Development Management Committee

Members of the Development Management Committee:

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

Liberal Democrats
Dr M Gray

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

Pre-Committee Members’ Question Time
9.00 am Blomefield Room

Agenda

Date
Wednesday 1 February 2017

Time
10.00 am

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

Contact
Sue Elliott tel (01508) 533869
South Norfolk House
Cygnet Court
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

Email: democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Website: www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

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

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

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

Large print version can be made available

24/01/2017
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 4 January 2017;
   (attached – page 9)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 18)
   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>2016/2607/F</td>
<td>PULHAM MARKET</td>
<td>Hannah’s Barn Barnes Road Pulham Market Norfolk</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2015/1461/F</td>
<td>REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON</td>
<td>Land West Of Station Road Harleston Norfolk</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2016/0627/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land West Of School Lane Spooner Row Norfolk</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2016/1973</td>
<td>KESWICK AND INTWOOD</td>
<td>The Exchange, Mulbarton Road, Keswick, Norfolk</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2016/2134/O</td>
<td>KETTERINGHAM</td>
<td>Land To The East Of 5 High Street Ketteringham Norfolk</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2016/2499/F</td>
<td>BRACON ASH</td>
<td>Land East Of Lodge Bungalow Cuckoofield Lane Bracon Ash Norfolk</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2016/2635/O</td>
<td>TACOLNESTON</td>
<td>Land West Of Norwich Road Tacolneston Norfolk</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2016/2793/H</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>2 Grenville Close Hethersett Norfolk NR9 3AG</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2016/2896/H</td>
<td>WORTWELL</td>
<td>Says Farmhouse 11 Low Road Wortwell IP20 0HJ</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2016/2897/LB</td>
<td>WORTWELL</td>
<td>Says Farmhouse 11 Low Road Wortwell IP20 0HJ</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Sites Sub-Committee;

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

7. Enforcement Report;  
   (attached – page 97)

8. Planning Appeals (for information)  
   (attached – page 103)

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

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

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

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

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

Member consideration/decision.

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

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

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

3. FILMING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS: GUIDANCE

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

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

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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

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

<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>
<tr>
<td>If the answer is “yes” to any of the above, it is likely to be pecuniary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above?</td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

YES

NO

YES

NO

YES

NO
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 4 January 2017 at 10.00 am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: V Thomson (Chairman), L Neal, B Duffin (not present for items 8-9), F Ellis, C Gould, C Kemp, G Minshull, J Mooney, B Stone and A Thomas.

Apologies: Councillor: M Gray

Substitute Member: Councillor: V Bell for M Gray

Officers in Attendance: The Development Manager (H Mellors), the Planning Decisions Team Leader (C Trett), the Place-Shaping and Majors Team Leader (J Hobbs), the Senior Planning Officers (C Raine and E Thomas) and the Planning Officer (H Bowman).

(The press and 34 members of the public were in attendance)

307. 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>2016/1566/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>G Minshull</td>
<td>Other Interest Leader of Diss Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by Applicant and Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2165/O</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>C Gould</td>
<td>Predetermined – Member considered he was predetermined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He reverted to his role as Local Member, and did not take part in the deliberations or the vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2535/F</td>
<td>CHEDGRAVE</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice Lobbied by MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>C Gould</td>
<td>Other Interest Member of Chedgrave Parish Council and knows applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
308. MINUTES

Subject to a minor amendment, the minutes of the Development Management Committee meeting dated 7 December 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

309. 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>2016/1566/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Mrs D Sarson – Diss Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr L Painter – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Woods – Objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miss S Waggett – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr T Palmer – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr K Kiddie – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2165/O</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Mr G Watts – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr J Parker – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr C Gould – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2535/F</td>
<td>CHEDGRAVE</td>
<td>Mr J Lurkins – Chedgrave Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr G Watts – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr J Parker – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cllr J Larner – Local Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2607/F</td>
<td>PULHAM MARKET</td>
<td>Mr P Schwier – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2713/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Mr L Rowe – Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr S Rowe – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2714/LB</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Mr L Rowe – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr S Rowe – Agent for Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2781/F</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>Mr M Davey - Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></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.

310. QUARTERLY ENFORCEMENT REPORT

Members noted the report of the Director of Growth and Localism.

311. PLANNING APPEALS

The Committee noted the planning appeals.

(The meeting closed at 1.45 pm)

____________________
Chairman
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

1

| Appl. No | : | 2016/1566/F |
| Parish | : | DISS |
| Applicants Name | : | Miss Sophie Waggett, Persimmon |
| Site Address | : | Land North Of Frenze Hall Lane Diss Norfolk |
| Proposal | : | A residential development comprising 136no. dwelling houses with associated accesses, car parking, refuse and recycling provision and landscaping |

Decision : Members voted unanimously for Approval

Approved with conditions

1. Standard time limit
2. In accordance with plans
3. Highway requirements
4. Detailed construction management plan
5. Retention of trees and hedgerows
6. Landscaping scheme and management plan
7. Reporting of unexpected contamination
8. Renewable energy – 10%
9. Water efficiency
10. Materials as per materials schedule
11. Surface water drainage to be agreed
12. Foul water to mains system
13. Biodiversity management plan to be agreed
14. Fire hydrant provision

Subject to the completion of a S106 to cover provision of affordable housing, open space and play areas, and green infrastructure contributions.

Informative note:
Developer encouraged to engage with resident opposite vehicular access to site to provide appropriate screening

Updates to officer report
SNC Landscape Architect - current scheme has largely addressed previous concern:

- the ‘landscape’ belt to the eastern boundary is not 10m wide for its entire length, but the buildings are set back and the proposed combination of private drives and paths create space to this frontage. The presence of the gas main here limits what can be added, but existing hedgerow will be retained and further planting provided. This is acceptable.

- root protection area of oak overlaps proposed lagoon, but final details to be agreed through condition to ensure no adverse impact on tree.

- some loss of hedgerow but new hedgerow planting along Walcot Green lead to net gain in hedgerow length.
- there are now fewer dwellings backing on to landscaping belt to the north of the site. Proposed landscaping strategy acceptable.

- the northern buffer planting is now continuous and there are links along the western buffer to the southern boundary. The improved eastern buffer too provides a connection and in turn links through to the POS.

SNC Housing Enabling & Strategy Manager has confirmed no objection.

SNC Community Services – Environmental Quality Team has nothing further to add to original comments confirming no objections.

Additional comments from objectors including:

- Concern issues still not addressed
- Documents submitted on traffic impact contain errors.
- Impact of construction phase on health of residents, in particular air pollution from heavy diesel powered vehicles.

Officer response: The proposal has been assessed by the Highway Authority in respect of traffic implications and they have confirmed that they have no objections. A construction management plan is to be agreed (condition 17) in order to seek to minimise the impacts associated with the construction of the scheme upon local residents.

Other Applications

2

Appl. No : 2016/0627/F
Parish : WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Trustees Of J M Greetham No. 2 Settlement
Site Address : Land West Of School Lane Spooner Row Norfolk
Proposal : Proposed erection of 7 residential dwellings

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

Updates to officer report

DEFERRED (pedestrian refuge issue not resolved)
Objections received from local residents:

Highway safety
- Proposal does not provide refuge required by policy.
- Alternative trod path not accepted and financial offer not sufficient.
- Cost of maintenance of trod path should not fall to the precept payer.
- Trod path would not have surface suitable for buggies or wheelchairs and would not meet DDA requirements.
- No acceptable pedestrian route from development site to the school.
- 7 extra houses means more young children walking to school increasing highway danger.
- Car park option may reduce car parking on road but does not provide pedestrian refuge as required by policy.
- No plans available for new car park.
- Car park would have to double in size to accommodate existing road parking (31).
- Telegraph pole obstructs plot 2 and plans unclear.

Flood Risk
- Increase flood risk to properties opposite.
- Increased risk of run-off, road flooding already a problem.
- Proposals lack provision for long term maintenance and are not sustainable.

Hedgerow /diversity
- 3 gaps in hedgerow affects sparrow roost. Contrary policy ENV1
- Gaps in hedge will affect bats
- Trod path and car park would involve loss of more vegetation – not assessed.

Local Plan policy 15
- Proposal does not provide pedestrian refuge.
• Quota of new dwellings for the village already exceeded.
Other
• Development opposite School Lane makes highway danger worse.
Village has no shop or bus service. Flood risk throughout village, school is full, poor broadband and mobile phone reception.

3  Applt. No  :  2016/1824
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        :  Members voted unanimously for Approval

1  In accordance with submitted drawings

4  Applt. No  :  2016/2165/O
Parish       :  LODDON

Applicants Name  :  Mr Reg Holmes
Site Address     :  Land At Beccles Road Beccles Road Loddon Norfolk
Proposal        :  Outline application for the erection of 4 self-build dwellings with all matters bar access reserved.

Decision        :  Members voted 10-0 for Refusal

1  Contrary to policy DM1.3
2  Insufficient Information – Heritage Impact
3  Not Sustainable development

5  Applt. No  :  2016/2535/F
Parish       :  CHEDGRAVE

Applicants Name  :  Mr & Mrs Frost
Site Address     :  Land South Of Norwich Road Chedgrave Norfolk
Proposal        :  Erection of 1 no. 4 bedroom self-build dwelling and garage

Decision        :  Members voted 8-1 for Refusal

Members also voted 7-3 with 1 abstention to also refuse the application on the grounds that it did not satisfy paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Refused

1  Contrary to policy DM1.3
2  Harm to countryside - not sustainable development
3  Contrary to Paragraph 55 of the NPPF
Updates to officer report
Letter of support received from Richard Bacon MP – circulated to Members
- Self-build enabling local family to remain local and freeing up rental property.
- Impressive local backing including from District Member and Parish Council.
- Would not extend beyond properties on north side of road.
- Local residents do not share concerns about erosion of character of local landscape.
- Concerned at passive nature of Council’s response to meeting the demand for self-build properties.

6  Appl. No       : 2016/2607/F
    Parish       : PULHAM MARKET

Applicants Name : Mr Paul Schwier
Site Address    : Hannahs Barn Barnes Road Pulham Market Norfolk
Proposal       : Conversion of 2no barns to residential unit and holiday let

Decision       : Members voted 10-1 for **Deferral**

Deferred

**Reasons for Deferral**
Members required that additional plans be submitted to show the total floor space, including that of the mezzanine floor, for the proposed Barn A.

7  Appl. No       : 2016/2635/O
    Parish       : TACOLNESTON

Applicants Name : Mr J Coston
Site Address    : Land West Of Norwich Road Tacolneston Norfolk
Proposal       : Outline application for 3 self-build plots with details of upgraded access, all other matters reserved.

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

Updates to officer report
**DEFERRED** at applicant's request

8  Appl. No       : 2016/2713/F
    Parish       : COSTESSEY

Applicants Name : Mr Lawrence Rowe
Site Address    : Land At Costessey Park Parklands Costessey Norfolk
Proposal       : 1. Restoration and conversion of Barn and Stable buildings to four houses, including a new infill extension.
                2. Construction of three new houses adjoining the stables and barn.

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

Approved with Conditions
1 Full Planning permission time limit
2 In accord with submitted drawings
3 Phasing of works to be agreed
4 External materials
5 Reporting of unexpected contamination
6 Contaminated land - submit scheme
7 Implement of approved remediation
8 Provision of parking, service
9 Ecology mitigation
10 Archaeological report
11 New Water Efficiency
12 Windows/external doors
13 Ground surfacing
14 Boundary treatment/planting/screening
15 No PD for Classes ABCDE & G
16 No PD for fences, walls etc
17 No additional windows at first floor
18 No satellite dishes, tanks etc
19 Domestic Microgeneration Equipment

Subject to completion of a Section 106 agreement to prohibit the use of marquees for functions in the adjacent golf club.

Updates to officer report

Revised elevations for conversion of Stable – received

| 9 | Appl. No | : 2016/2714/LB |
|   | Parish   | : COSTESSEY    |
|   | Applicants Name | : Mr Lawrence Rowe |
|   | Site Address | : Land At Costessey Park Parklands Costessey Norfolk |
|   | Proposal | : 1. Restoration and conversion of Barn and Stable buildings to four houses, including a new infill extension.
|   |        | : 2. Construction of three new houses adjoining the stables and barn. |
|   | Decision | : Members voted 10-0 for Approval |

Approved with Conditions

1 Listed Building Time Limit
2 In accord with submitted drawings
3 External materials
4 Archaeological report
5 Windows/external doors
6 External joinery - painted/stained
7 Mortar mix
8 Re-pointing sample panel

Updates to officer report

Revised elevations for conversion of Stable – received
Appl. No : 2016/2781/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 1 no 2 storey dwelling with attached garage.
(resubmission following refusal (2016/1741)

decision : Members voted unanimously for **Approval** (contrary to officer recommendation which was lost unanimously)
Approved with Conditions, to be agreed, and subject to the completion of a S106 to impose agricultural occupancy onto existing residence to tie this, and new proposed dwelling, to farm business.

**Reasons for overturning officer recommendation**

1. Location was not found to be inappropriate to fulfil the functional need
2. Acceptable impact on the rural character
3. Siting not deemed to be inappropriate
4. Harm does not outweigh the benefits of the development

**Updates to officer report**

Ecology comments:
This is a resubmission of refused planning application ref 2016/1741. From an ecology perspective the details have not changed significantly and comments are as for the previous application.

If you are minded to approve this development, provided no existing trees or shrubs will be lost we recommend the following mitigation of potential impacts on GCN should be undertaken, as follows:
• No piles of loose sand or other granular materials into which amphibians could bury themselves should be left around the site. All such materials should be delivered in bags and kept on pallets or hardstanding until required for use;
• Should any waste be generated from the development, this should be placed straight into skips or rubble sacks, or immediately removed and not left lying around the site;
• No bonfires should be made or lit on site. Amphibians often use piles of timber as a place of refuge;
• All trenches should be left covered at night. They must be checked in the morning before they are filled in.
• The development footprint and any working areas should be maintained in its current condition by regular mowing to ground level at weekly intervals until construction commences.

Letter of support received from Richard Bacon MP and circulated to Members.
• Concerned about potential adverse impact on local employer and possible loss of contract with Hook2Sisters.
• Should give greater weight to importance of fostering economic development and safeguarding local jobs.
Applications referred back to Committee

1  Appl. No : 2016/2607/F
Parish : PULHAM MARKET

Applicants Name : Mr Paul Schwier
Site Address : Hannah’s Barn Barnes Road Pulham Market Norfolk
Proposal : Conversion of 2no barns to residential unit and holiday let

Recommendation : Approve Barn A conversion to holiday let
Refuse Barn B Conversion and extension to form residential dwelling

Barn A conditions
1  Full Planning permission time limit
2  In accord with submitted drawings
3  Holiday occupation
4  Window details to be agreed
5  Specific details to be agreed
6  No PD for Classes ABCDE & G (C/e)
7  No PD for fences, walls etc
8  No satellite dishes , tanks etc
9  Domestic Microgeneration Equipment
10  Ecology Mitigation
11  Provision of parking, service
12  Reporting of unexpected contamination

Barn B Reasons for refusal
1  Insufficient dimensions to convert to a dwelling without excessive extension
2  Tantamount to a new dwelling in countryside
3  Not sustainable development.

Background

This application was deferred at the last Committee meeting to give the applicant the opportunity to provide details of the mezzanine floor proposed for barn A which was not shown on the drawings.

The proposal to convert barn A holiday accommodation has been reassessed in the light of the amended drawings.

1.  Planning Policies

1.1  National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 01 : Building a strong competitive economy
NPPF 03 : Supporting a prosperous rural economy
NPPF 04 : Promoting sustainable transport
NPPF 06 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design

1.2  Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4: The Economy
Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.1: Ensuring Development Management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk
DM1.3: The sustainable location of new development
DM1.4: Environmental Quality and local distinctiveness
DM2.10: Conversion and re-use of buildings in the Countryside for non-agricultural use
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic
DM3.12: Provision of vehicle parking
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life
DM4.2: Sustainable drainage and water management
DM4.9: Incorporating landscape into design
DM4.5: Landscape Character Areas and River Valleys

2. Planning History

2.1 2016/1376 Restoration and conversion of farm buildings to form single dwelling Refused

2.2 2016/0336 Restoration and conversion of farm buildings to residential Withdrawn

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Approve
- Would bring into use two redundant agricultural buildings and would contribute to the local economy through the creation of a unit of tourist accommodation

3.2 District Member To be determined by committee
- Traditional rural buildings make a significant contribution to the character and quality of the countryside of South Norfolk
- Application should be determined by committee if the recommendation is for refusal to give an opportunity to discuss the merits of this application in preserving an existing building in the rural landscape.
- It is my belief (maybe wrongly) that these buildings contribute positively to the character of the countryside and to avoid their loss, or them becoming derelict eyesores I am generally supportive (as is the Parish Council) of the proposal submitted for Hannah's Barn
- The proposal retains the architectural character of the buildings and their rural setting and will bring back into use and avoid their loss / becoming derelict.

