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 or applications raising issues of significant precedent

1  Appl. No : 2016/0482/F
Parish : DICKLEBURGH & RUSHALL
Applicants Name : Mr Chris Smith
Site Address : Land North Of Harvey Lane Dickleburgh Norfolk
Proposal : Residential development of land to provide 22 dwellings, together with access, parking and associated infrastructure

Decision : Members voted unanimously for Deferral
Deferred

Reasons for Deferral
To allow liaison between the developer, the Highways Authority and the school to explore the options for an alternative footpath.

Updates to officer report

Additional letters of objection received (summarised):
  • Further concerns over highway safety.
  • Road not wide enough to accommodate extra volume of traffic or two cars to pass.
  • No room for road or pavement to be widened.
  • Pedestrian ‘white line margin’ not safe.
  • Removal of verge outside of community centre will compound safety concerns.
  • Introduction of a 20mph speed limit will not work.
  • Extending the pavement on The Street will not help visibility leaving Harvey Lane.
  • Marginal carriageway width improvements.
  • Pedestrians forced to walk on verges.
  • Maintain original objections.
Officer response covering matters raised above are addressed in the Development Management Committee report.

Additional comments from Parish Council (summarised):
  • Harvey Lane is a physically constrained, heavily trafficked rural lane.
  • The new development and its occupancy mix would have a significant impact, it would make an unsafe route, which doesn’t meet County Highways standards, even more hazardous for vehicles and pedestrians.
  • The proposed development will account for a minimum of an additional 200 vehicle movements per day, an additional 70000 vehicle movements per year excluding traffic generation caused by goods, services and visitors.
  • The impact cannot be mitigated in this location, physical restrictions along the length of Harvey Lane prevent it being widened, even if possible it would be economically unviable.
• Preventing access to Harvey Lane and routing traffic from this development via Beech Way would significantly impact Rectory Road which is also severely challenged.
• The South Norfolk local plan highlights the dependency of cars in the rural environment yet development site(s) with access to better road infrastructure in the village have been overlooked.

Officer response covering matters raised above are addressed in the Development Management Committee report.

**Corrections to report:**
• Paragraph 4.61 on page 33 of the Development Management Committee Agenda should be omitted from consideration as it has been incorrectly included in this report.
• The last sentence on page 28, paragraph 4.22 of the Development Management Committee Agenda should read *It is considered that to refuse an application on the grounds of inadequate pedestrian facilities could not be substantiated at appeal.*

**Additional highways conditions to be agreed:**
Traffic regulation order to be promoted by NCC

---

**2**  
**Appl. No**: 2016/1627/O  
**Parish**: PORINGLAND

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

**Decision**: Members voted unanimously to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to **Approve**, subject to surface water matters being adequately resolved and submission of a viability assessment to demonstrate affordable housing can be secured.

**Approved with conditions**

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

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

**Note:** Access to Heath Loke is to be removed from the Plan.
Updates to officer report

Foul water drainage strategy condition to be added as required by Anglian Water

Landscape Architect comments on revised plans:

This is an improved scheme, offering an opportunity to create more of a positive feature of the Chet, and allows for the retention of existing trees.

Without a better survey/assessment of the existing trees it is not possible to ascertain whether or not what is shown on the indicative drawing tallies with the best trees, but this can be resolved at RM stage.

No objections.

District Member comments on revised plans:

Confirm application should only be determined by Committee as I have concerns about:
1. Access
2. Services
3. Surface water soakage? Is this a disaster waiting to happen?
4. Intrusion into the Countryside

Parish Council comments on revised plans:

Continue to object to this application. The submitted flood and drainage strategy states that flood risk is low to medium risk. Poringland is a known flood risk area and we are concerned that these proposals will create further issues downstream.

The Parish Council are also disappointed to see the plans propose clustered social housing – would prefer to see it integrated with the main development and of a similar build and quality.

NCC Highways on revised plans:

Revised plan accords with previous advice, however a plan showing the existing and proposed changes to the junction with the Norfolk Homes development is requested.

Some further comments on internal layout, though recognise that layout is not marked for consideration at this stage.

As advised previously, link to Heath Loke should be removed as this is a private road with no right to access it.

