns
- Both the Highway Authority and South Norfolk Council say that 45 is unacceptable as a permanent solution, however, the temporary use is open-ended and therefore does not ensure the access for upto 45 is temporary.
- No explanation is provided as to why it is acceptable on a temporary basis and but not permanently.
- If you are concluding that temporary use is acceptable when a permanent one is not, there must logically be a maximum period when it ceases to not be acceptable. In the absence of any analysis of this it is impossible to conclude that the amendment does not lead to unacceptable impacts
- The S106 does not ensure that it is temporary. The later of the two dates means that upto 45 dwellings can use Hudson Avenue in perpetuity in the event that the NH site is not developed or the access road is delivered but not adopted. Whilst it is NH desire to deliver the scheme there is no guarantee the scheme will happen, or the speed it will be delivered, given the risk of unforeseen circumstances.
- On the grounds of the above the scheme could be open to legal challenge under the Wednesbury grounds of unreasonableness.
- Legal challenge could be minimised by clarifying that “availability” of the route across NHL land does not mean adopted to ensure improved clarity.
- Alternatively, for improved certainty, the agreement could simply fix the permanent arrangements only, which we conclude to be 20 dwellings from Hudson Avenue on the recommendation of our highway consultant.
- If the figure of 20 dwellings permanently were used, it would allow for significant time for discussion between both parties as to the commercial arrangements for the access from the adjoining site, which as stated previously should have no bearing on the decision.                                                                 | 47      |

Officer comments: The committee report makes it clear and acknowledges that there is no fixed date known at
this time as to when the link from the adjacent will be available. The report considers the respective positions of the two sites and considers that there is a reasonable prospect that the link will be made available, and in a reasonable time frame, given the differing stages that each party is at. Having regard to these, it is considered that the recommendation is a reasonable decision, having regard to the Wednesbury principle referred to in the letter. The following text is a summary of the Wednesbury principle:

A standard of unreasonableness used in assessing an application for judicial review of a public authority’s decision. A reasoning or decision is Wednesbury unreasonable (or irrational) if it is so unreasonable that no reasonable person acting reasonably could have made it (Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd v Wednesbury Corporation (1948) 1 KB 223). The test is a different (and stricter) test than merely showing that the decision was unreasonable.

Trowse Parish Council comments:

Following on from the agreements made at the stakeholder meeting, is there really a need to allow for the additional 30 houses to have temporary access down Hudson Avenue and The Street? Therefore we agree with the fixed 15 houses but wish for the additional 30 to be removed.

We were assured as a PC that because Norfolk Homes have to be on site, a year post gaining permission, they are so much further down the line than Trustees of Arninghall Settlement, so the road structure will be in place and would negate the need for any temporary access.

Our concerns are that the temporary access had no end date and we have not been assured as a PC how the 30 houses would be prevented from having permanent access, after the temporary period has ceased. This will also not be shown to us until after reserved matters applications are submitted, which will be submitted by the developer who buys the land. Which hasn’t happened yet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 2011/0505, 2012/0371 and 2015/2168</th>
<th>No updates</th>
<th>51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 2016/1447</td>
<td>NCC Ecologist comments:</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No objection subject to conditions in respect of replacement planting being provided and working methods and mitigation as in submitted ecology report being followed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SNC Env Protection comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conditions required relating to external lighting scheme, contaminated land investigation, unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N° 2016/1737</td>
<td>No updates.</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- contamination, air quality mitigation measures as submitted, noise mitigation measures to be agreed, construction management plan to be agreed, delivery time restrictions 07:00 until 20:00.
Agenda Item 5

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Growth and Localism

Applications referred back to Committee

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

Applicants Name : Openfield
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 dryers and 6 bulk out load hoppers. New permanent and temporary access for construction vehicles and upgrading of on-site roadways.

Recommendation : Approval with conditions:

1 Time limit
2 In accordance with submitted information
3 Visibility splay 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 agreed
17 Noise attenuation to be agreed
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

1 Assessment

1.1 Having resolved to approve the application at the Development Management Committee on the 14th September 2016, prior to issuing its decision, the Council was subsequently made aware that the site notice posted adjacent to the site may not have been dated. To ensure compliance with the regulations a new site notice has been dated and posted adjacent to the site. This was done on the 21st September and consequently the 21 day period expires on the 12th of October. The original report and update is attached as Appendix 2.

1.2 Since the previous committee resolution, and in light of the new site notice being erected the following comments have been received:
1.3 Bressingham Parish Council – comments awaited following meeting on 3rd October and will be reported orally to committee.

1.4 A number of local representations have been received. A summary of these is as follows:
- unacceptable impact on amenity including noise concerns,
- heritage impact not fully considered,
- consultation has been inadequate,
- unacceptable level of tree removal, which has not been properly assessed,
- detrimental landscape and visual impact,
- ongoing demolition requires consent,
- economic benefits have been overplayed

1.5 In addition, one of the objectors has employed a noise consultant and stated:

"I understand from Chris that the matter has been heard at committee but a decision notice has not been issued and that conditions are currently being decided upon. What is not clear to me is how the committee could have come to a decision in the absence of any noise survey data to support the application: The Sharps Redmore Report (Document reference R1-19.16-Proposed Upgrade of Grain Store, Bressingham-1611275-DEB) did not appear to be before the committee when it sat and only became available on the planning portal three days ago. When we spoke this morning you said that you had not had time to read the Sharps Redmore report and therefore it is clear that you would not have been in a position to make any technical recommendations to members regarding this document.

I am concerned that in hearing the matter at committee without any noise information it would have been impossible to assess if the application meets the requirements of South Norfolk Local Plan Policy DM 3.13 (copy below for your reference). This I believe is an important procedural issue that needs to be resolved before any decision can be issued.

Furthermore the noise report, as submitted, does not include any survey of the existing background noise levels in the area, it does not provide specific information regarding the proposed plant type and model numbers, and it provides only the simplest of predictions of likely noise at some, though not all, noise sensitive receptor locations. These predictions use estimates and assumptions that are not qualified in the report.

The report concludes that plant noise could be 59dBA at some receptors at night. Referring to our own library data the background noise level at this location falls to circa 25dBA after midnight and therefore the predicted plant noise level is a 24dB above this background level. For reference a difference of +10dB would be an indication of significant adverse impact (British Standard 4142:2014). When external noise levels above 55 dB at night occur the situation is considered increasingly dangerous for public health. Adverse health effects occur frequently, a sizeable proportion of the population is highly annoyed and sleep-disturbed. There is evidence that the risk of cardiovascular disease increases (World Health Organisation Night Noise Guidelines for Europe, 2009).

Even if the report had been available to members of the committee there is not sufficient information to make an accurate assessment of the impact of noise on residential amenity. The limited data that is provided in the report indicates there would be a significant impact to residential amenity in the local community."

1.6 For the avoidance of doubt, as indicated above the site notice does not expire until the 12th of October and therefore it should be noted that the Council may still receive further representations after the publication of this report. In the event any received after publication these will be reported via the Development Management Committee update sheet.
1.7 With respect to the comments received to date, officers would wish to comment on the points raised in paragraphs 1.4 and 1.5 as follows:

Noise

1.8 Para 3.3 of the original committee report (appendix 2) highlights that SNC’s Community Protection Team’s comments would be reported to committee, the committee update sheet duly did this and advised that a number of suggested conditions had been recommended, including securing mitigation measures to be agreed.

1.9 It is evident that a noise assessment was received by the Council on the 6th September, however this was not uploaded to the Council’s website, upon being made aware of this it was duly added to the website. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that this undermines the recommendation insofar as the previous report acknowledges that noise is an issue which must be assessed, and consequently concludes, via the update sheet, that a condition would be required to secure measures to mitigate the impact of the development. It is considered that Members were aware of this when reaching their resolution.

1.10 In the context of Policy DM3.13 and noise it is evident that reference is made in part 1 criterion c to avoiding the “introduction of incompatible neighbouring uses in terms of noise............” With this in mind it is necessary to recognise that this scheme is not “introducing” a use as the site is already, and has been for some time in this use.

1.11 Part 2 of DM3.13, as above it is necessary to take into account the fact that the character and function of the area at present has this use in it.

1.12 Part 3 highlights that development should not be permitted where the proposed development would generate noise which would be significantly detrimental to the amenity of nearby residents, again in making a decision in the context of this part of the policy it is considered entirely reasonable to take into account the fact that the lawful use of the site generates noise at present, and any assessment of impact should recognise this point. The submitted noise report uses this rationale. Furthermore, part 3 highlights that proportionate mitigation measures will be used to reduce impacts, as is being employed here.

1.13 Since the committee resolution, further consideration of the context of this condition along with all other community protection based conditions and these are reflected in the list of conditions that accompany the recommendation in this report.

1.14 For the avoidance of doubt, taking into account the discussions that have taken place between the applicant’s noise consultant and the Council’s Community Protection Team they are satisfied that the methodology used in the report is appropriate and subject to appropriately worded conditions they have no objections.

Heritage

1.15 Paragraph 1.5 of the original committee report (Appendix 2) acknowledges its duties under S66(1) of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 and paragraph 3.8 of the committee report highlights that the Council’s Senior Conservation and Design Officer has within their assessment considered the impacts upon listed buildings and their setting. Paragraphs 4.21 and 4.22 of the committee report then assesses and conclude on the requirements of S66(1).

Consultation requirements

1.16 In terms of the consultation requirements associated with the application, upon the expiration of the site notice referred to above, the Council will have fulfilled all of its statutory requirements as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.
Tree removal

1.17 Paragraph 3.6 of the original committee report (Appendix 2) represents a summary of the Council’s Landscape Architect’s comments and confirms that “no significant existing trees will be lost”. This is entirely consistent with their full response dated 18th August which clearly acknowledges the removal of trees (40 in total), but clearly articulates that the quality of those scheduled for removal as a consequence of them being “contemporary with, or more recent than, the existing site developments” are not considered to be “significant”. It should also be noted that the layout plan which formed part of the committee representation clearly highlighted the tree removal proposed.

Landscape impact

1.18 Concern has been expressed at how the landscape impact has been assessed. The original committee report at paragraphs 4.17 to 4.19 clearly acknowledges that there would be a negative impact on the landscape as a consequence of the proposal and subsequently the recommendation made reflects this. Furthermore, the visualisations used in the previous committee presentation showed the impact from four viewpoints by providing existing images and proposed images at both year 1 and year 15 of the development.

Enforcement/Demolition

1.19 It has been suggested that enforcement action against the demolition of buildings on-site be considered. In considering this, it is appropriate to acknowledge that the current proposal, if approved, would allow for the demolition; whilst this is still a “live” application it is not considered appropriate to pursue the demolition through its enforcement powers.

Economic benefit

1.20 It has been suggested that the proposal would actually result in loss jobs given the content of section 19 of the application form. It has been clarified that those jobs indicated to be “proposed employees” are additional to those indicated as “existing employees”. This is consistent with paragraph 1.6.1 of the Planning Statement which confirms that they are “new” employees.

Other matters

1.21 It is also appropriate to confirm that since the previous committee resolution, the Council has received confirmation via the Planning Inspectorate that an appeal on an adjacent site has been allowed for the erection of a new industrial unit (our ref 2015/2856). A copy of the Inspector’s decision and approved plans are attached as Appendix 3.

1.22 In terms of the appeal decision, it is evident that the Inspector considered a condition to secure a right hand lane into the appeal site, which coincidentally is the same access as this proposed under this application, would be “necessary, relevant and reasonable given the proposed intensified use of the access” which to officers reinforces that the approach set out in the previous application to securing a right turn lane is an acceptable one in planning terms.

1.23 Also, it is evident that the Inspector recognises the existence of the existing enterprise as a material factor when considering the impact of the proposal on neighbour amenity, which is consistent with the approach taken by the Council’s Community Protection Team in assessing the application. The decision states at paragraph 11:

“While the precise use of the proposed development is not fixed, it is likely to generate additional noise from its operation as an industrial unit as well as the extra traffic movement. This would have some effect on the living conditions of occupiers of Waverley House to the south, but set against the context of existing noise from the adjoining business use and A1066, it would not
result in unacceptable harm. Noise generating equipment could be controlled through appropriately worded conditions."

2 Conclusion

2.1 It is evident that the consideration of heritage, trees, landscape impact, noise and economic benefits were all considered within the previous committee report, and also having regard to the other matters highlighted above, it is the officer’s opinion that there are no material changes to the previous recommendation, in light of the additional comments made since the previous resolution. Therefore officers continue to recommend approval of the scheme based upon the previous assessment and as updated in this report.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Christopher Raine 01508 533841 Chris Watts 01508 533765 craine@s-norfolk.gov.uk and cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
For the avoidance of doubt the site notice expires on the day of the committee (12th October) and as such any formal decision will not be issued until after this date.

As envisaged in paragraph 1.6 of the committee report, further additional comments have been received.

Parish Council

Rescinds comments of the 3rd of August and now recommends refusal.

Feels it is appropriate to make a formal objection on the grounds that information that should have been available to it was not available within the time scale then required for a response.

It is evident that the noise assessment was available to the parish Council in advance of their recent meeting and as it is considered that they could have made observations on the proposal, as has been the case by local residents as set out below.

Additional letters of objection received from local residents relating to procedural and administration matters, summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public comments (summarised, in no particular order)</th>
<th>Councils response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is EIA development and no Environmental Statement has been prepared</td>
<td>The Council consider that the proposal does not require an environmental statement having regard to the requirements of Schedule 2 of the EIA regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>See paragraph 1.19 of committee report 12th October. It should also be noted that health and safety issues can be covered by other legislative powers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognised area of exceptional landscape quality</td>
<td>None of the buildings/structures proposed are within any identified landscape quality area as set out in the South Norfolk Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage impacts</td>
<td>See paragraph 1.15 of committee report 12th October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The present facility does not need to be demolished it is in a good state of repair</td>
<td>There is no planning policy restriction to prevent the demolition of a building/structures such as these where they are still in a good state of repair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No support from local farmers</td>
<td>There is no planning policy requirement applicable to this proposal for an application to include support from local businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation flawed; householders affected not informed, site notices difficult to see.</td>
<td>See paragraph 1.16 of committee report 12th October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original site notice gave no date for comments. No community meeting held.</td>
<td>See paragraph 1.1 of committee report 12th October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical documents not available for the</td>
<td>Officers are satisfied that at the point of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>9 November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Public before the Planning Committee considered the application, including the landscape, air and noise reports. | Undertaking the initial consultations that there was sufficient information for interested parties to form a view on the proposal. Upon being made aware that the noise report was not available via the website it was added and has been available to comment on since the previous committee meeting. Concerns have been expressed in terms of noise and paragraph 1.8 to 114 of the committee report 12th October address noise. |
| Inaccuracies in Planning Statement and supporting information submitted by the applicant. | Officers are satisfied that they are in possession of sufficient information and plans to make a recommendation on. |
| Devaluation of property. | This in itself is not considered to be a material planning consideration. In terms of the issues which could contribute to this issue i.e noise impacts from a development. The reports from 14th September and 12th October address all the relevant material issues. |
| Damage the increased and continuous background noise will have on our Autistic teenage son. | Paragraphs 1.8 to 1.114 of the committee report 12th October addresses noise and it should be noted that noise mitigation measures are to be agreed and implemented under recommended condition 17. |
| Jobs will be lost. | See paragraph 1.20 committee report 12th October |
| Proposed structures will radically alter the character of the rural landscape of the River Waveney. | See paragraph 1.18 of the committee report 12th October |
| Visual effects will be ‘major’ on some receptors and as such there is harm. | See paragraph 1.18 committee report 12th October |
| No evidence to justify the need for additional grain storage facilities within the region. | There is no policy requirement to prove a need for this proposal. |
| 40 existing screening trees, 30 years old, specifically planted to screen previous building to be cut down and replaced by new young planting. | See paragraph 1.17 of the committee report 12th October |
| Acoustic report not available to members when making their decision, neither had officers the opportunity to consider it. Report reveals that night-time plant noise emissions will be 51dB and thus 25dB over assessed current background sound, causing ‘significant adverse impact’. No proper assessment of noise currently or to be generated. | See paragraphs 1.8 to 1.14 of committee report 12th October |
| Noise levels at unsociable hours are extremely likely to exceed acceptable levels. | SNC Community Protection consider that conditional approval is acceptable. |
| Application restricts its assessment on impacts to the few properties immediately adjacent. Noise assessment should be carried out over a wider area. | See previous comment. |
| Not all of the land needed for the offsite road | It is evident that the recommended condition |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Management Committee</td>
<td>9 November 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works appears to be in the control of the Highways Authority.</th>
<th>For the agreement of the full design details for the off-site highway improvements are to be agreed and as such this can ensure that land under the control of Paul Rackham Limited is not required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waveney House Appeal. The Planning Committee was informed that the nearest bus stop was 1km distant with no footpath serving the site and that approval would make the development reliant on the use of private vehicles conflicting with (NPPF) aims of achieving sustainable development. This factor seems to be ignored in the report to Committee for this much larger development.</td>
<td>The provision of a footpath network to serve the proposed development is not considered to be a key issue in the consideration of the scheme, given that the use exists at present and this is an expansion of the existing enterprise. Likewise, the nature of the scheme would be unlikely to rely on public footpath provision to support the scheme i.e. predominantly large commercial vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrary to National Planning Policy Framework, Joint Core Strategy and the SN Local Plan Policies. Proposals will overshadow nearby properties and will be totally out of keeping with the village.</td>
<td>See both committee reports as to why scheme is not considered to be contrary to any of these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirt and noise caused during the demolition of the old buildings and construction of the new ones will be considerable. The noise and pollution from the operation of the new facility with its increased capacity will also be highly intrusive.</td>
<td>It is not considered that significant overshadowing would occur given the separation distances to neighbouring properties and acknowledging the position of these and the proposal in relation to the movement of the sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Covert and Fen Barn Farm does not currently have significant planting within or adjacent to the boundaries, as implied in para 4.21 by the Conservation &amp; Design Officer.</td>
<td>Paragraph 4.21 states “it is noted that many of the listed buildings have significant planting within their curtilage or adjacent to their boundaries which will soften the impact”. It does not specifically refer to planting at either of these properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on near neighbours and their businesses (including B&amp;B’s) do not appear to have been given adequate consideration.</td>
<td>It is considered that both committee reports in combination cover all of the issues raised which would influence the impact of the scheme upon the neighbouring residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photomontages/viewpoints deceptive and do not show several important viewpoints.</td>
<td>The photomontages show a number of views, and it has never been claimed that they cover all views. They have been used to assist officers in reaching their views of the scheme and in indicating to the committee the impacts of the scheme as part of the presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree planting will not screen silos which will result in detrimental visual impact.</td>
<td>It has not been suggested that tree planting would screen the development, both reports acknowledge that some adverse visual impact would occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased traffic impacts including noise and disturbance from HGV movements and tailbacks on Fen Street.</td>
<td>The Highway Authority has assessed the impacts of the scheme and concluded that they have no objections subject to conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans fail to show any of the surrounding residential properties and their close proximity to the grain store.</td>
<td>Officers are fully aware of the position of neighbours in relation to the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not realised the height and revised number of silos. Information impossible for the layman to ascertain.</td>
<td>The submitted information does confirm accurately the description of the development and the key elements of the proposal including heights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weigh bridges will cause stopping and starting of engines and dust. There will be nothing to shield the noise and the visual impact.</td>
<td>SNC Community Protection Team has confirmed that they have no objections subject to conditions including noise and air quality mitigation measures to be agreed and implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will only be possible for less than half the trees shown to be planted on land owned by Openfield. The others will have to be planted on land owned by another party. Report states the development will cause visual harm, not reflected in the report summary.</td>
<td>The submitted landscaping scheme indicates that the new planting scheme can be accommodated within land under the control of the applicant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans show at committee failed to show any of the surrounding residential properties and their close proximity to the grain store.</td>
<td>This is not true. Please see first slide from the presentation which for the avoidance of doubt is the same as that used last month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in allergens from the grain dust which, with the removal of the screening trees, will also cause an increase in allergies already suffered.</td>
<td>Recommended condition 16 is proposed to secure air mitigation measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed road layout by BSP Consulting does not show or take into account two houses opposite the grain store.</td>
<td>The Highway Authority has reached its recommendation on the implementation of the off-site highway works in full acknowledgement of the existence of neighbouring properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed highways scheme will increase danger when turning into and out of site.</td>
<td>The Highway Authority has assessed the impacts of the scheme and concluded that they have no objections subject to conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorry movements will not be evenly spaced and will probably cause congestion (one at least every 4 minutes).</td>
<td>See above response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverse impact on tourism as the harvest peak coincides with the tourist season.</td>
<td>It is evident that the existing lawful use is influenced by harvesting now, it is not considered that the increase in the operation would significantly compromise tourism in the locality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe negative visual impact.</td>
<td>The reports clearly highlight an adverse negative impact but it is not considered that the visual harm is severe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly reduce the viability of local businesses and value of assets.</td>
<td>It is clear from both reports that officers do not consider that the scheme would present a level of harm that would contribute to a significant reduction in the viability of other local businesses and the value of assets. In terms of the impact upon local businesses it should be noted that in relation to increased competition affecting viability this would not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes conditions and comments regarding historic planning permissions for the site. Reference to 1988 conditions imposed on the height of the permitted development on the site at 15.5 metres.</td>
<td>It should be noted that a significant period of time has lapsed since these decisions were made and the relevant planning policies affecting the current proposal are not the same as those used at that time. It is necessary to determine the scheme in accordance with current relevant policies and any other material considerations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2016

by Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge BA (Hons) MTP MRTP IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/W/16/3150975
Adjacent Waveney House, Low Road, Bressingham, Diss, Norfolk IP22 2AG

- 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 Paul Rackham Ltd against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
- The application Ref 2015/2856, dated 11 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2016.
- The development proposed is erection of industrial unit.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of an industrial unit at land adjacent to Waveney House, Low Road, Bressingham, Diss, Norfolk IP22 2AG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2015/2856, dated 11 December 2015, subject to the following conditions:

1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 15178 8, 15178 100 and 15178 101.

3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

4) No development shall commence until details of the off-site highway improvement works for the provision of a ghost island right-hand turn lane on the A1066 Low Road at the site access have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied until the improvement works have been completed in accordance with the approved details.

5) The development shall not be occupied until the proposed access, on-site parking, loading, unloading and turning areas have been laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plans and shall thereafter be retained for such use.