3.3 NCC Highways No objection

3.4 Health And Safety Executive No objection

3.5 National Grid Original comments
Objection
- Further information required on the proposed upgrades to the track, information on the type of vehicles using it and how often

Amended comments
- No objection

3.6 British Gas Transco
No comments received

3.7 Fisher German
No comments received

3.8 NCC Ecologist
Support with conditions
- Satisfactory ecological report has been submitted
- Proposed development has limited potential to affect important and protected habitats and species.
- Also evidence of barn owls in the barn
- Condition mitigation and enhancements proposed
- One of the bird boxes proposed should be for barn owls

3.9 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team
Support with conditions

3.10 SNC Water Management Officer
- Surface water from the proposed development will discharge to an existing watercourse.
- In the first instance the applicant should consider discharge to an infiltration system
- Advisory comments on surface water and foul drainage

3.11 Other Representations
One letter of objection
- Increased traffic on Barnes Road which is a narrow road with twists, turns and high hedges and is used by pedestrians
- Condition of road is deteriorating
- Issues with speeding traffic
- Looking to reduce speed limit and make the road access only
- Road not suitable for large construction vehicles
- Track will need significant upgrading
- How will emergency vehicles turn around
- Bins located at bottom of track a long way from dwellings
- Will become a target for dumping rubbish
- The site has never been a residential use, possibly forge and hay storage
- Given condition of barn A it is unlikely that a significant proportion of fabric would be retained
- Looking at an extended new build in the open countryside
- No need for a one bedroom property
- Concern for the impact on protected species
- Holiday let of this size would not be viable
- Understand from the Department of Communities and Local Government publication on national technical housing standards studio apartments are required to have 37/39 sq. meters depending on whether separate bathroom is provided
• Would such cramped accommodation appeal to anybody
• Limited demand for such a small unit located away from amenities
• Likely to be subsequent application to join to two units together which has already been refused
• Proposal jars with the surrounding area
• Proposed alterations are not sympathetic
• Track would need to be upgraded
• Access would be difficult to negotiate with steep approach and road quite often becomes a stream

4 Assessment

4.1 The application relates to two small redundant agricultural buildings accessed off a farm track on Barnes Lane. The site is located approximately 700 metres to the east of the main settlement of Pulham Market and outside the development limit for Pulham Market as defined by the site specific allocations. It is proposed to convert building A which is of red brick construction to holiday accommodation and extend building B which has an exposed timber frame to form a one bedroom dwelling. There is a National Grid high pressure pipeline crossing the proposed access track. This application follows a refusal of permission to convert the buildings to one dwelling by providing an extension linking between the two buildings.

4.2 The key issues are the principle and acceptability of the conversion and extension to provide residential and holiday accommodation, highway safety, safety relating to the gas pipeline and ecology.

4.3 Policy DM2.10 sets out the principles for the conversion and re-use of buildings in the countryside for non-agricultural use. It reinforces the JCS which requires a preference for re-use of appropriate redundant non-residential buildings for Employment Uses, including holiday accommodation, to support the tourism industry and local economy. This Policy elaborates on this to encourage employment uses including business class uses into more modern buildings, and the creation of holiday accommodation in older character properties. The Policy sets out a basis for identifying when conversion to another use, including community use or residential use, may be more appropriate.

4.4 The application is for two distinct proposals and they have been assessed separately.

_Barn A which it is proposed to convert to holiday accommodation._

4.5 Policy DM2.10 only allows the conversion of buildings which are no longer suitable for agricultural use or which change of use would result in the need for a replacement. Given the height, scale and size of openings and poor access barn A is not particularly suitable for continued agricultural use.
4.6 Policy DM2.10 also requires the buildings to be standing and of adequate external dimensions to accommodate the proposed use, without the need for the erection of major extensions and additional outbuildings and / or significant changes in materials and appearance that would have a serious adverse impact on the rural characteristics of the original building. Barn A is brick construction with a pantile roof and appears to be in reasonable structural condition. The proposed alterations are sympathetic to the character of the building. A mezzanine floor has now been added to the proposal. The application was previously recommended for refusal because of the inadequate size of the unit which did not meet the space standards set out in the DCLG Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standards. There appear to be some discrepancies with the size of the building, the amended drawings now confirm that the internal floor measurements on the ground floor are 7.35m x 4.2 metres. Counting the mezzanine floor the building would have an overall floor area of 47.07 square metres. The National Described Space Standards recommend minimum internal floor area of 58 square metre floor area for a two person two storey dwelling. The proposal does not meet the required standard, but given that this a holiday let rather than dwelling without any restrictions where people may have greater storage and living requirements than someone on holiday, on balance it is considered to be acceptable.

4.7 The Highway Officer raises no objection to the application and National Grid has now removed their objection from the application.

*Barn B which it is proposed to extend and convert to a residential dwelling.*

4.8 Given the scale, height and size of openings and access Barn B is not considered suitable for continued agricultural use.

4.9 It is proposed to substantially extend Barn B in order to provide a one bedroom dwelling. The proposed dwelling with extension would be over three times the size of the existing building, which is a modest approximately 5.2 metres by 5 metres.

4.10 The proposed development clearly demonstrates that the building is not of adequate dimensions to accommodate a dwelling without the need for extension. The proposed extensions are relatively simple, but given their size in relation to the modest size of the original building would detract from the simple and modest rural characteristics of the building and as a result do not comply with policy DM2.10.

4.11 As with Barn A the building is relatively unassuming in the landscape. It is unclear in the application how the curtilage would be defined or where parking would be provided. However, a good quality landscaping scheme could mitigate any harmful impact on the setting of the buildings and wider landscape.

4.12 The proposal would not give rise to any commercial activity which would prejudice the vitality and viability of local rural towns and villages.

4.13 In order for a building to be considered for residential use it must be demonstrated that the building cannot be practically or viably converted for employment use. Given the size and location remote from the village and poor quality of the road network it is acknowledged that the building would not be particularly suitable for industrial or other employment uses. However, no justification has been put forward as to why the building could not be converted for holiday accommodation especially when barn A is being proposed for holiday accommodation. Notwithstanding that it would appear that building B is not of an adequate size to be viably converted to holiday accommodation without the need to extend the building.

4.14 The building itself has a timber frame with a brick plinth so is historically and traditionally constructed however the quality of the building is not significant enough to warrant departure from policy.
4.15 In conclusion, the building is not of an adequate size to accommodate the change of use without the need for extension and it has not been demonstrated the building could not be used for holiday accommodation as a result the proposal is contrary to policy DM2.10 of the Development Management Policies.

4.16 The proposal fails to comply with policy DM2.10 and is considered to be tantamount to a new dwelling by virtue of the significant amount of extension required. The proposal needs to be considered in the context of sustainable development and the presumption in favour of sustainable residential development as advocated by Paragraph 49 of the NPPF.

4.17 The site lies in the Rural Policy Area which in respect of housing supply has a 39.6 year supply as at December 2016 as such the Council’s policies for the supply of housing can be considered up to date and applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

4.18 The site falls outside of the development boundary where there is a presumption against new residential dwellings under DM 1.3. The proposal is considered to conflict with DM 1.3, which requires all new development to be located on allocated sites or within development boundaries, unless specific DM policies allow for it or there are overriding benefits. In this case the application is submitted on the basis of a conversion of a rural building under policy DM2.10 however, for the reasons set out above the Council does not consider that the proposal represents a conversion and fails to comply with Policy DM2.10. The proposal is tantamount to a new dwelling and does not demonstrate overriding benefits in terms of social, environmental or economic dimensions and fails to comply with policy DM1.3.

4.19 Paragraph 49 requires housing applications to be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, below is an assessment of whether the proposal is considered to represent a sustainable development when considering the requirements of the NPPF when taken as a whole including the Local Plan policies.

Economic Role

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

4.21 Construction of the extensions/conversions to create the new dwelling would provide some short term economic gain whilst over the longer term there would be economic benefit of spending by occupants of the dwelling to the local economy.

Social Role

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

4.23 The site is in a relatively isolated location being located approx. 700m from the edge of the development boundary of Pulham Market and being accessed by a narrow country lane with no footpath. Pulham Market is a designated service village with a range of social and community facilities however access to that settlement by means other than the private car is restricted given the nature of Barnes Road with no footways. The site is not therefore well connected by modes of transport other than private car. The proposal therefore conflicts with the social role of the NPPF which seeks to create development that is accessible to local services.
There are social benefits of delivering housing although this is limited as there is a sufficient supply of housing in the rural policy area.

Environmental Role

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

The proposal would utilise existing structures on the site, but these would need to be significantly extended to create the dwelling proposed and a viable holiday unit. The extensions and proposed residential use would result in harm by eroding the very rural and open character of the site.

The proposed development does not therefore represent a sustainable development, having regard to the three tests set out in the NPPF, by virtue of the negative impact on the rural character of the area, and social and environmental harm of the location of the site with poor access to facilities and services other than by the use of the private car. This identified harm outweighs the modest benefit of one additional dwelling in the rural policy area where there is an existing significant housing land supply (16.94 years) and the re-use of an existing building.

Residential amenity

The proposed dwelling and holiday let have been designed so they would not result in any significant amenity issues, subject to boundary treatments being agreed between the two properties.

Ecology

An ecology report has been submitted with the application and the NCC Ecologist is satisfied that the proposed development would not result in harm to protected species subject to the proposed mitigation and enhancements.

Drainage

The application form advises that surface water from the proposed development will discharge to an existing watercourse. In the first instance the applicant should consider discharge to an infiltration system. This could be dealt with via condition.

There is no mains sewer in the vicinity of the site so a package treatment plant would be acceptable.

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) as it includes a new dwelling and holiday unit plus additional floor space and the existing floor space has not been in use for a continuous period of six months in the last 36 months.
5 Conclusion

5.1 The conversion of Barn A is considered to be acceptable as a holiday let unit only.

5.2 It has not been demonstrated that building B is of a sufficient size to accommodate a dwelling (even if as a holiday let) without the need for extension and the size of the proposed extension would detract from the simple modest characteristics of the building. The building is not suitable without significant extension to serve the use intended and as a result is contrary to policy DM2.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Document 2015.

5.3 The conversion and extension of Building B is tantamount to a new build dwelling in the countryside, with no specific justification and does not comply with Policy DM 1.3. It does not represent a sustainable development, having regard to the three tests set out in the NPPF, by virtue of the negative impact on the rural character of the area, and social and environmental harm of the location of the site with poor access to facilities and services other than by the use of the private car. This identified harm outweighs the modest benefit of one additional dwelling in the rural policy area where there is an existing significant housing land supply (39.6 years) and the re-use of an existing building.

5.4 For this reason the scheme is contrary to the aims of the NPPF to secure sustainable development, acknowledging the advice in paragraph 49.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Helen Bowman 01508 533833 hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other applications

2  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/1461/F</td>
<td>REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicants Name : Mr Peter Crockford  
Site Address : Land West Of Station Road Harleston Norfolk  
Proposal : The re-submission of application to construct 6 new dwellings with access from Tudor Rose Way.

Recommendation : Authorise Director of Growth & Localism to Approve with Conditions  
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amendments  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Specific details to be agreed  
5. Levels to be agreed  
6. New Water Efficiency  
7. Contaminated land - submit scheme  
8. Implement approved remediation  
9. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
10. Surface Water details to be agreed  
11. No dig construction to protect tree  
12. Tree planting to be carried out  
13. Tree Protection  
14. Retention of trees and hedges  
15. Provision of parking, service  
16. Bathroom windows to be obscure glazed plots 5 and 6  
17. No additional windows at first floor plots 5 and 6  
18. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
19. No PD for fences, walls etc.  
20. No PD for Class E (outbuildings) plot 3  
21. Barrier to prevent use of Everson Lane by vehicles  
22. Ecology mitigation

Subject to the views of the Fire Service

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  
NPPF 10 : Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
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 6 : Access and Transportation  
Policy 13 : Main Towns

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
DM4.8 : 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 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. Planning History

2.1 2014/2572 To develop an existing brown field site, providing 8 new dwellings including 2 for affordable housing. Withdrawn

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council To the original submission
Refuse
- New plans still do not address issues previously raised
- Objection solely to do with access
- Site on west side of Station Road and is very close to the road
- Set of double gates that leads directly to the site
- Station Road is about 20ft wide and is a one-way street at this point
- Adequate for construction traffic as gates are before the houses, entry would be excellent both for construction traffic and ultimately for residents
- All traffic both construction and residents would have to detour 1 mile if it were required to enter by Tudor Rose Way
- Width of Tudor Rose Way is only 15ft 71/2 inches and that there are 3 tight bends, two of them forming an S.
- Distance is over 1 mile
- Using Tudor Rose Way instead of from simple entry from Station Road is wrong in principle and dangerous
- There is a vertical drop in height of about 7ft onto the building site
To amended plans
  • Although agree in principle to the development of this site, concerns were still expressed on the access to the site and the ongoing problems this will cause for the residents of Tudor Rose Way, particularly those living close to the proposed development.
  • Particular note was taken of the concerns raised by a resident of Station Road, relating to the extra drainage and aging sewer connections that may have to be used, and given the flooding that occurs in the town during times of heavy rainfall, the committee feel that these issues should be taken very seriously.
  • In addition, the following observations were made should the application be approved: -
    • That Footpath 10 should not be used for site traffic for either the proposed new development nor the building of the new garage at 9 Station Road
    • That bollards should remain in place (in the same position as they currently are in Eversons Lane) to prevent a 'rat run' of traffic developing from Station Road to Tudor Rose Way
    • That the Fire service should be invited to give their comments as far as access is concerned

3.2 District Member  To be determined by committee
  • Access from Tudor Rose Way is very contentious, many residents of Tudor Rose Way complain that access is difficult due to the width of the road and residents parking outside their properties more houses would only aggravate this problem further

3.3 SNC Landscape Architect
  • Original submission
    • Arboricultural Impact Assessment needs updating to consider the latest proposals
  • Final amendment
    • No objections subject to conditions

3.4 NCC Ecologist
  • To original submission
    • No objections subject to conditions
  • To amended scheme
    • Additional information re bat survey
  • To additional information
    • No objections subject to conditions

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

3.6 NCC Highways
  • No objections subject to conditions

3.7 SNC Conservation and Design Officer
  • To the original submission
    • Recommend that the scheme is redesigned
  • To the first amendment
    • Generally happy with layout and building forms but suggest some minor changes
  • No objections subject to conditions
I consider that the development meets the criteria of DM 4.10 in terms of not resulting in any harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area or its setting, and resulting in the positive enhancement of a redundant brownfield site. The development will also be consistent with policies as set out in the South Norfolk Council Place Making Guide and NPPF to preserve the setting of a conservation area and create a good sense of place.

3.8 NCC Public Rights Of Way
No comments received

3.9 The Ramblers
No comments received

3.10 SNC Water Management Officer
No objections subject to conditions

3.11 Other Representations
To the original submission
7 letters of objection
- Planning application ignores all the points raised previously and gives no regard to the residents of Tudor Rose way
- Tudor Rose way is a nice housing estate and cul-de-sac
- The road is already busy due to traffic, throughout the day
- Although a number of properties have garages and drives, may also do not, meaning that the road is already congested due to on street parking
- Already a health and safety issue, which have involved local police
- Risk of accident
- Object to construction plant, deliveries and site workers using Tudor rose way for access
- Not considered using Station Road which would be more suitable and less issues
- Access to new site located in the corner where there are currently a number of cars parked, residents will lose parking space
- Reducing number of houses does not address the car parking, congestion or health and safety concerns
- Design and access statement is thin at best and quite frankly rubbish
- Restriction placed on 2006, ensuring that any development would require secondary access
- Concerned that Government and health and safety guidelines are not followed by NCC Highways
- When purchased property checked the restrictions on site and finding 100 restrictions continued with purchase, knowing that the Maltings were to be developed for 8 dwellings giving a total of 105 and would require a secondary access
- Development of the Maltings and existing brownfield site will take us over the Nationals and NCC guidelines by 13% impacting on the safety of the residences of Doune or Tudor Rose Way
- Surface water connection point with main sewer not identified
- Concerned history of local surcharging and flooding in this area
- Is construction of new garage for 9 Station Road to be undertaken as part of this development?
- No construction traffic should access via Footpath 10
- Concerned construction traffic will use Everson Yard
- In favour of developing brownfield site and design but more consideration should be given to access
• Proposed entrance runs across the end of frequently used foot and cycle path, which is used by children and many others, not safe
• Access should be via Doune Way
• Concern re access in emergencies

1 letter of support
• Support reduction in properties from 8 to 5
• Appreciate reduction in height
• Hope construction traffic does not use Everson lane

1 letter of no comment
• Boundary wall between plot 5 and 7 Station Road needs replacing
• Beech tree should be the responsibility of Plot 5 at their cost

To first amendment

2 letters of objection
• Reiterate my previous concerns
• Traffic problems got worse since the previous consultation

1 letter of comment
• Would not wish to see any additional drainage to be added the system along Footpath10
• Wish confirmation from developer that the demolition of the existing garage would be undertaken from the site side of the structure and not impinging on the public footpath, and it will not be used for construction traffic
• Understand that the construction of a new garage for 9 station Road does not form part of this application

Final amendment

1 letter of objection
• Cannot see that the entrance from Tudor Rose way will be good for anyone
• If you open up Everson lane from Station Road then there will be a rat run through to Tudor Rose way, Doune Way and Weavers Croft
• Parking situation for residents is a nightmare at the best of times, especially in the evenings
• Refuse collections have missed the bottom half of Tudor Rose Way due to access problems

Assessment

4.1 This application seeks full planning consent for the construction of 6 new dwellings with access from Tudor Rose Way, at land to the rear of 9 Station Road Harleston. It follows a previously withdrawn application which proposed to develop an existing brown field site, providing 8 new dwellings including 2 for affordable housing.

