PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

Major applications referred back to Committee

1  Appl. No : 2014/2495/O
Parish : WYMONDHAM
Applicants Name : Hallam Land Management
Site Address : Land between London Road and Suton Lane, London Road, Wymondham Norfolk
Proposal : Outline application for up to 375 dwellings and associated infrastructure, new cemetery and 1.2 ha of land for neighbourhood centre comprising A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and/or B1 and/or D1 uses

Decision : Members voted 10 – 0 (with 1 abstention) to AUTHORISE officers to confirm to the Planning Inspectorate that the Council does not wish to contest the appeal

Subject to the completion of a S106 agreement and to undertake further discussions with the applicant in respect of viability

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

2  Appl. No : 2014/2222/F
Parish : THURLTON
Applicants Name : Mr Geoff Collen
Site Address : Land north of College Road Beccles Road Thurlton Norfolk
Proposal : Residential Development consisting of 27 dwelling houses

Decision : Members voted unanimously for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Full permission time limit
2. In accordance with submitted details
3. Visibility splays to be provided
4. Construction traffic management and worker parking
5. Retention of trees and hedgerows
6. Landscaping scheme and management plan, including maintenance details of open space and play areas
7. Tree and hedgerow protection
8. Contaminated land
9. Remediation scheme
10. Unexpected contamination
11. Renewable energy
12. Water efficiency
13. Materials to be agreed
14. Surface water drainage
15. Fire hydrant provision
Subject to the completion of a S106 to cover provision of affordable housing and green infrastructure contributions.

Updates

1 further objection which raises no new substantive planning issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appliance No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/1428/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicants Name: Marstons Estates Limited
Site Address: Thatchers Needle 33 Park Road Diss Norfolk IP22 4AS
Proposal: Erection of 4no non-food retail units (Use Class A1) comprising a total of 3948sqm with access from Park Road

Decision: Members voted 7 - 1 (with 1 abstention) for REFUSAL (contrary to officer recommendation)
Refused

Reasons for Overturning Officer Recommendation

The application has been refused on the following grounds:

1. Inappropriate design and scale having regard to the adjacent conservation area

Updates

Petition from local shop owners (63 businesses) objecting on the basis that it will seriously affect the town centre and result in closure of many independent shops, concern surrounding extra traffic.

13 further letters of objection referring to matters already highlighted in the committee report.

Agent has confirmed that the gross floor space figure of 3948sqm referred to in the committee report equates to a net figure of 31584sqm which equates to 80% of the gross figure.
Condition 8 of the suggested condition referring to non-food retail only will also make reference to this figure as a maximum figure for the development.

SNC Conservation and Design Officer:
No objection, with the following observations:

Previous comments suggested relocating unit 4 and breaking up the massing of the rear building, for example through staggering. The footprint and size of the units has not been changed because of commercial considerations, which is disappointing, however the elevations have been broken up to some extent 'with feature entrances'. I would suggest that these elements are conditioned for detail – particularly as they will also involve elements of advertising.

Also, although the elevation of unit 4 facing north remain unrelieved without any fenestration, additional glazing and the canopy feature has now been carried around the west side as well as the south side on the south west corner, which makes building less inward looking towards the car park and better addressing the main pedestrian access route from The Park to the North and town beyond. Ideally the canopy would be carried through and around the North east corner – and the entrance provided on the west elevation rather than the south elevation.
Previously it was suggested that the service yard is moved away from the SW to the SE corner so that this allows for connections through to neighbouring development if this comes forward. This has been changed, which is welcomed.

In terms of materials, the white cream brick for the ground floor is a good match to the local white gault brick, with the slight tinge of pink. The panelling is light in colour, and matches the tonal colour of the white brick, so should have the effect of making the building appear ‘lighter’ in terms of the perception of bulk rather than the use of a heavier/darker material. I am however concerned at the galvanised handrail, which could stand out on the roofline. As a consequence of this, it is suggested that the handrail be recessed back into the roof to minimise its impact.

Because of its lighter colour, the building may stand out a little in long distance views from across the Mere due to its overall size and bulk. However, it will be seen at some distance, which diminishes the size and scale of the building in views. Also, being mainly seen in long distance views from the conservation area to the north, it will not be quite as reflective of light. Numerous trees are also in the foreground associated with the Park and Park Road. Although the view is more permeable in winter months, in full foliage these should help to effectively screen the building in these longs distance views.