1 email from a local resident requesting a removable bollard be placed on Tubby Drive to prevent through traffic along Tubby Drive which is not a public road. Officers updated members orally that the possibility of a bollard had been explored with the Highways Authority but they did not consider it feasible.
Appl. No : 2016/2153/F
Parish : STOKE HOLY CROSS

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

Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval

Approved with conditions

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

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

Updates to officer report

Correction to report

Paragraph 4.8 should state total of 106 dwellings across the two (sites (53 on the existing Hopkins Homes site and 53 proposed).

Developer response to ecology query

Hopkin Homes have provided the following response to the ecological issue highlighted in paragraph 4.31 of the report:

The only trees being removed relate to the access point. These are small trees which do not have any bat roosting potential. The tree report stated… G15 and a section of H16 should be removed to facilitate proposed layout but will not have a detrimental impact to the local tree stock.
The ecologist reported that:

“Despite the site’s current negligible/low value for foraging bats enhancements have been recommended within the landscaping scheme and in order for this to be effective a wildlife sensitive lighting scheme should be employed.”

“Potential roost sites may be present within some of the larger, mature trees featured within the hedge and tree habitats on the site boundary (see photos in Appendix 4). Although no specific features were noted i.e. rot holes, stress fractures etc. these trees were of a size and age where they may have spaces present for roosting bats.

The larger trees which might have bat roosting potential are all retained and fenced away from the development during construction. These are photographed in plate 8 in the Ecology report. These trees are not part of G15 at the point of access. As such there is no requirement for further assessment.

This has been forwarded to the Council’s Ecologist who has confirmed that they are satisfied with this explanation and therefore they have no objection subject to the imposition of a condition (condition 10 of the suggested conditions).

SNC Senior Conservation and Design Officer has confirmed that the scheme has achieved a Building For life Score of 11 Greens and 1 Amber.

Local resident comment:
The revised layout now shows that there will now, not be a public footpath running to the rear of the gardens in Five Acres. At the moment several of the gardens (No’s 21, 23, 25 & 27) have an open aspect onto the site with no high fencing. We would ask that should planning permission be given for the development that a 1.8 metre high fence be erected by Hopkins Homes, at the boundary of the gardens so that our privacy is protected due to loss of amenity. Also it would mean the new bungalows adjacent will have a proper safe and secure boundary. At a Parish Council meeting held on 19th October (prior to the amended plan being submitted) to discuss the development, Robert Eburne did say that a fence could be erected but this does not appear to have been put forward in the new plan. We also have a query regarding the footpath/cycle track running through to Five Acres. Would it be possible to incorporate an area for visitor parking? At present the area is used by visitors to Five Acres which, if not replaced would mean that cars would be parked on the road causing obstruction.

Officer response:
In respect of the request for fencing, it is understood that this boundary is under the control of the residents of the individual properties on Five Acres rather than Hopkins Homes and as such it would not generally be appropriate to request a condition to undertaken works (in this case a new fence) on a boundary not under the developer’s control.

In terms of the provision of visitor parking for residents of Five acres, there is no planning requirement as a consequence of the proposal itself to provide visitor parking.

Local resident comment:
Do not want visitor parking requested in front of their property, other areas of Five Acres can be used for this purpose ie near the existing green. The buffer between my drive and the pathway/cycleway should be reinstated. A fence should be put between my drive and the footway/cycleway to protect privacy.

Officer response:
Do not believe the introduction of a fence would represent a positive feature within the streetscene, the absence of any such enclosure does not lead to an unacceptable level of intrusion given the relationship of the dwelling to the footway/cycleway.
Stoke Holy Cross Parish Council:
Concern over the issue of the need for a footpath from Lower Stoke to Upper Stoke along Long Lane. The request for this to be considered is in my response sent on behalf of Stoke PC. We would appreciate it if you could consider making this one of the conditions, when approving this application that funds are made available for the construction of this Trod path by NCC by a 106 agreement or by using part of the CIL money retained by yourselves.

Officer response:
It would not be reasonable in planning terms to require the delivery of the aforementioned footpath via either condition or S106 contribution. It should be noted that the scheme is CIL liable, and the Parish Council would receive a proportion of the payment (either 15% or 25% of the CIL payment)

Historic Environment Services
continue to have no objection.