6) The development shall not be occupied until details of external lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained as such.
7) No machinery or power tools shall be used on the site outside the building in connection with any industrial process or activity, except for the purpose of maintenance of the land and/or the building, unless approved in writing by the local planning authority.

8) No generator, compressor, chilling unit or cooling fan shall be installed on the site until details of the equipment have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The installation shall be carried out in accordance with the details as approved and shall thereafter be retained as such.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the safe and efficient operation of the highway network.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in the countryside on the A1066, a road identified as a principal route and ‘Corridor of Movement’ in the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document 2015 (DMP). While the amount of traffic was not high at the time of my early afternoon site visit, vehicles travelled at fast speeds past the appeal site around the national speed limit of 60mph and frequently included heavy goods vehicles (HGVs).

4. The existing access off the A1066 into the appeal site is used by vehicles entering and exiting the adjoining business premises. This includes HGVs and tractors, which typically take longer to complete turning manoeuvres due to their size and speed. The visibility of the access is reasonable in both directions along the A1066, although more reduced for eastbound traffic due to a crest and bend in the road. Traffic using this section of the A1066 is therefore at risk of disruption through reduced speeds and potential collisions in the vicinity of the access. Data from the local highway authority indicates that a considerable number of vehicles use the A1066 each weekday and highlights a serious road accident in 2013 involving a vehicle using this access.

5. In terms of the first reason for refusal, no detailed information has been provided regarding the existing and potential numbers of vehicles using the access or the precise use of the proposed industrial unit. The local highway authority has estimated 90 vehicle movements per weekday which the appellant has not disputed. Notwithstanding the lack of detailed information, it is evident that the proposed unit would result in significantly more vehicles using the access than is currently the case, including HGVs. This would represent an intensification of movements onto and off the A1066. Based on the current highway conditions, this would increase the risk of traffic disruption and accidents.

6. The Council, based on advice from the local highway authority, has indicated that a ghost island right hand turn lane facility would mitigate the impact of the proposed development and overcome the first reason for refusal. The appellant is unwilling to provide such a facility. However, it would allow vehicles entering the site from the east more time to wait and manœuvre, assist in terms of the flow of traffic along the A1066 and reduce the risk of collisions. While there is no evidence to suggest that the access has a capacity problem based on its existing or proposed use, there are safety issues arising from the nature of the A1066 in this location.
7. Therefore, I agree that a right hand turn lane facility would help to mitigate some of the negative effects the proposed development would have on the efficiency and safety of the highway network and could be secured by planning condition. I note the appellant’s concerns regarding the financial implications of providing such a facility on land outside of their control, but I consider that it would be necessary, relevant and reasonable given the proposed intensified use of the access.

8. In terms of the second reason for refusal, a tarmacked driveway leads from the A1066 to the appeal site which widens at the point where the industrial unit would be sited. Whilst wide enough for large vehicles to use, the proposed layout of the industrial unit and its car parking, along with existing buildings to the east on the adjoining business premises means that there would be insufficient space for HGVs accessing the appeal site to turn around without reversing.

9. It is apparent that the appellant only has access rights over a strip of land from the junction with the A1066 to the north-eastern corner of the appeal site that is narrower that the actual driveway. The appellant has sought to demonstrate how a HGV could reverse into the proposed unit within this strip of land and then enter the A1066 in a forward gear. The manoeuvre would be tight based on the existing and proposed layout of buildings, but not impossible. Furthermore, the strip of land is not marked on the ground and in planning terms there is nothing to prevent a HGV using the whole driveway if needed. Therefore, I am satisfied that the proposal incorporates adequate facilities to enable a HGV to turn and enter the highway in a forward gear in the interests of highway safety.

10. Concluding on the main issue, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the safe and efficient operation of the highway network based on the on-site turning facilities and the provision of an off-site ghost island right hand turning lane facility which would be secured by means of a planning condition. Therefore, the proposal would accord with DMP Policy DM3.11 as an intensified use of a direct access onto a Corridor of Movement that would not prejudice the safe and free flow of traffic. It would also meet the aims of paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework as safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people and improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of development.

Other Matters

11. While the precise use of the proposed development is not fixed, it is likely to generate additional noise from its operation as an industrial unit as well as the extra traffic movement. This would have some effect on the living conditions of occupiers of Waveney House to the south, but set against the context of existing noise from the adjoining business use and A1066, it would not result in unacceptable harm. Noise generating equipment could be controlled through appropriately worded conditions.

12. The access into Waveney House is in front of the property via the driveway off the A1066. The proposed unit would be located to the rear of the property. Therefore, while there would be additional traffic movements arising from the development, it would be unlikely to affect or block the access into Waveney House.
Conditions

13. Conditions setting a time limit for the commencement of development and for it to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans are necessary for clarity and compliance. A condition concerning the materials to be used on the external surfaces of the building is necessary and relevant to ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory. However, a condition relating to the details of boundary treatments is not necessary as the plans show that existing boundary treatments will remain.

14. As stated above, a condition for the off-site provision of a ghost island right-hand turn lane facility is necessary, relevant and reasonable to make an otherwise unacceptable development acceptable. Requiring the access, parking, loading, unloading and turning areas to be provided before the development is occupied is also necessary to ensure that it is satisfactory and safe for all vehicles. However, a condition requiring details of on-site parking during the construction period is not necessary as adequate space exists within the appeal site and around the proposed industrial unit.

15. A condition requesting details of the proposed external lighting is necessary to ensure that the living conditions of occupiers of the adjoining property at Waveney House are not unduly harmed. For the same reason, a condition requiring details of a range of noise generating equipment is also necessary, along with a condition restricting the use of machinery and power tools outside the building in connection with any industrial process.

Conclusion

16. The proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the safe and efficient operation of the highway network based on the on-site turning facilities and the provision of an off-site ghost island right-hand turning lane facility which would be secured by means of a planning condition. For this reason, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge

INSPECTOR
Major Applications

2. **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.

**Recommendation:** Approval subject to 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

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

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport
NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 6: Access and Transportation
Policy 7: Supporting Communities
Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment
Policy 12: The remainder of the Norwich Urban area, including the fringe parishes
Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.2: Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
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
DM3.16: Improving level of community facilities
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.3: Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste
DM4.4: Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space
DM4.5: Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys
DM4.8: Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.10: Heritage assets

1.4 Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan
1.5 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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

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

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

2. Relevant Planning History

2.1 None

3. Consultations

3.1 Cringleford Parish Council

Comments on original plans: Object on the following grounds (summarised): scale too large for the setting, the transport assessment is incomplete, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is inadequate and disingenuous; community benefits are exaggerated and approval of the application would disregard the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Scale: The development – including the pavilion, 300+ car parking spaces and the two lane access constitute a major intrusion into the Yare Valley at a point where the valley is most accessible and visible. The proposed materials will make the building very visible. The car parking will be very visible in the landscape, transforming this section of the valley. The new approach road will extend the amount of disruption nearer to the river with unfortunate ecological implications.

Transport: the section of Colney Lane southeast from the roundabout does not appear to have been taken fully into consideration. It is congested at rush hours. Use of the pitches by junior teams will exacerbate the evening traffic flow. This will be worsened when the housing developments near Newfoundland Farm are completed. Little consideration has been given to the use of the Colney Lane – Roundhouse Way route by ambulances. Congestion at peak time will cause delays to ambulances with potentially life-threatening consequences. Insufficient attention has been given to the impact of the development on the Thickthorn interchange, particularly on match days.

Environment: Disingenuous to suggest that further disruption to the Yare Valley is of little concern. It is a matter of judgement whether the benefits of the development outweigh the disadvantages. The landscape has been classified as Tributary Farmland with Parkland and of high-medium sensitivity and planning policies attach considerable significance to the Yare Valley. The EIA and Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) are only concerned with fluvial flooding and the risks are in need of reassessment. The Playing Field Strategy for the Norwich Plan Area states that pitches should not be located
in flood plains. Insufficient information has been provided about hard surface run off. No attention has been given to existing waterlogging of the valley slopes caused by the geology.

Community benefits: Limited appeal of the facilities and no consideration has been given to the impact of this development on the viability of other community facilities in Colney and Cringleford. High numbers of letters in response to the application is testimony to the high degree of concern about the loss of an amenity to support a minority activity.

Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (CNDP): Policy ENV4 notes the sensitivity of the Yare Valley and seeks to exclude residential and economic development from Protected Areas. The Parish insists this policy is respected. Whilst the CNDP recognises a need for playing fields it is clear that these should be provided within the housing allocation areas. The viability of the Parish’s own facilities could be undermined.

Joint response from Cringleford and Colney Parish Councils on amended plans (summarised):

The modifications made to the original application are welcomed but they fall well short of meeting the objections that both groups made previously.

Both parish councils:
1. Maintain that the proposed site is unsuitable and unsustainable in the long term
   - Site is on a flood plain - *The Greater Norwich Playing Field Strategy* states categorically that sporting sites should not be located in a flood plain.
   - There is historic evidence of the site flooding and climate change will increase flooding
   - Waterlogging of the pitches has been ignored

2. Argue that the Environmental Assessment is flawed
   - Mitigation is proposed but fact remains that the development itself will be a major intrusion.
   - The likely damage was acknowledged in the original planning application, but this was judged to be ‘moderate’ and outweighed by the ‘considerable’ community benefits which will accrue.
   - An elaborate environmental assessment has been constructed to justify the conclusion that damage to the environment will be ‘moderate’.
   - Benefits/harm to non-sporting users have not been fully explored
   - Don’t consider complies with policy as suggested
   - The challenge of climate change has been neglected, while the requirement to conserve and enhance the natural environment has been under-played.
   - Yare Valley has been regarded as a special locale and policies formulated to protect its character. It is arguable whether the relevant policy objectives have been met.

   - Agree with the applicants’ own conclusion *The Case for Development and Assessing of Planning Policy Compliance* (Summary 5.52)
'It is acknowledged that the determination of the proposals will be based on the scheme’s performance against Development Plan Policies, taking into account material consideration and will ultimately be a balance between the scheme’s environmental impact on the River Valley in this location and the considerable social and economic benefits that will be derived'.

3. Argue that the scale of the proposed development is too large for the site

- The modified application has made some changes to the proposed location of the car parks, introduced a segregated footpath/cycleway and a number of more ‘cosmetic’ alterations. These are to be welcomed, as far as they go, but no material change has been made to the actual scheme itself.
- The proposed development will be highly visible against the skyline from the river

Further joint comments from Colney and Cringleford Parish Council’s received (summarised):

- Importance of the Yare Valley and impact on this green corridor.
- A Green Infrastructure Group specifically looking at the cumulative impacts arising from piecemeal development on the Valley was previously set up and the group has not has not yet examined all developments in the Yare Valley. It would be premature to determine this application before the Green Infrastructure Group publishes its report.
- Inadequate appraisal of alternative sites considered
- Additional but avoidable CO2 emissions would result
- Known flooding and drainage problems on site
- Adverse impact on highway network
- Car parking control is not clear
- Harm to landscape
- Loss of trees
- Disagree with applicant’s assessment of ‘moderate adverse harm’. Consider harm to be ‘significantly adverse’.
- Norfolk Wildlife Trust maintains that this is not compatible with the maintenance of the Yare Valley Corridor
- Harm to general amenity users
- There is no proven community need

Colney Parish Council

Comments on original plans (summarised):

Surrounding developments have all been on greenfield sites in the Yare Valley resulting in piecemeal erosion of the landscape and natural environment.

These playing fields lie in a particularly sensitive location and are increasingly important as other areas are lost.

The existing pavilion could be refurbished.

Object to the application on the following grounds: inadequate consultation, contradiction of landscape character assessments, located in a river valley that is frequently waterlogged and poorly drained and traffic congestion.

Consultation: poor local engagement prior to submission and site notices inadequately displayed.
Yare Valley amenities: the application breaches all of the qualities of landscape protection provided in the Local Plan. The development is contrary to the Council’s landscape character assessment.

Flood risk: The site frequently floods. The applicants admit the sports will be abandoned on flooded pitches. This is not the basis for a sports area. We have no confidence in the FRA. The Environment Agency (EA) requires re-profiling of the site and regular redesign of the playing fields to accommodate future flood risk – this will result in changes to the building and an even more intrusive and aesthetically inappropriate construction. We urge the SNC to reconsider its own responsibilities under the Flood and Water Management Act to avoid giving planning permission to developments where the flood risk is already great and likely to become much greater over the course of the life of the development. The adopted Playing Pitch Strategy states that as a minimum all sites should be located in a no flood zone therefore this is contrary to policy.

Environment & biodiversity: Existing management of the playing fields have enhanced local biodiversity. These enhancements will be destroyed by the proposed development. No effective mitigation measures can address the loss of bird species from the site.

Traffic: Colney Lane is already congested at many time of the day and this will increase with future developments. The applicant’s envisage only one access point, where traffic is greatest, and where there is a light assisted crossing. If the application was standalone for a carpark of 300+ on the site it would almost certainly be refused. Concern about the carpark being used for the UEA and/or NRP – the applicants do not appear to have suggestions for the control of the car park usage. The development will encourage hundreds of additional traffic movements. It is vital that the full assessment of these proposals are subject to the most rigorous scrutiny covering all relevant eventualities for traffic movement over the coming 25 years.

Comments on amended plans (summarised):
Maintain objections.

1. Consultation on this application has been inadequate.

2. It contradicts existing landscape character assessments which form part of the South Norfolk Council’s Local Plan. It is a massive intrusion of a multi-function building with 168 car parking spaces and access arrangements, plus 50 new parking spaces adjacent to Colney Lane, and 30 new large scale sports pitches in a valley designated for its amenity and flood protection.

3. It is located in a river valley which already floods frequently, where the present pitches are often waterlogged and poorly drained, and where future likely flood risks will only increase. The current area is much loved for its walking and its diverse ecology. It is a green jewel in the western margins of the city.

4. It will create traffic congestion on a road not designed for this scale of additional vehicular movement, and where there is already frequent congestion due to the movement of vehicles entering and leaving the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital by staff and visitors. The overall number of additional parking spaces in the revised proposal (a total of 218) does not detract from this conclusion that severe congestion will occur on Colney Lane. Future housing on or near Colney Lane, already
approved by SNC, will add to this congestion to an alarming degree. This is not the peaceful open vista for a major hospital complex, where views of natural parkland settings uncluttered by noise and fumes are considered essential for patient recuperation, and which formed part of the case for the relocation of the complex and the successful planning application against considerable opposition.

Additional joint comments submitted with Cringleford Parish Council (as set out above)

Little Melton Parish Council

Comments on original plans:
Would like to see an extension of the pink pedal way to Hethersett. Under the proposals cyclists will lose one of the only traffic free sections. The Colney Lane junction will be dangerous for cyclists.

3.2 District Members: Cllr Kemp and Cllr Wheatley
To committee. The application is at variance with the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan.

3.3 County Councillor J Virgo
Commenting as County Councillor and member of Yare Valley Society (summarised):
Proposal conflicts with policies to protect the Yare Valley as valuable green space for recreation and ecological reasons. The proposed car parking may be used as overspill for UEA staff and students, impacting on already congested roads. Development is on existing flood plains. The size and height of the clubhouse is intrusive to the river and valley landscape. The Yare Valley and its immediate banks area valuable neighbourhood asset and any incursion should be carefully scrutinised for short and long term effects.

3.4 Norwich City Councillor J Lubbock
Object (summarised):
- Intrusive in the Yare Valley
- There are alternative sites more suitable
- Particular concern with the large club house and car parking
- Contrary to the UEA’s parking reduction policy
- Contrary to SNC Development Management Policies to protect the Yare Valley

3.5 Anglian Water
There is capacity in the foul sewerage network and at the water recycling centre. Note there are Anglian Water assets across the site that the development will need to have regard to or be diverted. Advise discharge of trade effluent to a public sewer requires their consent. Surface water does not affect Anglian Water as proposed.

3.6 Environment Agency
No objection – (comments summarised) -
Flood risk and surface water drainage
No objection subject to condition requested and advice on flood risk. Advice provided re. managing waste. The North East corner of the site is in Flood zone 2 and 3 but is classified as less vulnerable development. Local Planning Authority to be satisfied the development would be safe in its lifetime and to assess the acceptability of the proposal. All buildings are sited outside of the Flood Zones 2 and 3. The finished floor level of the proposed pavilion and storage building are at an acceptable 300mm above 1 in 100 climate change flood level. All land re-profiling within flood zones 2 and 3 which result in loss of flood plain storage will be
compensated for satisfactorily. The Flood Risk Assessment has the necessary information. Condition requires compensatory flood storage areas to be provided.

**Water framework directive (WFD)**

No objection. Advised in respect of the proposed drainage strategy that roof runoff will require one treatment stage prior to discharge and runoff from other areas such as roads, parking and other areas will need three treatment stages prior to discharge in order for there to be confidence that the proposal is WFD compliant. Confirm that the applicant has shown that the levels of treatment can be achieved and this can be the subject of a planning condition to secure precise details of compliance.

### 3.7 SNC Senior Conservation and Design Officer

Comments on original scheme: No objection with the following comments (summarised):

Principal impact will be on the landscape character of the Yare Valley. It is unfortunate that the pavilion is located in visually prominent location from the valley. In urban design terms the pavilion would ideally be positioned closer to the road to the west of the site – easier access from public transport and less hard surfacing required as a result. It would also be seen more in the context of the Norwich Research Park (NRP) buildings. The existing footpath provision through the site could also be improved.

The building has been primarily designed around its functional use however the massing is generally well balanced and well proportioned and the use of materials is appropriate to the sensitive character of the surrounding area. The inverted roof shape means the prominent roofing is minimised. Specification of materials and detailing will be key and this will need to be carefully conditioned.

If there is a concern about the design impact because of the prominent location then a wholly different and bespoke approach to the pavilion design could be considered to reduce any harmful impact. However this could come at considerable cost and potential compromise of the functionality of the building for the end user.

The bike shelter seems quite divorced from the building – it would be preferable if this was closer to the entrance of the pavilion to give the impression of security/overlooking.

### 3.8 NCC Highways

Comments on amended plans (summarised)

The revised application includes a reduction in parking levels, improved access and improved cycling facilities. The applicant has also agreed to provide a Parking Management Strategy for the site.

In terms of the local highway network, the impact of the development is mainly on Saturdays and Sundays which is outside of the normal highway network peak hours in this area. The Parking Management Strategy will be implemented prior to first occupation/use.

Colney Lane is a Clearway so no stopping/parking/dropping off is allowed. As Colney Lane is a Clearway there is no requirement for any other parking or waiting restrictions.
Given the information provided, the Highway Authority considers that the impact of the development is not 'severe' as per the National Planning Policy Framework and therefore recommends No Objection subject to the following conditions:
Vehicular access to be upgraded and widened prior to commencement of use; restrict gradient of access; no gates within 8m of carriageway; access/parking/turning etc. to be laid out prior to commencement of use; construction parring to be agreed; wheel cleaning facilities to be agreed; off-site highway improvement works in drawing 60438889-SKE-C-001 to be approved in detail and implemented; car parking management plan to be approved and implemented to include details of the methods of control employed to ensure that the parking is managed appropriately.

3.9 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority
No comments to make

3.10 Norwich City Council
Original comments (summarised) –
- Supportive of the principle of the sporting use but scheme results in an over-intensive layout requiring extensive ground remodelling and means of enclosure to the sports pitches. On balance we are not convinced that the harm on the local landscape character is adequately mitigated by the outlined social and economic benefits.
- Impact on pink pedalway through the site
- Incremental transport impacts need to be considered in relation to approved travel plan for the UEA being undermined.
- Conflicts with long standing principles of protecting the Yare Valley corridor
- Of particular concern are impacts (individually and cumulatively) of the positioning of the pavilion building, the large amount of proposed car parking space, ground works for pitches and associated floodlighting and fencing.
- The inclusion of large car parks in the centre of the site will cause a significant visual intrusion as well as noise and disturbance resulting from the car parks and be detrimental to the sensitive landscape setting.
- The river valley corridor is an environmentally sensitive area. Large areas of close mown grass have little or no habitat value and the intensive use of the area will result in further disruption for any established species.
- Health benefits of additional sports facilities should be weighed against the loss of low-key recreation areas and close contact with nature.
- Wider value of the Yare Valley as a key wildlife corridor needs further consideration and would be undermined by the proposal
- Mitigation measures do not go far enough

3.11 Sport England (incorporating Rugby Football Union comments)
Comments on original plans (summarised):
No objection to this application which is considered to meet exception E5 of our adopted Playing Fields Policy, subject to conditions relating to full pitch site survey/implementation plan, community use agreement for the artificial pitch and full specification for the artificial pitch to be approved.

5.6 Ha of sports pitch proposed compared to the existing 6.6 at the existing North Walsham Road site. However this includes the delivery of a 3G pitch and other qualitative improvements.
Sport England are therefore of the opinion that taking all factors into account across the range of proposed quantitative and qualitative improvements to sports pitch provision, the proposals satisfy exception E5 of the policy, in that the proposals deliver new sports facilities where the benefits to the development of sport outweigh any detriment caused by the loss (or conversion) of existing playing fields.

The artificial pitch will be the only one of its kind in the Norwich area (being fully rugby compliant) and will therefore offer a unique facility to benefit not only Norwich RFC and the University, but potentially other rugby/football clubs and local schools in the area.

The Rugby Football Union (RFU) support the proposal. Comments are made regarding the impact on Crusaders and the potential to off-set some under provision of quantitative supply by qualitatively improving other rugby facilities in the area (namely off site contributions to improve drainage at Crusaders Rugby Club). The FA supports the proposal. The ECB (cricket) have no objection.

It is accepted that the relocation of the club from its current site moves it a considerable distance (c.8 kilometres) from its current location to the north of Norwich to a site located to the west of the city. However, a club such as Norwich RFC will draw members/players from the whole of the Norwich built up area (and in some cases beyond), therefore a new location in a different part of the city is not considered unsuitable for a club of this nature.

The proposal is acceptable subject to conditions in respect of community use agreement being secured, a site survey/pitch implementation scheme and agreement of full specification of the 3G artificial pitch together with a S106 to secure contributions to offset under quantitative under provision of pitches with qualitative improvements to other facilities in the area.

No objection to this application (including the revised proposals) which are considered to meet exception E5 of our adopted Playing Fields Policy, subject to conditions relating to full pitch site survey/implementation plan, community use agreement for the artificial pitch and full specification for the artificial pitch to be approved.