There is some additional planting proposed within the site. At present these are shown to be relatively small specimens.....it is important that these are not ‘token trees’ but are specimens that can become mature and established – particularly those planted either side of the access – in order to provide effective green links -landscape officer to advise. These should further help to soften the impact of the large bulk and relatively unrelieved form of the building, both within the immediate setting and in views from Park Field and further away across the mere.

SNC Landscape Officer:
Has received and assessed the arboricultural assessment and confirmed that the service yard to Unit 4 needs to be re-designed in order to fully protect the adjacent TPO tree. The Landscape Officer has discussed the issues with the developer’s arboriculturalist, and together they are confident that a solution can be provided subject to suitable revision of the layout. Furthermore, the landscaping scheme as submitted cannot be agreed and therefore a planning condition is required to agree a suitable one.

Officer response to the above:
In light of this it is suggested that the resolution to approve be subject to the Council’s landscape officer being satisfied with the layout and arrangements for the service yard to unit 4.

River Waveney Trust has objected on the following grounds:
Does not comply with the approved development plan policies that require development to enhance the environment.
Site is in a key position between the mere and the river which could contribute to linking town to the river. The proposal is for a generic retail warehouse park of the type usually found at the edge of centre or out of town location.
The proposal is for intensive development with only modest landscaping. It does not appear consistent with the emphasis of DM policies on respecting the individual character of the area. Policies go beyond protection and preservation to require positive enhancement and improvement of the environment and therefore the applicant should be required to provide a landscaped walkway down the eastern side of the site to facilitate future linkages.
DIS6 requires contributions towards green infrastructure provision at DIS2. Can it be assured that CIL purposes will be reserved for this purpose. Can CIL contributions be released earlier for riverside habitat creation.

Diss Heritage Partnership:
Scheme is in breach of the NPPF, and specifically paragraphs 23 and 26.
We have requested that a social and impact analysis be undertaken, but told that this will not be done.
The Council are using economic impact evidence from 2007 linked to the JCS. This states that for Diss in 2016 the capacity for comparison goods should be 2361sqm and this is 3949sqm (67% greater).

As it was undertaken 9 years ago it cannot take into account subsequent development other areas of town and should not be considered robust evidence. For example the report notes 140 retailers in town, now there are 65 in the heritage triangle alone and about 200 in total in the town.

Para 23 of the NPPF states that LPA’s must “retain and enhance existing markets and, where appropriate, re-introduce or create new ones, ensuring markets remain attractive and competitive” and

Para 26 states “When assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres, which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:

● the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and
● the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made.

This development is much larger than the 2500sqm threshold, yet there is no documentation of any assessment. There is however, clear evidence of adverse impact on the town centre by looking at the damage that the supermarkets have caused to the food trade, only one pre-existing food retailer has remained, and the weekly market has contracted by 30%.

In terms of the impact on “existing, committed and planned public and private investment in the town centre, the targeted investment in the Heritage Triangle, and the above growth in retailers has not been considered by the development and must be taken into account by the LPA.

The significant adverse impact on existing trade undermining and placing at considerable risk Diss’ “established character and diversity”, would prevent approval, particularly as there is no evidence of ‘overtrading’ to justify the need for extension of comparison goods floorspace in the town.

Any claim of beneficial impact from additional footfall to the new site cannot be justified: even the applicant’s traffic experts claim that people will be able to use this new site and leave with no impact on, or visit to, the remainder of the town. This is clear evidence that the “adverse impacts [of presumption in favour of sustainable development] would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits” for the town.

It is clear that this development is not of an appropriate scale, in terms of gross floorspace in relation to the size of Diss town centre, it contradicts the LPA’s own strategic assessment for the development capacity of Diss, and it contravenes the guidance for sustainable development contained in NPPF.

Officer response to the above concerns:

In terms of the reference to using out of date information, the retail study in question was used to inform the policies contained within the JCS, this document is envisaged to be applicable up to 2026 for decision making purposes. Policy 13 of the JCS identifies significant expansion in or adjacent to the town centre for town centre uses (which would include retail) and also states that;

“Diss is an attractive market town with the largest number of shops and services outside Norwich. It serves a large rural catchment covering parts of South Norfolk and northern Suffolk and has the development potential for significant new shopping floorspace which be
accommodated on the existing retail allocation adjacent to the town centre. Smaller scale opportunities will be sought to strengthen the town centre’s non-food and leisure offer.”