SNC landscape Architect – No objection subject to a condition to agree updated landscape plan to reflect change in planning layout received.

SNC Community Services Env Quality Team – same comments as on original scheme (no objection subject to conditions)

4  Appl. No : 2016/1838/F
Parish : ROYDON
Applicants Name : Mrs Tracey Allen
Site Address : 18 Tudor Avenue Roydon Norfolk IP22 5SQ
Proposal : Proposed increase in childminding business from 6 to 12 children
Decision : Members voted 10-0 for Approval

Approved for 12 months temporary consent with conditions

1 12 months temporary use
2 In accord with submitted drawings
3 Maximum number of children
4 Hours/days of use

5  Appl. No : 2016/2112/H
Parish : TACOLNESTON
Applicants Name : Mr Oliver Read
Site Address : 1 Birkin Close Tacolneston Norfolk NR16 1BT
Proposal : Side and rear extensions
Decision : Members voted 9-0 for Refusal (contrary to officer recommendation which was lost 0-8)

Refused
Reasons for Overturning Officer Recommendation

The design is not in-keeping with the surroundings and is unacceptable due to mass and overdevelopment.

Updates to officer report

Additional conditions
3. Landscaping/ boundary treatment N and E boundaries
4. 3 parking spaces on plot

6  Appl. No : 2016/2155/CU
Parish    : DENTON

Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs Greenmore
Site Address : Rainbows End Norwich Road Denton IP20 0AN
Proposal : Retention of use as dog breeding facility

Decision : Members voted 8-0 for Refusal

Members also Resolved that enforcement action be taken to reduce the number of adult dogs on site to a maximum of 6, within 6 months.

Refused
1 – Noise disturbance
2 – Highway safety
3 – Not sustainable development

Updates to officer report

One additional letter of objection raising no new issues

7  Appl. No : 2016/2264/H
Parish    : BROOKE

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

Decision : Members voted 5-1 for Refusal

Refused
1 Incongruous with character and appearance of surrounding area

Updates to officer report

Photographs received from agent showing other approved garages.
Appl. No: 2016/2364/CU
Parish: ROYDON

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

Decision: Members voted 6-0 for Refusal
Refused

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

Updates to officer report

Letter from the agent
- This is an existing building and refusal on the basis that it is not an existing building is illogical
- This is an existing industrial style building with no agricultural use on the horizon
- Building is servable in its current state
- Can’t understand why cycling along the A1066 is undesirable. This is a major A road so suitable for bikes
- The site is close to Roydon, the public house, garden centre, stream museum, vets and wedding venue all accessed by cars, vans, lorries, bikes, pedestrians and bus passengers
- People do access these by the foot and bike
- Sansom Lane runs from High Road Bressingham to 150 metres from the site entrance.
- Street lighting is irrelevant when discussing rural businesses
- 50% of staff on the site come from Roydon or Bressingham
- Agricultural engineering business has two employees that cycle all year round
- Consider it is well related to a rural town as within 2 miles of Diss along an A road.
- Agricultural workers would need to travel to the site yet workers coming to an industrial use could not get there in a sustainable way.
- Cannot understand how the proposal can result in significant social and environmental harm
- The tenants pulled out of 5 year contract which had a specific intended use for the building, building no longer required.
- Storage is not required for sugar beet and grain crops
- The rest of the land is poly tunnels and grass land no interest has been found to rent this land there is a convent on this land which restricts the growing of plants for retail sales
- Applicant has a high volume water licence to enable the continued agricultural/horticultural use of the use he would not maintain this, if he did not intend to retain the agricultural use of the land.
- The land adjacent to the proposed site is owned by others which is now derelict and is no longer viable for use as shown by Meredith’s bankruptcy,
- Would provide rural jobs so people would not have to travel to Diss
- Policy DM2.7 recognises the need for agricultural contractor buildings to store equipment to serve a wider customer base.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2016/2520/F</td>
<td>NEWTON FLOTMAN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Decision: Members voted unanimously to authorise the Director of Growth and Localism to Approve, subject to receipt of revised plan to show correct form of existing archway.

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amended drawings, once received

**Updates to officer report**

**Parish Council**: Recommend approval