Comments on amended plans (summarised):
No objection

The application has been revised to take account of representations received on the original scheme, and seek to address technical or environmental concerns raised by consultees or third parties.

Sport England have been involved in the development of this project since its early inception and the original proposals were based on extensive negotiation thorough 2015. The amendments proposed are aimed primarily at reducing the visual and environmental impact of the scheme, with two elements having a specific impact on sports provision on this site:
1) The relocation of Pitches 14-20 (mini pitches) from the field next to the river to a location adjacent to the artificial pitch and close to the pavilion. Given that this has operational benefits as parents will...
be closer to the pavilion this is on balance acceptable.

2) The reduction in height of the artificial grass pitch fence, from 4.5m to 3 metres. No objection. Consider a low level spectator fence may be more appropriate.

Reconfirm that qualitative improvements to other clubs in the catchment should be secured to offset the net quantitative loss from the existing to the proposed site.

No objection to the other revisions to this scheme which are aimed at reducing environmental impact, or improving operational matters on the site. We would suggest parking is monitored on the site given a reduction in overall numbers, and the potential for additional grasscrete overflow areas assessed, in case new provision is required on an occasional basis.

Taking all factors into account across the range of proposed quantitative and qualitative improvements to sports pitch provision, the proposals will still satisfy exception E5 of the above policy, in that the proposals deliver new sports facilities where the benefits to the development of sport outweigh any detriment caused by the loss (or conversion) of existing playing fields, including the loss of the existing Norwich RFC site.

Further comments (summarised):
Sport England support the widening of a S106 agreement to secure quantitative or qualitative improvements to community rugby clubs within the catchment area of the UEA site. This could include Crusaders RFC but not exclusively so.

No objection to the Eastern Counties Rugby Group receiving the contribution to for them to determine the priorities for spending the secured monies, subject to proposals for the spending to be agreed and consulted with Sport England.

It is difficult to quantify a sum of money unless exact projects are identified. Further discussion required.

Any monies secured should be for clubs in a reasonable catchment of the UEA site.

3.12 Historic Environment Service

Comments on original plans (summarised)
A rapid Identification Survey is required to confirm the presence, form, surviving condition and significance of any heritage assets.

Comments on amended plans (summarised) – No objection. Based on the submitted desk assessment and Rapid Identification Survey report the development is acceptable subject to the imposition of a condition to require a programme of archaeological mitigatory work to address impacts on buried archaeological remains.

3.13 Norfolk Wildlife Trust

Original comments (summarised)
Concern that scale of development will lead to further degradation of local wildlife habitats. Do not agree it would be possible to mitigate majority of ecological impact. Concern loss of rough grassland in pitch area. Net loss of woodland habitat. Loss of semi natural green space should be avoided.
The broader ecological issues relating the value of the Yare valley as a green corridor should be given a high priority when a planning decision is made, even if the view is taken that it is possible to mitigate for the majority of biodiversity impacts, as set out in National Planning Policy Framework.

If the application is approved this should be on condition that the full suite of mitigation measures are put in place, as recommended in the Ecological Assessment.

Comments on amended plans (summarised)
Concur with the NCC Ecologist that further details are required in respect of mitigation measures.

Re-iterate key concern is that the scale of this development is not compatible with the maintenance of local wildlife habitats along the Yare Valley. Broader environmental issues relating to the value of the Yare valley as a key green corridor should be given a high priority.

3.14 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team
To be reported if appropriate.

3.15 SNC Landscape Architect
Comments on original plans (summarised) –
- Object to the application as it is contrary to JCS2 and DM4.9.
- Concerns about the proposal, its landscape and visual impacts. Does not consider that the scheme responds sufficiently to the situation and setting, and that improvements are both possible and reasonable.
- Do not dispute the findings of the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). Main concerns are the effects of the ground modelling, prominence of the pavilion building and its associated features – lessening these impacts needs to be further explored.
- Parking arrangements and detailing needs further consideration.
- Remain disappointed by the proposed landscape design and would have liked to see a scheme more inspired by its river valley setting, retaining the natural landform where it exists. The proposed planting and management is very indicative and I would have expected a more detailed concept at this stage.
- Further details and clarification required regarding the lighting.

Comments on amended plans (summarised)
Full comments are in Appendix 2.

In summary the amended scheme and its associated documents present an improved scheme, but some of the identified negative impacts will be impossible to avoid if the application proceeds and these would need to be accepted if the application is approved.

The LVIA identifies that there will be some adverse visual effect, but this is primarily from within the site and will reduce in time as mitigation planting matures. Some effects of the scheme are at odds with policy DM4.5; further intrusion of suburban development; increased perception of the level of development; and, further...
disturbance of the tranquillity of the area by traffic; but I do not consider that the whole scheme is contrary to the policy.

Previously I objected to the application on the grounds that it was contrary to JCS 2, and DM4.9, but now that the scheme has been revised – including the submission of a Landscape Masterplan - I consider that the grounds are much reduced. If this was a landscape with purely natural character and/or devoid of previous structures then an argument against the development would be clearer-cut. However the previous ground levelling and maintained pitches, along with the presence of pylons, other buildings in the vicinity and views of the University buildings in the distance reduce the argument that this site is a natural, undeveloped site and as such is unacceptable for any change.

3.16 Norfolk Police
No objection. Comments summarised-

Submission does not include any references to crime prevention measures and the site has high potential for burglary, criminal damage and theft from vehicles. Recommend the applicant adopt design measures to design out crime in line with the voluntary secured by design programme including areas such as measures to prevent scaling of the building, design security standards of windows and doors, roller shutters, alarms. Parking areas require: safe lighting, controlled access, provision for cyclists (currently unclear). Footpaths should create clear defined routes between the main site entrance and other facilities.

3.17 NCC Ecologist
Comments on original plans (summarised):
More detail needs to be provided to inform ecological considerations.

Comments on amended plans - No objection with the following comments (summarised):
90% of the area proposed for development is existing sports pitches. The area currently used as sports pitches has low ecological value, as is typical of close-mown, wear-tolerant turf grassland used for sports pitches.

Of the currently undeveloped land that will be lost as a result of the proposal, there is a small area of plantation woodland dating from the 1980s (approximately 0.8ha or 4% of the area covered by the proposed development) and an area of semi-improved, species-poor grassland (c1ha, 6% of area proposed for development). We accept that the habitats that would be lost are those of lower value for biodiversity; the higher value grassland and wetland habitats within the campus are not included within the application boundary; there will be no loss of wetland habitats, no loss of County Wildlife Sites or other areas of raised/higher biodiversity value.

Biggest change will be presence of building/car parking. Ecologically, impacts on habitats from the building/car park are likely to be limited, as this infrastructure will be located on what is currently close-mown, wear-tolerant turf grassland. However, there may be impacts on species, particularly those that are more mobile, and we have previously raised questions about the use of the area by such species.
In respect of bats, the presented evidence indicates that it is unlikely that any bat roosts will be adversly impacted by the proposed development, or that significant flight routes or feeding areas will adversely impacted.

In respect of reptiles, the presented evidence indicates that reptile populations are likely to be affected by this application.

In respect of mitigation, if consent is granted, some currently undeveloped semi-natural land will be lost (around 2ha – this in the context of the 17ha proposed for development). Compensation for the lost habitat will be necessary, together with mitigation for predicted ecological impacts. Various documents submitted by the applicant indicate potential mitigation, but this has not been drawn together in a comprehensive form. A Biodiversity Management Plan would be required.

In terms of the Yare Valley as an ecological corridor, it is noted that the river valley is one of the most significant corridors for wildlife in the greater Norwich area as reflected in its inclusion as a Primary Green Infrastructure Corridor within the Joint Core Strategy. Given that a core corridor immediately adjacent to the river will remain, it is not considered that a refusal is justified in this respect.

Ecological matters have been addressed by the applicant in a manner that broadly meets the legal requirements of the planning system as it relates to ecology, and is proportional to the scale and type of development. The ecological impacts from the proposed development can be addressed by a suitable compensation and mitigation package.

3.18 SNC Community Leisure Manager

No objection with the following comments (summarised):

The Built Sports Facilities and Playing Pitch Strategies produced by Neil Allen Associates in 2014/15 highlights a number of issues for rugby provision in the area, some of which could be addressed by the successful delivery of the proposed scheme.

Quality of playing pitches and ancillary facilities are important to encourage take up of rugby.

The inclusion of a 3G pitch will ensure training can be maximised and bad weather does not affect fixtures. It also offsets the 1Ha reduction in the overall playing pitch provision between Norwich RFC’s existing site and the new pitch provision at Colney Lane by increasing the number of hours of use that the overall facility can provide.

I am satisfied that the preferred option of a partnership with the UEA at Colney Lane presents both parties with the best way forward, and will result in the greatest benefit to them and the local sporting community.

Agree with conditions as required by Sport England: detailed assessment of ground conditions and approval of the pitch; community use agreement; specifications of the 3G pitch; A S106 detailing an off-site contribution for qualitative improvements to the facilities at clubs within the catchment of the newly relocated club,
ensuring that these other clubs remain sustainable in the longer term and helping to alleviate any concerns that they may have.

3.19 The Yare Valley Society

Object for the following reasons (summarised):
- Destruction of a pleasant and undeveloped scenic open space and landscape in the river valley
- Destroys the value of the site as part of a green corridor for birds and animals
- Harm to river valley walk and rural feel of the site
- Provision of car parking is in conflict with the university’s aim to reduce parking on campus
- Clubhouse should not be on the site. It is prominent and close to the river
- Conflicts with policies to protect the river valley
- Adverse impact on cycleway through the site
- Loss of rough pastureland
- Impact on wildlife from cars, noise, pollutants and light spill
- Flood risk and drainage issues

Comments on amended plans (summarised):
- The amendments fall a long way short to address our fundamental objections
- The proposals including clubhouse and car parking and roadway will be intrusive and disruptive to the essential character of the open valley
- The proposed benefits listed by the applicant either already exist, or could be accommodated elsewhere rather than in this sensitive location.
- The proposal is contrary to the Council’s River Valley policies

Additional comments (summarised):
Additional concerns:
- Destruction of the character of this section of the Yare Valley contrary to Planning and Sports Policies
- Impact of potential flooding on wildlife, general recreational activity, and property in the Valley (including upstream and downstream)
- Highways Authority assessment only of weekend use

3.20 National Planning Case Unit

No comments received

3.21 Natural England

No comments received

3.22 Norfolk County Council Planning Obligations

In respect of the need for fire hydrants, taking into account the location and infrastructure already in place, our minimum requirement would be 1 fire hydrant on no less than a 150mm main to serve the new pavilion/club house at a cost of £816.

3.23 Other Representations

288 letters of objection (summarised):
- Adverse impact on natural habitats, ecology and biodiversity
- Loss of hedgerows, trees, impact on natural environment
- Destruction of Green Infrastructure Corridor
- Question the timing and adequacy of the bat survey
- Question the adequacy of the ecology report submitted
- Loss of open space
• Potential flooding from land clearance by the river
• Site is prone to water logging and in area of flood risk
• The Neil Allen Sports Pitch Strategy for Greater Norwich advises that new sports facilities should not be on a flood plain
• Concern that the Strategic Flood Risk assessment for the local plan is not up to date
• Increased traffic and congestion
• Amount of car parking is excessive – not a suitable location for a car park
• Concerns of adequacy of any measures to control users of the car park – will inevitably be a UEA/NRP car park
• Impact on emergency vehicles
• Cyclist and walkers adversely affected
• Removal of dog exercising area
• Loss of open space for walkers
• Loss of existing safe pedestrian paths across the site
• Only cycling and walking should be allowed in this area
• No extra cycle parking provided
• Diminishing green space on the edge of Norwich
• Yare valley is a protected area and already suffers degradation
• Threat to wildness of Yare valley
• Urbanising effect of development
• Impact on the river valley walk
• Impact on skyline
• Proposal will have a detrimental and irreversible impact on all aspects of this unique area
• No significant increase in pitch provision
• Current playing fields blend in, proposed development will not
• Over ambitious for the area - monstrous scale and design
• Limited benefit to most users of the area
• Little demand during school time
• Loss of amenity space
• Other sites should be considered first
• Existing pitches have negligible use
• Site is not level, where will extra soil go?
• Poorly designed buildings
• Poorly located clubhouse within the site
• Prejudicial to the green infrastructure plan in preparation
• Feasibility studies carried out, is there a need?
• In conflict with the UEA’s environmental stance
• In conflict with UEA’s policy on car parking
• Conflict with policies designed to protect the Yare Valley
• Set a precedent within the valley
• Will not help attract top class researchers to the area
• Size of proposal is to overcome Sport England legislation only and not designed to work with the constraints of the site
• Outside any development limits in SNC Local Plan
• Contrary to JCS and SNC Development Plan policies
• No significant increase in pitch provision
• Light pollution
• Chemical pollution
• Litter
• Impact of high fences
• Impact of car parking in landscape and on highway
• Concerns with the provision of alcohol close to wildlife areas and river
• Disruption during construction
• Detrimental to welfare of hospital patients
• Close to two other rugby clubs will not be in the interest of Norfolk Rugby and may threaten other club’s futures
• Concentrating rugby to the south of Norwich with impact on facilities to the north
• Costs borne by Bullens for the improvements to the Colney Lane Roundabout should be proportionally shared by this development
• Access should be directly from the Colney Lane/Hospital roundabout
• Parking on site should be limited for use by the sports users only.
• Cycling should be segregated from both pedestrians and cars
• A dedicated cycling route through the site needs to be maintained
• Incorrect plans have been advertised misleading the public
• Public consultation has been poor
• Other site options not fully explored
• There is a lack of support from local communities and local rugby groups
• Existing facilities on the site are underused and the need for a private rugby club has not been demonstrated
• The flood assessment is based on incomplete data
• Information submitted with the application is insufficient to allow the Council to adequately assess and judge effects and mitigation
• Concerns of impact on water quality and implications for the Water Framework Directive
• Diminishes the current health and community benefits from interactions with a green landscape
• Amended plans do not overcome objections

168 letters of support (summarised):

• Sustain the area as green space for the longer term
• Provide access to enhanced sports facilities for both the UEA and local community
• Present facilities are inadequate
• Broaden the use of facilities
• Improve sport facilities in the area
• Not a site of natural beauty
• Facilities not only for members and UEA but also local schools
• Detract from electricity pylons that dominate the site
• Plans include room for recreational walkers, runners and cyclists
• Welcome additional floodlit sporting facilities
• Opportunity to train on high quality facilities will increase participation level, standard of sport and student satisfaction
• Attract inspiring professional sportsmen
• Opportunity of employment
• Provide drainage system to maintain and decrease flooding
• Raise the profile of the area among educators and students nationally
• Designed so flora and fauna not affected
• Parking will be an improvement
• Promote health and well being
• This would add another facet to the ‘offer’ at NRP in attracting new users to the research park and would be a social and economic benefit to NRP
• The ancillary café/meeting facility would be an ideally situated meeting point between the UEA and NRP
• Will be a state of the art all weather facility for the benefit of Norwich for a wide range of activities

2 letter with suggested changes:
• To reduce the impact on the yare valley
• To benefit cyclists

1 letter wishing for reassurance it will not affect flood plain.

Crusaders Rugby Football Club (RFC) – (summarised):
Object. Crusaders are in close proximity, based at Little Melton. The relocation brings Norwich in the catchment of Crusaders (and also Lakenham RFC). Historic geographic separation has ensured that all clubs have had a reasonable and sustainable catchment for new player recruitment, with little cross over, and that the City of Norwich has a distributed selection of clubs from which to choose. The relocation so close to two existing clubs, as proposed, will not be in the interests of Norfolk Rugby - and may indeed not just threaten our clubs very future, but the future of local competition of an enjoyed traditional team sport.

Further objection following amended details and plans (summarised) -
• Consider full costs for the drainage improvements to Crusaders Rugby club should be secured to address impacts on Crusaders RFC. These are estimated in the Neil Allen Sports Pitch report as £120K. Contributions secured from the applicant should not be a nominal amount and should specifically be for Crusaders at an agreed amount and also specific sums for any other club that might be affected.
• Crusaders original concerns remain; that Norwich RFC are encroaching too close to an existing established club and that new facilities attract; players, external funding, sponsorship revenues and volunteers, all from a finite local resource pool.

Norfolk Football Association (FA) (summarised):
Support for desire to have the second pitch floodlit. The importance of installing floodlights are fundamental to attracting interested local clubs who have the desire to play at a higher level. There is a lack of floodlit grass pitches in the area – this would address the shortfall whilst also acting as a catalyst for other clubs to develop.

4 Assessment

The site

4.1 The existing site is owned by the University of East Anglia (UEA) and is predominantly an existing playing pitch site used for various sports used by the UEA. The area has been subject to considerable re-profiling to provide level playing areas and a number of terraces have been formed as a result. The current sports pitches on the site include cricket, rugby, football, lacrosse, American football and softball. The overall site area in the red line of the application is approximately (approx.) 26.5Ha. The total area currently laid out for pitches amounts to 72,112 sqm (7.2Ha)
4.2 There are two small confined areas of undeveloped and un-profiled grassland areas that currently remain on the site and these are at the north eastern and south eastern ends of the site. As amended the southerly grassland area amounting to approx. 0.9Ha would be laid to pitches, the field to the north (approx. 0.9Ha) would remain unaltered.

4.3 There is a triangular area of acid grassland (approx. 2Ha) located in the south-western area of the site/adjacent to Colney Lane which would remain unaltered.

4.4 Plantation woodland of approx. 4Ha sits in the southern end of the application site. Approx. 0.8Ha of this is proposed to be removed as part of the development. The remainder is proposed to be the subject of a management plan.

4.5 The site is accessed off Colney Lane and sits between the Norwich Research Park (NRP), the hospital and the UEA. The Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital (NNUH) is to the west, to the east of the River Yare and beyond the river valley is the UEA campus, to the north are NRP buildings and to the south are plantation woodlands.

4.6 The site is delineated on its entire western side by Colney Lane which serves NRP, the NNUH and access to Cringleford and beyond. Colney Lane is delineated by a mature hedge for most of its length.

4.7 In terms of topography, running between Colney Lane and the River Yare is a distinct north-south ridge which forms a partial visual barrier between the university and the hospital. The slope of this ridge reaches a natural gradient of 1:5 in places, levelling off to the river valley. The landform has been extensively engineered on the eastern side of the natural ridge to accommodate the existing sports pitches, with levelled areas and artificial slopes up to 1:3 gradient.

4.8 There are two existing buildings on the site adjacent to Colney Lane which are an existing small pavilion and changing room facility. The former has recently been refurbished and is intended to be retained as a cricket pavilion, the latter is a sub-standard temporary building which the applicant indicates is no longer fit for purpose and is to be removed.

4.9 An existing grounds maintenance and storage facility is located within a hollow in the centre of the site. The hollow is proposed to be infilled/re-profiled and the storage would be located in a new building.

4.10 A number of formal and informal paths and cycleways cross the site including on both sides of the river.

4.11 Existing car parking is located adjacent to, and with access from, Colney Lane and provides 37 spaces.

The application

4.12 The application relates to the re-location of Norwich Rugby Club. The existing site for the club is at North Walsham Road which has been allocated for residential development by the Broadland Growth Area Triangle Area Action Plan (AAP).

4.13 The AAP policy requires that adequate compensatory provision for the loss of the rugby club's current site is made prior to the development of the allocation with the new replacement facility being needed within the immediate surroundings of Norwich. The application is therefore on the basis of providing the new site for the club. The applicant’s planning statement sets out the sites considered as part of the new site appraisal before making an application for this site.
4.14 The application has been amended to address some of the issues raised. The application as amended proposes the following:

- New sports pitches (including an artificial grass pitch with flood lighting and fencing)
- Re-profiling of existing pitches
- Infilling/re-profiling of area used as existing grounds maintenance facility
- New pavilion building incorporating a café, changing rooms, club room, bar and members lounge
- Car parking - 168 car parking spaces and overflow parking for up to 60 cars adjacent to the pavilion together with extension of existing car park adjacent to Colney Lane by 50 spaces with an additional overflow for 24 cars (total across site of 339 car parking spaces)
- Cycle and coach parking
- New grounds/sports equipment store
- Access road
- New footpath and cycleways
- Siting of temporary storage container (for grounds equipment)
- The new pitches would amount to 69,703sqm playing pitches and surrounds (including more usable 1Ha of artificial grass) compared to that at the North Walsham Road site which is 65,148sqm

4.15 The application has been amended following consultation responses received to the first round of public consultation. The revisions comprise the following changes:

- Removal of the car park to the south of the proposed pavilion
- Reduction in car park size and number of spaces at the car park to the north of the and west of the pavilion
- Change in surface treatment for car parking spaces north and west of pavilion from tarmac to gravel surface
- Change of surface treatment for two overflow car park areas - both to be surfaced with grasscrete or similar
- Change of surfacing material for access road from ‘black top’ tarmac to natural coloured tarmac or similar product
- Re-location of the mini-pitches (14-20) from adjacent to the river to an area to the south of the pavilion
- Re-location of bin-store within the service yard area
- Amended location of the coach parking area
- Proposed new installation of cycle shelter at the existing pavilion building
- Re-location of the temporary storage container
- Re-location of parking barrier from adjacent to proposed pavilion to adjacent existing pavilion at entrance to site in order to prevent unauthorised access on to the sports pitches and unauthorised use of the car park
- Introduction of a 3.25metre (m) segregated shared footpath/cycleway alongside access road linking Colney Lane with the existing route on to the university campus
- Revision of the landscaping scheme – including submission of a new strategic landscape plan
- Reduction in height of fences around the 3G pitch from 4.5m to 3m.

Key issues for consideration

4.16

- Principle and policy considerations
- Landscape and visual impact
- Ecology
- Access, highway and parking considerations
- Design
- Flood risk and drainage
Principle of development and policy considerations

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

4.18 Paragraph 197 of the NPPF requires that in assessing and determining development proposals local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

4.19 JCS Policy 7 requires all development to maintain or enhance the quality of life and the well-being of communities and promote equality and diversity and protect and strengthen community cohesion.

4.20 JCS Policy 8 requires existing cultural assets and leisure facilities to be maintained and enhanced.

4.21 The site lies in the open countryside and policy DM1.3 allows development in the open countryside where specific Development Management Policies allow for development outside of development boundaries or there are overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environmental dimensions as addressed in policy DM1.1.

