First Wednesday Planning Committee

Members of the First Wednesday Planning Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservatives</th>
<th>Liberal Democrats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr W Kemp (Chairman)</td>
<td>Mrs V Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr D Blake (Vice-Chairman)</td>
<td>Dr M Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr L Dale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr L Hornby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr C Kemp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr N Legg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs L Neal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr B Spratt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs J Wilby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Meetings

Conservatives: Blomefield Room 12.45 pm to 1.30 pm

Note: information that is publicly available may be shared at Group Meetings, but the outcome of applications or the ways in which Members may vote should not be discussed.

Agenda

Date
Wednesday 1 February 2012

Time
1.30 pm

Place
Council Chamber
South Norfolk House
Swan Lane
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

Contact
Caroline Heasley  tel (01508) 533685
South Norfolk District Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

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

Please note that the order of the agenda may change at the discretion of the Chairman, so it is advisable to arrive at the commencement of the meeting if you are intending to speak.

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

26/01/2012
**AGENDA**

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 6)

4. Minutes of the First Wednesday Planning Committees held on Wednesday 4 January 2012;
   (attached – page 9)

5. Enforcement Report
   (attached – page 21)

6. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (report attached – page 24)

<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>2011/1492/O</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>Former Cartco Transport Depot, Victoria Road, Diss</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2011/1518/F</td>
<td>GREAT MOULTON</td>
<td>Land at Little Orchard, Woodrow Lane, Great Moulton</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011/1651/F</td>
<td>GREAT MOULTON</td>
<td>Sub-division of garden at 1 High Green, Great Moulton</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2011/1668/RVC</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Gable Farm, Carr Lane, Poringland</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2011/1860/F</td>
<td>TACOLNESTON</td>
<td>Land rear of 23 &amp; 25 Norwich Road, off New Road, Tacolneston</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2011/1882/F</td>
<td>BROOME</td>
<td>Land adj. 184 Yarmouth Road, Broome</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2011/1905/F</td>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>The Hollies, Brick Kiln Lane, Morningthorpe</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2011/1906/LB</td>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>The Hollies, Brick Kiln Lane, Morningthorpe</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2011/1931/F</td>
<td>SWAINSTHORPE</td>
<td>Sub-division of garden at 6 Church Close, Swainsthorpe</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2011/1934/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land adj. 26 Northfield Gardens, Wymondham</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2011/2070/F</td>
<td>BARFORD</td>
<td>Caravans at Mud Walls Farm, Watton Road, Barford</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2011/2079/H</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>8 St Andrews Close, Poringland</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Sites Sub-Committee;

Please note that the Sub-Committee will only meet if a site visit is agreed by the Committee. If required, the site visit will take place on **Wednesday 29 February 2012** with membership to be confirmed.

8. Planning Appeals (for information) (attached – page 78)
## Details of Planning Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservative Councillor</th>
<th>Accreditation Expiry Date</th>
<th>Liberal Democrat Councillor</th>
<th>Accreditation Expiry Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>25/10/12</td>
<td>P Allen</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Bills</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td>V Bell</td>
<td>4/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Blake</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td>T East</td>
<td>20/09/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Blowfield</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td>J Hardinge</td>
<td>25/10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Dale</td>
<td>08/11/12</td>
<td>M Gray</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Dewsbury</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td>T Lewis</td>
<td>25/10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Edney</td>
<td>4/07/12</td>
<td>G Watt</td>
<td>22/09/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Ellis</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Foulger</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Goldson</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Gould</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Herbert</td>
<td>20/09/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Hornby</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Kemp</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Kemp</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Kiddie</td>
<td>20/09/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Legg</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Mooney</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Neal</td>
<td>08/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Overton</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Palmer</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Pond</td>
<td>22/09/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Riches</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Savage</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Savage</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Spratt</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Thomson</td>
<td>08/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Tilcock</td>
<td>08/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Walden</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Ward</td>
<td>8/03/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Webster</td>
<td>25/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Wheatley</td>
<td>4/07/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Wilby</td>
<td>08/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Wilby</td>
<td>08/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Councillor</th>
<th>Accreditation Expiry Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K Weeks</td>
<td>4/07/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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;
- Member consideration/decision.

GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

The following suggested guidelines are put forward to assist Members in providing a context in which 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/relationships between site boundaries/existing buildings are difficult to envisage other than by site assessment;

(ii) The impacts of new proposals on neighbour amenity eg shadowing, loss of light, physical impact of structure etc, 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, eg 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.
AGENDA ITEM 3

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

When declaring an interest at a meeting Members are asked to indicate whether the interest is a personal one only or one which is also prejudicial. The declaration should indicate the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which it relates. In the case of a personal interest, the member may speak and vote. If it is a prejudicial interest, a member has the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public but must then withdraw from the meeting. A member can participate fully where the interest is shared with the majority of residents in that particular ward. Members are also requested when appropriate to make any declarations under the Code of Practice on Planning and Judicial matters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is (or should) the Interest be registered in the Register of Members’ Interests?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If not, whose well being or financial position is affected to a greater extent than the majority of other people in the ward?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is (or should) the Interest be registered in the Register of Members’ Interests?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any person or body who has employed or appointed your family member/close associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any firm in which your family member/close associate is a partner or company of which they are directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any company in which your family member/close associate has shares with a face value more than £25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any of the following in which you hold a position of general control or management: outside organisations, other public authorities, charities, pressure groups, political parties or trade unions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the interest:

(a) affect your financial position or the financial position of a person or body described above?  *(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)*

(b) relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or any person or body described above?  *(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)*

(c) relate to scrutiny by the Overview and Scrutiny committee of a decision you were party to?  *(If Yes the interest is prejudicial)*

(d) relate to the functions of the council in respect of housing (except your tenancy), statutory sick pay, an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members, any ceremonial honour given to members, or setting the council tax or a precept under the Local Government Finance Act 1992.  *(If Yes the interest is NOT PREJUDICIAL)*

**PREJUDICIAL INTEREST**

If you answered Yes to (a) or (b) is the interest one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest?  *(If Yes the interest is PREJUDICIAL)*

If you answered Yes to (c) the interest is PREJUDICIAL

If prejudicial do you intend to attend the meeting to make representations, answer questions or give evidence?

FOR GUIDANCE REFER TO THE FLOWCHART OVERLEAF
DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to my interests?
A  Does it affect my entries in the Register of Interests?
   YES
   OR

B  Does it affect the well being or financial position of me, my family or close associates;
    or my family’s or close associates’
    • employment, employers or businesses;
    • companies in which they are a director or where they have a shareholding of more
      than £25,000 face value;
    • business partnerships; or
   YES
   NO

C  Does it affect the well being or financial position of the following organisations in which
    I hold a position of general control or management:
    - other bodies to which I have been appointed or nominated by the
      council;
    - other public authorities;
    - charitable bodies;
    - bodies whose main purpose is to influence public opinion or policy
   MORE THAN THE MAJORITY OF OTHER PEOPLE IN THE WARD?
   YES
   NO

D  Is Overview and Scrutiny considering a decision I made? If so you have a prejudicial
    interest.

