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 Planning and Environment’s final determination.

Enforcement Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Developer</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CDE/2006/0269</td>
<td>CARLETON RODE</td>
<td>Land Adjacent, Fen Road, Carleton Rode, Norfolk, NR16 1RT</td>
<td>Material change of use of land to recreational and sport fishing with integral works to create fishing ponds</td>
<td>Mr Tunmore</td>
<td>Members voted unanimously for Approval of the following, in relation to compliance with the requirements of the Enforcement notice:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Undertake and submit an Environmental Assessment ... of the existing unauthorised development ... to include information relating to the hydrological and ecological impacts of the unauthorised development and of the works proposed to satisfy the requirements of 2(a) and 2(c) of the notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- That the details submitted within the 2016 ES and further information submitted in 2017 meet Requirement 1 of the Enforcement Notice. They identify the hydrological and ecological impacts of the unauthorised works and assess the impacts of the works proposed to satisfy the requirements of 2(a) and 2(c) of the notice, and no further action is required in respect of this requirement, provided the outstanding requirements of the Enforcement Notice are satisfactorily completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2(a) submit a scheme of works for approval to reduce and maintain the total abstraction of groundwater from the site as a whole to less than 20 cu m / day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- That the scheme of works proposed to infill pond 1 complies with this requirement of the Enforcement Notice. A detailed planning stage and further ecology assessment and obtaining relevant licenses remains necessary to enable implementation of the scheme of works, and require approval. It is recommended that the approval of these technical details is delegated to the Director of Planning and Environment in consultation with the relevant technical consultees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 (b) submit a timetable for the implementation of the scheme

- That there is sufficient information in the 2016 ES and further information to reassure the Council that prompt implementation of the scheme of works is intended and can be delivered.

- That, in conjunction with the detailed requirements set out in relation to 2(a), approval of a detailed timetable for implementation is delegated to the Director of Planning and Environment in consultation with the relevant technical consultees, with an aim to secure implementation during the winter of 2017/2018 as set out in the Environmental Statement in order to minimise impacts associated with the implementation phase.

2 (c) submit a scheme of works to remedy the adverse ecological impacts as identified in the Environmental Assessment and a Management Plan to secure those measures for the future

- That the details submitted meet the requirements of 2(c) and the management plans referred to in the Environmental Statement are acceptable and accordingly approved.

2 (d) a description of the scope of monitoring reports and timetable for their submission to identify the outcome of the scheme with particular reference to groundwater abstraction, hydrological and ecological impacts

- That the details submitted meet the requirements of 2(d) and are acceptable and accordingly approved.

To note that Requirement 2 requires the implementation of the approved scheme of works, and Requirement 3 requires Mr Tunmore to submit the monitoring reports in accordance with the scope and timetable agreed, and the implementation of any further works or modification of the scheme identified as necessary in the light of the findings of the monitoring reports.

Updates to officer report

Verbal update – given at meeting of Committee:
Water Vole Survey –
Pond 1 is used for feeding within the reed dominated vegetation at the edge of the pond. Relatively few burrows were recorded along the banks of pond 1, however several were discovered around pond 2 and more along the banks of pond 4. Due to the different characteristics of the ponds, it is possible that water voles are using all four ponds concurrently.
It will be necessary to create alternative water vole habitat for translocated animals. The receptor site would need to be adequately established in order to be suitable to receive water voles. Restoration of suitable habitat could utilise existing water bodies and habitat manipulation such as bank profiles and adequate vegetated areas. Due to the size of pond 1 it is considered necessary to trap the water voles.
The project will require a mitigation licence, but it is considered in the long term, that the results of the proposed development will be the creation of fenland habitat, which along with the creation of additional water vole habitat will result in an overall benefit to biodiversity on the site.
Other Updates

5 e mails from Mr Chetwynd (copies circulated)

He has requested clarification relating to the impacts associated with the development, information regarding the northern catchment area, impact of the willow plantation, Hargate drainage scheme, bankside seepage and works to the River Tas.

He has also requested confirmation of the hydrological conceptualisation the Council are relying on.

He considers that the submitted Environmental Statement is not supported by the necessary evidence to support the stated opinions.

He also considers that a complete non technical summary has not been submitted

Officers response:
The details submitted in the Environmental Statement draw on a range of previously prepared reports and these are crossed referenced in the submitted details and the appendices. These have been considered by a range of technical consultees who have confirmed that they consider that sufficient information has been submitted to assess the impacts of the development and meet the requirements of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations.