The Council’s recently adopted Local Plan, which again is envisaged to run to 2026, builds on this strategic aim through policies DIS6 and DIS7 which both provide for flexible allocations to potentially provide a range of uses including no-food retail. For the avoidance of doubt DIS6 covers the application site with DIS7 the site immediately adjacent to DIS6.

The retail survey has been used to make informed choices about allocations for retail in Diss across the lifetime of the plan (to 2026), and it is clear that these have led to restrictions being contained within the policies namely (must be non-food due to the recognition that the food market is already well catered for in Diss and by making reference to net floorspace quotas in the Services and community facilities section of the Diss overview contained within the site specific allocations policies document (new comparison goods shopping floor space 2600m² net to 2016 and 4500m² net to 2021) and it is therefore considered that it would be unreasonable to request an updated/new retail survey to be produced now. Officers would also wish to highlight that reference is made to the JCS and retail study in paras 4.13 and 4.14 of the committee report.

In terms of the reference to para 23 of the NPPF, this sets out 10 criterion to be considered in the formation of planning policies for promoting competitive town centre environments and cater for the management and growth of centres over a plan period. The letter copies one of these criterion, which the officers believe has been fulfilled in the drawing up of its allocation DIS6 and DIS7 and in its Policy DM2.4.

In terms of paragraph 26 of the NPPF, paragraph 4.20 of the committee report highlights that the reason that an impact assessment has not been sought in this instance despite it being over the Council’s adopted threshold of 1000m² for Diss in DM2.4 is on the basis that it is allocated for non-food retail as part of the adopted allocation DIS6 which is an up-to-date Local Plan policy. As an observation it would be illogical to ask for an impact assessment to be undertaken for a use which has been agreed as being acceptable under an allocation within its Local Plan and which proposes a level of non-food retail within the figures recognised within the supporting text of the plan (4500sqm net to 2021).

There is reference to evidence that the “adverse impacts (of presumption in favour of sustainable development) would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits for the town”. The aforementioned wording is largely taken from paragraph 14 of the NPPF, and in particular from the section relating to decision-taking. However, it should be noted that it should be read in the context of decision-taking “where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date”. As set out above, and in the committee report, it is evident that the development plan in respect of this site and retail development is neither absent, silent or out-of-date.

Richard Bacon MP has objected to the scheme.
3. Single storey dwellings only
4. Visibility splays to be provided
5. Access roads to be agreed
6. Highway details to be agreed
7. Retention of hedge and trees on boundary
8. Surface water drainage to be agreed
9. Foul drainage to main sewer
10. Archaeological work to be agreed
11. Biodiversity Management Plan to be agreed
12. Water conservation to be secured
13. Renewable energy to be secured

Subject to receipt of information that satisfies the Council that the full affordable housing provision can be provided and subject to the completion a S106 to provide affordable housing

Updates

SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager:
Update to comments in their consultation response that the requirement is now for four affordable dwellings now scheme has been reduced to 12 dwellings

Anglian Water:
Stoke Holy Cross Water Recycling Centre has capacity for these flows
Sewerage system has capacity for flows from this development
Unable to provide comments on proposed surface water management as do not relate to Anglian Water assets

SNC Community Services – Environmental Quality Team:
No Comments to make

4 additional letters stating that they are still opposed to the development for the reasons highlighted in our original objection (prominent site, outside development boundary, need to retain rural character, highways impact given development to come forward in Poringland)

5
Appl. No : 2015/2630/F
Parish : LITTLE MELTON

Applicants Name : Abel Homes Ltd
Site Address : Land south east of The Gardens Mill Road Little Melton Norfolk
Proposal : Residential Development for 8no. dwellings, car parking and amenity space including 2no. affordable dwellings which form part of planning reference 2015/0253

Decision : Members voted 10 - 0 to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to APPROVE

Approved with conditions

1. Time limit
2. In accordance with plans
3. External materials to be agreed
4. Boundary treatments to be agreed
5. Surface water drainage system including maintenance and management details to be agreed
6. Foul water into mains sewer
7. Ecology mitigation to be followed
8. Tree protection
Subject to receipt of additional viability information to demonstrate affordable dwellings can be delivered and subject to completion of a Section 106.

Updates

Highway Authority (NCC):
No objections subject to conditions.