4.2 The site is within the Town of Harleston and its development boundary. The site lies in an area of transition between the backyard industrial tightly knit grain of the town centre, the Edwardian villas along Station Road, and later C20 development located to the west of the site. During the processing of the application the Conservation Area boundary has been extended to include the lower half of the site adjacent to Station Road.
4.3 The main issues in this case are the principle of the development, design and layout, impact on the conservation area, highway safety, residential amenity, ecology, trees and drainage.

4.4 This application follows a previously withdrawn application and seeks to overcome concerns raised regarding design and layout. Equally during the processing of the application the requirements for the provision of affordable housing has changed as members are aware and there is no longer a need to provide affordable provision associated with this development.

Principle

4.5 Policy 13 in the JCS allocates Harleston as a main town where further development is acceptable in principle under Policy DM 1.3, subject to other planning considerations. This approach is supported by the NPPF.

Design and layout

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

4.7 The layout of the original submitted scheme, with its curving access road, and the design and positioning of buildings with front lawned areas, the detached garages, all lent the development to a suburban character and this approach did not fit the context of the site. The scheme has undergone a comprehensive redesign following the above concerns.

4.8 The existing site is located on the west side of Station Road set back behind the existing frontage properties, including no 9 and its garden, and an area of converted single storey residences. To the south of the site is the former Malthouse and other industrial type buildings which have been converted to housing. To the west is modern estate development in a neo-vernacular style. The actual site had some outbuildings/sheds, that have been demolished. It is now an empty brownfield site of no merit although there are some existing trees to be retained, and redevelopment would therefore be considered as an enhancement.

4.9 The former design was considered to be suburban in character, and the revised scheme is now around a courtyard style approach with access from the southwest corner, also linking with the footpath access to Station Road. There will be a distinct division between private gardens at the rear of the properties, and shared semi-public area of frontage courtyard space with parking. In terms of character and appearance, the units have been designed to emulate some of the characteristics of the historic yards in Harleston that were often a mix of some additional housing and goods/warehousing/light industries. The group includes plots 1-3, which are designed to emulate more the character of workshops/factories with three separately identifiable sections of a larger conjoined. Plot 4 is a detached house at the 'head' of the yard, with plots 5&6 designed as a simple semi, similar in character to traditional worker's cottages. Garaging has been designed in the style of an open cart shed. Contextually therefore the development sits harmoniously within the existing context. The amended scheme is considered acceptable in terms of its 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 DM3.8 of SNLP, Policy 2 of JCS and Section 7 of NPPF.
Conservation area

4.10 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. On 12th December, the Conservation Area was extended to include either side of the Station Road up to and including the station. Part of the site, plot 5 and 6 are now to be included in the Conservation Area. The application has been assessed by the Senior Conservation and Design Officer who has raised no objection to the scheme and considers the redevelopment would be an enhancement. 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.

Highway Safety

4.11 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.

4.12 The means of access to the proposal, as can be seen from the comments set out above is the main reason for objections. The application proposes to provide access to the development via Tudor Rose Way. Residents have pointed out that when the planning permission was granted for the 75 dwellings under 2006/1153 (Tudor Rose Way and Doune Way) the Highway advised that ‘The proposed development will lead to 97 Dwellings being served by a single point of vehicular access. Norfolk County Council policy seeks to restrict residential development served via a single access to 100 dwellings’. Due to this and the on street parking/congestion etc. local residents consider the application should be refused. They have suggested alternative access points be pursued but the applicant wishes to use Tudor Rose Way and therefore the application has been assessed in accordance with this.

4.13 The Highways Authority have assessed the proposal and are aware of the concerns raised. The Highway officer has commented as follows: 'With regard to the previous application ref 2014/2572. On assessment, it was not considered that the additional small number of properties that were proposed and the additional traffic relating to that development, would increase highway safety risks by any notable margin. This is particularly the case where the site is accessed from the end of Tudor Rose Way where vehicle speeds are very low. The current application is for a reduced number of dwellings. With regard to providing an access through to Station Road, you may be aware that I did comment on that in my response to the 2014 application. This matter has been discussed. However, whilst the provision of an access from Station Road (to serve the development site only) is an option, we are not in a position to force the developer to take that option. Were the developments to be of a larger scale, such as 20 dwellings or more, or that further land could additionally be developed then our comments may differ.' 'The latest advice regarding the issue of the safety of a single means of access to development is provided in the Department for Transport document 'Manual for Streets 'in the section regarding Emergency Vehicles. The original document was dated 2007. This advises that the latest guidance is not related to actual property numbers or the length of cul de sacs, but that each situation should be considered on an individual basis.' 'As previously commented, the proposed means of access into land is rather contrived, being from that corner of the turning area. However, as noted above, I do not believe that we can force the developer to provide alternative access.'

4.14 The Fire Service have been consulted as requested by the Town Council and approval is recommended subject to their views.
Residential amenity

4.15 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.

4.16 The proposal has been carefully designed in terms of the siting and layout to protect the amenities of the neighbouring properties and together with appropriate conditions, I do not consider the application would give rise to a situation detrimental to their amenities via loss of light, overlooking and overbearing impact. As such, the scheme would accord with the requirements of Policy DM3.13

Ecology and trees

4.17 The appropriate surveys and reports have been submitted to support the application and no objections have been raised by the Landscape Architect or the Ecologist subject to appropriate conditions.

Drainage

4.18 Concerns have been raised as set out above regarding the means of drainage, the capacity and connections into the main drains are dealt with by the service provider. The Water Management officer has raised no objections to the proposal subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the details of surface water drainage to be submitted and agreed. In view of the above I do not consider the proposal can be refused on the drainage issues raised.

4.19 The Town Council and local residents have raised other concerns not addressed above in respect of use of Footpath 10 for construction traffic and confirmation from developer that the demolition of the existing garage would be undertaken from the site side of the structure and not imping on the public footpath; responsibility of maintaining trees; and concern Everson Lane will become a rat run. The agent has advised that the bollards currently in place will remain but in a different position and equally the Highways officer has requested a condition be imposed relating to this. Equally that Footpath 10 will not be used for any construction traffic and the future garage to serve no. 9 does not form part of this application.

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

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

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
Appl. No : 2016/0627/F  
Parish : WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Trustees Of J M Greetham No. 2 Settlement  
Site Address : Land West Of School Lane Spooner Row Norfolk  
Proposal : Proposed erection of 7 residential dwellings

Recommendation : Authorise Director of Growth and Localism to approve 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. New Water Efficiency  
   7. Hedge planting  
   8. Retention trees and hedges  
   9. Drainage to accord with submitted details  
  10. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
  11. No PD for fences, walls etc.  
  12. Highway Conditions

Subject to resolution of highway issues and completion of a S106 agreement to secure funding for a Trod path; or a contribution to an extension of the existing school car park; or to fund other works to improve pedestrian safety in the immediate area.

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  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation  
Policy 15 : Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM1.3 : 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  
DM3.11 : 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  
DM4.4 : Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space  
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows  
DM4.9 : Incorporating landscape into design

1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies  
SPO 2 : Land at School Lane
2. Planning History

2.1 2015/0644  Erection 16 dwellings and associated roads and open space. Withdrawn

3. Consultations

3.1 Town / Parish Council

Response to the original submission:

- Approve

Response to amended design and layout:

Refuse:
To be resolved
- 1 Provision of footpath
- 2 Scheme to address flooding issues
Concerns
- 1 Loss of hedging and effect on habitat
- 2 Safety of attenuation pond in view of close proximity to school

Response to additional drainage information and alternative to refuge:

Refuse:
The Committees view is that these amendments should be refused and has noted that a local resident Mrs K Dunn Hughes has emailed South Norfolk on the 21st December objecting on 3 grounds:
1. Highway safety.
2. Flood risk
3. Ecological report – Biodiversity.
In respect of the report prepared for the Development Management Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday 4th January 2017 I would take issue with Section 4.12. Yes we did indeed hold a meeting with yourself, Chris Trett, NCC Highways and representatives of the developers to discuss the pedestrian refuge.

Two scenarios were discussed being a ‘Trod’ footpath on Town Council land and/or enlargement of the existing car park (again on Town Council land) adjacent to the school. It was agreed that the developers would carry out further investigation to establish if either of these options were viable and that a fully costed proposal would be presented to the Town Council for consideration. This has never been received and therefore to state ‘At the time of writing the report no response had been received from the Town Council in respect of the alternatives’ is misleading as no proposal has been received.

Therefore to put in amended plans is extremely premature and it is my feeling that the Town Council will not agree to a ‘Trod path’ being constructed on its land and would certainly view the offer of a contribution of £10,000 towards an extended carp as derisory and unacceptable.
Further response to applicant’s offer to fund tarmac path, or contribution to school car park extension.

By way of background following a request from the school to enlarge the existing car park, the Town Council made enquiries regarding the possible cost of an extension together with another egress onto the road. This amounted to approx £35,000. At the time the Town Council did not have sufficient funds available so the scheme was not pursued. Regarding the availability of funding, the same situation still applies.

The Town Council is still willing to negotiate further with the developers to explore ways of improving pedestrian safety in this area by considering proposals to extend the car park which is adjacent to the school. It is for SNC as the planning authority to consider if this is an acceptable alternative to the required ‘pedestrian refuge’. If you feel that it isn’t then presumably SNC will have to make a determination without this provision, if you feel that it is then I would ask that you defer any determination until an agreement has been reached. The onus is on the developer to put a fully costed specification and plan to the Town Council for consideration. The Town Council’s objections as outlined in my letter to Claire Curtis of the 23rd December 2017 still stand.

3.2 District Member
To be determined by committee
- Due to local residents concerns re the number of dwelling (7 instead of the allocated 5) and local drainage issues

3.3 SNC Conservation And Design
To the original submission
- Concerns regarding the layout and design

To amended design and layout
- The general design approach is acceptable and conditions need to cover materials, windows and external hard surface treatments etc.

3.4 SNC Water Management Officer
To the original submission
- It is important that the applicant is able to demonstrate that the flood risk and surface water drainage aspects of this application can be satisfactorily addressed at this outline stage so as to ensure that the layout and landscaping proposals can be achieved. We would not recommend conditioning these aspects until such times as it can be demonstrated that a satisfactory solution can be achieved.
- Wish to place a holding objection.

To amended design and layout
- Wish to re-iterate my previous concerns

To additional drainage information
- Further clarification regarding future management of surface water drainage system, including the attenuation basin, flow control and outfall and also boundary ditches. But no objections in principle.

No further objections raised subject to conditions
3.5 NCC Highways

To the original submission

- I note that this site is an allocated site for residential development in Spooner Row and is covered by Policy SPO 2 in the Local Plan. The principle of the development of this site has therefore been accepted. The policy suggests that the development could accommodate approximately five dwellings.
- With the current Status of School Lane, from a highways perspective limited frontage development is preferred as opposed to a potentially larger estate development.

One of the requirements of the Policy is:

- Pedestrian refuge should be provided on the western side of School Lane to improve pedestrian access to the school
- The application as submitted does not provide for this requirement. The application will therefore need to be amended to comply with the above Policy

To amended design and layout

- No further comments made as the above not been provided

To additional drainage information and alternative to refuge

- No comments received at the time of writing the report

3.6 NCC Ecologist

To original submission

- No objections subject to conditions

To amended design and layout

- New site plan shows that the hedgerow will have 3 gaps for access along the eastern boundary and whilst the open area around the pond appears to be slightly enlarged as a result of the new design, we are uncertain whether this is sufficient to mitigate against the loss of species-rich hedgerow
- Overall feel that mitigation is possible, however at this stage we would like to see more detail which can be conditioned

To additional information re ecology

- No comments received at the time of writing the report

3.7 Other Representations

4 letters of objection

- This development if approved would take the number in Spooner Row to 59 As a service village have double the number of the plan allows
- Applicants say the application is sustainable, and says the new residents will have train and bus access.
- Bus comes once a week and train stops twice
- Add further to a dangerous school junction where recent appeal decisions have allowed new housing at both 1 & 2 Cantley Villas
dead opposite
- School is full
- The widening of the road will further compromise the safe access and egress for residents
- Build-up of traffic at drop off and pick up times of the school as well as Station Road
- Shows a new footpath into the school playing field. the developer has not consulted or discussed with the Town Council
- Application fundamentally flawed
- TPO on the Oak opposite
- Only one affordable unit
• Not in keeping with the character and appearance of the area
• Detrimental to existing wildlife
• Unsuitable for development and should be removed from the Local Plan
• NCC highways recommended for this site to be refused under the recent withdrawn application, due to safety issues, inferior road surface, pedestrian safety etc. These concerns still stand but they have appeared to now accepted the principle, putting policy over public safety
• Public footpath shown to playing field where does it then go?
• School Lane too narrow to accommodate a 1.8m footpath even if grass verge is removed
• Existing flood risk and drainage issues which have not been addressed

Norfolk Living Streets Local Group
• Leave space between houses to allow future footpaths to be built to developments that will probably be built in the future
• Do not plant hedges in front of properties
• As a condition of gaining planning permission the developer should have to build a pavement from the development to the school

To amended design and layout
4 letters of objection
• Previous concerns still
• Failed to make any provision for a path as required
• Total number of new properties should be 15-20 it is now 3 times that permitted number
• Amended plans have not included nor addressed crucial issues which affect local residents flood risk and highway/public safety concerns

To additional drainage and alternative to refuse
2 letters of objection
• Now on-site water storage has been agreed is there really any need for an attenuation pond opposite our house at a low point, already suffer flooding after heavy rain If it overflows then our property will be lower than the new build, the water will rundown towards us
• If ditch dug deeper and cleaned out regularly, then there would be no need for any detention basin or attenuation pond
• How will the developer protect wildlife
• The road is too narrow to provide a pedestrian refuge.
• The trod path alternative (which is just a quotation submitted on Wymondham Town council’s land) is not a suitable alternative to a pedestrian refuge and has not included access onto it and has created a bizarre situation.
• For the new residents to reach the trod path, they would need to enter the highway go over a muddy, uneven tractor access, over a ditch, where trees are, in which to enter onto it.
• This is not suitable for walking or pushchairs/wheelchairs.
• The previous site plan accommodated a path on the development site to reach the recreation ground, but this has been removed from the revised site layout due to the proposed driveways for plots 1 & 2.
• In the other direction, the access to the trod path at the school end goes nowhere as it reaches a Victorian brick wall at the school with a large timber building beyond this is also ridiculous.
Is it the developer’s intention to:

- A. remove both of these structures and provide access to the school here, there’s no mention of funding or permission for this?
- B. to turn left at the school wall, walk on the grass, make a new entrance in the hedgerow to re-enter the highway and use the school entrance there?
- This will defeat the purpose of the trod path.
- C. or, to turn right at the school wall, walk on the grass to the car park and expect children to walk through the busy car park to reach the school entrance from here?
- Any extension to the car park may reduce the cars on the road but it is NOT a pedestrian refuge which is a Local Plan and Highways requirement.
- The car park takes 30 cars. There is currently an average of 31 cars that park on the School Lane and station Road during the school run so the car park would need to double in size in order to accommodate these. No plans have been submitted
- Who will pay for the maintenance of the Trod path and car park.
- No highway comments.

4 Assessment

4.1 This application was deferred by Officers at the January meeting prior to any consideration by Members to allow more time to resolve the issues surrounding the policy requirement to provide a ‘pedestrian refuge’ (see policy SPO2). The applicant has offered to provide funding for a trod path within the adjacent recreation ground (in Town Council ownership) or a contribution (max £10,000) towards cost of extending the school car park (also owned by the Town Council). The Town Council’s responses to this are reported above. The applicants have also indicated that they would agree to the financial contribution being spent on other highway improvements in the vicinity of the school.

4.2 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of 7 dwellings with associated garages and curtilages at School Lane, Spooner Row. The site lies to the north of the playing fields. Opposite the site are existing residential properties and the school is located on the corner of School Lane and Station Road.

4.3 Spooner Row, 2 ½ miles South West of Wymondham, is a predominantly newly developed settlement and is still relatively dispersed. Prior to the C19 there was little settlement as such just a hamlet consisting of a handful of buildings at the road junction to the south and dispersed farms and cottages. The railway line and station bought some additional modest cottage development. This site is close to the Victorian School to the north of the dispersed settlement beyond the railway line. The development is now mostly C20, but is still quite modest and rural in character, generally reflecting the simple forms and materials of later Norfolk red brick and/or render vernacular.