4.22 In this case there are two policies that overlap and cover the principle policy issues of the proposal and these are policy DM3.15 and DM3.16

4.23 Policy DM3.15 requires that development must not result in a net quantitative or qualitative loss of existing open space unless it can be demonstrated that there is a surplus of amenity space.

4.24 Policy DM3.16 provides a general principle support to new or replacement community facilities and services. It indicates in the ‘countryside’ where this site is located proposals must demonstrate evidence of the need for new facilities, good accessibility to the community to be served and that no alternative sites are available within settlements with a development boundary.

4.25 These Development Plan policies are consistent with Section 8 of the NPPF which seeks to promote healthy communities.

4.26 Other key policies are policy DM 4.4 which seeks to protect natural environmental assets and policy DM4.5 requires all development to respect, conserve and where possible enhance landscape character, advising development proposals that would cause significant adverse impact on distinctive landscape characteristics will be refused. These policies are consistent with Section 11 of the NPPF which seeks to preserve and enhance the natural environment.

Consideration of each of these policies is set out separately below.

DM3.15

4.27 Policy DM3.15 requires that development must not result in a net quantitative or qualitative loss of existing open space unless it can be demonstrated that there is a surplus of amenity space. This is reinforced by the NPPF which sets out clear guidance that existing open space, playing fields, sports or recreational buildings or land should not be built on unless clearly supported by evidence of surplus requirements or a development resulting in an equivalent or better to outweigh the loss.
In respect of this application, there are two key issues for consideration in respect of this policy and this is the loss of the Norwich Rugby club site at North Walsham Road in the north of the city together with whether the new facility results in qualitative and quantitative improvements in sporting provision when taking into account the existing pitches at the UEA site; and the impact on the non-sporting recreational use which currently takes place on the open space.

Impact on sporting use

Sport England has been consulted on the application as a statutory consultee in respect of loss of existing sports facilities and the creation of new facilities. They have advised no objection to the application subject to conditions.

In respect of the existing pitches at the UEA site, they advise that as the existing pitches will require significant levelling and vegetation removal and seeding etc. and can therefore be classed as new pitches in their criteria, they would consider that 4.6Ha of new grassed pitches are being proposed at the site. Further to this the 3G rugby compliant artificial pitch is being proposed on a disused cricket pitch on the site and this equates to an additional 1 hectare of sports pitch.

They advise that whilst this 5.6Ha of playing pitch proposed is below the 6.6 Ha of playing field that would be lost at the club’s existing site, they consider that this project will bring significant sporting benefits over and above the quantitative element of pitch replacement provision which they quantify as:

- increased pitch capacity for current pitch 3 and 4 which results in a three pitches being sited in the same area;
- provision of a floodlit pitch which will allow year-round intensive training and match facility benefits the club, the UEA, local clubs and schools which will deliver a unique facility to help deliver rugby and other sports in the Norwich area;
- provision of enhanced changing/social facilities will benefit all users of the site and will be a qualitative improvement when compared to the club’s existing facilities at North Walsham Road and the existing facilities at Colney Lane;
- levelling/drainage of plateau area will deliver qualitative improvements, allowing a full senior rugby pitch to be sited on this part of the playing field;
- the proposed new and enhanced grass pitch provision will help the club deliver rugby across all age groups on pitches that will be a qualitative improvement when compared to the club’s existing site;
- the new 3G pitch will free up capacity at existing artificial grass pitches at the UEA sportspark, allowing a wider programme of activity across the UEA artificial pitch provision and indirectly benefitting sports such as hockey which will benefit from less use of existing artificial pitches at the Sports Park;
- Development benefits of co-location for club and University, together with closer links to other local clubs and school will allow a more co-ordinated delivery of rugby in the Norwich area;
- Off-site qualitative improvements to a rugby club in the reasonable catchment of the proposed application site.

Sport England therefore advise that taking all factors into account across the range of quantitative and qualitative improvements to sports pitch provision, the proposals satisfy their policies in that the proposals deliver new sports facilities where the benefits to the development of sport outweigh any detriment caused by the loss (or conversion) of existing playing fields. It is clear therefore in respect of sporting provision and the need for existing sports pitches to be retained, that the amount of sports pitches proposed cannot be reduced any further.

Sport England has also confirmed that the proposals broadly meet their policies for the replacement of the site from its existing location at North Walsham Road and therefore are unlikely to object to a planning application to develop that site for housing led development.
(subject to compliance with their policy and principally that the new facilities at the UEA would need to be provided prior to the loss of the existing site). Broadland District Council will determine any planning application made for housing led development on the current site at North Walsham Road and the requirement to replace the lost sports provision prior to development at North Walsham Road will be for Broadland District Council to address by way of planning conditions or a s106 agreement.

4.34 Sport England confirm that the artificial pitch will be the only one of its kind in the Norwich area (being fully rugby compliant) and will therefore offer a unique facility for the benefit not only of Norwich RFC and the University, but also other rugby/football clubs and local schools in the area (subject to condition to secure a community use agreement).

4.35 On the above basis they confirm that they have no objection to the application subject to a number of conditions including the need for a community use agreement to formalise the details of access to the facility for club/university/other users in order to fully maximise the benefits from this facility for the wider sporting community; a site survey/pitch implementation scheme; and approval of the full specification for the 3G artificial pitch.

4.36 Furthermore as there is an under-provision of pitches (quantitatively compared to the North Walsham Road site) and this in part can be balanced by making qualitative improvements to other rugby pitches in the area (one example could be drainage at Crusaders RFC as set out in the Playing pitch strategy and action plans Greater Norwich area October 2014), a S106 is also required to secure the contributions for those qualitative improvements on other pitches in the catchment.

4.37 In respect of the contributions as indicated above to partially offset quantitative under provision on the application site, as originally commented Sport England and the Rugby Football Union (RFU) indicated that the contributions should be secured for Crusaders Rugby Club for drainage improvements to offset any potential negative impacts of Norwich RFC moving into their catchment area. The RFU advised that the Greater Norwich Playing Pitch Assessment Strategy and Action Plan (2014) identified the need to improve pitch quality at Crusaders Rugby Football Club to help deliver greater capacity there, and the RFU would support off-site investment being secured to help deliver this priority identified in that plan. Crusaders RFC object to the application and consider that full costs for pitch improvements for drainage should be secured from the applicant. Paragraph 204 of the NPPF advises planning obligations should only be sought where they meet the following tests: necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Officers consider that securing contributions to address impacts in respect of competition between the clubs would not comply with the tests of Paragraph 204 of the NPPF. However, it is reasonable as proposed to offset a quantitative shortfall of pitch re-provision at the UEA site with qualitative improvements including off-site improvements and this to be secured for improvements to clubs in the catchment of the new site. On that basis Sport England has confirmed it is reasonable for an off-site contribution for qualitative improvements to clubs in the catchment (which would include Crusaders RFC). Officers are in discussion with Sport England and the applicants in respects of the terms of the S106 which will be progressed should the Committee resolve to approve the application.

4.38 The above suggested conditions and S106 are considered to meet the relevant conditions tests and paras 203 and 204 of the NPPF.

4.39 Therefore in conclusion in respect of sports facilities, maximising the existing sporting facility in this manner in a sustainable location and the community access proposed, together with a S106 to secure qualitative improvements to other rugby facilities in the catchment, represents a significant public benefit in support of the application.
Impact on non-sporting recreational use

4.40 In respect of impact on the non-sporting recreational use of the site, concerns have been raised regarding the loss of a natural and tranquil river valley open space for the use of walkers and non-sporting uses.

4.41 It should be noted that the vast majority of the site is already laid out to pitches and there are no public rights of way through the site. There is permissive access for walkers on and through the site.

4.42 In terms of the quality of the landscape that users of the site and those viewing the site from the surrounding area would experience, it is acknowledged that the river valley landscape would be further eroded by the proposed earth works, car parking and building, however this should be read in the context of the existing artificial engineering that the site has already been subject to in order to provide the existing pitches and the context of the site nestled in the backdrop of the UEA, the Norwich Research Park (NRP) and the hospital (this is set out more fully in the landscape section below). As such in terms of the quality of the open space experienced by users of the permissive access, this would be reduced by the proposed development but it is not considered to be significantly adverse.

4.43 In terms of the amount of access for permissive users, this will be maintained and in some degrees enhanced. New formalised footpaths are being created through the site and woodland which would encourage informal users on to footpaths rather than walking across pitches, although apart from two pitches which would be fenced, this would not be physically prevented on site.

4.44 As such in respect of community access for informal recreation it is considered that whilst users would experience a lesser naturalistic experience of the site due to the development, this is not considered significant and the level of access afforded by improvements to footpaths throughout the site is a significant public benefit.

4.45 Overall therefore in respect of policy DM3.15, the proposal would comply with the policy as it would not result in a net quantitative or qualitative loss of open space in respect of the relocation of the rugby club from its North Walsham Road site, the impacts on the existing sports pitches on the site or impacts on non-sporting recreational use of the site.

DM3.16 – improving the level of community facilities

4.46 In respect of policy DM3.16, as the existing site is a sports facility, the policy seeks to protect the loss of the facility. In addition as the proposal is enhancing an existing sports facility site but would represent a replacement of the existing North Walsham Road site, policy DM3.16 also advises that proposals for community facilities should be located within the development boundary and may be permitted in the countryside where good evidence is provided of the need for the new facility and the lack of a more suitable alternative site within settlements with a development boundary.

4.47 In respect of the protection of the existing community facility (sports venue), the proposals would clearly ensure they are retained and significantly enhanced as a community facility.

4.48 In respect of the proposal as a replacement of the North Walsham Road site consideration is had below in respect of the need, accessibility and alternative sites considered by the applicant as would be required by the policy were it to be a new facility in the countryside.

4.49 The application includes details of the 10 sites considered for the re-location of the rugby club and analysis against each site. Clearly the site needs a large land take to provide the necessary site area of sports pitches, and opportunities to provide such a facility in terms of area that also meet the operational requirements of the rugby club are limited.
within closely defined development limits. As such it is reasonable to conclude that a proposal of this scale in terms of pitch provision would need to reasonably be located outside of a settlement boundary. Furthermore, officers consider that opportunities to accommodate a site of the scale required and in a location that is sustainable and accessible to users by public transport and on a well-connected highway network (which the application site and proposal would achieve) would not be abundant.

4.50 Sport England and the Rugby Football Union (RFU) have confirmed and acknowledged that the club has carried out an extensive exercise in assessing potential sites for relocation and support in principle the re-location to the application site.

4.51 The joint venture with the UEA to also improve their sporting offer strengthens the need for the facility to be on the application site and is one that is supported by Sport England.

4.52 In respect of need, the application has set out a clear case for the need for the sports facility. The need in general for sports pitches and for sport to be increased and improved in general cannot be disputed and is reinforced by national and local policies for the protection of sports pitches and promotion of sport and recreation to create healthy communities.

4.53 The need for sports pitches in the Greater Norwich area is further set out in the Greater Norwich Playing Pitch Assessment Strategy and Action Plan (2014) prepared by Neil Allen Associates which identified the need to maintain or enhance the current level of rugby pitch provision in the Greater Norwich area, the need for qualitative improvement of existing rugby pitches and facilities, the role 3G pitches can play in reducing demand on grass pitches and providing opportunities for training and competition; the need to deliver more pitches to accommodate growth on the Greater Norwich growth areas (which includes Cringleford and Hethersett).

4.54 The need is not questioned by officers and the proposal is supported by Sport England, the Rugby Football Union (RFU), and the Football Association (FA) and has no objection from the England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB).

4.55 In terms of accessibility to the community to be served, Sport England accept that the North Walsham Road site would be re-located approximately 8km from its current location north of the city to this site to the west of the city. However they confirm that a club such as Norwich RFC will draw members/players from the whole of the Norwich built-up area (and in some cases beyond) and therefore advise that a new location in a different part of the city is not considered unsuitable for a club of this nature. Furthermore officers would note that the site is in a highly sustainable location in respect of public transport, foot and cycle links, an appropriate highway network and is in close proximity to the city and the growth areas of Cringleford/Hethersett. It is therefore considered that the site is in an accessible location for the community to be served.

4.56 Other key policies in respect of the principle are policy DM 4.4 which seeks to protect natural environmental assets and policy DM4.5 requires all development to respect, conserve and where possible enhance landscape character, advising development proposals that would cause significant adverse impact on distinctive landscape characteristics will be refused. These are considered separately in the report. These policies do not restrict development of the site, they seek to ensure any development respects natural environmental assets and the landscape character.

4.57 The new sport facility/improvement of the existing facility is therefore considered to be acceptable in this location in principle, subject to compliance and consideration of other policies and material considerations, including landscape and visual impact which will be considered next in the report and in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the balance of harm and benefits in social, economic and environmental roles.
Landscape and visual impact

4.58 NPPF Paragraph 61 requires development to address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.

4.59 Policy 2 of the JCS relates to design and includes requiring development to respect local distinctiveness including landscape character and the wider countryside. Policy 12 of the JCS sets out more detailed objectives for areas of growth in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) which cover the protection, maintenance and enhancement of green infrastructure and the protection of the landscape setting of the urban area.

4.60 Policy DM4.5 requires all development to respect, conserve and where possible enhance the landscape character of its immediate and wider environment. It advises that development that would cause significant adverse impact on the distinct landscape characteristics of an area will be refused. Particular regard will be had to protecting the distinctive characteristics, special qualities and geographical extents of the identified Rural River Valleys and Valley Urban Fringe landscape character types.

4.61 The site is located within the Yare Valley Urban Fringe Character Area as defined in the South Norfolk Landscape Assessment 2001 (SNLA) as updated by the 2012 Local Landscape Designations Review. This is noted as being at the perimeter of the City with boundaries marked by the transition of the valley form into the surrounding landscape at around 30m AOD. The SNLA notes the special qualities of the valley landscape of the river and that the area is heavily influenced by the urban influence of Norwich.

4.62 Key sensitivities and vulnerabilities of this landscape character type identified are:
- Loss of naturalistic quality as a result of further intrusion of suburban development, large institutional buildings and tall structures in particular pylons upon the valley landscape
- Developments with the valley or adjoining character areas that would increase the perception of the level of development surrounding the valley, which would therefore weaken the current perception that the River Yare is unconnected to a major city
- Further disturbance of the tranquillity of the area by traffic, in particular detrimental impact of cross-valley links or upgrading of existing links
- Loss or inappropriate management of vegetation on the valley floor or side and the need to maintain/improve the quality of the River Yare
- Sensitivity of recreational uses/users to losses in naturalistic quality including formalisation of recreational facilities
- Developments that intrude upon the views into the landscape, including views from the Norwich Southern bypass
- Developments that break the current green mantle to Norwich provided by the Yare Valley which would blur the distinction between the settlements north of the River and the City of Norwich

4.63 It is recognised that this character area is particularly vulnerable to change due to its periphery of Norwich, the SNLA sets out therefore that the strategy for this area is to maintain an open and distinctive boundary to the city of Norwich to provide a ‘green buffer’ between the city and its rural hinterland. The SNLA indicates that enhancement of landscape quality should be targeted in particular:
- Landscape improvements towards the eastern edge, where there is some erosion of landscape quality due to the presence of transportation and other infrastructure;
- Conservation and management of existing semi-natural woodland and wetland habitats to enhance the ecological and visual qualities of the valley;
- Conserve and enhance scheduled ancient monuments and their settings

4.64 It advises that any development should respect the character and landscape assets of the Yare Valley Urban Fringe and the will necessitate consideration of the following criteria:
• Respect the relative absence of development within the valley and ensure any new development relates to existing settled crossing points
• Maintain the distinction between settlements to the south and north of the Yare
• Maintain the role of the Yare valley as a comprehensible and tangible limit to the southern suburbs of the City of Norwich
• Ensure new development (including associated landscaping) does not intrude on the openness within the valley or character of the vegetation
• Conserve the ecology of the River Yare and consider the direct or indirect impacts of development on ecological character and quality
• Protect Scheduled Ancient Monuments and their settings
• Maintain open views to and from the southern bypass, the City of Norwich and important landmarks
• Cooperate with Norwich City Council to avoid city-related developments which would affect these considerations

4.65 In recognition of the sensitivities of the site in landscape and visual terms, the application is supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and Environmental Statement (ES) in respect of landscape and visual impact. The LVIA and ES submitted are robust and fit for purpose in their approach and assessment. The Council’s Landscape Architect has advised that he agrees with the overall conclusions of the LVIA in respect of the impacts identified.

4.66 For the purposes of terminology on the scale of impacts later in this assessment, to clarify, the significance of the predicted landscape and visual impacts are assessed against a 7 point scale which range from: Major adverse; moderate adverse; minor adverse; negligible/neutral; minor beneficial; moderate beneficial; major beneficial.

4.67 To assess the visual impacts of the completed scheme, 21 viewpoints were considered and assessed as part of the LVIA.

4.68 The assessment of landscape and visual impact of the proposals in regards to the above policy context is set out below:

Landscape impact

4.69 Potential landscape impacts are considered to be the following:
• Changes to the landform as a result of the significant quantity of land-remodelling which will be required to provide the new facilities namely the pavilion, the car parking and the pitches
• Loss of landscape features such as hedgerows, trees and woodland
• Impacts upon features of conservation value
• Changes in the perception of the landscape character of the area i.e. an increase in the urbanising effect of increased human activity, vehicle movement and buildings in an otherwise green space
• An increase in sprawl in the green space between the existing areas of extensive development

4.70 In terms of the specific changes to the landscape from the proposals, further levelling and earthworks would be required as a result of the new car park, 3G pitch and other pitches. The construction of pitches 7 and 8 will require substantial cutting into the valley side and into the plantation on the south-western part of the site which will result in the removal of approx. 0.8Ha of the plantation. Furthermore at its north-eastern corner the proposed 3G pitch will be approx. 2.5m above existing ground levels and surrounded by a 3m high chainlink fence. The new access road from Colney Lane will require the removal of a mature but poor quality oak at the roadside verge and the existing semi-mature avenue of trees near the site entrance would also need to be removed to make way for the proposed access road and cycle/footway.
4.71 The key sensitivities and vulnerabilities of this landscape character type as set out by the SNLA are set out above. A general assessment of those is set out below.

4.72 Officers consider that the site no longer exhibits the full character of a natural river valley, although do note that the landscape is relatively simple and open and is recognised as a green buffer between developed areas.

4.73 There has been previous ground levelling and profiling to create the existing situation and much of the site is maintained as formal pitches. There is a clear presence of pylons across the site, other buildings in the vicinity and views of the University buildings together with the presence of the busy Colney Lane also impact on the qualities of the landscape. Development of the site will undoubtedly change the immediate character of the site, however this must be considered in the context of the current nature and intrusions of the site as set out above and also that the proposed development is compatible with the existing sports use and facilities on the site.

4.74 Whilst the proposals include the building, car parking and access road within the valley, the proposal retains the vast majority of the site as laid sports pitches and so despite the inclusion of built form, the proposals would still ensure that the site maintains an open and distinctive green buffer.

4.75 In respect of loss of or inappropriate management of vegetation, the main loss of vegetation would be the loss of 0.8Ha of plantation. Given this is a relatively recent addition in the landscape and positive management of the plantation is proposed, this is, on balance, considered acceptable. An overall landscape management plan is proposed to cover the whole site and this would ensure that the landscape management provides enhancements in visual interest and habitat potential compared to the existing situation.

4.76 In respect of sensitivity of recreational users to losses in the naturalistic quality of the site, the site has already lost some of its natural characteristics due to previous levelling and land profiling for the existing laid pitches on the site, however further levelling will be required for the proposal together with new structures on the site. It is considered that, in time, the impacts would lessen due to proposed wildflower areas, native shrubs and trees in margins. At the extreme south-east end of the site an area of approx. 0.9Ha in a natural landform state is proposed to be re-profiled and managed. The loss of this naturalistic 0.9Ha of the site would result in harm, however the harm needs to be read in the context of the overall site.

4.77 Overall the LVIA concludes, to which the Councils Landscape Architect agrees, that the landscape impacts prior to mitigation will range from major adverse to minor adverse. Once mitigation is in place, the remaining impacts will range from moderate adverse to negligible.

Visual impact

4.78 The primary visual impacts of the proposed development are considered to be the effect of:
- The pavilion building
- The lighting columns in terms of their appearance and light spillage
- Fencing around two pitches
- Car parking
- Access road from Colney Lane and traffic movement

4.79 It is acknowledged that the visual impact of these features will be accentuated by their elevated position above the lower valley floor surrounding them.

4.80 The effect of these works is likely to be most noticeable for users of the main East-west footpath which runs between the university campus and the pelican crossing on Colney Lane. In particular the pitch and the car parking will have a significant impact on the
perception of open space here. There is also effect from the footpath along the river running north-south looking northwards towards the pavilion.

4.81 The effect of the car parking is two-fold – the introduction of hard surfacing into a previously green field in addition to the visual intrusion caused by the vehicle themselves and their movement in the landscape. New tree planting and use of more sympathetic surfacing will help reduce the impact of this but the full impacts cannot be mitigated and this will change how the open character of the landscape is viewed.

4.82 The proposed development is considered to result in a more developed and urban character to the area. Whilst the large proportion of the site will remain as pitches (the only areas proposed for pitches that are currently not laid to pitches or managed as such are the 0.8Ha of plantation and the 0.9Ha of grass land to the southern extent of the site), the land modelling required for the proposals will result in more conspicuous embankments.

4.83 The car park and pavilion located on higher ground in the centre of the site will be prominent and some Views within and to the site would be affected. As the site is generally enclosed either by landform, woodland or existing buildings the visual envelope of the proposal is relatively confined and as such longer views are limited and would not extend significantly along the valley or to the wider area.

4.84 Viewpoints across the valley from the University are assessed in the LVIA, which the Council’s Landscape Architect concurs, and concludes that the effects will at most be negligible. The new floodlighting around pitches 10 and 11 will likely have a wider impact due to their height and light spill and as such there are views possible from the UEA campus. However this would be seen in the context of the existing lit backdrop of the hospital and NRP.

4.85 It is acknowledged that complete mitigation for the proposals is not possible but landscape measures proposed will help to reduce the impact of lower level features such as car parking, storage areas and provide long term landscape structure.

4.86 The LVIA assessment concludes, to which the Council’s Landscape Architect agrees, that the visual impact prior to mitigation is considered to range from major adverse from viewpoints in close proximity to negligible at those more distant viewpoints. Once mitigation is in place, the remaining impacts are considered to range from moderate adverse to negligible.