6  Appl. No : 2015/2836/F
Parish : BERGH APTON
Applicants Name : FW Properties on behalf of Bergh Apton Developments
Site Address : Land South of Cookes Road Bergh Apton Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of 11 dwellings plus associated roads, landscaping and drainage infrastructure
Decision : Members voted 10 - 0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. Full details of drainage scheme
4. Standard Estate Road
5. Visibility splays to be provided
6. Provision of parking area
7. Highway improvements – offsite
8. Drainage meadow landscaping scheme
9. Ecological Management Plan to be agreed
10. Water efficiency to be secured
11. Renewable energy to be secured
12. Boundary treatment to be agreed
13. Details of doors and windows to be agreed

Subject to the completion of a S106 to cover affordable housing

7  Appl. No : 2015/0833/O
Parish : PORINGLAND
Applicants Name : Rev. R W Scorey
Site Address : Evangelical Free Church Carr Lane Poringland Norfolk NR14 7JZ
Proposal : Follow up on Outline Application 2014/2651 – Proposed demolition of church and erection of dwelling and garage
Decision : Members voted 10 - 0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Outline planning permission time limit
2. Approval of reserved matters
3. In accordance with approved plans
4. Parking/turning to be provided
5. Water efficiency to be provided
6. Any works to drainage pipes to be approved
7. Removal of permitted development rights – buildings/structures
8. Removal of permitted development rights – walls/fences
9. Boundary treatments to be agreed
10. Floor levels to be agreed
11. Details of attenuation tank to be agreed

8 Appl. No : 2015/1735/H
Parish : PULHAM MARKET
Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs Crane
Site Address : Sixmill Green Colegate End Road Pulham Market Norfolk IP21 4XG
Proposal : Front 2 storey extension to existing property
Decision : Members voted 6 - 4 for REFUSAL

Refused

1. Character and impact on existing dwelling and street scene
2. Impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property

9 Appl. No : 2015/2078/F
Parish : BURSTON AND SHIMPLING
Applicants Name : Mr Gary Collier
Site Address : Land East of Green Lane Diss Road Burston Norfolk
Proposal : Erection of building for the storage and processing of apples and for the processing of honey from the bee apiary
Decision : Members voted 9 - 0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. Details of machinery
4. Details of foul water disposal
5. Details of trade waste
6. Full details of external lighting
7. Ecological enhancement
8. Limited hours of use
9. No retail sales of products on site or access by commercial vehicles other than the applicant

Updates

1 further letter of objection on grounds of access and building not being justified (both are addressed in the committee report)

10 Appl. No : 2015/2175/B
Parish : REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON
Applicants Name : Mr and Mrs J Oberhoffer
Site Address : 21 Broad Street Harleston Norfolk IP20 9AZ
Proposal : Proposed first floor extension
Decision : Members voted 8 – 0 (with 2 abstentions) for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Listed Building Time Limit
2. In accordance with submitted plans

Updates

Further objection statement presented by neighbour

11 Appl. No : 2015/2176/H
Parish : REDEHNALL WITH HARLESTON

Applicants Name : Mr and Mrs J Oberhoffer
Site Address : 21 Broad Street Harleston Norfolk IP20 9AZ
Proposal : Proposed first floor extension

Decision : Members voted 8 – 1 (with 1 abstention) for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Full Planning Permission Time Limit
2. In accordance with submitted plans

Updates

Further objection statement presented by neighbour.
North point error on plan noted.

12 Appl. No : 2015/2344/F
Parish : TIVETSHALL ST MARGARET

Applicants Name : Mr Don Smith
Site Address : The Maltings  Moulton Road Tivetshall St Margaret Norfolk NR15 2AJ
Proposal : Conversion of old Maltings Building to New Site Office, Installation of New Steeping Silos, Installation of Germination Vessel, Installation of conveying system, Relocation of Engineering Workshop, Malt Dressing and outloading, Additional Malt storage, Water Treatment and Switch room demolition

Decision : Members voted 10 – 0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accordance with amendments
3. Materials
4. Air quality abatement
5. Implementation of approved noise control measures
6. External lights
7. Contamination site investigation
8. Verification of contamination mitigation
9. Monitoring of remediation
10. Unsuspected contamination
## Updates

**Environmental Quality Team:**
Have agreed with applicant that a further noise report will be carried out and required mitigation implemented additional condition required on noise attenuation scheme for engineering workshop and no generators/air handling plant without consent on this basis they are happy that any impact on neighbouring properties can be mitigated against.

### 13
**Appl. No**: 2015/2362/RVC  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM  
**Applicants Name**: Hope Community Church Wymondham  
**Site Address**: Ayton House Ayton Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0QJ  
**Proposal**: Variation of condition 2 of permission 2015/1664/ - Further extended to the rear to facilitate a larger main Auditorium.