4.4 The main issues in this case are the principle of development in this location, design and layout, refuge provision, highway safety, residential amenity, drainage and ecology.

Principle of development

4.5 Policy 15 in the JCS allocate Spooner Row as a Service Village where development for approximately 10-20 dwellings can be accommodated subject to respecting the character and form of the settlement. This approach is supported the NPPF.
Policy SPO 2 sets out the requirements for the development of the site, as set out below:

- Land amounting to some 0.3 hectares is allocated for housing and associated infrastructure. The allocation could accommodate approximately 5 dwellings.
- Development must not restrict public access to the playing field.
- Pedestrian refuge should be provided on the western side of School Lane to improve pedestrian access to the school.
- Site layout takes account of a tree protected by a TPO adjacent to the site.
- A sustainable urban drainage scheme should ensure that no surface water drains off the site.

The application seeks consent for 7 dwellings which is greater than the approximate figure contained within the allocation. It is considered that, in principle, providing 7 dwellings within the village which is a service centre is acceptable, subject to the proposal satisfying the requirements of the policy and other considerations such as design, layout, residential amenity etc.

The Council also is currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply within the Norwich Policy Area where this site is located, with a 4.7 year supply at December 2016. Consequently, the land supply policies within the Local Plan are out-of-date. Criteria (d) of Policy DM1.1 applies in line with paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that new development should be permitted unless the development would result in adverse impacts that significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Design and layout

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.

Concerns were raised in respect of the detailed design and layout of the submitted proposed dwellings and it was suggested that the materials should reflect the more traditional red brick and render and that the forms should be relatively simple C19-C20 ‘cottage’ style development. Although the hedge is of note, the development on the south east side of School Lane has already eroded to some extent the natural undeveloped rural character of the lane. It was considered that the hedge could however be retained with more than one access creating a less suburban character to the development.

Following discussions a revised scheme has been submitted, which creates a more rural layout and the buildings are more traditional in their size, scale, form and materials. The proposed 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.

Pedestrian refuge

The original submitted scheme showed a footpath running from the site and stopping at the top of the playing field, there is a ditch and hedging located in this area. No information was provided of how this would connect to the existing playing field and if the Town Council (the owners) supported the access onto their land. When the amended design and layout was submitted the footpath had been removed and no alternative provided. Both the Highway officer and I raised concerns that without the provision of a refuge or an alternative, the proposal would fail to meet the requirements of Policy SPO 2.
To try to resolve the issue a meeting was held on site with NCC Highways, the agents and representatives from the Town Council. It was quite clear that the existing School Lane is not wide enough to provide a refuge or a footpath along the western side linking the development with the school, within the highway. The meeting produced two alternatives (which both seem reasonable) to the requirement set out in the policy; a trod path running across the playing field; or a financial contribution (the cost of the provision of a trod path) towards extending the existing car park which is owned and maintained by the Town Council.

The Town Councils comments have been included in full in the above consultee comments and they recommend refusal. The Town Council have since given the matter further consideration and their further comments are also reported above. The provision of the trod path or the car park extension would require the agreement of the Town Council because they own the land involved. In the absence of such agreement, however, the applicants have indicated that they would also agree to the offered contribution being spent on other highway safety improvements in the vicinity of the school. This would offer an acceptable alternative in my view and would still be a reasonable and proportionate requirement for the development to provide. A Section 106 Agreement could be worded to secure the contribution for any one of the options (trod path; or car park extension; or other highway safety improvements).

Highways

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 Highway officer as can be seen from above raised concerns regarding the non-compliance with Policy SPO 2 and therefore to date he has not formally commented on the proposed alternatives or provided any conditions. He has raised no objections in principle to the parking, turning, access points or visibility. It is fully appreciated also that the school related traffic, parking/dropping-off on School Lane causes a significant impact and makes highway safety a sensitive issue locally. The Highway Officer has been requested to comment on the development if the offered contribution is secured and his comments should be available to report to the Committee meeting.

Residential Amenity

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. There are neighbouring properties to the east of the site separated by the road. Given the separation distances it is considered that the development will not give rise to a situation detrimental to the amenities of the nearby neighbouring properties via loss of privacy, loss of light, overbearing impacts. As such the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DM3.13.

Drainage

Policy SPO 2 requires a sustainable urban drainage scheme to ensure that no surface water drains off the site. Drainage has been subject to a number of negotiations with the Water Management officer, as the originally submitted scheme, did not address this issue. Although the information received enables the Water management officer to raise no objections in principle, further clarification regarding future management of surface water drainage system, including the attenuation basin, flow control and outfall and also boundary ditches has been requested. The Water Management officer has confirmed that she has now received the required information and does not object subject to the imposition of conditions.
Ecology

4.18 The NCC Ecologist raised no objections to the original submitted scheme, however they have commented that ‘the new site plan shows that the hedgerow will have 3 gaps for access along the eastern boundary and whilst the open area around the pond appears to be slightly enlarged as a result of the new design, we are uncertain whether this is sufficient to mitigate against the loss of species-rich hedgerow. Overall feel that mitigation is possible, however at this stage we would like to see more detail which can be conditioned.’

4.19 The agent has responded advising that all four hedgerows around the development site were assessed as part of The Phase 2 Ecological Survey and none of them were considered to be classified as important under the Hedgerow Regulations. Furthermore, the section of hedge where the new opens will be created does not contain any significant trees. By way of mitigation the Survey recommended additional planting and management measures which will enhance the habitat value of the existing hedges. In addition, two new native species hedges are proposed around the development site. These are matters which in his opinion could be covered by way of planning conditions. In respect of birds, the Survey also recommends that hedgerow removal is timed to avoid the bird nesting season. At the time of writing the report no further comments have been received from the Ecologist.

Other matters

4.20 Local residents have raised concerns as set out above, majority of which relate to the issues contained within the above report. However there are issues raised in relation to the number of dwellings being built in the village; school traffic, unsustainable location etc. and whilst these are fully appreciated, I do not consider the proposal can be refused on the grounds raised.

4.21 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.

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

5 Conclusion

5.1 Subject to the final comments of the Highway Authority, the principle of the application is acceptable on this site and is considered to represent a sustainable form of development. The appearance and layout of the development is considered acceptable for its context and it will not adversely affect the amenities of the neighbouring properties. The adverse impacts would therefore not outweigh the benefits of delivering housing where there is an identified shortfall. As such the proposal accords with the NPPF, JCS and SNLP

Contact Officer, Telephone Number
and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 cc Curtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4  Appl. No : 2016/1973  
Parish : KESWICK AND INTWOOD

Applicants Name : Mr B Moss  
Site Address : The Exchange, Mulbarton Road, Keswick, Norfolk  
Proposal : Demolition of 'The Exchange', and development of land with 4 no. dwellings (2 Detached Houses and 2 Detached Bungalows)

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions

1. Full planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted details  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Boundary treatments to be agreed  
5. Vehicular access in accordance with highway specification  
6. Visibility splays in accordance with submitted details  
7. Provision of parking and turning  
8. Scheme for off-site highway improvement works (footpath link)  
9. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
10. Noise attenuation scheme  
11. Landscaping scheme  
12. Tree protection  
13. Surface water details  
14. Method of non-mains water disposal to be agreed  
15. Details of foul water disposal  
16. Water efficiency  
17. Slab level to be agreed

1. Planning Policies

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 3 : Energy and water  
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation  
Policy 7 : Supporting Communities  
Policy 8 : Culture, leisure and entertainment  
Policy 9 : Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 16 : Other 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  
DM3.11 : Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.12 : Provision of vehicle parking
1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies
Policy KES 2: Land west of Ipswich Road

1.5 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2012/0631 Conservatory to side Approved

2.2 2012/0115 Conservatory to side and dormer to side Refused

2.3 2010/0467 Conversion of redundant telephone exchange into residential dwelling revised design of previous approval 2009/0325. Refused

On adjoining site:

2.4 2016/0764 Outline Application for Proposed employment development consisting of B1, B2 and B8 uses, associated access and landscaping; and proposed link road between the A140 and the B1113 with some matters reserved Pending consideration

Appeal History

2.5 2012/0115 Conservatory to side and dormer to side Appeal dismissed (insofar it relates to the dormer), part allowed (insofar it relates to the conservatory).

2.6 2010/0467 Conversion of redundant telephone exchange into residential dwelling revised design of previous approval 2009/0325. Appeal dismissed

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Considers the application should be Refused for the following reasons:
- There is no clarity about the outcome of the intended KES 2 proposals (Planning Application 2016/0764). Until the issues relating to that Application are resolved, especially those concerned with traffic flow and the supporting road infrastructure, the Parish Council does not consider it prudent to consider any other development in the immediate vicinity likely to further exacerbate the already problematic and troublesome B1113 and A140 traffic junction.
The Application does not form part of the Local Plan and is located within the Landscape Protection Zone (LPZ). Moreover, if this Application is granted, the Parish Council believes it will allow a surge of other developments both housing and industrial within the LPZ.

- The Parish Council has not seen anything in the Application which justifies departing from the Local Plan
- The intended development has not been included in any previous “site specific” or “infill” proposals and there are no material considerations presented for it to be added now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>Local District Member</th>
<th>To be reported if appropriate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>SNC Landscape Architect</td>
<td>No objection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The amended scheme is acceptable, subject to conditions to agree a landscaping scheme and tree protection measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>SNC Housing Enabling &amp; Strategy Officer</td>
<td>No objection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>SNC Water Management Officer</td>
<td>No objection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conditions recommended to agree details for surface water drainage including percolation tests and to agree the method of non-mains foul water disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team</td>
<td>No objection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the event that contamination was not previously identified is found, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>NCC Ecologist</td>
<td>No objection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>NCC Highways</td>
<td>No objection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The proposal now includes for the footway link on Ipswich Road to link between the development site and the existing footway on the west side of Ipswich Road. As requested the latest information also includes for the verge management plan which is required for the maintenance of the vision splays northwards from the site entrance. Recommends conditions in respect to vehicle access, parking and turning and implementation of viability splays and a highways verge management plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Representations</td>
<td>No representations received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Assessment

Site description and proposal

4.1 The site is located in Keswick to the south of Norwich, between the A140 and the B1113 close to where the two roads converge. To the north of the site is a row of residential properties known as Dunston Cottages and to the south is an agricultural field, which comprises of 4 hectares of land allocated in the adopted Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD for employment uses under Policy KES2: Land west of Ipswich Road. The allocated site is currently subject to an outline planning application (ref 2016/0764) for employment development consisting of B1, B2 and B8 uses which is under consideration.

4.2 The site is located outside of the development limits of Keswick, but within the Norwich Policy Area. The site comprises of an existing residential property, which was converted from an old telephone exchange in 2009 under planning reference 2009/0325. There is an existing vehicular access from the B1113 directly to the site to the west.

The application

4.3 The application is a full planning application, which seeks approval to demolish the former telephone exchange building and build 4 new dwellings. These consist of:

2 x 3 bedroom detached house (2 storey)
2 x 2 bedroom bungalows (1 storey)

4.4 It is proposed to retain the existing access to serve the development off a private drive to allow vehicles to turn and park within the site, as well as providing a footpath link from the development to Ipswich Road.

Principle of development

4.5 Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies Keswick as an ‘other village’ which will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village. The policy goes on to identify that settlements within this policy, which are also within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA), have been considered for development to help deliver smaller sites in the NPA. Whilst this particular site has not been identified in the JCS, it should be noted that given the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply (with a current figure of 4.7 year supply at December 2016), its housing supply related policies are considered to no longer be up to date in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 49 of the NPPF.

4.6 Paragraph 49 confirms that housing applications must be assessed in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. With this in mind it is necessary to establish whether the current scheme represents sustainable development. Sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. The NPPF goes on to stress in paragraph 8 that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole.

4.7 The following is an assessment of whether the scheme can be considered to represent sustainable development.
Economic Role

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

4.9 It is acknowledged that construction of 4 new dwellings would provide some short term economic gain whilst over the longer term there would be the economic benefit of spending by occupants of the dwellings to the local economy. Therefore the provision of 4 additional dwelling provides a modest economic benefit.

Social Role

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

4.11 The social role highlights the need for housing with appropriate access to a range of accessible local services. Keswick is identified as ‘Other Villages’ and defined as having limited level of services and facilities, however it should be noted that the site is located adjacent to an employment allocation (KES2) and on the B1113 linking with the A140 Ipswich Road into Norwich. The site also benefits from close proximity to a retail superstore located to the east of the site on the A140 as well as a wide range of services and facilities located in Norwich and regular bus services. In addition, the proposal includes provision for a new footway link on to Ipswich Road to link between the development site and the existing footway on the west side of Ipswich Road to further improve access to local services.

4.12 It is considered that the location of the development close to a wide range of services and facilities, albeit outside of the Parish of Keswick, as well as a new footpath link, along with the provision of dwellings where there is an absence of a five year land supply are significant benefits.

Highway impact

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

4.14 It is noted that the Parish Council has raised concerns regarding the traffic impacts and the surrounding infrastructure, having particular regard to the B1113 and A140 traffic junction.

4.15 A single point of access is retained from the B1113 to serve the development. With regards to the overall traffic impact, it is considered that the traffic impact generated by this development will be minimal given the number of properties proposed and the existing residential use already on this site. It is also acknowledged that the allocation to the south (KES2) requires improvements to the general traffic circulation in the area which will likely benefit the site, however the proposal is not reliant on this. The Highways Authority has carried out an assessment of the proposals and following amendments raises no objection to the development.

4.16 Adequate levels of parking and turning are provided in accordance with Norfolk County Council parking standards.
4.17 Subject to the imposition of conditions which include details of the vehicle access, parking and turning, implementation of viability splay and a highways verge management plan, the proposals are considered acceptable and to comply with Policy DM3.11 and DM3.12 of the Local Plan.

4.18 In terms of transport sustainability, as noted above, the proposal includes provision for a new footway link on to Ipswich Road to link between the development site and the existing footway on the west side of Ipswich Road to further improve access to local services. The Highways Authority has recommended a condition for the off-site footpath improvements to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council in consultation with the Highway Authority. Subject to the imposition of a suitable worded condition it is considered that the improvements are acceptable in the interests of catering for the development proposed. Based on these plans the Highway Authority indicate they have no objection to the application.

Environmental Role

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

4.20 The environmental role also seeks to secure a high quality built environment. The site layout and house types have been subject to revisions during the application process, which have included reducing the number of dwellings from 5 to 4 to minimise the schemes impact on existing landscape features as well as minimising impact on neighbouring uses.

4.21 In considering the overall scale of development, regard has been given to the density and form of existing development to the north of the site, which helps to establish and define the site. It is considered that the overall density and layout of the development in this location, ensures the efficient use of land, yet is reflective of the scale of the local area.

4.22 House types have also been considered in the context of the wider surroundings to help reinforce and enhance the local character of the area. The house types use traditional forms and materials, with a simple and uncluttered appearance. The height, scale and form of the proposed buildings are considered appropriate for the site and its context.

Residential amenity

4.23 Safeguarding residential amenity is also considered to be part of securing a high quality built environment. It is considered that the relationship between the existing dwellings to the north and the proposed properties, as well as the relationship the new dwellings have with one another has been assessed and it is considered that the separation distances are adequate in respects to safeguard amenity levels of existing and future residents.

4.24 In terms of the field immediately to the south of the site, allocated for employment use under Policy KES2, the policy specifies that the uses should be B1 workshops or light industrial which can be carried out in a residential area in order to be compatible with the existing cottage to the south of the site. The policy also requires additional landscaping/bunding to protect the amenity of properties to the north. As such it is considered that there is adequate provision in place to protect the amenities of existing and future occupiers to the north of the site without compromising the ability of the site allocation to come forward.
4.25 With regards to noise, the Environmental Quality Team has carried out an assessment of the scheme and has recommended that a condition that requires a noise mitigation scheme to be submitted before development commences. This is to ensure that noise arising from adjacent roads does not cause detriment to amenity to the occupants of the proposed dwellings, and will identify any appropriate mitigation measures. Subject to a suitable worded condition it is considered that the proposal satisfies policy requirements in respect of Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and DM3.13 of the Development Management Policy Document.

4.26 It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 2 of the JCS, section 7 of the NPPS and policy DM1.4, DM3.8, DM3.13 and DM4.3 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD have been met.

Landscape impact

4.27 With regards to landscape impact, the revisions to the scheme have ensured that the impacts of the development on existing landscape features, such as existing trees and hedges, are minimised as well as ensuring that the ‘undeveloped approaches’ as defined in the Site Specific Allocations & Policies DPD (map 059) continue to reinforce the rural character and approaches into Norwich, both along the B1113 and A140.

4.28 The site is within the boundary of the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone (NSBLPZ) and as such the proposal should have regard to maintaining the openness of the Zone. Given that the site has a permitted residential use already, and that the adjacent site has been allocated for business development, it is considered that this scheme will not affect the openness of the NSBLPZ. Furthermore, the site is bounded on the east by mature hedging and trees which block views across the site.