Disclose the existence & nature of your interest

Is the interest financial or relating to a regulatory issue e.g. planning permission?

YES

You may have a prejudicial interest

This matter relates to
• housing (except your tenancy)
• statutory sick pay from the council
• an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members
• any ceremonial honour given to members
• setting the council tax or a precept

NO

You have a personal interest in the matter

The interest is not prejudicial you can participate in the meeting and vote

Prejudicial Interest

NO

Would a member of the public – if he or she knew all the facts – reasonably think
that personal interest was so significant that my decision on the matter would be
affected by it?

YES

The interest is prejudicial withdraw from the meeting by leaving the room (after making
representations, answering questions or giving evidence). Do not try to improperly
influence the decision

NO

YES
Enforcement Report

Report of The Development Control Services Manager

1 Enforcement Ref : 2010/8156
Parish : FORNCETT
Site : Mill Grove Farm, Wacton Road, Forncett St Peter
Development : Residential occupation of static caravan
Developer : T & A Plant Ltd

1. Background

1.1 Following the submission of a planning application for the extension of existing buildings, it was noted that a residential static caravan had been sited within the site.

1.2 A subsequent planning application (2011/1947/F) for the retention of the caravan was submitted which set out that the caravan was needed for security reasons and would be occupied by a family member who is also a director of the firm.

1.3 The site is located in a countryside location where National and Local Planning policies seek to restrict new dwellings to those required to enable agricultural, forestry and certain other full time workers to live at or in the immediate vicinity of their place of work. While the protection of property can be a material consideration it is not by itself sufficient to justify a new dwelling. The submitted details did not demonstrate that it was essential for the proper functioning of the enterprise for one or more workers to be readily available at most times and as such the proposal was considered to be contrary to Policies ENV8 and HOU9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and advice in Planning Policy Statement 7 - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas and was refused under Delegated procedures.

2. Planning Policies

2.1 National Planning Guidance
PPS7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

2.2 Joint Core Strategy

Policy 1 : Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2 : Promoting good design
Policy 3 : Smaller rural communities and the countryside

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan

ENV 8 : Development in the open countryside
HOU 9 : Dwellings for other rural enterprises
IMP 8 : Safe and free flow of traffic
IMP 9 : Residential amenity

3. Assessment

3.1 The site is located in an isolated unsustainable countryside location where new dwellings are strictly controlled. The justification submitted with the application related to the need for the accommodation to provide on site security and did not set out any functional needs relating to the operation of the business.
3.2 While I recognise that there may be security issues associated with the site, there are a number of other properties which are in the vicinity of the site and which overlook the yard area and the application also indicated that all the staff live in the local area. In addition, a current application is being considered for additional indoor storage which will improve security of the plant and machinery. The site is also bunded and has a locked, gated access to the highway. I consider that there are other measures which are available to the applicant to secure the site, without having a dwelling on the land.

3.3 While the caravan is partially screened from the wider countryside it is immediately adjacent to a public footpath and is visible from that public viewpoint. I consider that the retention of the caravan introduces a further urbanising feature which is unnecessary and erodes the wider sustainable objectives of Development Plan policies and it is therefore appropriate to take enforcement action.

4. **Recommendation**

4.1 That Authority be granted to secure removal of the caravan and that the period for compliance be determined by the Development Control Manager following a human rights assessment of the occupiers of the caravan.
PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

Report of Director of Development and Environment

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  
AD Certificate of Alternative Development  
CA Conservation Area  
CU Change of Use  
D Reserved Matters  
F Full (details included)  
H Householder – Full application relating to residential property  
C Application to be determined by County Council

G Proposal by Government Department  
HZ Hazardous Substance  
LB Listed Building  
LE Certificate of Lawful Existing development  
LP Certificate of Lawful Proposed development  
O Outline (details reserved for later)  
SU Proposal by Statutory Undertaker

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

S.P. Structure Plan  
S.N.L.P South Norfolk Local Plan  
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).
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

1. **Appl. No**: 2011/1492/O  
   **Parish**: DISS

   **Applicants Name**: Lexham Property Management  
   **Site Address**: Former CartcoTransport Depot, Victoria Road, Diss, IP22 4HZ  
   **Proposal**: Residential development

   **Recommendation**: Approve

   1. Outline permission time limit
   2. All matters reserved
   3. Detailed plans of roads and footways to be submitted prior to commencement of development
   4. Roads, footways and cycle ways to binder course before any dwelling is occupied
   5. Off-site highway works
   6. Landscaping
   7. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment
   8. No built development to be located within flood zones 2 & 3
   9. Contaminated land – assessment to be undertaken
   10. Details of foul and surface water drainage to be submitted and agreed
   11. Masterplan / Design Code to be submitted and agreed prior to approval of any reserved matters. Development shall be within the range of 15 - 25 dph.

Subject to a S106 Legal Agreement requiring contributions towards the provision of off-site older children’s open space, improved education and library facilities, and the provision of a minimum of 33% affordable housing in perpetuity.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 Joint Core Strategy  
   - Policy 2 – Promoting good design  
   - Policy 13 – Main towns

1.2 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   - ENV 3: River valleys  
   - ENV 8: Development in the open countryside  
   - HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes  
   - IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
   - IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2009/2005/O Residential development (outline) Approved

2.2 2009/0949/O Residential development (outline) Refused

2.3 2005/0992 Change of use of part of the site from vehicle hire and sales to B1 office use Approved

2.4 2002/0117 Change of use from HGV parking to overflow parking for staff and fleet hire Approved
First Wednesday Planning Committee  1 February 2012

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1985/1729</td>
<td>Extension to lorry park (subject to S106 legal agreement)</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1982/2490</td>
<td>Change of use to lorry park</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Town Council**

- Original plans
  - Refuse
    - lack of open space
    - insufficient parking
    - concern about proposed access
    - concerns about potential flooding
    - the site is still in use contrary to the assertion in the Design & Access statement

  **Amended design & access statement and plan**
  - Opposed to the principle of residential on the site
  - Location of proposed open space unacceptable as it is located within a flood zone. Its location can only be mitigated by reducing the density
  - Insufficient parking
  - Concerns about traffic exiting onto Victoria Road
  - Still have concerns about potential flooding from Frenze Beck
  - The amendments in no way alleviate the Town Council’s concerns about the very inadequate onsite car parking provision

3.2 **District Member**

Mr K Kiddie: To be determined by planning committee.

3.3 **NCC Highways**

- No objection
  - Subject to suitable conditions, including requiring off-site highway works to provide a right hand turn lane.

3.4 **Environment Agency**

- No objection, subject to
  - the mitigation measures outlined in the FRA being carried out
  - a buffer zone to the watercourse should be submitted and agreed
  - a scheme of pollution control to be agreed
  - contaminated land assessment undertaken

3.5 **Mid Suffolk District Council**

- No objection

3.6 **NCC: Planning Obligations Co-Ordinator**

- Financial obligations towards improved education facilities and libraries will be required via a S106 legal agreement. A table and formula will be used to calculate the amount of monies required, based on the number and type of dwellings put forward under a reserved matters submission.