**Decision**: This item was **DEFERRED** to a future meeting of the Development Management Committee

### 14
**Appl. No**: 2015/2856/F  
**Parish**: BRESSINGHAM  
**Applicants Name**: Paul Rackham Ltd  
**Site Address**: Land North of Waveney House Low Road Bressingham Norfolk IP22 2AG  
**Proposal**: Erection of industrial unit

**Decision**: Members voted 7 – 0 for **REFUSAL**  
Refused  
Reasons for refusal:  
1. Corridors of Movement  
2. Inadequate Turning Facilities

## Updates

**Note**: Agenda Plan not accurate. Correct version displayed

Email from agent suggesting highway objection is unfounded. Increase in traffic only slight on established commercial access. Also applicant does not own the access

### 15
**Appl. No**: 2015/2874/H  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY  
**Applicants Name**: Mr & Mrs J Flowerdew  
**Site Address**: 38 Ruskin Road Costessey Norfolk NR5 0LL  
**Proposal**: Extension & loft conversion including raising existing roof level

**Decision**: Members voted 7 – 2 for **REFUSAL**
Refused

1. Impact on residential amenity

Updates

2 additional letters of support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2015/2896/F</td>
<td>SHOTESHAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs K Heazle</td>
<td>Meadow View Brooke Road Shotesham Norfolk NR15 1XN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Replacement of a mobile home with a new three bedroom bungalow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members voted 9 – 0 for APPROVAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved with conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Full Planning permission time limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>In accordance with amended plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Mobile home to be removed within one month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Slab level to be agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>External materials to be agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Window details to be agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Specific details to be agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Hedge planting to be agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Retention trees and hedges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>No permitted development rights for Classes ABCDE &amp; G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>No permitted development rights for fences, walls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Domestic Microgeneration Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Water efficiency to be agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Provision of parking, service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Ecology mitigation to be agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Surface water to be agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Foul drainage to be agreed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updates

Final decision have not been made regarding surface water drainage and foul drainage it is proposed the condition the details of these.

Parish Council comments on amended drawings
- Positive changes to cladding and roof tiles
- No change to size of dwelling
- No application for change of use to include part of the neighbouring file d
- Concern change in practice which has been required for other properties and will set a precedent detrimental to the village
- If permission is granted then it should be sited on footprint of existing building thus making minimal impact and local scene, will reduce impact on local landscape
- Prospective owners wish to live on the site, a short term need should not take precedence over the accepted understood planning rules of using a properties existing footprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2016/0158/O</td>
<td>CAISTOR ST EDMUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Daniel Skinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development Management Committee 2 March 2016

Site Address: Land South of High Ash Farm High Ash Lane Caistor St Edmund Norfolk

Proposal: Outline planning permission (with all matters reserved) for one detached, four bedroom self-build dwelling, double garage and gardens

Decision: Members voted 6 – 0 (with 2 abstention) for APPROVAL (contrary to officer recommendations) (officers authorised to decide conditions)

Reasons for overturning officer recommendations:

1. Particular circumstances of applicant and his historical link to management of the holding for significant public benefit.

Updates

Water Management Officer Comments:
Support subject to condition for disposal of foul drainage and surface water.

Caistor St Edmunds Parish Council: 2 letters with the following comments:

Caistor St Edmund Parish Council fully supports this application for the reasons as stated below:

“The applicant was born, brought up and now works full time in the village. Together with his father, he farms the land on which the proposed self-build will be situated. The farm is a unique local amenity which provides many miles of permissive footpaths giving excellent walking and unspoilt views. It is not only used extensively by residents from this and surrounding villages, but by visitors from Norwich and further afield in Norfolk. The proposed self-build will better enable the applicant to maintain his business to the benefit of the wider community, and to enjoy a reasonable family life. In light of recent decisions to allow developments despite strong local opposition and with no obvious benefits to the local community, if there is any natural justice in the planning process, this application should be approved”.

2nd letter states:
“The Parish Council has seen the Development Management Committee Report, and notes the officer recommendation to refuse the application. However, we remain strongly of the view that this application should be approved.

There has been a substantial (perhaps unprecedented) level of support both from within the Parish and further afield. Indeed we are not aware that a single objection has been lodged.

Officers have concluded that there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate there is a functional need for a 4th dwelling on the site. Apart from a desire to support a parishioner born and brought up in the village, our primary concern is to ensure that the unique and widely valued community facilities offered under the existing regime at High Ash, can be sustained into the future.