4.29 The Council’s Landscape Architect has carried out an assessment of the scheme and confirmed that he has no objections to the proposals, subject to appropriately worded conditions to secure a landscaping scheme and tree protection measures. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is within the boundary of the Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone (NSBLPZ), it is considered that scheme will not affect the openness of the NSBLPZ as detailed above and therefore is not a reason for refusal of this planning application. On this basis, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable and would accord with the aims of Policy DM4.8 and DM4.9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, JCS Policies 1 and 2 and section 11 of the NPPF.

Contamination

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

4.31 The site lies within Flood Zone 1 which is low risk probability and as such the key issue for this site is the means of surface water drainage. Surface water is proposed to be discharged via soakaways. A condition is considered appropriate to agree details for surface water drainage including percolation tests to demonstrate the effectiveness of infiltration to demonstrate the most appropriate means of surface water drainage, as well as details of management and maintenance of surface water devices/features.

Foul water

4.32 It is noted that currently there is no foul sewer available near this location. Foul water disposal is proposed via a package treatment plant. Prior to the commencement of development, evidence will need to be provided to demonstrate that connection to the public sewer is not to feasible. If a package treatment plant is considered acceptable then the minimum standards and conditions set out in the General Binding Rules will apply. Subject to suitable worded conditions to agree the method of non-mains disposal to minimise the risk to the water environment, the proposals are considered acceptable.

Ecology and Protected Species

4.33 This application has been supported by an assessment of the presence or absence of bats. The assessment has been reviewed by Norfolk County Council Natural Environment Team who has concluded that the proposed development is not likely to have an impact on protected habitats and species. The County Ecologist has confirmed that the proposals are acceptable.

Sustainable construction/water conservation

4.34 Policy 3 of the JCS required the sustainable construction of the buildings and water conservation. Compliance could be secured by way of condition if the application were to be approved.

4.35 In terms of the environmental role, there are some disbenefits identified in relation to siting outside the development boundary and within the NSBLPZ, along with impact of noise on residential amenity, as outlined above although these are mitigated to a degree for the reasons given above and through recommended conditions. These will now be balanced against the benefits of the scheme to consider whether the development can be considered sustainable development.

Summary of sustainable development consideration

4.36 Having due regard to the above assessment in relation to sustainable development it is considered that the benefits of providing additional housing, albeit not a significant amount of new housing, is sufficient to outweigh the disbenefits identified above relating to development in the open countryside and NSBLPZ, and it is considered that the scheme represents sustainable development. It is therefore considered to accord with the requirements of paragraph 49 of the NPPF.
Having established that the scheme represents a sustainable development in the context of the NPPF, it is necessary to have regard for paragraph 14 of the NPPF in respect of the presumption in favour of development for decision-taking. This states that:

"where the development is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless:
- Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole; or
- Specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted."

As set out above, it is accepted that the Council’s housing related policies are out of date by virtue of not being able to demonstrate an up to date 5 year housing land supply, and therefore the Council should only refuse planning permission if the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme when assessed against the policies of the NPPF when taken as a whole or specific policies of the NPPF indicate restricting the development.

In this instance, it is considered that the impacts of this development, as identified above, do not represent harm that significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of providing additional housing where there is a need to do so, acknowledging that the scheme is for a limited number of new dwellings.

Other considerations

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

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

On balance, the scheme is considered to represent sustainable development where no significant harm would demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme. It is considered that the proposals as amended, results in a scheme that delivers a high quality design and layout which is well considered for its location with its own distinctive character that relates positively to its surroundings. It is therefore considered that the requirements of Policy 1, 2, 4 and 15 of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan Policies DM1.1, DM1.3, DM1.4, DM3.1, DM3.2, DM3.8, DM3.11, DM3.12, DM3.13, DM3.14, DM3.16, DM4.2, DM4.3, DM4.8 and DM4.9 have been met. All other matters are considered acceptable and subject to the imposition of conditions the application is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Watts 01508 533765 cwatts@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5  Appl. No : 2016/2134/O
Parish : KETTERINGHAM

Applicants Name : Mr Michael Austin
Site Address : Land To The East Of 5 High Street Ketteringham Norfolk
Proposal : Development of three bungalows (Phased development)

Recommendation : Approval with Conditions
1 Outline Permission Time Limit
2 In accordance with amendments
3 Standard outline requiring Reserved Matters
4 Single storey dwellings only
5 No additional windows at first floor
6 External materials to be agreed
7 Contaminated land - submit scheme
8 Implement of approved remediation
9 Reporting of unexpected contamination
10 Standard Outline Condition - highways
11 Slab level to be agreed
12 Percolation tests for Foul and surface water
13 Drainage strategy to accord with BHA Consulting Drainage Summary Report
14 Water Efficiency
15 Retention trees and hedges
16 Boundary treatment to be agreed
17 Air source heat pumps
18 Details to be submitted shall include details of mitigation and protection of the setting of the War Memorial

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
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 4 : Housing delivery
Policy 16 : Other Villages

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
DM1.4 : 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
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. Planning History

2.1 2015/0075 Use of land for equine and residential purposes, including a concrete pad for standing one residential caravan, erection of day room, and retention of existing gates
Refused and Dismissed at Appeal

2.2 1989/1027 Erection of 3 or 4 dwellings
Refused

2.3 1986/1035 Residential Development
Refused

2.4 1981/1854 Erection of Loose Box Range for Horses (Application To Relax ‘Temporary’ Condition)
Approved

2.5 1981/1854 Erection of Loose Box Range for Horses (Application To Relax ‘Temporary’ Condition)
Approved

2.6 1980/3524 2 Stables and Tack Room and Adjoining 3 Hay Stores
Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council To the original submission
Refuse:
- The South Norfolk local plan adopted in October 2015 shows Ketteringham as an "other village" and states "will have a defined development boundary within which very limited infill development can occur without affecting the form and character of the village. However, settlements identified in this policy that are also within the Norwich Policy Area and may be considered for additional development, if necessary, to help deliver the 'smaller sites in the NPA' allowance. No such suitable sites have been identified in Ketteringham."
- The proposed development is outside of the development boundary which The South Norfolk local plan states: "has been drawn to include the main built form of the settlement. Due to the setting of the village in open countryside and limited service and facilities available, the boundary has been defined to allow only very limited infill development."
- The planning inspector stated in an appeal against refusal of a previous application: "The character of Ketteringham High Street is that of a quiet rural village with a linear development of traditional dwellings of generally modest scale with shallow front gardens. The appeal site forms part of an important gap in development along the High Street opposite the Village Hall".
- The planning inspector's opinion is consistent with Policy 16 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS), which states: "The setting of the village within open countryside is made apparent by the significant breaks in the built-up area to the north of The Street around the War Memorial and between 'Cytringa' and 'Thatched Cottage' to the south of Low Road. These afford views over the surrounding countryside."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.2 District Member</th>
<th>To be determined by committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside development boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part backland development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impingement on the local street scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May conflict with recent appeal judgement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3 SNC Water Management Officer</th>
<th>To original submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not feel it would be appropriate to condition the drainage and would recommend that a site specific drainage report be submitted to identify the most appropriate means of both surface water and foul drainage at this location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To additional drainage information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can confirm that we are satisfied that based on the information submitted in the BHA Consulting Ltd, Drainage Summary Report dated 6 December 2016, Version 2, a satisfactory means of surface water and foul drainage disposal can be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request conditions imposed to include requiring location specific percolation test results for both foul drainage and surface water drainage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3.4 NHSCCG | No comments received |

| 3.5 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team | Verbally no objections subject to conditions |

| 3.6 NCC Highways | The Local Highway Authority does not object to the residential development of this site, but considers the site to be poorly located in terms of transport sustainability, contrary to the aims as suggested in the NPPF and also the Local Transport Plan for Norfolk, to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, in order to provide a sustainable development. If minded to approve request conditions |

| 3.7 SNC Conservation And Design | No objections |
3.8 Other Representations

To original submission 13 letters of objection

- Recent application and appeal rejected
- Inspectors decision included the fact the site lies outside the development boundary as well as referring to the important gap in the village as stated in the Site specific Allocation Document
- Looking to build a small housing estate on the site reference to 10 or more houses by the agent is concerning
- Seems to suggest that the fence and gates would form part of the application but the Enforcement Notice requires the removal of 6ft close boarded fence and static caravan
- Infrastructure in village is inadequate including drainage, water supply and electricity
- No gas supply
- No street lights
- No footpaths
- Flooding a huge issue, further troubled by unauthorised works, infilling drainage ditches, levelling land and driveway
- High water table and existing watercourses are overloaded
- Curtilages of new proposal does not accommodate required drainage field
- Foul drainage report by Bingham Hall Associates needs to be overhauled for this application as there are considerable differences between one caravan and 3 dwelling, as well as location
- Important gap in Ketteringham directly behind War Memorial and in front of village hall
- Significant breaks in the built up area are what makes the setting of the village and should be preserved
- Backland development
- Breaks have historical and cultural importance
- From medieval times, an estate village owned by lord of the manor and unusually remain so until 1958 retaining its estate history and character
- Out of character and not in keeping with the streetscape
- Loss of view
- Land designated for equestrian purposes
- Contrary to DM1.4
- Application made to Historic England for War Memorial to be listed, listed monument would be compromised by any development of the adjacent land
- Part the rural community of Norfolk played in the Great war is historic and cultural importance to the County and should be protected
- Five year land supply nearly full
- Site plan and location of 3 houses does not continue the linear development
- No details of dwellings and therefore inadequate information to assess
- Roof of bungalow can be converted to additional living space and it may not require planning permission
- Not affordable
- Unsuitable and heavy reliance upon vehicles
- Remote form services, shops and doctors etc.
- 3 dwellings are not going to make an impact on the lack of supply
- Social Impact - 3 dwellings will create no impact
• Economic benefits - negative since there will be no CIL, will not create jobs nor increase local income
• Environmental - Impact negatively on flooding, wildlife, unsustainable
• Noise disturbance
• Light disturbance
• Loss of privacy
• Traffic huge problem, significantly increased since new developments in Hethersett, Little Melton and Wymondham
• Erosion of verges
• Weight limits done little to reduce heavy traffic

1 letter of objection and letter of objection from Ketteringham Residents Group
• Concern that there is a significant lack of a full understanding of the current and historic drainage and water problems in the village
• Know our drainage and water supplies very well and have a Professor of Hydrology living locally
• Some comments are fundamentally wrong
• Some comments based on conjecture
• Water does not flow eastwards, it settles on all land to north of High Street
• Application site prone to high water table
• Culverts and drainage ditches not become blocked but actively filled in
• Full aware of nature of water supplies and been in regular contact with Anglian Water over disputes about ownership of pipes
• Quite obvious that new building is going to have a detrimental effect on current flooding issues
• Do not believe the testing carried out
• Concern that percolation test from septic tanks/sewage disposal have not been assessed
• Application should be refused on drainage grounds as applicant has failed to provide sufficient evidence to prove that the drainage fields would fulfil their required purpose

1 letter of additional comment re War Memorial
• Continue to object notwithstanding the Senior Conservation Officers comments due to detrimental impact of the development would have on the War Memorial

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks outline consent with all matters reserved for the erection of 3 self-build bungalows.

4.2 The site is a field which is accessed from High Street. To the south and west are a number of residential properties. To the north is a railway line and beyond that is the A11 dual carriageway. To the east is agricultural land and beyond that there are further residential properties. The site is opposite the Village Hall and there is also a War memorial adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. A public right of way runs north-south adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site.

4.3 The site is outside the defined development boundary for the village but adjacent to it, the boundary includes 5 High Street and the Village Hall opposite. Ketteringham is an Other Village as defined by the JCS, which can accommodate infilling within its boundary.
4.4 Ketteringham is a small village which lies to the south of the new A11 and the Norwich-Ely railway line. The village has developed in a linear form along The Street and Low Road. The site lies within the D1: Wymondham settled plateau farmland where the landscape is described in the South Norfolk Place Making Guide as being composed of 'large expanse of flat landform with little variation over long distances with strong open horizons' with 'vernacular character partly eroded by modern estate type development'. The character area includes more recent infrastructure and the guide refers to the A11 as 'cutting across the plateau and introduces an element of noise and movement into the landscape resulting in marginalised land in the corridor.' Outside the more built up areas, the general grain and pattern comprises of widely dispersed individual dwellings and farm buildings of mixed character set in an arable landscape context. The narrow lane, hedgerows and trees, together with agricultural activity, creates a very rural feel.

4.5 The main issues in this case are: the principle of the development in this location; the character and appearance of the area; highway safety, drainage, impact on the War Memorial and residential amenity.

Principle of development

4.6 The site falls outside of any development boundaries. Policy DM1.3 states that permission for development outside of development boundaries will only be granted where specific Development Management Policies allow for development outside of development boundaries or were development otherwise demonstrates overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environmental dimensions as set out in Policy DM1.1.

4.7 The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply within the Norwich Policy Area where this site is located (with a 4.7 year supply being identified at December 2016). Consequently, the land supply policies within the Local Plan are out-of-date. Criteria (d) of Policy DM1.1 applies in line with paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that new development should be permitted unless the development would result in adverse impacts that significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Economic Role

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

4.9 The construction of 3 dwellings in a location adjacent to an Other Village would help enhance the economic viability through local spending from future occupants of the dwellings.

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

Social Role

4.11 The NPPF confirms the social role as "supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being."

4.12 The social benefit of the scheme is that it provides housing within a location where a 5-year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated, which is enhanced as the properties are self-build.
Environmental Role

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

4.14 The development would result in an infringement into open countryside. The level of harm needs to be assessed as to whether it is of such significance that it outweighs the benefits detailed above. Due regard has been given in the assessment of this application of the recent appeal decision dated 11 August 2016 for the Caravan, High Street, Ketteringham. A copy of the decision is attached as Appendix 2 for information.

4.15 The site is currently bounded by a residential property to the west, the development boundary is adjacent to the site again to the west. Village Hall lies opposite the site together with existing residential properties. The land is a field which is accessed from Ketteringham High Street. The railway line is located to the north, separated from the land subject of this application by land owned by the applicant. Public footpath to the east. War Memorial to the south. The Inspector commented that the appeal site forms part of an important gap in development along the High Street opposite the Village Hall. The appeal site extended behind existing residential properties fronting the High Street and this is where the residential caravan had been sited, the Inspector therefore considered that it was in contrast to the established gain and character of the High Street, the caravan comprises backland development (that is development located behind existing development without road frontage, also often referred to as tandem development). This location he considered to be an incongruous form of development both by its nature and its location, not assisted by the 2m close boarded fence along the highway. Equally due to the caravan's location it gives rise to a detriment to the living conditions of the neighbouring properties. It was the above identified harms which outweighed the benefits of the provision of 1 residential unit.

4.16 The proposal is for 3 bungalow plots with road frontage except for the War Memorial which occupies part of the frontage. The plots cannot be considered to be backland development like the appeal caravan and would be consistent with the general grain and character of the existing frontage development. The proposals are single storey and can be designed so as to not give rise to detriment to the amenities of the neighbouring properties. In view of the above, the remaining issue is the important gap in development along the High Street.

4.17 Although the application site forms part of a significant gap in the linear form of the village, when assessing how much harm would arise from the loss of this part of the gap, it is relevant to consider to what extent the gap is essential to the character of the area and what impact three bungalows on the site would have. It is considered, on balance, that three single storey properties can be designed so as to not create a detrimental impact to an unacceptable degree. While the proposed development would still follow the linear pattern of the village, the bungalows could be set back slightly from the road (respecting the setting of the Memorial) which would maintain the sense of rural spaciousness which the site currently provides (although currently eroded by solid fencing). When applying the balance required by paragraph 14 of the NPPF it is concluded that the degree of harm caused by the development would not be so great as to outweigh the benefits of the scheme.
4.18 Concerns have been raised by local residents and the County Highway Authority that the site is remote from local services and public transport. The closest bus stops are on Norwich Road, 1.8km from the site. Other facilities, such as the Infants and Junior School in Hethersett are approximately 2.6km away. The Highway Authority considers that the proposed occupiers would be reliant on transport by private motor car, contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Transport Plan. Whilst it is recognised that there are very limited services within the village itself, the site is well related to the existing built up area of the village which has been designated as suitable for infill and small scale residential development within the JCS. In addition the town of Hethersett and city of Norwich are both within relatively close proximity and contain a number of services. For these reasons, I consider it would be difficult to substantiate a reason for refusal on the above grounds.

4.19 In respect of self-build, this is a material consideration in the determination of the application and has been given due consideration, however is not itself an overriding factor if the application was to be considered to otherwise represent unsustainable development.