3.7 **Environmental Services (Protection)**

- No objection
3.8 Landscape Officer : None received.

3.9 SNC: Economic Development : No objection to the site being used for housing. There is a sufficient supply of employment land in Diss without this site.

3.10 Local Residents : 1 letter of objection received:
• potential flooding issues
• town is already overrun with rented properties
• traffic pollution will impact on local residents
• loss of privacy

4. Assessment

4.1 This 0.8-hectare site straddles the development boundary at the eastern entrance to the town. The current commercial use of the site, and its previous use as a lorry park, has resulted in the majority of the site being hard surfaced. The existing buildings are contained in part of the site within the development boundary and comprise a commercial shed and a two-storey office block (currently used by an insurance company). The majority of the site was last used as a transport depot in the late 1990’s, although since this time it appears to have been in use in connection with the overnight parking of vehicles and storage. In 2010, the applicant’s obligation to use part of the site as a lorry park was discharged.

4.2 The predominant surrounding land use on entering the town is that of commercial, although the character soon changes to a more mixed use with residential dwellings fronting onto both Victoria Road and Stuston Road. The southern boundary of the site is largely defined by the River Waveney, which also forms the district boundary with Mid-Suffolk.

4.3 A large portion of the application site inside the development boundary lies within a Flood Zone 2 (medium risk) area. The site is also adjacent Flood Zone 3 (high risk). This application now proposes development within these flood zones, however the Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the application includes mitigation measures involving remodelling of the land, effectively re-aligning the limits of the flood zones. Taking this into account, all development is still proposed outside of Flood Zones 2 & 3 (as amended).

4.4 In March 2010 outline permission was granted for residential development on the vast majority of the site subject to this application. Effectively, this application seeks consent for an enlarged residential development area that includes the two properties, nos. 41 and 43 Victoria Road. The application is in outline only, with all detail matters except access reserved. Indicative plans have been submitted with the application that show a two / three-storey development outside the re-aligned flood zone, and partially outside the development boundary. (Approx. 1/5th of the development is shown beyond the existing development boundary.)

4.5 As the application is in outline only, the main issues for consideration are:
• The principle of residential development on this enlarged site, and;
• Access and highway impact.

Principle of development

4.6 South Norfolk Local Plan Policy ENV8 restricts development (including housing) to within defined limits of towns and villages, and in this case, residential development should only be considered for the 60% approx. of the site within the development boundary. However, the applicants have suggested that some development could be accommodated outside the development boundary, on an area of land already laid to hard-standing, in connection with the commercial operation of the site. Although this application does not seek to agree siting or design, I feel that a small amount of development of the hardstanding area outside the development boundary could be acceptable, subject to later consideration of design, scale and siting.
4.7 This application also includes a proposal to re-align the flood zones adjoining the river Waveney through the re-modelling of the land, and this scheme has been agreed with the Environment Agency who raise no objection to the application. Suitable conditions can be placed on any approval that will ensure that the scheme is carried out in accordance with the agreed mitigation measures outlined within the applicant’s Flood Risk Assessment. The proposal will therefore comply with the requirements of Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy in this regard.

Indicative design & layout

4.8 Although only indicative and not for determination at this stage, the applicants have submitted a basic Masterplan and a design and access statement that assess the scheme against the 20 criteria of the Building for Life checklist (as required by JCS Policy 2). The Design Officer is satisfied that the submitted information and draft Masterplan demonstrates a commitment to achieving the required Building for Life score when a submission of reserved matters is made.

4.9 Taking into account the developable area outside the flood zone (approx. 0.6 hectares), a development of 30 dwellings equates to a density of 50 dwellings per hectare. I consider this to be inappropriate for this site, and, taking into account the concerns raised by the Town Council, I would recommend that a condition be attached to any approval restricting the density of the site to between 15 and 25 dwellings per hectare. Given the prominence of this site, I feel it appropriate that should this outline application be approved, a Masterplan / Design Framework be submitted and agreed before the submission of any detailed reserved matters. This can be required by condition.

Access & highway impact

4.10 Although access matters are reserved, the applicant has indicated that access would be via the existing access point, but with the addition of a dedicated right hand turn lane, and a 3-metre wide cycleway/footway between the site and Rose Lane. These off-site highway works can be required by condition, and on this basis, NCC: Highways raise no objection to the scheme.

4.11 I note the comments of the Town Council, however I can see no material reasons of such weight as to disagree with the view of NCC: Highways, and, subject to the provision of the off-site highway works outlined above, I consider the proposal to accord with local plan policy IMP8 (Safe & Free Flow of Traffic).

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The residential development of the site within the development boundary, and, outside of Flood Zones 2 & 3 (as amended), is acceptable in principle and accords with policy HOU4 of the South Norfolk Local Plan, and Policy 13 of the Joint Core Strategy, and national Planning Policy Statement PPS25 (Development & Flooding).

5.2 The proposed development of the hard-surfaced area outside the development boundary would not cause any additional harm to the character and appearance of this river valley area, and in my view would not be contrary to local plan policy ENV3. This element of the proposal can therefore be allowed as a slight departure from normal planning policy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Gary Hancox, 01508 533841, ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other applications

2. **Appl. No** : 2011/1518/F  
**Parish** : GREAT MOULTON

Applicants Name : Mr Roger Burrows  
Site Address : Land at Little Orchard, Woodrow Lane, Great Moulton, NR15 2DR  
Proposal : Development of land at Great Moulton to provide 3 new 3 bedroom chalet dwellings with a double garage to each property and a double garage to the existing property Little Orchard.

Recommendation : Refuse

1. Contrary to JCS Policy 2 and SNLP Policy IMP8 due to overdevelopment of site, intensification of use of substandard access and out of character with surrounding properties.
2. Overbearing impact on property to south - contrary to policy IMP9

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 15: Service Villages

1.2 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
HOU 7: Development within defined boundaries of small villages

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2003/0122 Renewal of permission 1998/0088/D for the erection of bungalow and garage  
Approved

2.2 1998/0088 Renewal of permission 1993/0101 for the erection of bungalow and garage  
Approved

2.3 1993/0101 Erection of bungalow and garage  
Approved

2.4 1989/2125 Erection of single storey dwelling and double garage  
Approved

2.5 1989/1615 Erection of one dwelling and garage with shared access to Little Orchard  
Refused

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council : Refuse  
- The proposal represents an over intensification of use for the site and is out of keeping with the location  
- Access onto the road is already poor and further dwellings on the site would constitute a significant hazard

3.2 District Member : To be determined by Committee  
- Design in keeping with surrounding area  
- Need for new properties such as these in Great Moulton
3.3 NCC Highways: Highway concerns with the application as submitted
- The site has access constraints from either direction. A reduction to two additional units would therefore be favoured to reduce the number of additional vehicle movements from the site.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection): No objections
- Informatives recommended relating to contamination, surface water drainage and control of nuisances.