Mitigation

4.87 The LVIA and ES accepts that the scope for landscape mitigation for the proposals will be limited by the constraints on the site which include: the need for open spaces for the sports pitches resulting in limited areas around edges and margins for planting; presence of high voltage overhead power lines limiting the scope for stature tree planting nearby; the constrained and intense usage of the site for sports pitches leaves little space for planting.

4.88 Members should note that officers have explored all opportunities with the applicant in order to locate the building and car parking in a less visible and prominent location on the application site (namely to the west of the electricity pylons and adjacent to Colney Lane). The applicant has advised that the proposed configuration offers the best solution in that it provides the necessary replacement playing pitch areas required to meet the Sport England exceptions test to offset the loss of the Rugby Club’s existing site. It enables the pavilion to be located adjacent to the 1st team match pitch (the 3G pitch) and provides easily accessible parking adjacent to the building. Officers accept for the purposes of meeting the number of pitches etc. required by Sport England and for reasons of operational and practicality purposes, the location selected for the pavilion and parking is the best for the functioning of the site as a sports facility. Therefore and notwithstanding the Council’s preference for the location of the facility within the site, Officers accept that
mitigation in respect of re-configuration of the uses and buildings within the application site is not possible in this respect and the application must be considered on its merits and the landscape and visual impacts of the development as proposed, assessed and balanced against other policies and material considerations.

4.89 Opportunities to mitigate the impacts of the development as proposed have also been fully explored but it is acknowledged that the impacts of the development cannot be fully mitigated given the needs of the development and the constraints of the site and its context.

4.90 The application has been amended in order to address some of the landscape and visual impacts identified and this includes omitting development of pitches on the current meadow field in the north-east corner of the site; amending surfacing materials for proposed access and car parking; removal of car parking to the south of the proposed pavilion; revision of the landscaping scheme; and a reduction in the height of the fence around the 3G pitch from 4.5m to 3m.

4.91 In terms of landscape impact, the location and number of car parking spaces has been reduced but not significantly. Some areas are now designated as overflow and their surfacing amended to grasscrete and other parking areas amended to gravel. The access road and circulation roads are amended to a natural colour finish (albeit in tarmac).

4.92 The impacts of the car parking and access roads are twofold in landscape terms, these are the visual impact of the physical laying out of the car park and access road themselves, but secondly and more prominently the presence of vehicles in the landscape. In that regard (presence of vehicles in the landscape) and also for purposes of highway impact (see Highway section of the report) Officers would recommend that to mitigate the impact of cars in the landscape, it is reasonable to require a parking management strategy to control the parking to users of the sports facility only (since the extent of the car parking is justified on the basis of the need for the rugby club at peak times and not as a day to day need). This would ensure that the car park would not be a general public or UEA car park in periods not required by the sport facility and would therefore limit the extent of cars parked on the site to predominantly those of the users of the sports facility. Furthermore the overflow car park areas will need to be controlled so that they are used as overflow only. Precise details of that parking management strategy to ensure that it is effective and enforceable would need to be secured by condition.

4.93 Other mitigation proposed for the resulting amended scheme for both the landscape and visual impacts identified are:

- car parking areas to be been divided into smaller areas by planting which will break up the mass and appearance of the cars when viewed from the primary receptors to the east and west
- amended ‘softer’ surfacing to roadway and parking areas
- new hedgerow planting along the western side of the new pavilion car park to provide screening for the car parking areas for views from Colney Lane direction
- new avenue tree planting to be introduced along the new access road to mitigate for the loss of existing
- protection of the existing veteran oak trees along the eastern side of Lusty Hills
- protection and reinforcement of the existing hedgerow on the western side of Lusty Hills
- a condition to be imposed to bring the plantation under positive management which will offset to some degree the loss of 0.8Ha of the plantation. (it should be noted that the function of the plantation in the landscape is not considered to be significantly compromised by this minimal loss)
- New planting around pitches and in margins. This to be managed together with the pitches and plantation as a package to ensure a comprehensive approach to the management of the landscape.
4.94 It is considered that the mitigation goes as far as it can in consideration of the proposed intended use of the site for sports pitches and the operational needs of the sports use in respect of location of the building and car parking together with the characteristics of the site. The loss of the relatively open character of the site cannot be mitigated. A condition would be required to ensure that a detailed landscaping scheme is secured in line with the above mitigation aims, including further planting between the plantation and the river to ensure connectivity (as required by the Council’s Landscape Architect) together with management of the plantation, pitches and pitch margins in order to ensure that the mitigation is maintained and effective. A condition for the parking management strategy would also need to be secured.

Conclusion in respect of landscape and visual impact

4.95 Policy DM4.5 advises that all development should respect, conserve and where possible enhance the landscape character of its immediate and wider environment and have regard to the Landscape Character Assessment. As the site is in the River Valley the policy advises particular regard will be had to protecting the distinctive characteristics, special qualities and geographical extents of the Valley Urban Fringe landscape character type. It advises that development proposals that would cause significant adverse impact on the distinctive landscape characteristics of an area will be refused.

4.96 It should be acknowledged that due to the scale of the new building on the site, the proposal cannot be seen to conserve and enhance the landscape character of the area, however, it is assessed in this report that there will not be any significant adverse impacts and any harm needs to be balanced against the wider benefits of the scheme as a whole.

4.97 In respect of policy DM4.5 the policy is up to date. Para 14 of the NPPF advises for decision taking that the presumption in favour of sustainable development means ‘approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay’.

4.98 It is acknowledged that the amended proposal presents an improved scheme but some of the negative impacts will be impossible to avoid. The LVIA identifies that there will be some adverse visual effect but this is primarily from within the site and will reduce in time as mitigation planting matures. Some effects of the scheme are at odds with policy DM4.5; further intrusion of suburban development; increased perception of the level of development; and further disturbance of the tranquillity of the area by traffic, but it is not considered as a whole the proposal is contrary to policy DM4.5.

4.99 As set out in the above policy assessment it is acknowledged that harm would result to the landscape however in the context of the existing nature of the site (laid and managed as sports pitches and not a wholly natural and untouched/unmanaged landscape) the level of harm is considered, following mitigation proposed and having particular regard to the distinctive characteristics, special qualities and geographical extents of the river valley, to be moderate adverse. The policy test advises proposals that result in significant adverse impact will be refused. Whilst the proposal would not fully accord with the policy as would not conserve or enhance the landscape character, the level of harm identified is not considered to be of a level that is significant adverse and as such overall on balance the proposal would not conflict with the second part of the policy.

Tree implications

4.100 Policy DM 4.9 advises that the Council will promote the retention and conservation of significant trees, woodlands and traditional orchards.

4.101 An Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and preliminary method statement has been submitted in support of the application.
4.102 The proposal results in the loss of some trees in and around the site, a small section of hedge and approx. 0.8Ha of plantation, although none of the trees are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) there are no designated ‘important’ hedgerows.

4.103 Loss of part of the plantation is the main loss of vegetation within the proposals. The plantation is a relatively recent addition to the valley landscape and does not form part of an older historic landscape. Furthermore it is acknowledged that the plantation in general would benefit from management and this is being offered as part of the current proposals. The loss of the plantation on that basis on balance is considered to be acceptable.

4.104 The Council’s Landscape Architect has confirmed that the proposals are acceptable. Tree protection measures are requested by condition and where possible replacement planting as mitigation for the loss of trees is proposed.

The proposal is considered to accord with Policy DM4.9.

Ecology and green infrastructure

4.105 Policy 1 of the JCS requires the development to both have regard to and protect the biodiversity and ecological interests of the site and contribute to providing a multi-functional green infrastructure network.

4.106 Policy DM4.4 has regard to natural environmental assets advising developers to work with partners to evolve strategies to enable individual new development sites to contribute most effectively to the opportunities for the establishment and positive improvement of coherent ecological networks, Biodiversity Enhancement Areas and multi-functional Green Infrastructure Networks.

4.107 The application is accompanied by an Ecology Assessment (as amended and updated).

4.108 There are no international or national designations on the site or in close proximity. The site is not a County Wildlife Site however there are County Wildlife Sites in the area, the closest being those on the eastern side of the river (Butterfly Meadow) which is also in the ownership of the applicant (UEA).

4.109 The application has been amended in relation to ecology to remove field 4 (the field in the north-east corner of the site) from the scheme (the junior pitches instead being relocated next to the club house on current sward and sports turf); movement of the floodlight football pitch 10m eastwards to address light spill for bats; additional tree planting and landscaping proposed.

4.110 The County Council Ecologist has commented on the application as amended.

4.111 The Ecologist confirms that it is recognised that around 90% of the area proposed for development is existing sports pitches. The area currently used as sports pitches has low ecological value, as is typical of close-mown, wear-tolerant turf grassland used for sports pitches.

4.112 He confirms that of the currently undeveloped land that will be lost as a result of the proposal, there is a small area of plantation woodland dating from the 1980s (approximately 0.8ha or 4% of the area covered by the proposed development) and an area of semi-improved, species-poor grassland (c1ha, 6% of area proposed for development). We accept that the habitats that would be lost are those of lower value for biodiversity; the higher value grassland and wetland habitats within the campus are not included within the application boundary; there will be no loss of wetland habitats, no loss of County Wildlife Sites (CWS) or other areas of raised/higher biodiversity value.
4.113 He advises in practice, if approved, the biggest change will be the presence of the building/car park. From an ecological perspective, impacts on habitats from the building/car park are likely to be limited, as this infrastructure will be located on what is currently closely-mown, wear-tolerant turf grassland. He confirms however, there may be impacts on species, particularly those that are more mobile and comments in relation to those species are set out below.

4.114 In relation to bats, it is acknowledged that the surveys and reports are fit for purpose. The report indicates that the level of bat activity was generally low throughout the surveys, with relatively little activity along the track adjacent to the Lusty Hills trees and areas that would be affected by light spillage (as shown on the revised light spillage drawing). Along the track adjacent to the Lusty Hills trees, the relatively few bats observed were foraging, and there was no indication of roosting. There was no evidence of bats crossing the open playing fields during the period of survey. The presented evidence indicates that it is unlikely that any bat roosts will be adversely impacted by the proposed development, or that significant flight routes or feeding areas will be adversely impacted.

4.115 In respect of reptiles, the survey, undertaken at the optimal time for such work, found no reptiles. If Slow Worms or other reptiles are present, then the populations are highly likely to be very small. As such, the Ecologist does not believe that reptile populations are likely to be affected by this application.

4.116 In respect of mitigation, the Ecologist has confirmed that if consent is granted, some currently un-developed semi-natural land will be lost (around 2ha – this in the context of the 17ha proposed for development). Compensation for the lost habitat will be necessary, together with mitigation for predicted ecological impacts. Various documents submitted by the applicant indicate potential mitigation, but this has not been drawn together in a comprehensive form. As such they require a condition for a comprehensive Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP) which should include management of the Butterfly Meadow CWS in the ownership of the applicant on the other side of the river and also management of the plantation woodland on the campus.

4.117 In terms of the functioning of the Yare valley as an ecological corridor, it is acknowledged that this is one of the most significant corridors for wildlife in the greater Norwich area as reflected in its inclusion as a Primary Green Infrastructure Corridor within the Joint Core Strategy. Whilst noting that the building could be sited further from the River Valley which would enable a wider corridor to be maintained, the proposal is not considered in itself in its impacts on ecological connectivity to result in impacts to justify a refusal of the application as the ‘core’ corridor immediately adjacent to the river would remain. It is noted that there is wider work being undertaken between Norfolk County Ecology and the Greater Norwich Growth Board to consider strategic mitigation for potential cumulative impact from the development of the valley.

4.118 Overall, the County Ecologist has confirmed that ecological matters have been addressed by the applicant in a manner that broadly meets the legal requirements of the planning system as it relates to ecology, and is proportional to the scale and type of development.

4.119 The ecological impacts from the proposed development can be addressed by a suitable compensation and mitigation package.

4.120 Therefore subject to the imposition of conditions it is considered that the proposal accords with Policy 1 of the JCS and Policy DM4.4.
Access, highway and parking considerations

4.121 Policy DM3.10 advises that new development should be designed to reduce the need to travel and to take advantage of sustainable forms of travel. Policy DM3.11 advises that development will not be permitted which would have a negative impact on the local highway network. Para 32 of the NPPF also requires decision takers to take into account that opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up; safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people and; improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.

4.122 The application is supported by a Transport Assessment (TA) which includes an addendum submitted during the course of the application.

4.123 Access is to be served from Colney Lane and a total of 339 car parking spaces as amended are to be provided made up of 111 spaces adjacent to Colney Lane (37 existing, additional 50 formally laid out and a further 24 new as an additional overflow) and 228 adjacent to the proposed pavilion (168 formal parking spaces and an overflow for 60 spaces).

4.124 The level of parking proposed has been justified by the applicant to address the parking needs of the rugby club (peak parking required by the rugby facility at the weekends) and is on the basis of the level of parking currently enjoyed and required at their North Walsham Road site. The applicant advises that any potential use of this parking by the UEA would be a by-product of the development which is aimed at making efficient use of the facilities. They advise that the TA submitted with the application presented a worst case analysis of this potential use to alleviate any potential concerns over traffic capacity.

4.125 The applicant suggests that any use of the main car park by the UEA would be restricted to non-NRFC times and only to those UEA permit holders accessing buildings on NRP, such as the Edith Cavell and Bob Champion buildings.

4.126 The applicant advises that ensuring that NRFC have sufficient parking on its busiest days will reduce the likelihood of parking occurring on-street impeding the flow of traffic along roads such as Colney Lane which provides access for emergency vehicles to the NNUH and is based on a traffic count and parking needs for the existing club. As a result of the amendments to reduce the proposed parking at the site, there will be a net reduction compared to parking levels at the existing site on North Walsham Road, as such the applicants have indicated that they will adopt a Travel Plan committing to promote the use of sustainable modes capitalising on the more sustainable location of the proposed site.

4.127 Whilst the applicant has set out its intention in the application for UEA staff at the Edith Cavell and Bob Champion Buildings to use the car park during the week when not needed by the Rugby Club, Officers and the Highway Authority have concerns with this in respect of the impact on the highway network at peak periods and the landscape and visual impact. The amount of car parking proposed is only justified and acceptable on the basis of the need for the Rugby Club.

4.128 As such and as has been set out to the applicant/agent by the LPA, a planning condition would be required to make the development acceptable in these regards to control the users of the car park to substantially those utilising the sports facility only and not for the wider use of surrounding uses including the UEA/NRP/Hospital.

4.129 The amount of car parking is justified on the basis of infrequent event days and to enable and anticipate any parking requirements should the Rugby Club grow (as acknowledged by Sport England/RFU) as such the overflow parking needs to be controlled to ensure that it is infrequent overflow only as this would mitigate impacts of cars in the landscape.
4.130 On the basis of the above condition, peak use would be for rugby uses at weekends and evenings and as such it is not considered that the proposed access from the highway or its location within the wider highway network, nor the levels of likely traffic movements would result in any adverse impact on the existing highway network.

4.131 The Highway Authority have therefore advised that in highway terms the proposed development with its access and levels of parking as amended are not considered to be severe and so are acceptable subject to a car parking management plan to be approved to control how the car parking is to be used (for the reasonable use of the sporting facility only).

Pedestrian and cycling

4.132 In respect of the pedestrian and cycle network in and across the site, the cycleway currently running east-west across the site from the toucan crossing on Colney Lane to the UEA Campus forms part of the pink pedalway. The pedalway forms part of a cycle route in the city’s cycle network and crosses the city from the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital (NNUH) through the city centre, to Heartsease and Broadland and is the subject of investment for improvement.

Concerns were raised regarding the impact of the proposal on the pink pedalway across the site. Amended plans have been submitted to address concerns raised which include the following amendments:

- The existing route will be upgraded to a shared use footway / cycleway facility provided along the northern side of the NRFC access road for its entire length. This will measure 3.25 metres in width and will be segregated from the adjacent access road by a kerb and level difference. This width reflects the current path.
- Dropped kerbs will be provided where the shared facility crosses the access to the existing UEA Sports Pavilion parking and give-way markings will be provided for cyclists to ensure that they are aware that there is requirement to slow. Timber bollards will also be placed on the facility to prevent vehicle use.
- Give-way markings will be provided on the existing shared facilities on Colney Lane where the facility meets the new access to the development site.
- The site access to Colney Lane will be relocated slightly further south to improve alignment with the vehicular route to the NRFC clubhouse. This will further improve the safety of the existing junction. It also allows the shared pedestrian and cyclist facility to continue adjacent to the existing UEA pavilion

It is considered that the proposals as amended ensure the pedalway through the site is satisfactorily maintained.

A further cycle and pedestrian route is proposed to have access/egress further along Colney Lane near to the NNUH roundabout and pedestrian only footpaths proposed running south from the pavilion through the site and to formalise a route through the plantation woodland and along the western side of the river. These are considered to represent an enhancement of the existing pedestrian facilities through the site.

Adequate on site cycle parking is proposed.

The County Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposals in respect of cycle and pedestrian facilities and routes.

Design

4.138 Policy DM3.9 and JCS policy 1 requires all development to achieve high quality design, to protect and enhance the environment and locally distinctive character and encourage innovation. NPPF section 7 also sets out the requirements in relation to design.
The Council’s Senior Conservation and Design Officer has confirmed that it is unfortunate the building is located in a visually prominent position from the valley and could be located better in urban design terms to be better related to the existing developments of the NRP. It is acknowledged that this is a matter largely to consider for the landscape impact, however a more bespoke design approach could be explored to further minimise the impact of the building. It is acknowledged that such a redesign could compromise the functionality of the building and be a significant cost exercise.

In respect of the design of the building, the Senior Conservation and Design Officer has confirmed that whilst the design is built around the functional use and relationship of the building and the public interaction required between the building and the 3G pitch, it is above the merely utilitarian with the massing generally well balanced and well-proportioned and the use of materials appropriate and sensitive to the character of the surrounding area. It is noted in respect of the form of the building the inverted shape of the roof means that the prominence of the building is minimised. Overall it is concluded that the building fits in with the F1 Yare Valley Fringe in the South Norfolk Place Making Guide and subject to the imposition of conditions which will need to include specification of the materials and detailing, the design is considered acceptable.

Fencing is proposed around 2 pitches. The design is functional for sports pitches and the key impacts will be on the landscape and visual impact as set out in the landscape section of the report.

Exterior spaces are well defined and will be appropriately surfaced and landscaped in order to mitigate their visual impact as far as is practicable.

Flood lighting is proposed around pitches 10 and 11 (the 3G pitch and a grassed pitch further south). The design is functional for its use. The key impacts of the flood lighting are the landscape and visual impact and the light spill in respect of ecology. The impacts in relation to these issues are addressed in the relevant sections of the report. The design of the floodlighting is considered acceptable.

Overall on balance the proposed design is considered acceptable and to accord with policy DM3.9, JCS policy 1 and Section 7 of the NPPF.

Residential amenity

Policy DM3.14 requires development to have regard to the impacts on residential amenity. Given that there are no residential properties in close proximity it is not considered that the proposal would result in any adverse impact on residential amenity.

Flood risk and drainage

JCS Policy 1 requires development to be located to minimise flood risk, mitigating any such risk through design and implementing sustainable drainage. Paragraph 103 of the NPPF advises that Local Planning Authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere and only consider development appropriate in area at risk of flooding where informed by site specific flood risk assessment and give priority to the use of sustainable drainage systems. Policy DM4.2 requires sustainable drainage measures to be fully integrated within the development to manage any surface water arising from the development proposals and to minimise the risk of flooding on the site and surrounding area. It advises that development must not cause any deterioration in water quality and measures to treat surface water runoff are to be included in the design of the drainage system.

The site lies adjacent (south) to the river Yare. The majority of the site lies in Flood Zone 1 which is the lowest risk of flooding, with some of the site area in flood zones 2 and 3. The key issues for consideration are flood risk and surface water drainage.
The application is submitted with a flood risk and surface water drainage assessment.

Flood risk

In respect of flood risk, the proposed development comprising the Pavilion and Storage building, access roads and car parking areas is classified as ‘Less Vulnerable’ and is located with Flood Zone 1. Therefore in accordance with Table 3 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), the Sequential and Exception Tests are not required to be undertaken by the Local Planning Authority as part of the planning process.

The proposed development comprising of the various Sports Playing Fields/Pitches is classified as ‘Water Compatible Development’ and is located with Flood Zones 1, 2, 3a and 3b. The majority of this site area is currently utilised as Sports Playing Fields/Pitches and seeks reconfiguration to the pitch layouts. Therefore in accordance with Table 3 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change PPG, the Sequential and Exception Tests are not required to be undertaken by the Local Planning Authority as part of the planning process.

The Environment Agency have commented that the buildings are sited outside of flood zones 2 and 3; the finished floor levels are to be set 300mm above the 1 in 1000 climate change flood level; all buildings and access road save a small section of existing/proposed access road are in Flood Zone 1; a flood warning evacuation plan is proposed; and any land re-profiling within flood zones 2 and 3 which would result in a loss of flood plain storage will be compensated for on a level for level basis. On this basis and subject to a condition that mitigation measures set out in the flood risk assessment as amended, specifically the provision of compensatory flood storage for any land re-profiling, are secured, the Environment Agency has confirmed no objection to the application in respect of flood risk.

The Greater Norwich Playing Pitch Assessment Strategy and Action Plan (2014) prepared by Neil Allen Associates advises that new pitches should be located in a ‘no flood zone’. Whilst this strategy helps inform sporting provision across the Greater Norwich Area, it does not form part of the adopted Local Plan and as such a lesser weight is afforded to it. Whilst some of the pitches are within the flood zone, the proposed pavilion is outside of flood zones 2 and 3. Sport England has raised no objection to the location of the sports pitches in a flood zone. As such it is not considered that a refusal of the application due to the location of sports pitches in the flood zone could be substantiated.

Surface water drainage

In respect of surface water drainage, the overarching drainage strategy advises that the development will include a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDs) to suit site conditions which will be determined at the detailed design stage.

Infiltration has been considered in line with the SUDs hierarchy, however the ground conditions suggests the site is likely to be of silts and clays and this will limit the effective use of high intensity infiltration devices such as soakaways to drain the proposed development. Furthermore the likely presence of a high water table will also be a restricting factor in the use of soakaways. The submitted report indicates that at detailed design stage (which would need to be at the condition discharge stage) further intrusive investigation will be undertaken and if percolation tests show the soil conditions to be suitable for infiltration, then the SUDS surface water drainage strategy will include infiltration.