4.20 Having due regard to the above assessment made in the context of not being able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, it is considered that the benefits of providing additional housing is sufficiently high that the concerns regarding encroachment into the countryside are outweighed by the benefits as it is not considered that the visual impact would cause such harm as to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits as set out in paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

Design, layout and impact on the character of the area

4.21 Both JCS Policy 2 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.

4.22 The application has no details as it is an outline with all matters reserved, however, it is considered that the site can accommodate the development without unacceptably impacting on the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area (as noted above). Notwithstanding the objections raised, the site is of sufficient size to accommodate the 3 bungalows, parking and turning, together with associated curtilages and would not be overdevelopment. The principle of the development therefore accords with policy 2 of the JCS and NPPF.

Highway Safety

4.23 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.

4.24 The application indicates access via the existing access, concerns have been raised by local residents as set out above, at the impact the proposal will have on highway safety. The Highways Authority have assessed the proposal and raised no objections to the residential development on highway safety grounds subject to the imposition of conditions, as such, it is considered that the scheme would accord with Policies DM3.11 and DM3.12.

Residential amenity

4.25 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.
4.26 Local residents have raised concerns regarding light pollution, loss of privacy, noise and disturbance as set out above. I fully appreciate the concerns raised, however, the proposal is for single storey properties and with careful consideration in terms of the siting and design, together with appropriate conditions, I do not consider the application can be refused on the grounds raised. As such, the scheme would accord with the requirements of Policy DM3.13

Listed War Memorial

4.27 The setting of listed buildings requires consideration under the development management policies and S66(1) Listed Buildings Act 1990, which requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

4.28 The War Memorial has been put forward to Historic England for listing and it is highly likely this will be confirmed, as such the application has been assessed by the Senior Conservation and Design officer. He has commented as follows:

‘The likelihood is that it will be listed as they are listing the war memorials more for their communal and historic significance rather than architectural or artistic significance. As with any Listed Building, setting would be the issue. The development is on a field to the rear of the site with the memorial surrounded by a hedge. On google this does not appear that high. It would I suggest be undesirable to see any form of housing behind the memorial in views, however the fact that the field itself is currently an undeveloped field does not greatly contribute to the setting/significance of the war memorial itself. The war memorial is not seen and experienced in an ‘open’ context but within its hedged enclosure. However, development may have the potential to change that. I would therefore suggest that the mitigation in this case would simply be to increase the height of the hedgerow above head height so that the memorial is viewed within its own space, and not affected by views over the hedge of rooftops etc. or development.

‘Also, there is an argument that you might not be able to ‘experience’ the memorial in quiet contemplation if for example people are talking or kids playing in private gardens if they were directly to the rear. Mitigation with regard to this respect would be to shape the design/layout to have a ‘buffer’ area of shared planted visual amenity space around the back of the memorial rather than private space, and before any driveways and frontage development private space of the bungalows.’

4.29 In view of the above, the Senior Conservation and Design officer has raised no objection to the scheme on the grounds that it would not have unacceptable impact on the setting of the War Memorial. 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, the proposal would not adversely affect the setting of the Memorial as a proposed Listed Building.
Drainage

4.30 Concern have been raised as set out above regarding drainage, and it is fully appreciated that that there are known drainage problems and flooding in the village. With this in mind when the application was originally submitted concerns were raised by the Water Management Officer that the information provided in the Bingham Hall Associates Report dated December 2015, version 1 was submitted in support of application 2015/0075 and specific to the northern half of that site only. The report identifies infiltration drainage as being appropriate at the location of trial pits TP1 and TP4 identified for the foul drainage field associated with application 2015/0075. The report states (3.6) that testing at location TP2 and TP3 in the central area of the site were abandoned due to poor percolation, consistent with the variable strata identified in the Report. Therefore, it was not considered that it would be appropriate to condition the drainage and recommended that a site specific drainage report be submitted to identify the most appropriate means of both surface water and foul drainage at this location. It was also understood that the Highway Authority were also investigating flooding issues in High Street adjacent to this site.

4.31 Following discussions and a meeting, additional drainage information has been provided and the Water management Officer has confirmed that she is satisfied that based on the information submitted in the BHA Consulting Ltd, Drainage Summary Report dated 6 December 2016, Version 2, a satisfactory means of surface water and foul drainage disposal can be achieved. This is subject to the following information being submitted as part of the Reserved Matters application:

Location specific percolation test results to demonstrate that an adequate foul drainage field can be achieved for each plot.

Location specific percolation test results to demonstrate that an adequate means of surface water drainage can be achieved for each plot.

The drainage strategy shall be carried out in accordance with the BHA Consulting Ltd Drainage Summary Report dated 6 December 2016 Version 2. In view of the above, whilst I fully appreciate the concerns raised by local residents, I do not consider the proposal can be refused on the drainage issues raised.

4.32 The local residents have raised other issues and concerns not addressed above. The application is only for 3 dwellings, the agent has provided for information a copy of a Paid Enquiry for the land adjacent to the application site, by a different landowner for the provision of 6 self-build properties. Officer’s informal advice is that the development of this site would in principle be acceptable. This application does not change or effect the requirements of the Enforcement Notice and decision made by the Inspector. The rights to add additional accommodation in the roof would be controlled by conditions.

4.33 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.

4.34 This development would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) because they are new dwellings, but exemption could be claimed if delivered by self-build.
5 Conclusion

5.1 The level of harm identified is not sufficient to present significant and demonstrable harm that outweighs the benefit of providing additional housing in a location where it is not possible to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. As such, the development proposed is considered sustainable development and is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
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Appeal Decisions
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an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 11 August 2016

Appeal A Ref: APP/L2630/C/15/3138527
Land North of High Street, Ketteringham, Norfolk NR18 9RU

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
- The appeal is made by Mr Michael Austin against an enforcement notice issued by South Norfolk District Council.
- The enforcement notice, numbered 2014/8301, was issued on 10 November 2015.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission the change of use of the land from land used for equestrian purposes to land used for the standing and occupation of a residential caravan together with the storage and standing of ancillary residential items including a portable toilet.
- The requirements of the notice are remove all residential caravans together with all ancillary residential items from the land.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is six months from the date the notice takes effect.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (b), (c), (e), (f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

Appeal B Ref: APP/L2630/W/15/3130520
The Caravan, Ketteringham High Street, Ketteringham, Norfolk NR18 9RU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Michael Austin against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
- The application, Ref 2015/0075, is dated 11 January 2015.
- The development proposed is described as retention of existing gates and associated access and additional works including change of use.

Decision Appeal A

1. The enforcement notice is corrected by the deletion from the allegation of the words "the change of use of the land from land used for equestrian purposes to land used for the standing and occupation of a residential caravan together with the storage and standing of ancillary residential items including a portable toilet." and the substitution of the words "the change of use from equestrian to a mixed use of equestrian and use as a residential caravan site."; and the deletion of the requirements of the notice and the substitution of the words "Cease the use of the land as a residential caravan site and remove from the land all residential caravans and return the land to its condition before the breach took place."
2. Subject to these corrections the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld, and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

**Decision Appeal B**

3. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for change of use of the land from equestrian to a mixed use of equestrian and use as a residential caravan site and associated works including concrete pad for standing one residential caravan, erection of day room and gates is refused.

**Procedural Matter Appeal A**

4. During the Hearing the appellant announced that he would not be pursuing Appeal A on grounds (b), (c), (e), and (f). No further action was taken on those grounds and the appeal has been considered on grounds (a) and (g).

**Procedural Matter Appeal B**

5. The application describes the development as retention of existing gates and associated access and additional works including change of use. "Retention" is not development as defined by the Town and Country Planning Act as amended. I have determined the appeal in respect of works already carried out in, in accordance with section 73A of the Act.

6. The draft Statement of Common Ground provided by the appellant more fully describes the development as (change of) "use of land for equine and residential purposes, including a concrete pad for standing one residential caravan, erection of day room and [retention of] existing gates". I have determined the appeal on that basis.

**Point of Clarification Both Appeals**

7. Whilst the appellant claims to be an ethnic Romany Gypsy he accepts that he does not meet the definition of a Gypsy or Traveller in Annex 1 of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) in that he has not previously led, nor does he currently lead, a nomadic habit of life. The appeals therefore fall to be determined on the basis that the proposed/existing use is as a residential caravan site and not as a traveller site. The terms and policies of PPTS do not, therefore, apply in the determination of the appeal.

**The Enforcement Notice**

8. The enforcement notice alleges the change of use of the land from land used for equestrian purposes to land used for the standing and occupation of a residential caravan together with the storage and standing of ancillary residential items including a portable toilet. The correct allegation should be "Without planning permission the change of use from equestrian to a mixed use of equestrian and use as a residential caravan site." The requirements of the notice should therefore be "Cease the use of the land as a residential caravan site and remove from the land all residential caravans and return the land to its condition before the breach took place." Both main parties agreed at the Hearing that no injustice would be caused to either party by correcting the enforcement notice in these respects.
Application for costs

9. At the Hearing an application for costs was made by Mr Michael Austin against South Norfolk District Council. This application [is]/[will be] the subject of a separate Decision.

Appeal A Ground (a) and Appeal B

Main Issues

10. The main issues in these appeals are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of High Street, Ketteringham and the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to loss of privacy and to noise and disturbance.

Reasons

11. The character of Ketteringham High Street is that of a quiet rural village with a linear development of traditional dwellings of generally modest scale with shallow front gardens. The appeal site forms part of an important gap in development along the High Street opposite the Village Hall. Along the frontage a roadside hedge has been substantially removed and a 2m close boarded fence has been erected. The fence continues along the eastern boundary alongside a public footpath. At a central point on the road frontage stands the Village War Memorial to the rear and sides of which there remains a mature hedge.

12. The appeal site extends behind residential properties fronting the High Street and the residential caravan has been sited upon this part of the site alongside an existing stable building and in close proximity to those residential properties.

13. In contrast to the established grain and character of the High Street, the caravan comprises backland development and, although there are other examples of caravans located within residential curtilages, it constitutes an incongruous form of development both by its nature and its location. The 2m close boarded fence along the highway, which partially screens the caravan from public view, adds substantially to the incongruous appearance of the appeal site.

14. By virtue of its location to the rear of residential properties the occupation of the caravan results in detriment to the living conditions of the occupiers of those properties due to loss of privacy, particularly with regard to the private rear gardens, and disturbance from general domestic noise, external lighting and from traffic movements along the site access.

15. Whilst the caravan could potentially be removed to another part of the appeal site, so as to reduce the detriment to the living conditions of neighbouring residents, relocating it to an otherwise more open part of the site would substantially increase the harmful impact on the character and appearance of the High Street.

16. The use of the appeal site as a residential caravan site is, therefore, detrimental to the character and appearance of Ketteringham High Street and to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to loss of privacy and to noise and disturbance. The use is
therefore in conflict with Policy DM1.4 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (LP), which seeks to maintain and improve environmental quality and local distinctiveness.

**Other matters**

17. The putative reasons for refusal included that insufficient information had been received to demonstrate that a sustainable form of foul water drainage could be achieved. This, together with concerns regarding surface water drainage and the adequacy of water supplies, was reflected in various submissions by local residents. These are matters which could be dealt with by way of a suitably worded condition requiring details of a scheme to be submitted, approved and implemented; and that should that not be the case, the use as a caravan site would cease. This matter has therefore been given little weight in the determination of the appeals.

18. The Council acknowledge that there is not a demonstrable 5 year supply of housing land. Therefore relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date and the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

19. Whilst the lack of a 5 year supply therefore adds considerable weight in favour of the appeal, the harm described above is sufficient to outweigh the benefits arising from the provision of one housing unit.

**Overall Conclusion on Appeal A ground (a) and Appeal B**

20. For the reasons given above and taking account of all material planning considerations raised, the appeals fail.

**Appeal A ground (g)**

21. Under ground (g) the appellant argues that the period for compliance should be extended as the Council have failed to make any provision for 'non-migratory' gypsies in its Local Plan.

22. However the appellant has provided no justification for an extended period of 12 months, the imposition of which would merely remove the urgency of arranging alternative accommodation.

23. Appeal A on ground (g) therefore fails.

**Overall Conclusion**

24. For all the above reasons Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

*Andrew Hammond*

Inspector
Appeal Decisions APP/L2630/C/15/3138527, APP/L2630/W/15/3130520
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6 Appl. No : 2016/2499/F
Parish : BRACON ASH

Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs Keable
Site Address : Land East Of Lodge Bungalow Cuckoofield Lane Bracon Ash Norfolk
Proposal : New residential building with parking (revised application)

Recommendation : Approval with conditions
1 Full Planning permission time limit
2 In accord with submitted drawings
3 Building details to be agreed
4 Tree protection
5 Contaminated Land
6 New Access Construction over verge
7 Provision of parking, service
8 Submit Emergency Flood Plan
9 Water entry and exclusion strategies
10 Surface water drainage
11 New Water Efficiency

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 06 : Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07 : Requiring good design
NPPF 08 : Promoting healthy communities
NPPF 10 : Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
NPPF 11 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
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 9 : Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 10 : Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area

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
DM4.8 : Protection of Trees and Hedgerows
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets
1.4 Site Specific Allocations and Policies

1.5 Mulbarton Neighbourhood Plan

1.6 Supplementary Planning Document: South Norfolk Place Making Guide

2. Planning History

2.1 2016/1224 New residential building with parking. Withdrawn

3. Consultations

3.1 Town / Parish Council No comments received

3.2 District Member Delegated


3.4 SNC Community Services - Environmental Quality Team No objection but recommended condition regarding the reporting of any contaminated land.

3.5 NCC Highways No objection but requested conditions regarding construction of the vehicle access, parking and turning areas.

3.6 SNC Conservation And Design No objection subject to detailing being agreed under conditions. Also advised of potential overlooking from proposed roof light.

3.7 SNC Arboricultural Consultant Officer No objection but requested a condition regarding tree protection during works.

3.8 Other Representations One neighbour response received objecting to proposal, which is outside the village boundary and not in keeping with nearby houses in scale and design.

4 Assessment

Context

4.1 The site is situated on the eastern edge of the village of Mulbarton, which has local shops, bus services, schools, public house, small light industrial area and medical facilities. The village is within the Norwich Policy Area and policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy identifies Mulbarton as a Service Village.

4.2 The proposed site is situated just outside the development boundary which ends on the east boundary of the property. Also, for the avoidance of doubt, the site lies outside but is adjacent to the area covered by the Mulbarton Neighbourhood Plan.

4.3 The site of the proposed dwelling forms part of the existing garden area of a Lodge Bungalow, formerly the gatehouse of the Bracon Lodge Estate, main house being some distance away. The Gatehouse is not listed and is a single storey building constructed in Gault brick with hipped slate roof. A flat roof extension to its north east side very much detracts from its original character.
4.4 Other than Lodge Bungalow there are no immediate neighbours to the site. To the west side is the main entrance drive to Bracon Lodge and farm land. To the south is an area of woodland beyond which is late 20th century housing some distance away from the proposed site. To the east side beyond the mature boundary hedgerow is an open area of grass land that forms the entrance to the adjacent road leading to the new housing. To the north side of the site on the opposite side of the road is a park/play area of grassland.

4.5 Positioned at the bend in the road, Lodge Bungalow marks the gateway into the village along Cuckoofield Lane beyond which the land opens out with late 20th century residential development either side of the road, mostly single storey and constructed in red brick with concrete Pantile roofs.

Proposal

4.6 This proposal sub-divides the plot of Lodge Bungalow with a new entrance being provided at Cuckoofield Lane for the bungalow leaving the existing entrance for access to the proposed new dwelling. The new house has a modern zinc finish on the roof and end elevations with brick construction on the main side elevations and plinth level. The large zinc finish and modern appearance of the proposed windows and doors provide a much more contemporary design compared with existing housing in the immediate area.

New build housing

4.7 Policy DM1.3 states that planning permission for development outside of any development boundaries will only be granted where specific Development Management Policies allow for development outside of development boundaries or where development otherwise demonstrates overriding economic, social and environmental benefits as set out in Policy DM1.1.

4.8 The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply within the Norwich Policy Area where this site is located (with a 4.7 year supply at December 2016). Consequently, the land supply policies of the Local Plan, where they relate to the Norwich Policy Area, are out-of-date.

4.9 In the absence of a 5 year housing land supply in the NPA, paragraph 49 of the NPPF confirms housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Likewise, paragraph 14 of the NPPF confirms that in terms of decision-taking where the development plan is out of date (as is the case here) permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the framework when taken as a whole.

Sustainability

4.10 On the basis of the requirements of paragraphs 14 and 49 of the NPPF, the following is an assessment of the scheme in the context of the three roles that make up sustainable development as set out in the NPPF.

Economic

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

4.12 This proposal would not cause economic harm but would result in some short term economic benefit as part of any construction work and in the longer term by local spending from the future occupants.
Social

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

4.14 Positioned between the Lodge Bungalow and existing modern residential development to the northeast side, the new dwelling will appear part of the existing settlement and follows the existing general pattern of development of dwellings either side of the road. Access to nearby shops/local services/schools can be undertaken by car, bicycle or on foot. There are nearby bus services, which also help to provide access to employment locally and in Norwich. The proposal therefore provides social benefits without any social harm.