Reference to delegation to officers in paragraphs 8.3, 8.4, means the Director of Planning and Environment.

Major Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2017/0001/F</td>
<td>WICKLEWOOD</td>
<td>Mr R Long</td>
<td>Land North Of High Common Morley St Botolph Norfolk</td>
<td>Full Application - proposed anaerobic digestion renewable energy unit, landscaping vehicular access and associated works</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refused

1. Inadequate highway access
2. Impact on landscape
3. Harm to setting of heritage assets
4. Insufficient information to ensure there is no impact on ground water quality
Updates to officer report

Further landscaping information has also been submitted showing a cross section of the bund and in regard to the impact on trees adjoining the site.

Landscape Architect response:

The additional information and clarification provided by the landscape architect, but my concerns about the landscape and visual effects remain.

- The visualisations represent vegetation at 10 to 15 years’ growth, during which time the visual effects of the scheme will be major significance from some of the viewpoints.

- The details of the mound confirm the height as 2.6m measured from up the slope, but it will be marginally more when measured from outside the compound. It is correct that the feature, when viewed from a lower elevation (such as viewpoint 7, Low Road) as the feature will be perceived as being taller from this vantage point. It is clear that the mound will read as a man-made feature against the gently sloping landform of the vicinity.

- The absence of a full tree survey/assessment is not ideal, but I do not disagree with the judgement about the existing trees. The topographical plans confirm that the planting margin in the north-west corner of the site is limited, which does little to allay my reservations about the proposed landscape treatment, which may be limited in its effectiveness if space is not available in which the planting can fully develop.

Environmental Management Officer

Note Highway Officer questions assumptions about vehicle movements which therefore calls into question the findings of the noise assessment. Whilst road noise does not constitute a statutory nuisance the proposal is likely to have an adverse impact on residential amenity which is difficult to quantify given the information available.

Other Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2017/1187/O</td>
<td>HEDENHAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

     Applicants Name: Mr Alam B M Shah Alam
     Site Address: The Mermaid Balti House Norwich Road Hedenham NR35 2LB
     Proposal: Replacement of derelict barn in car park with new 2 storey building with holiday lets class C1

     Decision: Members voted unanimously for Refusal

Refused

1 Location of tourist accommodation contrary to policy DM2.12
2 Demolition of heritage asset resulting in substantial harm
3 Insufficient information to assess impact on Conservation Area
4 Insufficient information to assess impact on setting of listed building
5 Insufficient ecology information
Development Management Committee
16 August 2017

4 Appl. No : 2017/1268/O
Parish : TASBURGH
Applicants Name : Mr C Davison
Site Address : Land south of Saxlingham Lane, Tasburgh, Norfolk
Proposal : Single dwelling
Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval

Approved with conditions

1. Time limit outline – (reduced as 5 year land supply)
2. In accordance with submitted drawings
3. Outline requiring reserved matters
4. Materials
5. Retention of existing boundary treatment
6. Foul drainage
7. Surface water drainage
8. Contamination
9. Visibility splays
10. Gates set back
11. Turning area
12. Levels
13. Phase 1 Habitat Assessment
14. Clearing of the site time limit
15. Water efficiency

Updates to officer report

Committee Plan - the application site boundary has been increased to incorporate the whole site. The presentation slides will show this at committee.

1996 Enforcement Notice – to clarify the enforcement notice CDE.226/95 was complied with prior to the enforcement case closure date of 30th July 1997.

5 Appl. No : 2017/1650/F
Parish : DICKLEBURGH AND RUSHALL
Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs N Atkins
Site Address : Orchard Farm Norwich Road Dickleburgh Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of two new build dwellings to replace dwellings given the consent by application ref: 2016/1440 (Change of use of redundant agricultural buildings to form a pair of semi-detached dwelling houses with associated alterations)
Decision : Members voted 6-2 (with 1 abstention) for Refusal

Refused

1 Contrary to policy DM1.3 as per the conclusion in the report

Updates to officer report

Additional comments received:
Dickleburgh and Rushall Parish Council: No comments to make.

NCC Ecologist: Nearby pond does not have features to attract newts, but as no information submitted recommended a condition relating to newt mitigation if application were to be approved.
### Applications submitted on Council owned land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appliance No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2017/1271/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Mr Barry Rooks</td>
<td>Offices At 46-60 Ayton Road Wymondham NR18 0QH</td>
<td>Proposed change of use of B1/B2 offices to community outreach building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decision**: Members voted 8-0 for **Approval**

Approved with conditions:

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accord with submitted drawings