3.5 Local Residents: 1 letter of objection to revised plans
- The proposed changes to the application are not very significant and will make no difference to the effect the proposal will have on the neighbouring properties.
- Our original objection still applies.

- 3 letters of objection to plans as originally submitted
  - Overdevelopment of site.
  - The proposed dwellings are not in keeping with the surrounding area being chalet properties and not traditional bungalows with virtually no garden whereas all properties in the vicinity have very good sized gardens.
  - The proposed driveway from this lodge shown on the site plan is a drainage ditch which is a part of the land belonging to Copper Beech. Any development to Little Orchard should be the west of the boundary trees which were established when we bought this site 35 years ago.
  - Will be overlooked from the property ‘Type A’ proposed on the site of Little Orchard because it will overlook our property and adversely affect the resale value.
  - Chalet properties will also overlook the rear garden of No7A Station Road removing the privacy of their small rear garden.
  - The existing pedestrian and vehicular access to the highway shown on the site plan is solely for Copper Beech, the existing driveway for Little Orchard is to the west side of the boundary trees.

4. Assessment

4.1 The proposal is for a site within the development boundaries of Great Moulton. The site consists of two parts, the garden of Little Orchard and a grassed area to the south of Little Orchard. There is no objection in principle to residential development on the site which has previously had consent for the erection of a bungalow; however there are a number of concerns relating to the level and nature of development being appropriate to the site and its surroundings. Revised plans have been submitted to try and address some of the more detailed concerns, but do not address the more fundamental concerns relating to the development of the site with buildings with first floor accommodation and the number of dwellings proposed.

4.2 The nature of the surrounding area currently consists of bungalows closest to Station Road with larger houses to the rear. The proposed development would be within the area currently comprising of single storey dwellings. The proposal to introduce chalet-style properties therefore raises a concern about the impact on the character of this area. It is also considered that the desire of the applicant to develop the site with three additional units is overdevelopment of the site, particularly in the context of the two additional units to the south of Little Orchard resulting in very restricted amenity space and a cramped form of development.
4.3 Norfolk County Council’s highways officer has also raised concerns with the level of development proposed. Currently, the property at Little Orchard is served from the entrance sited north-east of the property on Woodrow Lane with The Lodge being served via the long drive from Station Road. The proposed development seeks to swap this arrangement, with the additional three units also being accessed from Station Road resulting in a total of four dwellings using this access. The access is located only 30 metres from the 90 degree bend leading from Woodrow Lane and the junction with Sneath Road. Visibility from the entrance is available from the minimum set back distance of 2 metres, but not at the set back of 2.5 metres as recommended in Manual for Streets. With vehicle speeds around the bend being low at 20mph, the level of visibility meets the appropriate standard of 25 metres although vehicles turning out of the entrance would have little warning of a vehicle approaching. It is therefore recommended that a reduction in the scale of the development is considered to reduce the intensification of this constrained access.

4.4 The introduction of first floor accommodation into such a location also has the potential to introduce overlooking of private amenity space where none existed previously. As initially proposed, the properties on the land to the south of Little Orchard would have introduced direct overlooking over the previously entirely private amenity space of No7A Station Road to the south. The revised plans do now angle the first floor window to minimise overlooking. It is accepted that this largely removes the concern of overlooking on the private amenity space of this property, although it does result in adverse impact on the appearance of the building. Nonetheless, the height of a building with first floor accommodation does result in an overbearing impact on No7A due to its proximity to the boundary as a consequence it is considered that the proposal is contrary to policy IMP9.

4.5 It is therefore accepted that the site could accommodate additional development, potentially including a bungalow adjacent to Little Orchard and another on the land south of Little Orchard, and that this is likely to be acceptable in highway terms. The applicant was requested to amend the plans in this way but wishes for the application to be determined as originally submitted. However, the scheme as proposed involves overdevelopment of the site which is out of character and is likely to result in an unacceptable increase in usage of the access onto Station Road with an overbearing impact on No7A Station Road and therefore the scheme is recommended for refusal.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the adopted Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan including, in particular, Policy 2 (Promoting good design) of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP8 (Safe and free flow of traffic) as the proposed development would result in overdevelopment of the site and an unacceptable intensification of a substandard access due to the number of dwellings proposed whose chalet-style nature would also be out of character with the adjoining bungalows.

5.2 In addition, the proposed development is considered contrary to Policy IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan due to the overbearing impact of the proposed dwellings to the south of Little Orchard on the amenities of No7A Station Road.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number
and E-mail: Tim Barker, 01508 533801, tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3. **Appl. No**: 2011/1651/F  
**Parish**: GREAT MOULTON

Applicants Name: Mr Stefan Kent-Webb  
Site Address: Sub-division of garden at 1 High Green, Great Moulton  
Proposal: Proposed Detached Dwelling to the side of no. 1 High Green, Gt. Moulton.

**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions

1. Planning Permission Time Limit
2. In accordance with amended drawings
3. No PD for Classes ABCDE & G
4. External materials to be agreed
5. Foul drainage to main sewer
6. New Access - Construction over verge
7. Access Gates
8. Provision of Visibility Splays
9. Provision of parking area

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 15: Service Villages

1.2 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 7: Development within defined boundaries of small villages  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2004/0809 Proposed erection of 2no semi-detached dwellings with garage to rear  
Refused

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: Refuse  
- The proposal represents an over intensification of use for the site  
- There will be considerable visual impact on the village scene and will ruin the balance of the traditional 1920’s art and crafts development  
- Access onto the road is already poor and further dwellings on the site would constitute a significant hazard

3.2 District Member: Can be delegated

3.3 NCC Highways: Conditional support

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection): Conditional support  
- If CNC Building Control are satisfied that the proposed soakaway is sufficient, we have no objection
3.5 Local Residents : 1 letter of objection

- We have been granted the right to cross the land of 1 High Green for maintenance of our sewer. The proposed subdivision of the property will cut off our access to our sewer.
- The immediate surrounding properties on Hallowing Lane and Heather Way are all bungalows, a two storey house in this position will be out of keeping with the surrounding vicinity; further, the layout proposed site makes the area look overcrowded in comparison with surrounding properties.
- The first floor rear window would result in a loss of our privacy by overlooking our rear and front gardens.
- The relative proximity of the proposed two storey dwelling to our bungalow (which lies due north of the proposed house) would result in our rear garden (and front garden) suffering from being shaded from the sun in Winter months.
- With Hallowing Lane being heavily used by pedestrians we are very concerned about the safety of the proposed position of the new driveway for 1 High Green which will exit onto Hallowing Lane very close to the junction with High Green.

4. Assessment

4.1 The application is for the development on land to the side of No1 High Green to form one new dwelling which it is proposed to be of a style reflecting the design of the original dwelling. The site falls within the development boundaries for Great Moulton and therefore the principle of development is acceptable under Policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy, subject to considerations such as the design and the impact on neighbouring properties.