Environmental

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

4.16 The proposal will result in an infringement into the open countryside but as previously mentioned will visually form part of the existing residential development rather than being wholly separate from it. It is therefore considered that this small level of infringement only presents a very small level of harm.

4.17 The existing character of the area is very much defined by late 20th century development to a traditional form and design. Mature trees and hedge-rows together with areas of open grassland help to soften this rather harsh character and provide more interest to views. The contemporary approach for the proposed new dwelling will not only provide some architectural interest to views but will also help to further mark the gateway to the village but without being too dominant. The position of the new dwelling on the site together with other recessive elements of the design will help to ensure that the new dwelling sits comfortably, particularly in the wider landscape setting to the east side, without being too dominant in views. For this reason the building will also not conflict with the existing character and appearance of Lodge Bungalow. This proposal also provides a new dwelling which is to be super insulated with efficient energy source, the design making good use of natural light and ventilation.

4.18 The site is situated in flood zone 1, guidance in the NPPF stating that all uses of land are appropriate in this zone. The Flood Risk Assessment in the application concludes that there is a low to high surface water flood risk across the site but this will be mitigated through a Water Entry Strategy and Water Exclusions Strategy and Flood Response as is outlined in the report. These mitigation measures will not reduce the risk of flooding but will limit its impact through appropriate water management.

Conclusion on sustainable development

4.19 Having due regard to the above assessment made in the context of not having a demonstrable 5 year housing land supply, it is considered that the social, economic and environmental benefits of providing the new dwelling do sufficiently outweigh concerns regarding encroachment into the countryside and the level of remaining flood risk and therefore on balance, in light of the requirements of paragraphs 14 and 49 of the NPPF, it is considered that the scheme does represent a sustainable development and accords with policies DM1.1 and DM1.3 of the Local Plan 2015.
Design

4.20 The Council’s Senior Design and Conservation Officer, who has no objection to the scheme, discussed the design of the new building at length with the agent prior to submission of the application. In commenting on the formal application he states the following:

4.21 ‘The approach with regard to scale, form, height, massing and materials is considered to be an appropriate response to the context of the existing gatehouse to Bracon Lodge and existing surroundings, which contribute towards the entry point to the village. The building will be a modern, contemporary design, so will stand out as a bespoke individual building, but has been designed with recessive elements to enable it to fit in more harmoniously with its surroundings. Although the building is two stories in height, the sloping roof eases the transition to the single storey lodge to the west. The dull sheen of the zinc will be a recessive element that will tie in with the existing landscaping to the south which forms a backdrop.’

4.22 As is explained in the submitted Design and Access Statement, there is no obvious vernacular style in the immediate area and therefore the new dwelling has been designed to the site context and proximity to the existing gatehouse. The more recessive elements in terms of roof design and material finishes will reduce the impact on views of the gatehouse Lodge whilst the design also maximises view across open green space and adjoining woodland.

4.23 A local resident has objected to the proposal as the new dwelling will sit outside the village boundary and its scale and design is not in keeping with nearby houses. The issue of being outside the village boundary is dealt with in the Sustainability section of this report and in terms of scale and design the proposal is considered justified as explained above.

4.24 Critical to the success of the design of the new dwelling is the construction of architectural detailing and therefore details such as verges, window and door reveals and other material junctions are all to be agreed under conditions to ensure a coherent design.

4.25 With appropriate conditions it is therefore considered that the proposal accords with Section 7 of the NPPF regarding design as well as with policy DM3.8 of the Local Plan 2015.

Highways

4.26 The Highways Officer has no objection to the scheme but has requested conditions regarding parking/turning areas and the construction of the new vehicle access. With these conditions it is considered that the proposal accords with policies DM3.11 and DM3.12 of the Local Plan 2015.

Environmental Protection

4.27 The Environmental Protection Officer has no objection to the proposal but has requested a condition regarding the reporting of any contaminated land. With this condition it is considered that the proposal accords with policy DM3.14 of the Local Plan 2015.

Trees

4.28 A Tree Report was submitted with the application. The proposal includes the removal of some trees and new planting to the north side of the site and at the dividing boundary with Lodge Bungalow. The Council’s Arboriculturist has no objection to the proposal having assessed the report, as the trees to be removed are of lower wider landscape value due to their size and positioning, with limited views from outside the site. He has requested a condition to ensure the protection other trees close to the site. With this condition it is considered that the proposal accords with policy DM4.8 of the Local Plan 2015.
Neighbours

4.29 The only immediate neighbour to the house is Lodge Bungalow. The original submission has been amended to ensure there is no overlooking from the new dwelling onto the bungalow site. With new garden fencing together with screen planting between the properties it is considered that the proposal will not have any significant impact on neighbouring amenity so as to justify further amendments or refusal of the application and therefore the scheme accords with policy DM3.13 of the Local Plan 2015.

Water Management/Flood Risk

4.30 The Water Management Officer has no objection to the proposal but requested conditions to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the recommendations in the Flood Risk Assessment by implementation of the Water Entry Strategy and Water Exclusion Strategy together with details regarding a Flood Response Strategy.

4.31 Whilst the risk of low level flooding will still remain, dealing with the above recommendations under conditions will ensure appropriate water management on the site and help minimise the level of adverse impact. It is therefore considered that, with these conditions the proposal is acceptable under the requirements of policy DM4.2 of the Local Plan 2015.

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 CIL under the Regulations

5 Conclusion

5.1 This proposal will result in a level of harm by encroaching on the open countryside on a site that continues to have a low to high level of flood risk. Having assessed the level of harm against the economic, social and environmental benefits of the proposal, with appropriate conditions, particularly with regard to water management and design detailing, it is considered that overall the benefits of the scheme outweigh the level of harm, the proposal being in a sustainable location and having a positive impact on the provision of housing in an area that does not have a five year land supply.

5.2 Having therefore given careful consideration to proposal it is considered that the requirements of policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 9 of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan policies DM1.1, DM1.3, DM3.1, DM3.8, DM3.10, DM3.11, DM3.12, DM3.13, DM3.14, DM4.1, DM4.2, DM4.8 and DM4.10 are met. All other matters are considered acceptable and subject to the imposition of conditions the application is recommended for approval.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Philip Whitehead 01508 533948 pwhitehead@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7 Appl. No : 2016/2635/O
Parish : TACOLNESTON

Applicants Name : Mr J Coston
Site Address : Land West Of Norwich Road Tacolneston Norfolk
Proposal : Outline application for 3 self-build plots with details of upgraded access, all other matters reserved.

Recommendation : Refusal
1 Contrary to policy DM1.3
2 Not Sustainable development – encroachment into countryside

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
Policy 3 : Energy and water
Policy 4 : Housing delivery
Policy 6 : Access and Transportation
Policy 15 : Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
Development Management Policies
DM1.3 : 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
DM3.11 : 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
DM4.4 : Natural Environmental assets - designated and locally important open space

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document
South Norfolk Place Making Guide 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 None relevant

3. Consultations

3.1 Town / Parish Council
No comments received

3.2 District Member
To be determined by committee
- It is for self-build which is a strong material consideration in favour of the application
3.3 SNC Water Management Officer
No objections subject to conditions

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

3.5 NCC Ecologist
To original submission
- Insufficient information provided to adequately assess the impact of the proposal on Protected Species
To amended report
- The amended report is now fit for purpose and raise no objections subject to conditions

3.6 SNC Landscape Architect
Refuse
Detrimental to the landscape character as identified in published documents

3.7 NCC Highways
No objections subject to conditions

3.8 Other Representations
4 letters of support - 3 from 89 and 89A Norwich Road, within the ownership of the applicant
- Look in keeping with bungalows on Norwich Road
- Not a huge amount of anything blocked from view
- Layout presented not overlooking anyone
- Privacy intact
- Not on top of one another
- Nice to see the space used to home people who obviously need it
- Brilliant idea as it will bring young people back into the village who obviously need it and who are renting or living with parents and give them affordable housing
- Increase population in the village, helping the school and other local amenities
- Can only be a good thing for the village

2 letters of objection
- The applicant is making the application for a family member, as far as we are aware the ‘dwelling’ is for the son of Mr & Mrs M Page who live at Hill Top Farm and they are not related to the applicant
- Land considered and rejected by SNC under Site Specific Allocations and Policies - Preferred Options. Informed by the Council that it would not be considered for planning in the future. Planning Statement 3.5.5 states “the proposed allocation was dismissed by the Council due to concerns regarding TPO trees and a public concern that this would impact negatively on the setting of listed buildings.”
- Consider very limited bus service, it is not a viable alternative to using a private car
- There is no post office or shop, have a Chinese takeaway and hairdressers. The Pelican PH is closed and is only a B&B, although there is the Jolly Farmers in Forncett End
- The floor area proposed is 145m2 each is excessive for a single storey 3 bedroomed dwelling. Housing standards recommends 74m2 for 4 persons and 95m2 for 6 persons. Consider that the massing of the dwellings is unacceptable and would ruin our view for the Meadow land
• Earmarked for development under LDF until chair of Parish Council stated it should be kept as a ‘Green Lung’
• It would appear that this misled everyone at this stage and it should have been considered for affordable housing
• Central to village near school and all other activities and bus services
• Few houses for such a large piece of land, consistently told that houses on TAC1 have to have houses which are affordable, are terraced or at least linked, these are separate - mixed messages from the Council
• Who will be self-building? Family members to landowners?
• Where will the access be?

Following deferral from January committee
2 letters of objection
• The loss of a prime view of the rural landscape from Norwich Road to be detrimental to the character of the Village.
• There are many areas on this property where using existing buildings and integrating them further away from the entrance would be beneficial.
• In danger of becoming another Ashwellthorpe where the rural views from the street have been or are being lost by new developments
• No reason to depart from existing local plan and allow this development
• An agricultural field forms an important part of the green break within the village

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of 3 self-build detached residential dwellings with associated parking and curtilages with all matters reserved apart from the access. The site is located off Norwich Road, Tacolneston. To the north and east are existing residential properties, to the south is open countryside and to the west separated by a field Hill Top Farm, 89 Norwich Road. The Horse Chestnut tree to the north of the existing access to the site is subject to a TPO. The application was deferred at the request of the agent to allow additional ecology information to be submitted.

4.2 The site lies within the E1: Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland where the landscape is described in the South Norfolk Place Making Guide as being composed of ‘distinctive flat elevated landform; large scale rural landscape of both openness and enclosure by woodland; and linear settlement along roads’

4.3 The Landscape Character Area E1 Ashwellthorpe Plateau Farmland and the theme of open areas is within the published Landscape Character Assessment [LUC – 2006]. The following are the most pertinent extracts from the Assessment for E1:

Sensitivities and Vulnerabilities
• strong sense of openness with vast skies and long range views particularly from the plateau edge;
• the smaller field pattern associated with settlements;
• overall peaceful, rural character.

Landscape Strategy
• conserve the pattern of fields and particularly the smaller enclosures around settlements;

Development Considerations
• consider the impact of any form of development on the open character and panoramic views that can be obtained from parts of the plateau.
4.4 The site is outside the development boundary for Tacolneston which is defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan Site Specific allocations 2015.

4.5 The main issues in this case are the Principle of development, Landscape impact, Highways, Residential amenity, Self –Build, Ecology, Other considerations and Sustainable development

Principle of development

4.6 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) (2004) states in that 'regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under any planning act the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material consideration indicates otherwise'.

4.7 As set out in this report there are no material considerations to outweigh, override or change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making in accordance with paragraph 12 of the NPPF. This is reinforced by paragraph 17 bullet point one of the NPPF in that the planning system/process should 'be genuinely plan-led'.

4.8 The site lies in the Rural Policy Area (RPA), which in respect of housing supply has a 39.6 years supply. Consequently the Council's policies for the supply of housing can be considered up-to-date and applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

4.9 The site falls outside of the development boundary where there is a presumption against new residential dwellings under policy DM1.3. The proposal is considered to conflict with DM1.3, which requires all new development to be located on allocated sites or within development boundaries, unless specific DM policies allow for it or there are overriding benefits.

Landscape impact

4.10 As mentioned above, the site is located within a Plateau Farmland agricultural landscape and outside of the site is relatively open in nature. A core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework is to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, which is reflected in Policy DM1.3 of the Development Management Policies document. Planning Practice Guidance clarifies that conservation and enhancement of the landscape, not only designated landscapes, contributes to upholding this principle.

4.11 The proposal necessitates the removal of hedgerow which is subject to the Hedgerows Regulations, but a full assessment against all the ‘importance’ criteria has not been provided. However, information via NCC’s Historic maps, lead the Landscape Architect to be of the opinion that it is unlikely that the hedge will be important (primarily because the boundary and therefore the hedge does not feature on the 1st Edition OS map).

4.12 It appears that the existing TPO tree on adjacent land could be safeguarded sufficiently from a development such as that proposed. (Note that the TPO tree formerly on the north-east corner of this site was removed, with authorisation from the Council, in 2007)+.

4.13 Notwithstanding the above, the Landscape Architect’s main concern is the effect of the proposed development on the character of the village landscape. The Site-specific Allocations and Policies document offers a commentary on the character of the existing settlement: “A significant break in the built-up frontage on both sides of Norwich Road exists to the north of the Manor House buildings whose setting in spacious grounds with good tree growth contributes towards the ‘open’ nature and rural character of this part of the village.” Development on this land will undoubtedly change its character from agricultural land, and will reduce the noted significant break in the built-up frontage.

4.14 It is considered that the development of the site would erode the rural character of the local landscape and consequent sense of place, thereby conflicting with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy DM1.3.
Highway Safety

4.15 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. Access for the dwellings forms part of this application and has been assessed by the NCC Highway Authority who has raised no objections. The application seeks to serve the development of 3 dwellings by an existing access which is to be widened, this will enable two cars to pass each other and that a footpath can be created which will link to the site to the highway. In view of the above the proposal accords with Policies DM3.11 and DM3.12.

Residential amenity

4.16 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. There are neighbouring properties to the north, east and west. Given the separation distances, however, it is considered that the development, whilst in outline, could be designed to not give rise to a situation detrimental to the amenities of the nearby neighbouring properties via loss of privacy, loss of light, overbearing impacts. As such the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DM3.13.

Ecology

4.17 This application is supported by a Phase 1 Habitat Survey (East Anglia Ecology, October 2016). NCC Ecologist has commented as follows: 'The report is brief and unusually for reports of this type in Norfolk, makes no mention of the likelihood of the site being used by either bats or Great Crested Newts (GCN). There appears to be approximately 6 waterbodies within 250m of the proposed development site. Whilst the site itself consists primarily of poor, semi-improved grassland, there is connectivity to these waterbodies which means that there is a possibility that GCN could be using commuting using the site boundaries. Bats could also use the hedgerows surrounding the sites for foraging. The author conducted a Desktop Survey but this was for local designated and non-designated sites only and did not include species found in the locality. The report did not state the author, nor their qualifications and experience, or whether they are a member of a professional body such as CIEEM. Overall whilst it is likely (from looking at the block plan submitted with the application) that if the boundary features are retained any ecological impact should be minimised, there is insufficient information in this report to give us any certainty. Ideally the waterbodies should be assessed for GCN potential and also the fact that bats may use the hedgerow should be considered. If it is possible that GCN may use the site for commuting then extra mitigation measures for this species, particularly during construction should be implemented.'

4.18 The application was deferred from the January DM committee to enable additional ecology information to be submitted to address the above concern. The Ecologist has responded advising that the amended report is now fit for purpose and subject to the imposition of conditions on a planning consent, they now raise no objections.

Self-build

4.19 It has been put forward that the dwellings would be self-build and full consideration has been given to this. The NPPF sets out in principle support for the provision of self-build housing. Paragraph 50 includes the requirement to 'deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create inclusive and mixed communities, Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should plan for… the needs of different groups in the community such as people wishing to build their own homes'.

4.20 Paragraph 159 of the NPPF sets out the requirement to carry out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment, which includes identifying a need for people wishing to build their own home and there is also further advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.
Further support is given by the Self-build and Custom House Buildings Act 2015, the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding (Register) Regulations 2016 and Housing and Planning Act 2016 and the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Regulation 2016.

The Acts and Regulations have given Local Authority's a number of duties.

Firstly local authorities have a duty to have a self-build register. The Council established one as part of its Vanguard role and continues to operate it.

Secondly the Local Authority must have regard to the register when carrying out functions relating to
a) Planning
b) Housing
c) The disposal of any Local Authority Land
d) Regeneration

In terms of the planning function as well as plan making the register is also a material consideration in decision making.

Section 10 of the Housing and Planning Act requires Local Authorities to give suitable development permission in respect of enough serviced plots of land (or plots which in the view of the LPA could be serviced within the lifetime of the permission) to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in the authority's area arising from each base period. The first base period ended on 30th October 2016. To comply with these requirements the LPA needs to give sufficient planning permissions that could be suitable for self-build or custom build properties in relation to any base period in the 3 years beginning immediately after the end of that base period. Therefore the timescale to comply with the current requirement is between 31st October 2016 and 30th October 2019.