If infiltration is not an option due to ground conditions, a restricted discharge into an adjacent watercourse would be the next preferred method of surface water disposal.
The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) submitted advises that the River Yare forms the site’s eastern boundary and currently receives brownfield and greenfield runoff from the development site. It advises if at detailed design stage infiltration is demonstrated to be inappropriate, it is intended to discharge the surface water runoff from the proposed development into the River Yare at suitable restricted discharge rate.

In this case the proposed surface water drainage strategy would incorporate the use of a restricted discharge into an adjacent watercourse with on-site attenuation (in the form of an underground tank) designed to accommodate the 1:100 storm event.

The proposed development has an impermeable of area of approximately 2.581 ha and increases the impermeable area of the site by approximately 2.206 ha when compared to the existing site layout. Due to the site topography, the existing surface water drainage system and the vast area of land that the built development is spread across, the proposed development has been split between three separate land parcels. The area of the existing pavilion and adjacent car parking and surrounds are currently served by a positive surface water drainage network with an unrestricted discharge into the River Yare. The application as proposed will retain the above surface water drainage system will remain in place and continue to serve this area of the site, including the additional impermeable area created by the localised widening of the existing site entrance and access road.

Due to the site topography, the existing surface water drainage system and the vast area of land that the built development is spread across, the proposed development has been split between three separate land parcels. The area of the existing pavilion and adjacent car parking and surrounds are currently served by a positive surface water drainage network with an unrestricted discharge into the River Yare. The application as proposed will retain the above surface water drainage system will remain in place and continue to serve this area of the site, including the additional impermeable area created by the localised widening of the existing site entrance and access road. However, the increased impermeable area will be offset against the removal/demolition of one of the buildings (southern) and this will ensure the overall area of impermeable surfacing discharging into the existing network will not be increased as a result of these works.

A small section of land in the northern part of the site which has an area of approximately 0.144 ha. and currently comprises of permeable grassland, discharges into the River Yare at the greenfield runoff rate. As part of the proposed development, the car park will be extended, with an additional area beyond the car park extension which will used as an overspill carpark. The small area of impermeable surfacing created by the construction of the tarmac access strip will discharge onto the adjacent gravel surfacing where the runoff will infiltrate into the ground and across the sport playing fields towards the River Yare. Therefore, the runoff from the car park and overspill area will remain at the existing greenfield runoff rate will a small enhancement due to the urbanization created by the impermeable access strip.

The main area of development (2.276Ha) which currently comprises permeable grassland which discharges into the River Yare at the greenfield run-off rate, will be served by a separate drainage network with a restricted discharge of 5.0 l/s into the existing drainage system. On-site attenuation will be provided using an underground geo-cellular tank to accommodate the 100 year plus climate change storm event. The submitted report indicates that other options to reduce the amount of underground tank required will be explored at detailed design stage including: above ground flood storage within car parking areas; use of attenuation storage within the sub base of permeable paving; gravel parking bays; use of swales along proposed access road; rainwater harvesting. A surface water drainage condition would need to be imposed to agree the detailed design of the surface water system including appropriate attenuation measures for the ground conditions and constraints of the development within the site.

Overall across all three areas, there will be an increased volume of surface water runoff from the site if infiltration is not considered suitable for the site. Therefore to mitigate the increased volume of runoff, the FRA advises that the discharge rate from the site has been reduced to 5.0 l/s where a restricted discharge has been proposed (Land Parcel C) and long term storage has been provided.

In terms of pollution control, the FRA advises that adequate pollution control measures should be put into place during the detailed design stage and indicates that the private access road and car parking areas will present the highest pollution risk from this source.
A number of measures are suggested with the precise measures to be agreed at the detailed design stage. Further detail in respect of water quality is set out in the Water Framework section below.

4.163 It would appear from the FRA submitted that the surface water drainage strategy proposed for surface water reflects the ground conditions on site in considering the appropriate level of SUDs proposed. The Lead Local Flood Authority has not commented on the proposed strategy. It would be appropriate to require a condition to agree the final detail for the surface water drainage strategy including whether infiltration can be included as part of the SUDs strategy, whether alternative attenuation measures can be included and the precise measures in respect of water quality.

4.164 Therefore the proposed development is considered appropriate from a flood risk and drainage perspective subject to the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures as outlined in the FRA as amended and subject to the imposition of a surface water drainage condition to secure the precise details of the surface water drainage strategy including water quantity and quality. Further consideration of water quality and quantity in specific regard to the water framework directive are set out below.

Water Framework Directive


4.166 The overarching aims of the WFD are to achieve an overall ‘good’ status, taking into account both ecological and chemical status and so encompasses matters of water quality and quantity.

4.167 Duties under the WFD are set out in The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) Regulations 2003, which requires each public body in exercising its functions so far as they affect a river basin to have regard to any relevant river basin management plan or any supplementary plan prepared under these regulations (Regulation 17). Furthermore Regulation 19 requires public bodies to provide ‘such information in its possession’ and ‘such assistance as the Environment Agency may reasonably seek’ in connection with its WFD functions.

4.168 The NPPF sets out the need to comply with European Union (EU) obligations and statutory requirements (paragraph 2) and to make decisions based on up to date information about the natural environment including River Basin Management Plans (para 165).

4.169 NPPF paragraphs in relation to ecology, biodiversity and flood risk are also relevant to the aims of the WFD and are taken into account by the local planning authority in exercising its planning functions.

4.170 The River Basin Management Plans (RBMP) are produced by the Environment Agency (EA). The relevant RBMP for this area is the Anglian River Basin District RBMP. The EA is the lead competent authority for the WFD in England. It is the lead organisation for producing, implementing and monitoring the RBMP.

4.171 Policy DM4.2 sets out the Council’s planning policy in relation to sustainable drainage and water management. This includes the need for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDs) to be integrated into a development unless it can be demonstrated that SUDs are unsuitable and includes the requirement to ensure that there is no deterioration in water quality. The use of SUDs which have regard to water quantity and quality supports the aims of the WFD.
4.172 The Council has consulted the EA on the application with specific regard to the WFD who have advised that in respect of the proposed drainage strategy that roof runoff will require 1 treatment stage prior to discharge and runoff from other areas such as roads, parking and other areas will need three treatment stages prior to discharge in order for there to be confidence that the proposal is WFD compliant.

4.173 The applicant has submitted additional information to demonstrate that that the necessary levels of treatment can be provided within the drainage strategy to protect the water environment. As such it is considered that the impacts can be addressed by planning condition to require the surface water drainage strategy to include a requirement for the scheme to include appropriate treatment stages for water quality prior to discharge.

Foul water

4.174 In respect of foul water, Anglian Water has confirmed that there is available capacity in the foul sewerage network and at the waste water treatment centre (Whitlingham Trowse Water Recycling Centre) for these flows. They advise an application will be required to them to discharge trade effluent, to connect to the foul sewerage network and that the development will need to accommodate the assets currently crossing the site in its development.

Archaeology

4.175 NPPF paragraph 128 and policy DM4.10 have regard to the archaeology of the site.

4.176 There are no designated or undesignated archaeological assets recorded within the site.

4.177 An archaeological desk based assessment has been submitted with the application and a rapid identification survey report for the southern part of the site as requested by the Historic Environment Service has been completed and submitted.

4.178 The Historic Environment Service (HES) advise that the archaeological desk-based assessment submitted with the application highlighted that there is moderate to high potential for heritage assets of prehistoric and Roman date to be present within the site area. Landscaping and other ground-disturbance associated with the proposed development is likely to have an adverse impact on any such heritage assets with archaeological interest (buried archaeological remains) present at the site. As such they advise that to make the development acceptable a condition is required for a programme of archaeological mitigatory work.

4.179 Therefore subject to an archaeological mitigation condition, the proposal would accord with Paragraph 128 of the NPPF and policy DM4.10.

Heritage assets

4.180 The setting of listed buildings requires consideration under policy DM4.11, S66 of the Listed Buildings Act 1990 and section 12 of the NPPF.

4.181 There are no listed buildings on or adjacent to the site. The nearest listed building is approx. 470m north west of the application site on the B1108 Watton Road. These are separated from the application site by a large number of buildings of the NRP, road infrastructure, planting and changes in ground level. As such it is not considered that the application proposal would affect the setting of those listed buildings.

4.182 As such it is considered that the for the purposes of the Council’s duties under S66 (1) of the Listed Buildings Act 1990, policy DM4.11 of the Development Management Policies Document and section 12 of the NPPF, the proposals are not considered to affect the special architectural or historic interest or the setting of those listed buildings.
Sustainable construction/renewable energy

4.182 Policy 3 of the JCS requires the sustainable construction of the building, water conservation measures to be included in addition to requiring 10% of the predicted energy requirements to be delivered by on site decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy. JCS policy 3 is consistent with NPPF paragraphs 95, 96 and 97, which includes supporting the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate and encouraging the use of renewable resources. Paragraph 96 of the Framework specifically indicates that Local Planning Authorities should expect new development to “comply with adopted Local Plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by an applicant… that it is not feasible or viable”.

4.183 The applicant has submitted additional information to demonstrate that by using air source heat pumps and photo voltaic panels the 10% renewable energy requirement could be met, but acknowledge this would be challenging in respect of feasibility. A condition would need to be imposed to secure the above requirements subject to feasibility and viability.

4.184 Compliance with sustainable construction and water efficiency would need to be secured by condition.

Other matters

4.185 Norfolk County Council Planning Obligations have confirmed that one fire hydrant would be required. This would need to be secured by condition.

Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan

4.186 The southern part of the site lies in the parish boundary of Cringleford and as such also is covered by the Cringleford Neighbourhood Development Plan (CNDP).

4.187 The area does not have any specific CNDP policy designation. The area is shown as ‘white land’ and woodland within the proposals map. A green infrastructure corridor is denoted running north-east/south-west across the current area of plantation woodland and existing pitch area to the river.

4.188 Policies of the CNDP that are particularly relevant are policies for the Environment including policies ENV1, policies for the society, community and culture including policy SCC3; SCC4, polices for Transport including policy TRA1, TRA3 and TRA4.

4.189 Policy ENV1 seeks to ensure the visual impact of new development when viewed from approaching main roads and surrounding countryside should be minimised by use of appropriate landscaping and landscape features.

4.190 The landscape impacts are assessed in the main landscape section. Harm is identified however subject to appropriate mitigation which includes landscape planting and features, it is not considered that the impacts are significant adverse. It is considered that the proposal is therefore in general conformity with Policy ENV1 of the CNDP.

4.191 A green infrastructure corridor will be maintained through the woodland area and across the site (through appropriate verge planting between pitches) and this planting will be secured by condition. Whilst there is no specific CNDP policy in this respect, it is considered that the retention of a green corridor in the indicative area shown on the CNDP proposals map would be complied with.

4.192 Policy SCC3 advises walking and cycling will be encouraged by the provision of new routes and new routes should be designed to be safe. The application proposes enhanced pedestrian and cycle links across the site in accordance with this policy.
Policy SCC4 reflects the requirements of JCS policy 3 which requires the sustainable construction of community buildings and water conservation measures. The proposal subject to condition would accord with this policy.

Policy TRA1 has regard to the free flow of traffic, integration with other roads and the community and adequate on-site parking. For the reasons set out in the highway section above, the proposal would also comply with this CNDP policy.

Policy TRA3 advises that integration of the village will be improved by the construction of new and enhanced walking and cycling routes between and within neighbourhoods and should be connected to the Hospital and NRP. The application proposes enhanced pedestrian and cycle links across the site in accordance with this policy.

Policy TRA4 has regard to the design of footways/cycleways and encourages shared cycle footways, clearly differentiated from roads and well signed. The application proposes enhanced shared pedestrian and cycle links across the site in accordance with this policy.

It is therefore considered that the proposal is in general conformity with the CNDP.

Sustainable Development

The NPPF requires applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF is one such material consideration.

From the above assessment Officers consider whilst there are some conflicts with policy DM4.5, on balance as amended the proposal accords with the development plan. Therefore in this respect in line with para 14 of the NPPF the development should be approved without delay.

This is however a finely balanced matter with the key impacts being the harm to the landscape and the social, environmental and economic benefits need to be weighed against that harm. As set out earlier in the report the NPPF requires the application to be considered in the context of sustainable development.

In consideration as to whether the proposal represents a sustainable development, when taking the NPPF as a whole, it is necessary to consider and balance that harm (namely and significantly the landscape and visual impact) with the benefits in the three dimensions of sustainable development (social, economic and environmental). The NPPF stresses that these three roles 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.

Economic impacts

The scheme would result in some short term economic benefits as part of any construction work and in the longer term some limited employment opportunities in the running of some aspects of the building and grounds.

It is therefore considered that the scheme would bring forward a level of economic benefit.

Social impacts

Maximising the new sporting facility in a sustainable location and the community access proposed, where there currently is no formal public access, represents a significant public social benefit in support of the application.
There is harm to the sensitivities of users of the site from a loss in the naturalistic qualities of the river valley.

Enabling the development of the Rugby club’s existing site in the Norwich Policy Area for residential development in accordance with the emerging Development Plan for that area is a significant benefit in terms of both social and economic aspects.

Delivering a scheme with ancillary uses such as the café will ensure the long term stability and sustainability of the Rugby Club for the benefit of the club members and sporting in general in the area.

Benefits of creating a new hub between the UEA and NRP for meetings.

Benefits to other rugby facilities in the catchment through a S106 to secure qualitative improvements to the facility.

There is the potential for heritage assets of prehistoric and Roman date to be present within the site area and for these to be affected by the proposals. Conditions are required to ensure there would be no harm to these unknown assets.

Overall it is therefore considered that the scheme would result in significant social benefits.

Environmental impacts

Harm is identified in the environmental role through impacts on the landscape namely the siting of the building; earth banks required for the new pitches; and car parking and access road.

The loss of 0.8Ha of plantation represents a level of harm in respect of the environmental role although it is acknowledged that this is a relatively new feature in the landscape and would benefit from management (as proposed).

It is acknowledged that there are limitations as to what can be mitigated in respect of the landscape and visual impact due to the nature of the proposal and characteristics of the site. There is a balance between providing sufficient sports provision on site in order to ensure that the current sport offer at the North Walsham Road site is offset and replaced, and ensuring that the site, its topography and context are respected and allowing sufficient space to mitigate and lessen impacts on site. It is accepted that whilst mitigation landscape planting and surfacing is proposed this will not completely mitigate the landscape and visual impact of the scheme and there will be residual impacts that can’t be mitigated.

Ecologically there will be some impacts through loss of habitat of the 0.9Ha of grassland and 0.8 Ha of plantation. In terms of species the presented evidence indicates that it is unlikely that any bat roosts will be adversely impacted by the proposed development, or that significant flight routes or feeding areas will be adversely impacted and surveys indicate it is unlikely reptile populations will be affected by this application. Any ecological impacts can be addressed through condition and the management of the plantation could improve the current situation.

Subject to conditions in respect of surface water run-off which address water quality and quantity there should be no significant adverse impacts on the water quality of the River Yare.

The site is in a highly sustainable location in terms of access to transport links and public transport. This represents a social benefit and will be accessible to a large range of users.

There are social and environmental benefits of maintaining and enhancing cycle and pedestrian routes through the site.
Renewable energy, sustainable construction and water efficiency are proposed for the building and would represent a level of environmental benefit to help offset the impacts of the proposed building.

Overall it is therefore considered that the proposal would not entirely fulfil the environmental role.

Conclusion on sustainable development

Landscape harm is identified, and it is evident that this cannot be fully mitigated, but this is not considered to be at level that is significantly adverse and therefore does not conflict with the development plan. Furthermore in consideration of the benefits of the scheme identified above in the social, economic and to some degree environmental role, these benefits are considered to outweigh the harm identified.

On balance the proposal is therefore considered to represent a sustainable development.

Crime and disorder

In relation to the Council’s duties under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, the application raises no significant crime and disorder issues. A number of comments have been made by Norfolk Police Architectural Liaison Officer to improve the security of the building and to ensure car park areas and footpaths are safe and secure. It is considered that the scheme has taken all opportunities as far as is practicably possible to ‘design out crime’.

EIA

A single issue Environmental Statement (ES) was submitted with the application following informal scoping with the Council identifying the need for an ES on Landscape and Visual Impact.

The ES has assessed the likely significant environmental effects to arise from the development, recommends mitigation measures and makes a judgement on the significance of the impact, both at the construction phase and during the operational phases of the development.

The ES covers the information required by Schedule 4 of regulation 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (EIA) regulations 2011.

It was identified that the residual impacts arising from the development range from moderate adverse to negligible with the majority of impacts being considered moderate adverse.

The ES sets out where possible environmental impacts have been avoided or where not possible have been reduced through mitigation. It is acknowledged in the ES that the development will have moderate adverse environmental effects upon the local landscape character and key viewpoints associated with the proposed development which are unable to be completely mitigated.

Measures have been identified to mitigate landscape and visual impact which are to be secured by condition in order to reduce and offset any significant adverse effects on the environment.
4.231 It is acknowledged that the harm identified cannot however be fully mitigated. The assessment of the application has carried out a balancing exercise to determine whether in planning terms, notwithstanding the harm identified, the social and economic benefits and any other environmental benefits outweigh the harm, inline with paragraph 196 and 197 of the NPPF and policies DM1.1 and DM1.3.

Appropriate assessment

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

Financial considerations

4.233 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

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

5.2 Key impacts of the development identified are landscape, ecology and highway impacts.

5.3 As set out in the report whilst harm to the landscape would result, this is considered to result in moderate adverse harm. The policy test is significant adverse impact and as such and whilst the proposal would not preserve or enhance the landscape due to the proposed new structures and surfacing, the level of harm is not considered to be of a level to conflict with the landscape policy.

5.4 In respect of ecology, the impacts are not considered severe and can be addressed through condition for suitable mitigation and compensation.

5.5 In respect of highway impact, the Highway Authority have advised that the proposed development with its access and levels of parking as amended are not considered to be severe and so are acceptable subject to a car parking management plan to be approved to control how the car parking is to be used (for the reasonable use of the sporting facility only).

5.6 In other respects the application is considered to be acceptable, or can be made acceptable through the imposition of planning conditions and S106 obligations.

5.7 Maximising the existing sporting facility in this manner in a sustainable location and the community access proposed, together with a S106 to secure qualitative improvements to other rugby facilities in the catchment, represents a significant public social benefit in support of the application.

5.8 In respect of community access for informal recreation it is considered that whilst users would experience a lesser naturalistic experience of the site due to the development, this is not considered significant and the level of access afforded by improvements to footpaths throughout the site is a significant public social benefit.
5.9 On balance, in consideration of the identified harm and benefits of the proposal, the benefits are considered to outweigh the harm.

5.10 The application as amended and subject to the imposition of conditions and a S106 (which are considered to accord with the relevant conditions tests and paragraphs 203, 204 and 205 of the NPPF) is considered on balance to be acceptable, to accord with the Development Plan and to represent a sustainable form of development. The application is therefore recommended for approval.
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Landscape Architect comments (revised scheme):

The revised proposals address some of my previous comments and have attempted to reduce the previously-identified adverse landscape and visual impacts.

Removal of existing trees and/or hedgerows:

The discrepancies previously between the Tree Protection Plans and the proposals drawings are largely resolved. The exception being the mature oak on the roadside verge to the north of the Colney Lane entrance. AECOM’s drawing highlights this tree as being within the visibility splay, but is not explicit about its fate. Both the LVIA and the Tree Protection Plan, however, note that this specimen is to be removed so this is assumed to be the true case. Obviously it would be good if the tree can be retained as it is a mature specimen, but its current form means that the tree should not be seen as a barrier to development.

It is unfortunate that none of the trees within the avenue G2 can be retained, but the masterplan now features replacement avenue planting; in time a similar feature could be re-established. I note that many of the public comments refer to the existing trees as marking an old boundary. From old maps it is clear that the current line of the drive is where there was a boundary between two fields – probably a hedgerow - but this is not a parish boundary nor does it appear to have any other significance. The age and form of the trees is such that I am certain that they will not have been part of the original hedge boundary. Regardless of whether this application is approved, this avenue will require thinning if it is to achieve its long-term potential. The relative young age of this feature means that an equivalent replacement feature is relatively easy to establish and as such I confirm that I have no objection, subject to planting of a new avenue as indication on the submitted Landscape Masterplan.

Impact on retained trees and/or hedgerows:

My previous concerns about the aspens and willows of groups G4 and G5 have been addressed; the children’s pitches are now moved to be near the pavilion building and the conservation meadow is no longer to be developed. The conservation land can continue to be managed as it is now. Subject to agreed tree protection, there appear to be no foreseeable significant adverse impacts for the retained trees.

Visual Impact:

The LVIA has been revised in light of the changes to the scheme. It confirms that the revised proposals have lessened some of the potential visual impacts, but still notes that it will be impossible to fully mitigate for the visual effects of this proposed development which the LVIA concludes will be generally “moderate adverse” after completion plus mitigation and I concur with the assessment. The primary visual impacts will be a result of the pavilion, lighting, fencing for 3G pitch, presence and movement of cars and the access road, and the significance will be greatest for those experiencing the site from within; the visual effects are less (and in some instances, negligible) from viewpoints immediately outside and surrounding the site. In light of the fact that
the greatest adverse visual effect will be from within the site – and that access to the site is on a permissive basis only – I conclude that an objection on visual impact grounds is not sustainable.

**Impact on landscape character**

Policy DM 4.5 (Landscape Character and River Valleys) requires that:

> All development should respect, conserve and where possible, enhance the landscape character of its immediate and wider environment. Development proposals that would cause significant adverse impact on the distinctive landscape characteristics of an area will be refused. All development proposals will be expected to demonstrate how they have taken the following elements (from the 2001 South Norfolk Landscape Assessment as updated by the 2012 review) into account:
> 1. The key characteristics, assets, sensitivities and vulnerabilities;
> 2. The landscape strategy; and
> 3. Development considerations.

*Particular regard will be had to protecting the distinctive characteristics, special qualities and geographical extents of the identified Rural River Valleys and Valley Urban Fringe landscape character types.*

The application does not specifically systematically address the elements, but the LVIA does highlight that “the application site is considered to be fairly representative of the character area described in the South Norfolk Landscape Character Assessments”.