Whilst we accept that nothing can be guaranteed going forward, we believe that this application, which will provide the sort of family accommodation which doesn't currently exist on the site, does offer an opportunity to secure those facilities.

We are also not persuaded that “the development would erode the open countryside and its predominant rural character”. The location is unquestionably rural, but arguably not in open countryside. We feel that a suitably appropriate and sympathetic final design, would not be detrimental to the existing rural view.
We urge the Committee to consider the wider benefits which this application might afford, to take account of the widespread level of support for the application, and to approve the application.”

18

| Appl. No | : 2016/0174/H |
| Parish   | : SHOTESHAM |

Applicants Name : Mr and Mrs J Parnell
Site Address : Highfield Hawes Green Shotesham Norfolk NR15 1UL
Proposal : Proposed extension and improvement of existing dwelling

Decision : Members voted 6 – 1 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit
2. In accordance with submitted drawings
3. Materials to be agreed
4. Details to be agreed

Updates

6 letters from 4 households
Concern in change in Conservation Officer’s comments between withdrawn and current application.

The proposed building ‘...would have a dramatic impact on views along the lane becoming a very prominent building.’ He recommended that it ‘...needs to be smaller in scale and height and designed so that it does not dominate over the lane and adjacent building...the current design will have a considerable and harmful impact on the character of the settlement...’

A slight amendment to the projecting bay will not make the building more recessive surprised at changed view of Conservation Officer

Despite drawing attention to negative elements features of the proposal report is recommended for refusal

No clear understanding of historical importance of complex of building.
Designer states that it offers views across the valley these could a only be dealt with by felling neighbours trees

Designer states property is not suitable for modern family life, but what about affordable homes.
Although footprint is quite small extensively floor space is being created by raising the height of the roof resulting in 3 fold increase in floor spaces

Due to elevated position existing roof heights are in line with Ardenne and Havelock House.
Statement says most properties are two storey only Archers House is two storey other properties are one and half storeys

Not been designed to fit in with surrounding buildings
Overlooking only considered in relation to Ardenne not two bungalows opposite, windows facing these properties.

Bungalow now more exposed by cutting back vegetation
Feature of area is hipped roof and first floor windows tucked under the eaves and large chimney stacks these features have been ignored do not considered that it is in accordance with Place Making Guide

Render will make the house even more prominent
### 19 Applications submitted by South Norfolk Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>2016/0019/F</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Mr Trevor Haystead</td>
<td>Cygnet House Swan Lane, Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2XE</td>
<td>Construction of a temporary access to show homes</td>
<td>Members voted 7 – 0 for APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. In accordance with submitted drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Temporary access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Access as shown on plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Access is to serve block 25 only (no through road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Visibility splay provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Construction hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Reporting of unexpected contamination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>2016/0043/RVC</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Big Sky Developments Ltd</td>
<td>Land North of Shotesham Road Poringland Norfolk</td>
<td>Variation of Condition 2 of permission 2014/0393/D – Revisions to plot house types, parking and materials</td>
<td>Members voted 7 – 0 for APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Conditions on previous permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. In accordance with submitted drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Reporting of unexpected contamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Ecological management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Provision of Bat and Bird boxes (discharged under 2014/1772)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Tree protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. No dig in root protection (discharged under 2014/1772)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Implement landscaping scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Retention trees and hedges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. New Water Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Slab levels to accord (discharged under 2014/1772)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Restrict office use to B1 use only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>2016/0216/RVC</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>South Norfolk District Council</td>
<td>Wymondham Leisure Centre Norwich Road Wymondham Norfolk NR18 0NT</td>
<td>Variation of condition 2 of permission 2015/0581 - Fire escape stairs have been added and the fire escape door has been moved into the new cladding panel</td>
<td>Members voted 7 – 0 for APPROVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Conditions on previous permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. In accordance with submitted drawings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Reporting of unexpected contamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Ecological management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Provision of Bat and Bird boxes (discharged under 2014/1772)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Tree protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. No dig in root protection (discharged under 2014/1772)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Implement landscaping scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Retention trees and hedges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. New Water Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Slab levels to accord (discharged under 2014/1772)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Restrict office use to B1 use only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decision : Members voted 7 – 0 for APPROVAL

Approved with conditions

1. Conditions on previous permission
2. In accord with submitted drawings
3. Materials to accord with agreed
4. Hours of use