4.2 Concern has been raised by the Parish Council that the development constitutes overdevelopment of the site and that it would harm the setting of the original dwellings. Whilst it is acknowledged that the existing pattern of development does give the impression that the plot is restricted, it in fact measures 12 metres in width at the narrowest point where the dwelling is proposed. There are numerous examples in the surrounding area of similar or narrower plot widths and therefore a plot width of this size is not considered out of character for the area. However, given the nature of the plot and in particular the restricted rear garden area, it is recommended that permitted development rights should be removed. The visualisations provided by the applicant also demonstrate that the proposed dwelling integrates well into the streetscene when viewed from High Green. The elevation facing onto Hallowing Lane would be similar to the existing, although it is accepted that the new dwelling would be more prominent than the original, protruding to a similar level as the bungalow to the north. Taking into account the positioning of the bungalow and the size of the plot, it is considered on balance that a new dwelling in this location is acceptable and that the proposed design reflecting the original dwelling is the most appropriate design solution.

4.3 Concerns have also been raised about the impact on the neighbouring bungalow to the rear in respect of overlooking and overshadowing. In terms of overshadowing, the distance to the boundary and orientation of the properties is such that the majority of any additional overshadowing would be on the garage block. There would be negligible difference to any windows to habitable rooms. In regard to overlooking, it is accepted that the first floor rear window would overlook part of the rear garden of the neighbouring property, however it is considered that its impact will be considerably less than that of the first floor window of the existing dwelling which directly overlooks the rear garden of this property. Concern was also raised about access for maintenance of the sewer. The applicant has responded to note that the proposed dwelling will not adversely affect this right of access, which in any case is not a planning issue as such.
4.4 The development has been designed so that the existing access and parking provision will be for the new dwelling, with a new access and parking to the front of the dwellings provided for the existing dwelling. Some concerns have been raised about the highway safety implications of the new access which is close to the junction of High Green and Hallowing Lane. However, Norfolk County Council as the highway authority raise no objections to the proposed access and parking layout and therefore it is not considered that a refusal of planning permission could be sustained on highway safety grounds.

4.5 Drainage is recognised as particular issue of concern in Great Moulton and therefore the applicant was required to submit drainage information as part o the application. Environmental Services have no objection to the information submitted provided CNC Building Control also being satisfied that the proposed soakaway is sufficient.

4.6 Amended plans have been provided to correct some anomalies with the original drawings and to add some detailing onto the elevation facing Hallowing Lane. Overall it is considered that in terms of its design and impact on neighbouring properties, the proposed development is acceptable and is recommended for approval.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 15 (Service Villages) of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy HOU7 (Development within defined boundaries of small villages) of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the proposed development would be in keeping with the form and character of the village and its settings.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker, 01508 533801, tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No** : 2011/1668/RVC  
**Parish** : Poringland  

Applicants Name : D & W Properties Ltd  
Site Address : Gable Farm, Carr Lane, Poringland  
Proposal : Variation of Conditions 2 & 4 on planning permission 2011/0942/RVC - amended plans and revised access details omitting planting to frontage and substitute fence to wall and retain lean-to store extension to workshop.

Recommendation : Approve with Conditions

1. **Conditions on 2011/0942 still apply**

1. **Planning History**

1.1 2011/0942 Variation of conditions 2, 5 & 6 on planning permission 2011/0621 – repositioning of workshop / garage, alterations to fenestration of workshop / garage, amendments to access and turning area to workshop / garage  

Approved

1.2 2011/0621 Sub-division of existing curtilage and erection of 5 dwellings and ancillary works including demolition of existing garage  

Approved

1.3 2011/0283 Sub-division of existing curtilage and erection of 6 dwellings and ancillary works including demolition of existing garage  

Refused

2. **Consultations**

2.1 Parish Council : Refuse  
- It is intrusive on the streetscene and out of keeping with rural Carr Lane

2.2 District Members  
Ms L S Neal : To be reported if appropriate  
Mr J Overton : To be reported if appropriate

2.3 NCC Highways : No objection to the wall  
- Our road records indicate that there was a minimum 2.3m highway verge across the frontage of this site prior to the erection of the wall and it is unacceptable that a hedge would now be planted in the highway  
- In addition, the vehicle access to Gable Farm was allowed on the basis of a 39m x 2m x 39m visibility splay that would be provided and it is considered that the planting of a hedge in the position shown will eventually compromise that provision  
- For these reasons, the hedge will be removed

2.4 Landscape Officer : Object  
- The previously agreed scheme is intended to complement the presently rural character of Carr Lane

2.5 Local Residents : No response received
3. **Assessment**

3.1 The application is for the retention of a wall along the Carr Lane frontage of new residential development within the curtilage of Gable Farm. The approved plans for this boundary were for a fence with a hedge to be planted in front. The fence and hedge had been agreed to allow the continuation of an existing hedge along Carr Lane across the site frontage.

3.2 The Council's Landscape Officer and the Parish Council have both raised an objection to this application on the grounds that the proposed hedge would be more suitable to the rural character of Carr Lane. The applicant had attempted to address these concerns by planting a hedge in front of the wall. However, Norfolk County Council as the Highway Authority have advised that the hedge as planted infringes onto highway land and would obstruct visibility from the access to Gable Farm. Given the position of the wall as built, it is unlikely that a hedge could be planted satisfactorily in front of the wall without raising an objection from the Highway Authority. It therefore needs to be considered whether the wall as built without any hedge planting in front forms an acceptable form of boundary treatment, notwithstanding the agreed scheme for a fence and hedge.

3.3 Prior to the development of the site, the boundary with Gable Farm consisted of a close boarded fence which was not an attractive frontage on to Carr Lane and was not of a particularly rural nature. It should also be noted that the character of this section of Carr Lane has changed and will continue to change as a result of the large residential allocation both to the north and the south of the road with most of the residential development immediately to the north of the road now nearing completion and a planning application currently under consideration for the allocation to the south. This allocation will also involve the spine road of the new residential development crossing Carr Lane almost immediately adjacent to where the wall has been constructed. In the context of this, it is not considered that a refusal based on preserving the rural character of this section of Carr Lane by insisting on the demolition of the wall and the planting of a hedge could be sustained. The wall is considered visually acceptable and a considerable improvement on the fence that previously existed in this location. Given these considerations, the retention of the wall is recommended for approval.

3.4 The application also relates to a small store for the oil tank which takes the form of a lean-to extension to the workshop. Although close to the boundary, the store is of such a small scale as to have little impact on the streetscene and does not have an adverse impact on the character of the development and therefore is considered acceptable.