The site is within the F1 Yare Valley Urban Fringe character area. Looking at the identified sensitivities and vulnerabilities, landscape strategy and development considerations I make the following observations with regard to the current proposals:

- **loss of naturalistic quality as a result of further intrusion of suburban development, large institutional buildings and tall structures in particular pylons upon the valley landscape; and, developments within the valley or adjoining character areas that would increase the perception of the level of development surrounding the valley, which would therefore weaken the current perception that the River Yare is unconnected to a major city.**

The proposal will introduce a new large building and associated features within the river valley and the submitted LVIA concludes that “the Proposed Development will result in a more developed urban character to the area”.

Whilst it could be argued that the existing institutional buildings nearby have affected the landscape character, they are not within the river valley designation itself. However, the site does already include pylons and overhead wires which have reduced the naturalist quality.

- **further disturbance of the tranquility of the area by traffic, in particular detrimental impact of cross-valley links or upgrading of existing links;**

The proposal upgrades the new access road and introduces parking areas within the site; whilst these do not constitute cross-valley links, they will result in vehicular movements within the site being increased and more commonplace. The LVIA concurs – and I agree - that this will be a visual intrusion and notes that whilst the planting proposed will help to reduce the visual impact, this in itself will cause a change to the open character as a consequence.

- **loss or inappropriate management of vegetation on the valley floor or sides and the need to maintain/improve the quality of the River Yare;**
The main loss of existing vegetation within the valley is a section of W1 plantation. This plantation is a relatively recent addition to the valley landscape and as such does not form part of an older historic landscape. Furthermore, it is accepted that the plantation in general would benefit from management; this is being offered as part of the current proposals and in my view is a positive opportunity. The general approach to the planting and management across the site has evolved in response to my previous comments; provided the necessary detail design is undertaken and a full management plan implemented, so parts of the site are likely to provide an arguably improved landscape situation in terms of visual interest and habitat potential.

- **sensitivity of recreational uses/users to losses in naturalistic quality including formalisation of recreational facilities;**
  The site has already lost some of its naturalistic characteristics insofar as the land has already been levelled to some degree to create the pitches that already exist. The application proposes additional re-modelling which will mean that in places the banking will be more pronounced. It is proposed that the areas between the pitches be managed for wildflowers and or native shrubs and trees, and in time the effect will lessen. The application, however, also includes land that appears to be in its natural landform state (at the extreme eastern limit of the site); the necessity to re-profile this land in order to achieve pitches 1, 2, 7 and 8 will result in a loss of the natural landform in close proximity to the river.

- **developments that intrude upon the views into the landscape, including views from the Norwich Southern Bypass.**
  The new pavilion building and associated feature will be prominent features in the middle distance where views into the site are possible, for example from Colney Lane and as such there will be a clear visual change of moderate adverse harm. Long views of the site from the A47 Southern bypass are limited by the relatively recent planting that is maturing alongside the road and as such there will be limited/negligible impact.

- **developments that break the current green mantle to Norwich provided by the yare Valley which would blur the distinction between the settlements north of the River and the City of Norwich.**
  Despite the introduction of the pavilion, the nature of majority of the development will see the existing green nature of the site retained, and the 'soft' non-pitch areas are now proposed to be managed for landscape and wildlife benefit. Where possible, the choice of ‘hard’ ground surfacing aims to be as visually incongruous as possible.

The landscape strategy for F1 is "to maintain an open and distinctive boundary to the city of Norwich to provide a 'green buffer' between the city and its rural hinterland." Also "Open views within the valley and, where possible, from the valley should be protected and views from and across the valley towards Norwich, particularly the cathedral, should be maintained and enhanced."

The LVIA has considered viewpoints across the valley from the university and concludes that the effects will at most be negligible. The effect of the proposed floodlighting appears to be the only issue for the views from the university campus, but these will be in the context of existing backdrop of lighting at the hospital and John Innes Centre.

Development considerations (with comments where applicable) set out in F1 are:

*Any development should respect the character and landscape assets of the Yare Valley Urban Fringe and this will necessitate consideration of the following criteria:*
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• respect the relative absence of development within the valley and ensure any new development relates to existing settled crossing points;
• maintain the distinction between settlements to the south and north of the Yare;
• maintain the role of the Yare valley as a comprehensible and tangible limit to the southern suburbs of the City of Norwich;

The proposal will obviously increase the level of development but the pavilion, road and ‘hard’ structures will represent only a small proportion of the site in terms of area. The majority will either be living grass or other vegetative areas and as such a sense of separation between the developments will prevail.

• ensure new development (including associated landscaping) does not intrude upon the openness within the valley or character of the vegetation;
the LVIA finds that the site is “generally enclosed, either by landform, woodland or existing buildings, with the result that the visual envelope of the Proposed Development is relatively confined”. I agree with this conclusion.
However, it should be noted that from the publicly-accessible College Lane the new pavilion and associated features will initially be prominent features in the middle distance (as identified by the LVIA). Whilst the setting of these will be generally open land and pitches, the sense of ‘openness’ will be lessened by the fact that some views will now feature the pavilion building and its associated features (and planting).

• conserve the ecology of the River Yare and consider the direct or indirect impacts of development (including run-off) upon ecological character and quality
Lusty Hills, whilst part of the application site, is not part of the development proposals and therefore is conserved. At a landscape level, the proposal offers opportunities to try to improve on the current pitches by incorporating wildflower and shrub margins, and improved management of the plantation.

• protect the scheduled Ancient Monuments within the valley and their settings including Arminghall Henge.
   No Scheduled Ancient Monuments within site.

• maintain open views to and from the Southern Bypass, the City of Norwich, and important landmarks;
   No conflict with this has been identified.

• co-operate with Norwich City Council to avoid city-related developments which would affect these considerations.

Proposed landscape design:

Some new information is provided about how the new woodland edge (exposed after some of the W1 plantation has been removed to enable pitches 2, 7 & 8 to be accommodated) will be treated. The concept of this, along with the intention to manage the plantation is acceptable, but a fully-detailed management plan will be required in due course. The submitted Landscape Masterplan (a welcome addition to the suite of plans) gives a better indication of the landscape mitigation and enhancements that may be possible here, but I would wish to see a much more detailed indication of a connection from the plantation to the river to mitigate for the loss of the existing hedgerow; this could be, for example, between pitches 3 & 4.

I accept that the Landscape Masterplan is a general concept scheme only, but if possible I would suggest that more shrubs/trees are included on the embankments of the 3G pitch in order to mitigate as much as possible the visual effect of the earth mound, fence and pavilion.
Ideally we need a revised Landscape Masterplan to include these suggestions prior to approval (if the application is approved), but the detail design can be conditioned.

Conclusion:

In summary, the amended scheme and its associated documents present an improved scheme, but some of the identified negative impacts will be impossible to avoid if the application proceeds and these would need to be accepted if the application is approved.

The LVIA identifies that there will be some adverse visual effect, but this is primarily from within the site and will reduce in time as mitigation planting matures. Some effects of the scheme are at odds with policy DM4.5; further intrusion of suburban development; increased perception of the level of development; and, further disturbance of the tranquility of the area by traffic; but I do not consider that the whole scheme is contrary to the policy.

Previously I objected to the application on the grounds that it was contrary to JCS 2, and DM4.9, but now that the scheme has been revised – including the submission of a Landscape Masterplan - I consider that the grounds are much reduced. If this was a landscape with purely natural character and/or devoid of previous structures then an argument against the development would be clearer-cut. However the previous ground levelling and maintained pitches, along with the presence of pylons, other buildings in the vicinity and views of the University buildings in the distance reduce the argument that this site is a natural, undeveloped site and as such is unacceptable for any change.

Robin Taylor
Landscape Architect
t 01508 533753 e r.taylor@s-norfolk.gov.uk www.south-norfolk.gov.uk
Other Applications

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

Recommendation : Approval with conditions
1. Time Limit
2. In accordance with amendments
3. External materials to be agreed

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 Development Management Policies
DM3.4 Residential extensions and conversions within Settlements
DM3.8 Design Principles
DM3.11 Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.13 Amenity, noise and quality of life

2. Planning History

2.1 2013/0726 Non Material Amendment to planning permission 2012/1322/H- Changes to the proposed colourings of the windows/doors from UPVC white windows to anthracite grey and white front door to black front door Approved

2.2 2012/1322 Proposed single storey infill extension to existing bungalow Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Original scheme
Over development of the site
Loss of amenity (light) to adjacent properties
Issue with construction traffic in the area.

Revised Scheme:
No comments received.

3.2 District Members Original scheme
Cllr Dale - No comments to make
Cllr Bills - No comments received

Revised scheme
Cllr Dale - No comments to make
Cllr Bills - To Committee - Out of character and still too large for the site.
3.3 SNC Conservation and Design

Original comments:
Concerned at the views of the side of the property, as being on the corner the building will be prominent and the sides exposed - especially to the north east. The increase in height towards the rear is more acceptable juxtaposed with the two storey dwelling to the south west (although that is hipped), however the increase in the extent of blank and unrelieved walling to north east will dominate over the bungalow, and is therefore detrimental in terms of views and neighbourhood amenity when viewed from the north east.

Revised scheme:
No further objections following partial change in the remodelling to divide the building into clearer separate parts. Break up reduces the bulk, particularly in street views of the side of the property from the East (and juxtaposition with the adjacent property.) Suggest conditions for materials.

3.4 Other Representations

9 letters of objection

- At present our view of 9a is mitigated by the line of trees behind the existing property, this will be totally obliterated particularly from our ground floor living rooms.
- It is impossible to visualise where all the equipment needed to dismantle the actual roof can be fitted into such a limited space and the noise and disturbance that will be involved is simply unimaginable.
- Months of disruption during the last conversion we object to a repeat performance.
- Such work is inevitably noisy but when it extends into the weekend and peace is denied even on Sundays, it becomes intolerable.
- Overdevelopment of the site - property already extended by previous permission in 2012 and now takes up the full width of the plot, any further increase in the size of the property to include first floor will constitute excessive overdevelopment of the is very tight space.
- Loss of light in side kitchen window of No 11 and to a lesser extent into the 2 side windows of the lounge.
- Loss of daylight from proposed extension onto side of No11 including the glazed kitchen door.
- Little frontage of existing property construction traffic will pose a serious problem restricting the traffic.
- Proposal will result in a 5 bedroom property with limited parking to the front of the property.
- Permission will not be given for any works to take place from No 11 for the development. No building rubble will be accommodated on No11’s property; also impact on the construction work on the garden request condition is imposed to prevent this happening.
- Electricity supply to Nos 9a and 11 is via pole in No11 garden; the neighbour paid for the cable to be buried underground, the development will require the removal of the pole as it is so close to the site.
- The said property 9a Lynch Green has very little access from the front, so would possibly need to use my part owned private drive. When other major work has been carried out no communication has been made and certain building equipment has been left and parked on the said drive causing me to have no parking when visiting my property. This also caused damage to the drive as it is not suitable for this sort of traffic and equipment. I will not give permission for my part owned private drive to be used for this purpose.
• Request Committee carry out a site visit.
• Lynch Green is narrow with no footpaths.
• 9a already forward of No11 adding first floor will reduce the amount of light to our front lounge and bedroom.
• Position of Oak Tree (70 years Old) is 4 metres from the boundary of 9a not on the boundary as shown on the plan.
• Overall change in appearance of the property is not in keeping with the area.
• Last time works was undertaken on the property the applicant used neighbours driveways for turning purposes.
• Road blocked by construction vehicles and the refuse lorry on previous occasion.
• Boundary of site is incorrect.
• Deliveries from construction companies broke branches off Pine tree in Neighbours garden.
• Disruption to neighbours would be unbearable.
• Proposed materials will not match surrounding houses.

4 Assessment

4.1 The proposal seeks permission for a first floor extension and remodelling of the existing dwelling. The existing property is a detached single storey property which has previously been refurbished and extended under the 2012/1322 planning permission. The plot on which the property sits narrows to the rear resulting in an awkward footprint of property, which limits the options for further extensions. A large garden lies to the rear of the site and extends to the rear of Nos 9 and 11 Lynch Green. The front of the property benefits from a brick weave drive which provides parking for 3 or 4 cars. The plot sits between No 9 which is two storey property, and No11 which is a single storey dwelling. The site is within the Development Limits of Hethersett.

4.2 The application is assessed against Policy DM3.4 which states: Within development boundaries proposals for residential extensions and conversions to create new dwellings will be permitted provided they:

a) Incorporate a good quality design which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of the building, street scene and surroundings; and
b) Do not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers or adversely affect neighbouring commercial uses

Specifically, proposals must provide and maintain:

c) Suitable amenity and utility space; and
d) Adequate access and parking

4.3 As originally submitted the first floor extension included a gable frontage which projects beyond the ground floor resulting in an overhang on the front elevation, behind the gable section sites a cube element which provides a bathroom, this element increases the height of the existing wall on the boundary of No11. A further pitched roof section sits to the rear of the front gable, leaving a large section to the rear of the property as single storey. The overall extensions at first floor level as originally submitted were considered to have an adverse impact on the neighbouring property (No11) and the street scene which would appear prominent especially to the north east. Discussions were held with the agent to recommend a simplification of the roof form giving more emphasis to the gable form at the front, which is a strong feature.

4.4 Amended plans have now been received which keep the majority of the extension as originally proposed, but relocate the bathroom to the opposite side of the first floor therefore allowing this section of the extension to be stepped in resulting in a much reduced element
of bulk on the side boundary of No11 which also reduces the impact on within the street scene.

4.5 Objections have been received from the Parish Council and local residents to the design and scale of the proposed extension on what is perceived as an already overdeveloped plot. I accept the plot is an unusual shape which restricts the options for extension at ground floor level. In terms of design the revised scheme does significantly change the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, however, Lynch Green comprises a total mix of designs of properties, some old and some very modern other have been extended resulting in a mix of form and design. While the proposed scheme changes the appearance of the property, the development is considered to be of good design which is considered to add to the character of the existing property, and enhances the street scene.

4.6 In terms of the impact on the neighbouring properties, concerns have been raised to the scale of the dwelling and also the loss of light. No 11 to the North East is a single storey dwelling, and while the scheme as originally submitted would have an overbearing impact on the side boundary of the property, the scheme as revised significantly reduces the bulk of the first floor extension to an acceptable level. The side elevation of No 11 comprises side facing lounge windows and a kitchen window, while there may be some loss of light I do not considered this is so significant to justify refusal on this ground. No 9 which is a two storey property to the South West of the application site and sits further back within the plot than 9a the subject of this application. There may be some loss of light to the front window which serves a lounge and the first floor bedroom, however, light to these windows is already reduced as a result of the Oak tree on the boundary of No9, given the angle of the two plots and the orientation I do not consider any light loss resulting from the proposal would be so significant to the amenities of the neighbours as to justify refusal.

4.7 The scheme as proposed does not change the amenity space available for the existing property which is situated to the rear of the site. The rear gardens of Nos 9 and 11 are protected from overlooking by the location and design of the windows. Given the design and the general built up area of the location, I do not consider any loss of privacy to neighbouring properties justifies refusal of this scheme.

4.8 The existing site benefits from a hard surfaced area to the front of the property which remains unchanged. Concern is raised by neighbours relating to the lack of parking spaces for the size of the property proposed. I would suggest the space available could accommodate 4 cars which is adequate for the size of the property. Having regard to the criteria of policy DM3.4 the scheme as revised is considered to accord with the criteria and therefore accords with policy. In addition the design is considered to be of a high standard albeit of modern design, there is minimal impact in terms of loss of amenities for the neighbouring properties the scheme is therefore also considered to accord with policy DM3.13 of the SNLP 2015.

4.9 Other issues have been raised relating to the parking of construction traffic; delivery of materials resulting in disruption to residents; highway safety issues and to the applicant parking in neighbours driveways when previous works has been undertaken. However, while these points are fully appreciated, they are short term and private issues which do not justify refusal of permission.

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

4.11 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the additional floor
5 Conclusion

5.1 The site is within the development limits of Hethersett, the scheme has been amended to overcome our concerns and it is now considered acceptable in design terms. The impact of the revised scheme on the amenities of the neighbour is considered acceptable, and the existing parking area to the front of the property provides space for 3 to 4 cars which is considered to accord with the requirements of County Highways Authority Parking Standards (which is 3 spaces for a 4 or more bedroom unit). The scheme as revised accords with policies DM3.4, DM3.8, DM3.13, DM3.11 and DM3.12 of the SNLP 2015.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number
and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837
jjackson@snorfolk.gov.uk
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

**Recommendation**: Approval 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

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 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**  
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 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  
DM3.5: Replacement dwellings and additional dwellings on sub-divided plots within Development Boundaries  
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.10: Promotion of sustainable transport  
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking  
DM3.1: Meeting Housing requirements and needs  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM3.14: Pollution, health and safety  
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management
1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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

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

2. Planning History

2.1 2009/1508 Proposed erection of single storey extensions to rear of dwelling. (Cantara) Approved

2.2 2008/0264 Two and single storey extension to rear of dwelling. (Cantara) Withdrawn

2.3 2006/2409 Construction of new single cartshed garage with attached lean-to store. (Cantara) Refused

2.4 2006/0353 Proposed two storey rear extension, timber frame, brick & pantiled roof. (Cantara) Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Town / Parish Council To the original submission Refuse
- There are other sites very close to this one, a brownfield site - rather than eroding this green field spaces, which borders the periphery of the village
- Looking to the future for generations, the environment & biodiversity of this site would diminish the natural heritage of the village
- Part of the historic culture of the village is found along this road - the Chapel - a significant historic building and the Reading Rooms situated further up, these proposed dwellings would detract from the local street scene
- This is a single track highway, although used by Chenery Coaches, the coaches did not traverse this narrow section of the highway

To amended scheme Refuse
- Site is inappropriate as stated previously
- Impact on historic culture of the village
- Greenfield situated near to an alternative brownfield
- Environmental quality and local distinctiveness
- Capacity of the physical infrastructure - water management

3.2 District Member To the original submission Can be delegated
To amended plans
To be determined by Committee following concerns raised, being inappropriate area to build because of the historic interest of the site
and it would be better to build on nearby brown field site instead of this greenfield site

3.3 SNC Conservation And Design
No objections subject to conditions

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

3.5 SNC Water Management Officer
No objections subject to conditions

3.6 NHSCCG
No comments received

3.7 NCC Ecologist
No objections subject to conditions
To amended plans
Welcome the hedge to the frontage

3.8 NCC Highways
No objections subject to conditions

3.9 Other Representations
2 letters of objection
- Far too much development in Dickleburgh and it cannot cope with further development and the increase in traffic
- Schools is not able to cope
- Practically non-existent bus service
- 15 homes going up behind Mount Pleasant, 22 still under consideration in Harvey lane, 2 in Burston Road where is it going to end?
- Object strongly to further development

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 4 two storey dwellings with associated access drives, turning facilities and amenity space at land West of Cantara, Burston Road, Dickleburgh.

4.2 The main issues in this case are the principle of development in this location; design and layout; impact on the conservation area, highway safety; and drainage.

Principle

4.3 Policy 15 in the JCS allocates Dickleburgh as a service village where further development can be accommodated subject to it respecting the character and form of the settlement. This approach is supported by the NPPF.

4.4 Policy DM3.5 of the Development Management Policies requires the sub-division of plots within the development limit to incorporate good quality design which maintained or enhances the character and appearance of existing building, street scene and surroundings and does not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties.
Design and layout

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

4.6 The site lies on the periphery of the Dickleburgh, along Burston Road, and will fill the gap between outlying an Edwardian semi villa dating from 1902, and a modern late 20th development to the east. The former Baptist chapel just to the east and almost opposite on the north side of the road, is an attractive classically based building of architectural and historic interest, but not listed, and is now converted to a dwelling. The existing modern housing has already established a linear grain of development, and the infill of the plot is within the development boundary. The conservation area boundary runs through the site at the north-eastern corner. The character of this part of Dickleburgh is very much characterised by later C19 development with more modern infill set back behind hedgerows, which is very different to the village core.

4.7 The proposed buildings are traditional in their scale, size and form, but have a more contemporary take with regard to architectural elements and their use of traditional materials within elevations. This will create some variety in the development, whilst maintaining an overall cohesive character and loosely referencing more traditional buildings. The proposed 4 dwellings are considered acceptable in terms of their design, scale and relationship to the surrounding properties. The layout demonstrates that the site is of sufficient size to comfortably accommodate the proposed dwellings, curtilages, parking and turning. On this basis, it is considered that the scheme would accord with DM3.5 of SNLP, Policy 2 of the JCS and Section 7 of the NPPF.

Impact on the Conservation Area

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

Highways

4.9 Policy DM3.11 of the South Norfolk Local Plan states that planning permission will not be granted for development, which would endanger highway safety or the satisfactory functioning of the highway network. The Highways Authority have assessed the proposal and raised no objections subject to the imposition of conditions. As such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Polices DM3.11 and DM3.12.

Residential Amenity

4.10 Policy DM3.13 Residential amenity directs that development should not be approved if it would have a significant adverse impact on nearby resident's amenities. The proposed dwellings have been carefully designed as to protect the amenities of the existing neighbouring properties and it is considered that the development will not have any significantly detrimental impacts on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties in respect of privacy, light and noise. As such, the scheme would accord with the requirements of Policy DM3.13.
Drainage

4.11 The Water Management officer has raised no objections to the proposal subject to a condition requiring the surface water drainage details to be submitted and in view of the above I do not consider the application can be refused on drainage issues.

4.12 The Parish Council and 2 local residents have raised concerns as set out above, whilst these are fully appreciated the application site is within the development boundary; the layout and design are considered acceptable and will not adversely affect the character of the area or the conservation area; and both the Highway Officer and Water management officer raise no objections to the development subject to conditions. In view of the above I do not consider the proposal can be refused on the grounds raised.

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

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

5 Conclusion

5.1 The appearance and layout of the development is considered acceptable for its context and will not harm the Conservation Area. It will not adversely affect the amenities of the neighbouring properties or highway safety. As such the proposal accords with the NPPF, JCS and SNLP.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788
and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Parish : DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL

Applicants Name : Mrs Croner
Site Address : Land East Of Bangala Rectory Road Dickleburgh Norfolk
Proposal : Two dwellings

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions
1 Outline permission time limit
2 In accordance with submitted drawings
3 Standard outline requiring reserved matters
4 1½ storey dwellings only
5 No 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

1. Planning Policies

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2 : Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4 : Housing delivery
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation
Policy 15 : Service Villages
Policy 20 : Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.1 : Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable
development in South Norfolk
DM1.3 : The sustainable location of new development
DM1.4 : Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM3.1 : 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
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design
1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place making Guide

2. Planning History

2.1 No relevant planning history.

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council

**Objects**
- Proposals cannot empathise with its immediate surroundings. The close proximity to the boundary of Bangala, the narrow nature of the plot, the impact on the entrance to the village and street scene are contrary to established properties.
- The windows on the west side of the application look directly into the bedrooms of the property next door, the first floor windows will look down onto the gardens and into rooms on the east side of the house – a two storey semi property is unsuitable to this plot - a good sized single storey dwelling would complement the street scene.
- The size of the plot is inadequate to support a pair of semidetached properties, the ‘gateway’ to the village would be compromised, the outlook towards Dickleburgh Moor is at risk and the significant loss of privacy to immediate properties.