Given existing self-build exemptions for CIL and the Council's current record on granting planning permissions which could be suitable for self-build or custom build properties, there is no reason not to expect that this requirement will be met from sites which are in accordance with the adopted Development Plan.

In terms of the Council's five year housing land supply this is defined in NPPF paragraph 47 for market and affordable housing. Self-build housing would be included in this requirement, but there is no specific requirement for a five year land supply for self-build housing.

The Regulations now make it clear that the demand for self-build housing is defined by the self-build register and there is no requirement to consider other sources of information.

These regulations are not intended to supersede the overarching principle and golden thread of the NPPF which is the delivery of sustainable development.

The JCS Policy 4 states that proposals for housing will be required to contribute to the mix of housing required to provide balanced communities and meet the needs of an area. Although there is not an individual policy for self-build developments, this policy allows consideration to be given to the provision of any identified need. Furthermore DM 3.1 focuses on meeting housing requirements and needs, specifically referencing self-build sites within the preamble. Para 159 of the NPPF goes on to instruct LPAs that their Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMA) should include the range of housing that local populations are likely to require, to include people wanting to build their own homes.

Therefore although there is not an individual policy for self-build developments, and details of self-build delivery are expected to be drawn up through a Supplementary Planning Document now the regulations have come into force, the Council’s policies allow consideration to be given to the provision of any identified need including self-build.
For the reasons set out above, the Council does not consider the development plan is silent on the matter of self-build. This view was supported by a Planning Inspector in determining an appeal on application 2016/0526, Planning Inspectorate reference APP/L2630/W/16/3152650.

With Tacolneston falling within the Rural Area of South Norfolk, there is a sufficient housing supply (39.6 years being identified at December 2016), to meet the requirements in the JCS. As a result, it is considered that the development plan is not out of date and can be given full weight.

As required by paragraph 50 of the NPPF consideration has been given to the benefits of providing self-build dwellings, but it is not considered to outweigh other identified harm.

Sustainable Development

Sustainable development has three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. It goes on to stress that these are not to be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. The NPPF also sets out 13 themes for delivering sustainable development but considers its meaning of Sustainable Development to be taken as the NPPF as a whole. The following is an assessment of whether the scheme can be considered to represent sustainable development.

Economic Role

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

The scheme would result in some short term economic benefits as part of any construction work, which may be done by small scale builders and in the longer term by local spending from the future occupants. It is therefore considered that the scheme would bring forward a small level of economic benefit.

Social Role

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

As the Council has a significant housing supply in the rural area the provision of three dwellings is considered to have limited benefit which may be slightly enhanced if the properties are self-build.

Environmental Role

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

The development would result in an infringement into open countryside, which would further erode the rural character of the area causing significant environmental harm.
Conclusion on sustainable development

4.43 Having due regard to the above assessment made in the context of having a five year land supply, it is considered that the concerns regarding encroachment into the countryside, is not outweighed by minor economic and social benefits, when considered as a whole, as a result the scheme does not represents sustainable development.

4.44 The Council considers that the development plan is not silent on self-build and the Council has a five year land supply in the RPA, as a result it is considered to be up to date. In addition the proposed development would not result in sustainable development as a result paragraph 14 of the NPPF is not invoked and there is no need to carry out a paragraph 14 assessment.

4.45 However, for the avoidance of doubt the requirements of paragraph 14 of the NPPF in respect of the presumption in favour of development for decision-taking have been considered.

4.46 In the context of promoting sustainable development, Paragraph 14 advises this means: "Where the development is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, granting permission unless:
Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole; or "Specific policies in this framework indicate development should be restricted."

4.47 In this instance it is considered that the harm caused by the encroachment of the open countryside would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the very minor benefits to the local economy and by the provision of four houses in a location where the Council has a significant land supply.

Other considerations

4.48 A number of concerns have been raised as set out above, which do not form a reason of refusal of the application, whilst they are fully appreciated, the fact the a site was not considered acceptable under the LDF does not prevent an applicant being submitted. I note the concerns relating to limited services, however the village has been designated as a Service Village under the JCS. The fact properties are not for family members is not itself a planning consideration but the potential benefits of the plots being available for self-build has been taken into account.

4.49 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.

4.50 This development would be liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) because they are new dwellings, but exemption could be claimed if delivered by self-build.

5. Conclusion

5.1 In conclusion, the site is outside the development limit in a location where the Council has a significant housing land supply and the development plan is considered to be up to date. There is no overriding justification for departing from policies DM1.1 and DM1.3 in the Development Management Polices, which restricts development outside the development limit.

6 Reasons for Refusal

6.1 The site is located outside the development limit in an area where there is not an identified need for new dwellings. No overriding justification identified in the National Planning Policy Framework or the South Norfolk Development Management Policies 2015 has been put forward for the development. As a result the proposed development is contrary to policy DM1.3 of the Development Management Policies.
6.2 The proposed development does not represent sustainable development, having regard to the three tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The adverse impact of the encroachment on the open countryside, outweighs the modest social and economic benefit of three additional self-build dwellings in the rural policy area where there is an existing significant housing land supply (39.6 years). For this reason the scheme is contrary to the aims of the NPPF to secure sustainable development, acknowledging the advice in paragraph 49.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis 01508 533788 ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
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**Appl. No**: 2016/2793/H  
**Parish**: HETHERSETT  

Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs N Simpson  
Site Address: 2 Grenville Close Hethersett Norfolk NR9 3AG  
Proposal: First Floor Shower Room Extension  

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

.  
**Planning Policies**  

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM3.4: Residential extensions and conversions within Settlements  
DM3.8: Design Principles applying to all development  
DM3.11: Road safety and the free flow of traffic  
DM3.13: Amenity, noise, quality of life  

2.  
**Planning History**  

2.1 None  

3.  
**Consultations**  

3.1 Parish Council: No comments  

3.2 District Member: Determine as delegated. Bricks should be as exact a match as possible.  

3.3 Other Representations: None received  

4.  
**Assessment**  

4.1 The application site comprises of a detached two storey dwelling within the development boundary of Hethersett. This dwelling is located within a cul de sac off the main road through this residential development. This application proposes a first floor extension over a projecting section on the front elevation. This application is reported to Committee as the applicant is related to a member of staff.  

4.2 The alteration of the existing dwelling is acceptable in principle. As such the main considerations are design and impact upon residential amenity. The proposed extension would be of an acceptable scale and, given its relatively narrow width and lower ridge height, would remain sub-ordinate in appearance within the front elevation. Therefore, subject to it being completed in matching materials, it would remain in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling. This dwelling is within a cul de sac of properties of varying design and external finish. Therefore, the proposed extension would have an acceptable impact on the character of this mixed street scene.
4.3 The proposed extension would incorporate a small first floor bathroom window on its western elevation which would remain obscure glazed. Due to the siting of the extension to the front and its orientation and separation from neighbouring properties, it is not considered that it would have an adverse impact on residential amenity through overlooking, loss of daylight or appearing overbearing. No objections have been received.

4.4 Existing parking provision within the site would be unaffected by this proposal.

4.5 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.

4.6 This application is not liable for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – less than 100 sq m of new floor space is proposed.

5 Conclusion

5.1 It is considered that the design is in keeping with the property and that the proposal will not have an adverse impact on the amenity of either the immediate neighbours or the wider area. As such the proposal accords with the criteria set out within policies DM3.4, DM3.8, DM3.11 and DM3.13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2015.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Blanaid Skipper 01508 533985
and E-mail: bskipper@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9  **Appl. No**: 2016/2896/H  
**Parish**: WORTWELL

Applicants Name: Miss Pauline Allen  
Site Address: Says Farmhouse 11 Low Road Wortwell IP20 0HJ  
Proposal: Extension to dwelling and conversion of outbuilding

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

10  **Appl. No**: 2016/2897/LB  
**Parish**: WORTWELL

Applicants Name: Miss Pauline Allen  
Site Address: Says Farmhouse 11 Low Road Wortwell IP20 0HJ  
Proposal: Extension to dwelling and conversion of outbuilding

Recommendation: Approval with Conditions  
1. Listed Building Time Limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
Development Management Policies  
DM3.13 : Amenity, noise, quality of life  
DM3.4 : Residential extensions and conversions within Settlements  
DM4.10 : Heritage Assets

1.4 Supplementary Planning Document

**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 2012/2246  
Replace existing greenhouse and erect new summerhouse  
**Approved**

2.2 2002/0757  
Alteration of 2no tie-beams and creation of additional living space in attic  
**Approved**
2.3 1996/0618 Alterations to rear of house & demolition of timber garage Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Town / Parish Council The Parish Council considers the scheme would be a good improvement.

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate

3.3 SNC Water Management Officer Advises that while part of the site is within flood zones 1, 2 and 3, the proposal is within zone 1. Applicants need to provide details of any flood proofing/resilience to improve the flood performance of new buildings.

3.4 Other Representations None received

4 Assessment

Site context

4.1 The house and its former outbuildings to the north, now a separate dwelling, lie within the village development boundary. The house is a grade 2 listed building described as being of 17th century origins, a timber framed building which was encased in red brick in the 19th century. The house is set back from the road and has a steep pantiled roof which has been extended with a lean to at the rear. The garden beyond to the east includes water meadows leading down to the River Waveney. Opposite the house on the west side of the road, is a group of modern dwellings, while the nearest neighbour to the south is some 200 metres away.

Proposal

4.2 At the rear of the house is a single storey former wash house, in brick and pantile, and the intention is to convert this to a studio and connect it to the house by a glazed link. The existing building is in sound condition and would be improved to introduce insulation to the floor, walls and roof, while a side window would be altered to incorporate double doors. A section of garden wall needs to be removed to accommodate the glazed link. The link is fully glazed except for the roof over the lean to which will be in matching pantiles.

4.3 The application needs to be assessed in the context of section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 where special regard has to be given to the preservation of the building or its setting or any features of special interest. Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires proposals to enhance the significance of the heritage asset or where "harm" is caused, that this should only be supported where there is clear and convincing justification and where the harm can be weighed against the public benefits. Policy 4.10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (DM), follows this lead. DM Policy 3.4 allows for extensions to dwellings in development boundaries primarily provided they are of good design, maintain the character of the building and do not have an unacceptable impact on the neighbours.
4.4 The wash house is an attractive ancillary building that makes a positive contribution to the character of the rear of the house. It has been well maintained but is under used for storage. This proposal involves only minor external alterations. New doors to the side and west have been designed to blend with the existing, while the interior is already rendered and this appearance will not alter with the conversion. The link is designed to be set within the width of the wash house and below the ridge in order to retain the dominance of the existing buildings. The section of wall to be removed, with the gate, is a later build to secure access to the rear of the house.

4.5 It is felt that the proposal will enhance the special interest of the house and provide for the future of this ancillary building. Its design has been carefully considered. The proposal would have no impacts on the neighbours; the boundary to Tyrells Barn to the north comprises a blank brick wall, while neighbours to the west and south are unaffected.

4.6 The Water Management Officer has advised the site is within flood zones 2 and 3 with the buildings in question within Flood Zone 1. In accordance with Environment Agency standing advice, the applicant has confirmed that the finished floor level of the proposed extension "will not involve lowering the existing floor levels which will remain the same". This would ensure that the proposal would not make the liability to flood risk any worse than at present and as such has the support of the Water Management Officer and allows the Council to support the scheme as submitted. Incidentally the applicant advises that the buildings have not been flooded since 1904.

4.7 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.

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

5 Conclusion 2016/2896/H and 2016/2897/LB

5.1 The proposal complies with the provisions of the policies and guidance outlined above and would be a positive addition to the accommodation of the house.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Steve Beckett 01508 533812 sbeckett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016/2896 &amp; 2016/2897</th>
<th>Appendix 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Not Set**
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Enforcement Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enforcement Ref</th>
<th></th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2016/8140</td>
<td></td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Address**: 2 - 4 Roydon Road, Diss, Norfolk, IP22 4LN,

**Development**: Alleged untidy land and unauthorised works to a listed building

**Developer**: Mr Aklakur Rahman

---

### 1. Background

1.1 The property is a grade 2 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. He also advised 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 would not normally support the use of uPVC windows in a listed building.

1.4 Having looked into the matter further it was evident that 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

---

### 3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council

No Comments Received

3.2 District Members

Cllr Kiddie – Windows not entirely out of character and prevent further dilapidation of building. Rendering has been carried out well and stabilises façade on Roydon Road
3.3 Conservation & Design Officer  
Detrimental impact on listed building  
Limited impact on the Conservation Area

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 being sliding sashes, multi paneled 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. He considers the materials used and design detail to be harmful to the character of the listed building, however in views within the conservation area the design of the windows are generally more in keeping with the period style and change will be less noticeable to the casual observer.

4.3 It should be noted that the building has been in a state of gradual decay for a number of years and the recent works to render and paint the property has greatly improved the appearance of the building and has prevented further decay to the fabric. This view is shared by Cllr Kiddie. 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.

4.4 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 the harm of the replacement windows to be such that it warrants taking further action.

5 Recommendation

5.1 That no further action be taken on the matter.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  
Andy Baines, 01508 533840, abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk  
and E-mail:
2 Enforcement Ref : 2016/8190
Parish : DISS

Site Address : The Two Brewers, 11 St Nicholas Street, Diss, Norfolk, IP22 4LB
Development : Lean-to smoking shelter
Developer : Mr & Mrs Musk

1. Background

1.1 It was brought to the council’s attention that a structure had been erected to the rear of the premises without the benefit of planning permission. Following a visit to the site and having discussed the matter with the occupiers it was apparent the structure was a smoking shelter. The smoking shelter comprises of a lightweight wooden timber post frame with a wooden pallet and corrugated plastic roof. The timber posts are attached to the ground and the roof rests on an existing wall.

1.2 The occupiers of the pub were invited to submit an application to regularise the situation but advised they nor the owner of the premises wished to do so.

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
Development Management Policies
DM4.10: Heritage Assets

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

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

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. Relevant Planning History

3.1 2014/2092 Refurbishment and redecoration of building interior. Refurbish bar and form new back bar. Approved

3.2 2016/1133 Retention of signs on listed building. Approved

3.3 2016/1134 Retention of signs on listed building. Approved
4. Consultations

4.1 Town Council

No comments received

4.2 District Member

Cllr Kiddie – To be reported if appropriate
Cllr Minshull - To be reported if appropriate
Cllr Palmer - To be reported if appropriate

4.3 SNC Conservation And Design

No strong objections

- Smoking shelter is tucked in to corner of rear yard, is functional in its character and appearance and does not impact on the streetscene.
- Structure is utilitarian and of no design merit but is temporary in nature and easily reversible.
- Being of timber with a transparent roof it is fairly ‘natural’ in appearance.
- Whilst the structure could be considered to have some harm to the character of the listed building, considering the context and nature of construction the level of harm is not significant on the special character of the listed building.

4.4 Local residents

No comments received

5 Assessment

5.1 The property is a Grade II listed building located within the Diss Conservation Area. The smoking shelter is located to the rear of the building and is not visible from any public vantage point. It is therefore considered not to have an adverse impact on the Conservation Area.

5.2 The smoking shelter is utilitarian and of a simple design. Its lightweight construction means it is easily reversible with no harm to either the character or fabric of the listed building. Furthermore it is accepted that licenced premises require a designated smoking area and without one this could be detrimental to the business.

In view of the above I do not consider it expedient to take any further action on the matter.

6 Recommendation

6.1 That no further action be taken on the matter.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:

Andy Baines, 01508 533840, abaines@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Not Set
### Planning Appeals

**Appeals received from 20th December 2016 to 23rd January 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish / Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2016/1301 | Wymondham  
2 Cantley Villas Station Road  
Spooner Row Norfolk NR18 9JR | Mr & Mrs P. Dimoglou       | Erection of two semi-detached dwellings, access and associated works     |
| 2016/1548 | Ashwellthorpe And Fundenhall  
Belmont Wymondham Road  
Ashwellthorpe Norfolk NR16 1EN | Mr Terry Cheesman          | Retention of earth banking and enlarged pond with associated earthworks. |
| 2016/1693 | Costessey  
26 West End Avenue Costessey  
Norfolk NR8 5BA | Mr And Mrs J Green         | Proposed conservatory to front                                           |

### Planning Appeals

**Appeals decisions from 20th December 2016 to 23rd January 2017**

<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>
</table>
| 2016/0884 | Broome  
Land Rear Of Yarmouth Road Broome Norfolk | Mr Alison Neilson         | Erection of two storey residential dwelling with attached garage (details reserved except for access) | Delegated      | Refusal        | Appeal Allowed  |
<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>2016/1114</td>
<td>Great Moulton Hope Valley Low Common Road Great Moulton NR16 1LP</td>
<td>Mr Adam Price</td>
<td>Change of use of land to a mix of single Gypsy and Traveller residential pitch and paddocks for the keeping and breeding of horses, together with widening the existing access onto Overwood Lane, closure of northern access onto Overwood Lane, and closure of the existing access onto Low Common Road</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Granted temporary consent for 4 years. Dismissed Enforcement Appeal with modifications.</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>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>