4. **Reasons for Approval**

4.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy as the wall is considered to be of an acceptable design which relates well to the approved development and would not have an unacceptable impact on the character of Carr Lane when taking into account the routing of the proposed spine road.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker, 01508 533801, tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No**: 2011/1860/F  
**Parish**: TACOLNESTON  
**Applicants Name**: The Realty Business  
**Site Address**: Land rear of 23 & 25 Norwich Road, off New Road, Tacolneston, NR16 1DD  
**Proposal**: Erection of 2 houses and garages and ancillary works  
**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**
   1.1 **Joint Core Strategy**
   - Policy 2 Promoting Good Design  
   - Policy 3 Energy and Water  

   1.2 **South Norfolk Local Plan**
   - HOU7 Development within Defined Boundaries of Small Villages  
   - IMP2 Landscaping  
   - IMP8 Safe and Free Flow of Traffic  
   - IMP9 Residential Amenities

2. **Planning History**
   2.1 2010/0195 Proposed erection of dwelling Approved  
   2.2 2009/1700 Erection of one dwelling Withdrawn

3. **Consultations**
   3.1 Parish Council: Approve  
   3.2 District Member: To be reported if appropriate  
   3.3 NCC Highways: Support conditionally
   - Any access gates etc to be set back 5 metres from carriageway edge  
   - Parking and turning as shown on plan
   3.4 Environmental Services: Support subject to appropriate disposal of surface water  
   3.5 Local Residents: 7 letters of objection received
   - Loss of light and privacy windows in the rear and side elevations would overlook the rear and side of Ka’anapali and other neighbouring properties.
   - Residents choose to live in a rural village without good transport links, doctors etc if further development goes ahead residents may as well be living in an estate in town.
• Dwellings out of keeping with the size of plots
• Neighbours would not object if a bungalow was sought for this plot.
• House adjacent to Ka’anapali is not of lower chalet design and therefore there will be more loss of light to property and garden.
• Residents opposite will feel totally overshadowed by development.
• Houses will appear imposing and result in loss of privacy to properties opposite
• Problems with parking on New Road since the Abel development (McKee Drive) obstructing the pavement. School pick up point at junction of New Road/Norwich Road further development will make the situation worse, and increasing the risk to pedestrians and traffic.
• Concerns raised previously to a precedent being set by permission being granted for one dwelling. Assurance given that when outline permission granted that the rear gardens of adjacent properties to number 23 would not be developed.
• Villages feel that no further development is appropriate and that housing density too high
• Area already suffers from temporary surface water flooding in the winter months, any loss of grass soil hedges etc would increase the run off from the site increasing the risk of flooding.
• Environmental Impact Assessment incorrectly states that there are no hazardous or toxic substances present. There is an existing garage on the site which has an asbestos roofing material which will require expert removal and disposal.
• Loss of value to The Vineries making it much more difficult to sell.
• Loss of vista, skyline will be completely lost from the Vineries by the new development.
• The hedge along the highway boundary is a haven for butterflies, birds and the common lizard, which have been recorded over the years, what guarantee does SNDC planning give that the hedge will stay in its original for?

2 letters of support – each part owner of the adjacent site 23 & 25 Norwich Road.

1 Letter not objecting in principle, but raising issue of surface water disposal and the suitability of soakaways.

2 Further letters received raising questions over accuracy of percolation test results submitted, and the adequacy of using soakaways on this site.

4. Assessment

4.1 The site is within the Development Limits of Tacolneston, and currently forms part of the rear garden of No23 and 25 Norwich Road running parallel to New Road. No 23 and 25 are two storey semi-detached properties with the front elevation facing onto Norwich Road. The vehicular access to the site is off New Road which also serves as vehicular access to No 23. The site is adjacent to McKee Drive, which is comprised of 24 two storey dwellings, some of which face New Road. The Design and Access Statement included the provision of solar panels, however, these are no longer included as part of the scheme and deleted from the elevation plans. The scheme includes the provision of Air Source Heat Pumps situated to the rear of the proposed dwellings, and includes the provision of 2,500 litre rain water harvesting tanks on each plot.

4.2 A previous outline application for one dwelling in the garden of No 23 was approved under the 2010 reference number; the access arrangements were approved and remain unaltered for the current proposal.

4.3 Concern has been raised by neighbours to the principle of the development of the site. However, as already stated the site is within the Village Boundary and benefits from extant outline permission, therefore the principle to develop the plot is acceptable.
4.4 The current scheme includes part of the rear garden of no 25 which allows for deeper plots providing space for garaging, parking and turning area within the site. The only trees to be removed to facilitate the scheme are fruit trees which are not considered to provide any landscape importance to the area and could be removed by the owner without the need for permission. Both the proposed dwellings are two storeys, and take into account the scale of the adjacent development of McKee Drive, and the existing properties on Norwich Road.

4.5 The proposed house adjacent to Ka’anapail (on McKee Drive) on the west boundary has been designed to match the eaves and ridge height of the existing property. The proposed dwelling on Plot 1 closer to No 23 Norwich Road is designed with a lower eaves and ridge to reflect the scale of No23 and be more in keeping with the appearance of the overall street scene.

4.6 The garage to serve both properties is set between the two dwellings with a pyramid roof. The eaves height of the garage is 2.3 metres with the highest part of the roof measuring 4.8 metres.

4.7 As part of the scheme, the boundary treatment of the site is proposed to erect/retain a 2.1 metre close board fence along the boundaries of McKee Drive, 27 Norwich Road and nos 23 & 25 Norwich Road. In addition, some sections of Beech hedging will be planted to provide additional boundary treatment.

4.8 The hedge along the highway boundary contributes to the overall character of the street scene. The previous scheme for one dwelling required this hedge to be retained. I suggest it is necessary to retain this hedge for the proposed development to retain its contribution to the character of the street.

4.9 Concern has been raised by the neighbours to the loss of privacy from first floor windows.

4.10 The property proposed for plot 2 includes two side facing windows at ground floor level which serve a WC and utility room, with a side facing first floor window which serves a bathroom. In the rear elevation the window closest to the boundary serves an en-suite, but does include a bedroom window which will result in some overlooking to the rear garden of Ka’anapali and other properties on Norwich Road. However, I do not consider this loss of privacy so significant to justify refusal, particularly as the area is already overlooked by existing first floor windows.

4.11 The windows in the rear elevation of Plot 1 (adjacent to 23 Norwich Road) are restricted to three velux roof lights to serve an en-suite, a bedroom and the stairwell, the two high panel ground floor windows serve a dining area and the living room.

4.12 Although concerns have been raised by neighbours about the loss of privacy to the rear gardens of Norwich Road residents, I consider that due to the orientation of nos 23 and 25 these already overlook the rear gardens of these properties, and the proposed development does not result is any additional loss of privacy to such a degree as to justify refusal.

4.13 As with the previous application, issues relating to the increase in highway danger are raised. Photos have been provided by one of the residents of vehicles parked on the pavement outside the application site and the neighbouring properties which results in hazard for pedestrians and other road users alike. The junction of New Road & Norwich Road is a school pick up point for 3 Wymondham schools. The proposed development will increase the level of traffic movements close to the junction which local residents feel will result in increased safety issues for school children. However, the increase in traffic movement will be modest and no objections have been received from the Highways Officer on these grounds. Subject to the recommended conditions, Highways support the proposal. In the absence of a Highway objection I do not consider there are any grounds to refuse the scheme on highway safety issues. I therefore consider that the proposal accords with the principles of policy IMP8.
Environmental Services have noted that no details have been submitted at this time to
demonstrate the suitability of the site for soakaways as a method of surface water disposal.
These have now been received from the agent. CNC Building Control have commented that,
provided the soakaways are constructed in accordance with the report in addition to the rain
water harvesting system proposed, then they will be appropriate for the site. This comment
remains disputed by the neighbours. However, this issue for the disposal of surface water is a
matter for Building Control.