3.2 District Member

Requests that application is heard by Development Management Committee.
- Cramped form of development
- Not in keeping with adjoining properties
- Foul and waste water problems
- Impact on adjoining properties such as loss of privacy and light

3.3 SNC Water Management Officer

No objection
- Recommends conditions requiring a foul drainage assessment to be carried out and full details of the means of sustainable surface water drainage prior to commencement of development.

3.4 NCC Highways

No objection
- Recommends conditions regarding vehicle access, parking, turning and visibility splays.

3.5 Other Representations

9 letters of objection received:
- Loss of amenity, overshadowing, loss of light and privacy
- Highways impacts, including inadequate passing places for lorries and viability splays
- Impact on bats
- Erosion of character of village
- Design and spacing not in keeping with arrangement and form of the street
- Loss of agricultural land
- Inadequate provision for waste water and surface water drainage
- Conflict with planning policies and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide
- Loss of amenity for the village
Assessment

This application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of two dwellings with all matters reserved except for access.

The site is located on Rectory Road, Dickleburgh to the east of the property known as Bangala. The site currently forms part of an agricultural field within the development boundary of Dickleburgh and as such the principle of new development is acceptable in accordance with Local Plan Policy DM1.3, providing the development accords with other relevant planning policies and guidance when assessing sustainable development.

Policy DM1.3 supports new dwellings in sustainable locations, which this site is considered to be by virtue of its location within the development boundary and location within a service village in accordance with JCS Policy 15.

An indicative site layout has been submitted which shows how the two dwellings could be accommodated within the site boundaries in a manner consistent with the surrounding development. This is considered to be consistent with the character of the surrounding area and street scene, which comprises of a mix of different building styles, including bungalows, semi-detached and detached dwellings. With careful consideration at reserved matters stage it is considered that the development has the potential to integrate well within the street scene and will not cause adverse harm to the surrounding character or appearance of the area, in accordance with Policy 2 of the JCS, DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and the South Norfolk Place Making Guide.

With regards to residential amenity, Local Plan Policy DM3.13 directs that development should not be approved if it would have a significant adverse impact on neighbouring amenity. Having considered the separation distances between the proposed plot and existing residential curtilages it is felt that through careful consideration at the reserved matters stage along with appropriate boundary treatment, an acceptable standard of amenity could be achieved, which would not give rise to significant unacceptable impact on amenity with regard to overlooking, loss of day light, overshadowing or an overbearing impact. To ensure the form and scale of development is compatible with the adjacent property and in the interests of the residential and visual amenities of the locality, a condition is suggested that restricts the height of the dwellings to 1 ½ storeys only. It is also suggested that a condition is added to remove any permitted development rights for windows or other openings to be constructed in the west elevation of the development to help safeguard the privacy and amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent property. Subject to these conditions and details to be agreed through a reserved matters application, it is considered that an acceptable standard of amenity can be achieved in accordance with Policy DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

In terms of access, the proposed development is not considered to endanger highway safety or the satisfactory function of the highway network. In addition, the Highways Authority has not raised any objection to the proposal. They have recommended conditions regarding vehicle access, parking and turning and visibility splays which I will condition. In my opinion, the proposal satisfies Local Plan Policy DM3.11. An access has also been retained to the rear agricultural field along the eastern boundary of the site from Rectory Road, which is considered acceptable.

With regards to foul and surface water drainage, the Councils Water Management Officer has carried out an assessment of the proposals and has no objections, subject to a number of conditions recommending that a foul drainage assessment is carried out to determine the most appropriate treatment facility for the site and that full details of the means of sustainable surface water drainage are submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority prior to commencement of development. Subject to these conditions it is considered that the scheme is acceptable.
4.8 Members should note that there have been a number of local concerns raised about the proposal, including overlooking, loss of light, character, separation distances between properties and highways impacts. In response to these concerns I have addressed each of these matters above and it is not considered that the proposals are likely to give rise to any significant adverse impacts in terms of residential amenity or character of the area, subject to detailed design.

4.9 The reserved matters stage will assess all relevant impacts in relation to this outline proposal. Matters relating to surface water drainage, foul drainage, materials, boundary treatments, finished floor levels, water efficiency, and contamination are subject to suitably worded conditions as noted above, to ensure compliance with the above planning policies.

Other issues

4.10 Under paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) requires Councils to plan for people wishing to build their own homes. This can be a material planning consideration for this application as self-build has been identified as the method of delivering the site. Whilst an indication of self-build has not been given by the applicant it should be noted that in the instance of this application the other material planning considerations detailed above are of greater significance.

4.11 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.

4.12 This application is liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) at the reserved matters stage.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The principle of residential development is accepted as the site is within the Dickleburgh settlement boundary. The proposed two plot layout is in keeping with the pattern of surrounding development. Two dwellings can be accommodated without adversely affecting the character of the area. An acceptable standard of amenity could be achieved, which would not give rise to significant unacceptable impact on amenity, subject to conditions. Vehicle accesses can be provided in a manner that does not cause an unacceptable highway safety outcome. Subject to detailed design, to be considered at the reserved matters stage, the development is considered to comply with the South Norfolk Development Management polices DM1.1, DM1.3, DM1.4, DM3.1, DM3.8, DM3.10, DM3.11, DM3.12, DM3.13, DM4.2, DM4.3, DM4.8, DM4.9 and policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 15 and 20 of the Joint Core Strategy and objectives of the NPPF.

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

Recommendation: Approval with conditions  
1. Temporary 3 year permission  
2. Occupational restriction  
3. Foul drainage sealed treatment plant

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk  
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development  
DM2.11: Agricultural and other occupational 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  
DM4.5: Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2015/2750 Retrospective application for the use of the Highfield Polo Ltd, Polo Horses used for competition around the UK and proposed horse walker. Approved

2.2 2014/0778 Proposed Horse Stable Extension Approved

2.3 2006/1957 Change of use for the keeping of horses including erection of hay barn ménage and stable block Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council Approve  
- Subject to the stated materials: Timber cladding and slate tiles and not mock materials  
- Residential use should be restricted to polo centre of excellence.
3.2 District Member  To be determined by committee

- Questions whether there is a business operating from the site
- Limited vehicular movements to and from the site
- Related party transactions would fall out of the definition of a business.
- External business would need to be the majority of the transactions otherwise principle use is as a hobby.
- Need to confirm this is a bone-fide business
- Functional need - are horses stabled here really more vulnerable to particular ailments which would justify a dwelling.
- There are plenty of stables without a dwelling
- Applicant has secured an alternative better drained site elsewhere, which is more suitable for the intended use, would bring into question the sustainability and longevity of the proposed use and a requirement for a dwelling
- If bone-fide commercial use evidenced by non-related transactions of a material nature this is potentially supportable.
- Also need to demonstrate functional need and some additional professional evidence is required to pass the test
- Both tests need to be passed for it to be considered favourably
- Could still be minded to refer this to committee if the tests were on balance.

3.3 NCC Highways  No Objection

3.4 SNC Water Management Officer  Advisory comments on surface water drainage and foul drainage

3.5 SNC Property Consultant  No Objection

- I have reviewed the business plan and other supporting information and am satisfied that a reasonable case has been made in support of the future financial viability of the business.
- From the information provided it is evident that the viability of the business will be dependent upon arm’s length business with third parties and not the owner of the business.

3.6 Other Representations  None received

4  Assessment

4.1 The application relates to land opposite Highfields Farm on Highfields Lane Brooke. Permission was originally granted in 2006 for the use of the site for the keeping of horses, associated stable and manege for leisure use. Last year permission was granted for the site to be used for the keeping of polo horses, polo training & coaching. Polo matches were specifically restricted and there is also a condition restricting the number of people at the training sessions including the coaching to 5 people. There is an existing, manege and a horse walker on site. The site is outside any of the development limits defined by the site specific allocations.

4.2 This application seeks consent for an occupational dwelling for a polo groom and includes a classroom. The proposed dwelling would be in the form of a log cabin structure which it is proposed to provide two bedrooms and a flexible space for living accommodation/classroom for coaching sessions.
There is provision in paragraph 55 in the NPPF and policy DM2.11 in the Development Management Policies to permit occupational dwellings in the open countryside subject to a number of criteria being met.

Policy DM2.11 requires functional need for one or more fulltime workers to be readily available at all times for the enterprise to be demonstrated. In addition it must be demonstrated that the functional need could not be met by another existing dwelling in the area that is available and suitable.

The applicant has put forward a functional need case to have a member of staff on site 24 hours a day because polo horses are highly trained and as a result are more prone to conditions which can be life threatening, if they are not treated quickly and as a result require overnight supervision. Letters have been received from an equine veterinary specialist, the Hurlington Polo Association Senior Coach and International Umpire to support the case that polo horses needing frequent monitoring overnight.

There are no other dwellings on site or in the immediate area which are available or suitable to provide the close supervision required.

The business is operational, but is relatively new. Business accounts have been submitted for the first year of trading and small profit has been shown. The business has not been operating sufficient time to be able to demonstrate financial soundness, as a result a permanent consent would not be appropriate at this stage. Policy DM2.11 does however, give provision for temporary consent to allow a business to establish itself. The building is a log cabin structure which could easily be removed from site after 3 years if necessary.

A copy of the first year of accounts and a business plan outlining the predicted trading of the business in future years has been submitted and has been reviewed by the Council’s property consultant who considers that a reasonable case in support of the future financial viability of the business has been made.

It has been suggested that there is not a business operating on site as significant traffic movement have not occurred. The business is relatively new and submitted accounts shown income from external sources. Given the nature of the road network around the site the Highway Officer was concerned about the use of the site by a business which generated a lot of traffic and evidence was put forward as part of the previous application that traffic generation would not high. In addition, part of the growth and development of the business is dependent on having accommodation on site. In any case for a temporary dwelling the policy does not require the business to be operational prior to consent for an occupational dwelling being given.

As a result it is considered that there is a functional need for an occupational dwelling on site and an adequate business case has been put forward to demonstrate the business could be financially sound in the future and as a result complies with policy DM2.11 of the Development Management Policies.

The log cabin is proposed to have two bedrooms and a space for classroom/living accommodation. The Hurlington Polo Association require a written test to be passed before a person can take part in a polo match or tournament as a result the coaching sessions which are provided by an external coach. The space will also provide facilities for the clients when on site. Also as clients and their grooms may not be local, the second bedroom could provide accommodation when they bring their own horses to the coaching sessions.

The design of the log cabin is of a good quality and it is proposed to be located in the corner of the site which is screened by existing hedges. It is not considered it would adversely affect the character of the local landscape.
4.13 The Highway Officer raises no objection to the application.

4.14 In terms of drainage it is proposed to deal with surface water drainage by soakaway and foul water by package treatment plant both of which are acceptable in terms of the guidance in the Planning policy Guidance.

4.15 It is also been raised the applicant has secured a better site elsewhere is the district which brings into question the sustainability and longevity of the proposed site. This is only a temporary consent for a temporary building, so if the business does not continue on the site or is not financially viable then the log cabin would need to be removed.

4.16 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.

4.17 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) because it is temporary structure.

5 Conclusion

5.1 In conclusion it is considered that the business meets the functional need for occupational dwelling and it has been demonstrated that the business could be financially sound within the next three years and result meets the requires of paragraph 55 in the NPPF and policy DM2.11 in the Development Management Policies.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman 01508 533833
and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
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.

Recommendation : Approval 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

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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

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 and quality of life
DM4.2 : Sustainable drainage and water management

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

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

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

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2013/0211  
Outline permission for the development of a detached, 3 bedroom dwelling with garage and garden  
Allowed at appeal
2.2 2015/2945 Reserved Matters from 2013/0211/O, details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout, scale and details of an archaeological watching brief. Withdrawn

2.3 2016/0362 Proposed erection of new dwelling. Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Town / Parish Council Recommend refusal
- The site was refused and a subsequent appeal was granted for a bungalow – permission was granted for a reduced height house in spite of this
- Now the proposal increases the dwelling to full height – this is a blatant attempt to manipulate the planning system.

3.2 District Member Application should be determined by committee
- Possible overdevelopment of site, and question as to whether it is now outwith the scope of the appeal decision which allowed a bungalow.

3.3 Other Representations 1 letter of support
- 3 letters of objection
- The proposal ignores the consideration of the Planning Inspector of the outline permission (2013/0211), which allowed a bungalow on the site
- The pattern of applications and decisions concerning this development has been one of overwhelming drift away from the outline permission that had been given
- The house is substantial and will be visible from the lane and neighbouring properties
- A large two storey dwelling intrudes unacceptably on the neighbour's (to the east) privacy and natural light – intended increase in height is unacceptable
- It is an inappropriate development in the context of the site, being at the edge of the developed area
- Opposed to the transformation from a modest bungalow to a substantial house

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks permission to vary a condition of the previously approved permission, application ref. 2016/0362, which was for the erection of a two storey dwelling and garage. This application proposes to raise the roof height of the dwelling.

4.2 The site is a parcel of land, west of Whiteford Lodge, and to the south of Chandler Road, and is outside of the development limits of Stoke Holy Cross. The site is bounded by hedges, with a ditch running to the west of the site.

4.3 During the application, amended plans were received with amended measurements of the proposed site levels.

4.4 The principle of the development has been assessed and deemed acceptable under the previously approved application. Therefore, the main consideration of this application is the impact the increase in roof height would have on; the design of the dwelling and the character and appearance of the surrounding area and residential amenity.
Design and character of the area

4.5 Concern has been raised over the principle of increasing the height of the dwelling when outline permission (2012/0211) applied for a bungalow on site, which was refused by the council and allowed under appeal. Following this application, a full planning application was submitted under ref. 2016/0362 for a two storey dwelling. The principle of development of this site was established given weight to the lack of a 5 year housing supply in the area, and consequently the application was assessed on its individual merits and deemed acceptable.

4.6 I acknowledge concerns from neighbours that the proposal would be inappropriate in its context and that the dwelling would be visible from the street scene and neighbouring properties. Because the design details and appearance of the dwelling would not be significantly altered, and the increase in height is a relatively small scale alteration, I do not consider that the proposal would justify refusal on the grounds of design.

4.7 I consider that the raising of the roof would not significantly alter the appearance and character of the original application, and would not result in the dwelling having an inappropriate form or massing.

4.8 The application site is opposite a Grade II listed building. 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 not considered the proposed increase in roof height of the dwelling would significantly harm the setting of the listed building as required by section 66 of the Act and policy DM4.10 of the Development Management Policies.

Residential amenity

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

4.10 I acknowledge concern from the adjacent neighbouring property to the west of the site, regarding a loss of privacy and natural light. Although I appreciate these concerns, due to the orientation of the dwellings, and the siting with sufficient distance between the properties, I would not consider that the increase in roof height, including eaves height, would have a significant increase in overshadowing or loss of light than the dwelling proposed in the original application. There are no new windows proposed in the elevations, so I would not consider there to be an increase in loss of privacy through overlooking.

4.11 In view that the neighbouring property to the west is a two storey dwelling, and that the overall height of the proposed dwelling would not be an appropriately sized two storey dwelling, I would not consider that the increase in height would have an adverse impact through being overbearing.

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 liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
5 Conclusion

5.1 Overall, I would not consider that the proposed variation of condition 2 would fundamentally change the overall appearance of the original scheme, and have no adverse impact on residential amenity, or have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

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

1.1 It was reported to the Council that caravans had been brought on to the site. The area where they have been located is outside the residential curtilage of the property on agricultural land. The owners informed me that the two static caravans are used as overspill residential accommodation for the dwelling. The residential use of the caravans is not associated with the agricultural use of the land and therefore constitutes a material change of use.

1.2 The owners of the site claimed that the land on which the caravans are sited is established residential curtilage. They were invited to submit either a planning application or certificate of lawfulness to regularise the situation. A certificate of lawful use application was submitted to demonstrate the land in question was residential curtilage. The application was refused and has subsequently been dismissed at appeal.

1.3 A caravan remains in situ despite a request for it to be either removed or relocated within the approved residential curtilage of the dwellinghouse.

2. **Planning Policies**

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework
- Policy 7: Requiring good design
- Policy 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

2.2 Joint Core Strategy
- Policy 2: Promoting good design

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
- Development Management Policies
  - DM2.8 Equestrian and other changes of use of agricultural land
  - DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development
  - DM3.13 Amenity, noise and quality of life
  - DM4.5 Landscape Character and River Valleys

2.4 Supplementary Planning Document
- South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

3. **Relevant Planning History**

3.1 2015/1141 Continuing use of land for residential garden Refused

3.2 2006/0277 Conversion of existing redundant stable block to holiday cottage Approved

3.3 2006/0251 Proposed erection of conservatory Approved
Appeal History

3.4 16/3143550  Continuing use of land for residential garden  Dismissed

4 Assessment

4.1 The South Norfolk Place-Making Guide designates the land as Tas Tributary Farmland. One of the key characteristics of this land is framed open views across the countryside. The siting of caravans on this land is considered to have a detrimental impact on the open nature of the area.

4.2 The caravan (large mobile home) is sited in open countryside outside any defined development limit or village boundary as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan. The site is an open field with limited screening, which contributes to the landscape characteristics of the area.

4.3 The use of the site for the standing of caravans has a significant and demonstrable harm to the open nature of the site and surroundings. Furthermore it has an adverse impact on the availability of productive agricultural land. For these reasons the development is considered to be unacceptable.

5 Recommendation

5.1 That enforcement action be authorised to cease the use of the land for the standing of caravans and to secure the removal of caravans from the land.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Andy Baines, 01508 533840
and E-mail: abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1.

**Background**

1.1 The property is a Grade II listed building located within the Diss Conservation Area. Concerns have been raised regarding the condition of the building and its impact on the surrounding area. The key concerns were the condition of the render as large pieces were falling off, the condition of windows and the overall need for the building to be better maintained.

1.2 The owner of the property was informed of the concerns and invited to advise how he was going to improve the condition of the building.

1.3 The owner informed me that he had ordered uPVC windows following a request from the Council’s Housing Standards team to improve the condition of the building and that he would be repairing the render. I advised him that Listed Building consent was required for the works and that the local planning authority does not normally support the use of uPVC windows in a listed building.

1.4 Having investigated the matter further it became evident that unfortunately there had been some misunderstanding between planning and the Housing Officer, as the owner had unfortunately been advised in writing, that the windows could be replaced with uPVC provided they were of a similar profile to the existing and that Listed Building consent would not be required.

1.5 No application has been submitted and uPVC sliding sash windows have subsequently been installed and the building has been re-rendered and painted white.

2.

**Planning Policies**

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

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

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
Development Management Policies
DM 4.10 Heritage Assets

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

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

3 Consultations

3.1 SNC Senior Conservation & Design Officer  
The windows are considered to be inappropriate in terms of their intrinsic materials and design detail, however, in views within the conservation area the design of the windows is generally more in keeping with the period style and the change will be less noticeable.

4 Assessment

4.1 It is an offence to carry out unauthorised works to a Listed Building. In deciding whether to pursue enforcement or prosecution action the merits/harm of the works carried out need to be assessed to determine whether it is expedient/proportionate to warrant further action.

4.2 The Senior Conservation and Design Officer has commented that there is some merit to the replacement windows in terms of them having sliding sashes, multi paned and flush fitting like the previous windows. On the negative side the diagonal moulding joins and trickle vents are visible, the detailing where the horns and frame meet are untraditional and the double glazing results in a more unusual reflection in the glazing. On balance it is considered that whilst the materials and design detail are inappropriate, the design of the windows are generally more in keeping with the period style and change will be less noticeable to the casual observer, when viewed within the conservation area. It should also be noted that the building has been in a state of gradual decay for a number years. The recent works to render and paint the property has greatly improved the appearance of the building and it is no longer considered to have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the vicinity or in a wider context the conservation area.

4.3 Taking into consideration the circumstances leading to the replacement windows, the recent improvements to the property and the limited harm of the new windows, on balance I do not consider that the replacement windows create such a significant harm to the Listed Building as to be warrant taking further action.

5 Recommendation

5.1 That no further action be taken on the matter.

Contact Officer, Telephone Numberandy Baines, 01508 533840, abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk
and E-mail:
### Planning Appeals

**Appeals received from 1st October 2016 to 31st October 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016/0884</td>
<td>Broome Land Rear Of Yarmouth Road Broome Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Alison Neilson</td>
<td>Erection of two storey residential dwelling with attached garage (details reserved except for access)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/1268</td>
<td>Dickleburgh And Rushall Land Adjacent To Moorlands Norwich Road Dickleburgh Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Derek Lock</td>
<td>Proposed new passivhaus / carbon negative dwelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Appeals

**Appeals decisions from 1st October 2016 to 31st October 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>2015/2737</td>
<td>Tharston And Hapton Land North Of Acorn Hollow Chequers Road Tharston Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Baldwin</td>
<td>Proposed new dwelling and double garage (revised application)</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal part allowed, part dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2802</td>
<td>Claxton Durrants Barn Church Lane Claxton Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Kris &amp; Mrs Anna Gamble</td>
<td>Change of use and conversion of a timber frame agricultural barn to a single dwelling (revised application)</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0463</td>
<td>Surlingham Land South Of Bramerton Road Surlingham Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr N Gooch</td>
<td>Outline application for 2 new dwellings including Access, Layout and Scale</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Parish / Site</td>
<td>Appellant</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Decision Maker</td>
<td>Final Decision</td>
<td>Appeal Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0526</td>
<td>Alburgh Land East Of Hope Cottage Station Road Alburgh Norfolk</td>
<td>Mr Mark Thompson</td>
<td>Detached 4 bedroom house.</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/0775</td>
<td>Brooke 4 Brecon Road Brooke NR15 1HS</td>
<td>Mr Dennis Jeans</td>
<td>Alterations to existing bungalow, demolition of garage, partial sub division of garden and erection of chalet style bungalow and garage</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>