5. Reasons for approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk
Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the
Joint Core Strategy and Policies HOU7, IMP2, IMP8 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

The siting and design of the proposed dwellings is appropriate for the size of the plot, is
considered to be in keeping with the character of the street scene, and to have minimal impact
on the neighbouring properties. The position of the access is acceptable in terms of highway
safety, and there is adequate space on the site to provide parking and turning for both
properties, and the existing dwelling of No 23 Norwich Road. The scheme as submitted
therefore accords with the principles of the above policies.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number         Jacqui Jackson, 01508 533837,
and E-mail:                              jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2011/1882/F  
**Parish**: BROOME

Applicants Name: Mr T Linehan  
Site Address: Land adj. 184 Yarmouth Road, Broome  
Proposal: Erection of two bedroom bungalow

Recommendation: Approve with conditions

1. **Full - Planning Permission Time Limit**
2. In accordance with submitted amendments
3. External materials to be agreed
4. Slab level and finished floor levels as per amended plan
5. No PD for Classes ABCDE & G
6. Boundary treatment to be agreed
7. Provision of Parking and Servicing Areas
8. Foul drainage to main sewer
9. Details of Surface Water
10. Water efficiency measures – code level 4

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National policy  

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: energy and water  
Policy 15: Service Villages  
Policy 20: Implementation and monitoring

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU6: Development within the defined development limits of specified large villages  
IMP8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2009/1940 Erection of detached dwelling  
Refused  
Dismissed on Appeal – copy of decision attached as Appendix 2

2.2 2008/2462 Erection of 3 bedroom bungalow  
Withdrawn

2.3 2007/0638 Erection of 1 no. two storey dwelling and proposed access for existing  
(Note – relates to adjacent site)  
Refused

2.4 1989/1858 Demolition of building and erection of bungalow  
Refused

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: Refuse  
- believes previous reasons for refusal still apply, in particular the appearance as recognised by the appeal decision of previous application and flooding problems as highlighted during current extension of mains sewage work in the vicinity
3.2 District Member : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : No objections
   • note layout and car parking and turning arrangements is an improvement over the layout submitted for 2009/1940 and is therefore considered satisfactory
   Condition – turning/parking as per plans

3.4 Environment Agency : No objection
   • note plans show bungalow to be outside Flood Zone 2
   • advice given re ground levels data and given proximity of site to flood Zone 2, advise topographical survey is undertaken to establish finish floor levels, to reduce flood risk to the site and preferably keep the building dry

3.5 Anglian Water Services Ltd : No comments received

3.6 Waveney Valley Internal Drainage Board : No comments received

3.7 Local Residents : 1 letter of objection
   • loss of privacy and enjoyment of garden
   • loss of landscape views
   • concerns about noise, inconsiderate parking, problems caused by other users of the lane
   1 letter of support

4. Assessment

4.1 This application relates to a site on the south east side of Yarmouth Road in Broome. It is proposed to demolish an existing single storey building on the site and replace this with a modest two bedroom single storey dwelling. The site is located just within the development boundary of Broome. As such there would be a presumption in favour of development in accordance with policy 15 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (JCS) and policy HOU6 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) provided that such development would be in keeping with the form and character of the village and its setting. The site is located with Flood Zone 1 but is adjacent to Flood Zone 2.

4.2 As can be seen from the history section above there have been a number of applications refused on the site, the last application being in 2010 (2009/1940) and subsequently dismissed on appeal. A copy of the appeal decision is attached as appendix 2. The Council refused the application on the following grounds: form of development would not be in keeping with the character of the area; the scale and siting of the dwelling resulted in overdevelopment and lack of off-site parking and insufficient foul and surface water drainage information. It should also be noted this proposal was for a two storey dwelling.

4.3 The Planning Inspector also dismissed the proposal and like the Council accepted the principle of development could not be ruled out but noted as the site is almost on the boundary of the development area and beyond the built up frontage it occupies a prominent location. The Inspector concluded that a two storey dwelling, on such a limited plot would have an unacceptably cramped appearance. He made reference to the single storey rural building on the site, of a style commonly found in rural areas and as the proposed dwelling was larger its visual impact would be significantly greater and thus would detract from the character of the village and its setting. The Planning Inspector considered the on-site parking issues could be addressed and did not feel drainage was an issue and noted at this time the Environment Agency had not objected. He was satisfied drainage issues could be dealt with by conditions.
4.4 Clearly this appeal decision is a material consideration in determining any future applications on the site. It should also be noted that since this decision Broome’s new sewage pumping station is located adjacent to the site, which this scheme will directly link to.

4.5 This site has never been easy to develop or even to suggest a way forward. Following the appeal it was suggested the only form of development that may be considered acceptable would be to convert and extend the existing building, which would address the visual impact of any further development on this prominent site. This was initially pursued by the applicant but it became apparent the existing building was not suitable for conversion and thus the scheme is to replace this building with a single storey building, based on the height and proportions of the building to be demolished. The dwelling is very modest in scale and due to the flood restrictions on the site has been positioned to be within Flood Zone 1. The Environment Agency has not raised any objections to the proposal and as advised the applicant has carried out a topographical survey to establish finished floor levels.

4.6 I am satisfied, having taken into account, the appeal decision that this proposal which although greater in scale than the building to be demolished, is significantly reduced in scale to the appeal proposal and will not cause unacceptable harm to the area’s character and appearance. As such it will not detract from the character of the village and accords with policy 2 and 15 of the JCS and policy HOU6 of the SNLP.

4.7 County Highways have not raised any objections to this proposal and feel the layout, car parking and turning arrangements is an improvement over the previously refused layout. The proposal therefore accords with policy IMP8 of the SNLP and will not endanger highway safety. The concerns of the neighbour are noted but in this instance sufficient off-street parking (2 spaces) is provided within the site.

4.8 Given this is a single storey dwelling I do not consider the proposed dwelling would cause any harm to the adjacent residential property, provided adequate boundary treatment is provided and these details can be agreed by way of a condition. Subject to this condition and the removal of permitted development rights the proposal accords with policy IMP9 of the SNLP and will not have a detrimental impact on residential amenities by loss of privacy. For information, the previously refused two storey dwelling was not refused on neighbour amenity grounds.

4.9 The views of the Parish Council and adjacent neighbour are noted but I feel there is a significant material change in the proposal to now recommend approval for the proposed dwelling which as already stated above will not cause unacceptable visual harm in the locality.

5. Reasons for approval

5.1 The proposed single storey dwelling having taken into account the previous appeal decision is considered to accord with national policy PPS25, policies 2, 3 15 and 20 of the JCS and polices HOU6, IMP8 and IMP9 of the SNLP.

5.2 The proposal is considered to accord with the above policies as the site is located within the development boundary for Broome and has been sited within the plot in Flood Zone 1. The scale of the dwelling now proposed will not detract from the character of the village and its setting, and as such will not harm the area’s character of appearance. The proposal will not harm the amenities of the adjacent residential proposal by loss of privacy. The proposed access, parking and turning arrangements are satisfactory and will not endanger highway safety.
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 September 2010

by John Felgate BA (Hons), MA, MRTP

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

Decision date: 18 October 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/A/10/2128970
Land adjoining 184 Yarmouth Road, Broome, Norfolk NR35 2NZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Reuben Linehan against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
- The application Ref 2009/1940/F, dated 2 December 2009, was refused by notice dated 25 February 2010.
- The development proposed is the erection of a detached dwelling.

Decision
1. I dismiss the appeal.

Preliminary matters
2. In the application, the appeal site’s postal address is given as 184 Yarmouth Road, Broome, Bungay, Suffolk, NR35 2NZ. For local government purposes however, Broome is within the county of Norfolk. At the site visit, it was also established that the site adjoins the curtilage of No 184 Yarmouth Road, but does not form part of that property. For the avoidance of doubt therefore, I have amended the site address, as shown above.
3. Prior to the Council’s decision, the site boundary was amended by the submission of a revised layout plan, dated-stamped 11 January 2010. I have based my decision on the application as thus amended.

Main issues
4. From the submissions before me, the main issues in the appeal are:
   - the proposed development’s effects on the character and appearance of the area;
   - whether the development would provide adequate car parking; and
   - whether the submitted proposals for foul and surface water drainage are acceptable.

Reasons for decision

Character and appearance
5. In the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003, Broome is defined as a large village. Within such settlements, Policy 6 provides that residential development of up to 10 dwellings may be permitted, provided that such development would be in keeping with the form and character of the village and its setting. In
addition, Policy IMP1 requires all development to be of a high standard, and to be in keeping with the surrounding townscape or rural setting.

6. Yarmouth Road is the main village street running through Broome. No 184 is at the northernmost end of the village, and has a large L-shaped curtilage, with its main garden to the rear and some outbuildings to the north side of the house. The appeal site lies mainly to the rear of these outbuildings, with an additional narrow strip returning to Yarmouth Road. On the site’s outer boundary is an unmade track, and beyond this and to the rear is open agricultural land. The site’s stated use is for storing wood in connection with another nearby property.

7. The appeal site is located just within the village limits, where Policy HOU6 applies, and thus residential development is not ruled out in principle. But nevertheless, the site is almost on the boundary of that area, beyond the existing built frontage. As such, it occupies a highly prominent location, particularly in views from the north.

8. The new dwelling now proposed would have an L-shaped footprint, on one and a half storeys, which would fill most of the site, leaving only a shallow garden to the rear, and a narrow margin around its other sides. As a result of these characteristics, it seems to me that the development would have an unacceptably cramped appearance, at odds with its surroundings in this edge-of-village location. This shortcoming would be evident in views from Yarmouth Road, despite the existing buildings to the front of the site. Whilst some landscaping would be possible around the site boundaries and on the strip alongside the track, the scale of planting that could be achieved in these small areas would be unlikely to significantly soften the visual impact of a building of this nature, so close to the settlement edge. I note the appellant’s willingness to carry out additional planting beyond the site boundary, but in such an open landscape this would be likely to give the appearance of extending the development beyond the village boundary and thus encroaching on the surrounding countryside.

9. I appreciate that the proposed dwelling would replace the existing building on the site. But that structure is a former agricultural building, of a style commonly found in rural areas. The new dwelling would be larger, and would be domestic in character. Its visual impact would thus be significantly greater than the existing, and its effect on the countryside more urbanising. I agree that the proposed design would not be unattractive in itself, and I accept that there are other dwellings in the area on backland or side-facing plots, or without a direct road frontage. But none of these are in equally prominent locations on the village edge. And in any event, none of these considerations outweighs the harm that I have identified.

10. I therefore conclude that the development now proposed would detract from the character of the village and its setting, causing unacceptable harm to the area’s character and appearance. In these respects it would conflict with the development plan policies referred to above.

Car parking

11. The submitted plans indicate that one on-site parking space and a small turning area would be provided. Although this is less than would be required to
meet the Council’s standards, it appears that the proposed turning space is not strictly necessary for a single dwelling accessed off a private track, carrying very little other traffic. It therefore seems likely that an alternative parking layout, incorporating two spaces, could be achieved without any increase in hardstanding.

12. In the circumstances, had there been no other overriding issues, I am satisfied that this matter could have been overcome by means of an appropriate condition.

**Drainage**

13. The application proposes that surface water be drained by means of soakaways, and that foul sewage be dealt with by a package treatment plant. With regard to surface water, the Environment Agency (EA) has commented that percolation tests should be undertaken to establish whether soakaways would perform adequately in this location; and if not, alternative proposals should be submitted. Had the EA envisaged the possibility that no satisfactory solution might be feasible, it seems unlikely that it would have made this comment. In my view it is clear from this that the EA envisages no overriding technical obstacle to surface water drainage. Nothing in the EA response suggests that planning permission should be withheld until the percolation tests referred to have been carried out.

14. In the case of foul sewage, I accept that part of the site appears to be within a flood zone 2 area, and that the submitted plans do not show exactly where the proposed treatment plant would be sited. But the majority of the site appears to be in a zone 1 area, and provided the treatment plant were located in that part of the site, it appears that the risk of any flood waters becoming contaminated would be low. Again the EA has commented on the scheme without raising any objection.

15. In the circumstances, I see no reason why these drainage matters could not be dealt with by conditions.

**Other matters and conclusion**

16. I note the appellant's contention that the site is under used and is previously developed land; and that the proposed dwelling would be for his and his wife's own occupation. I also do not doubt the difficulties faced by local people in finding housing in villages such as Broome at an affordable price. However, in my view, none of these matters outweighs the harm that would be caused by the present proposals to the village's character and appearance.

17. I have taken into account all the other matters raised, but I can find nothing else to alter these conclusions. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

*John Felgate*

INSPECTOR
7. **Appl. No**: 2011/1905/F  
**Parish**: HEMPNALL

**Applicants Name**: Mr S Orrick  
**Site Address**: The Hollies, Brick Kiln Lane, Morningthorpe, Norfolk, NR15 2LG  
**Proposal**: Erection of new two storey ten bedroom extension wing with common room and conservatory accommodation

**Recommendation**: Authorise Director of Development and Environment to approve with conditions or refuse in default

1. Full - Planning Permission Time Limit
2. In accordance with submitted amendments
3. External materials to be agreed
4. Specific details to be agreed
5. Slab level for extension
6. Full details of external lighting
7. Contaminated land during construction
8. Details of foul water disposal
9. Surface Water
10. Highway conditions

Subject to the submission of satisfactory amended plans to address the Highway Officers requirements

8. **Appl. No**: 2011/1906/LB  
**Parish**: HEMPNALL

**Applicants Name**: Mr S Orrick  
**Site Address**: The Hollies, Brick Kiln Lane, Morningthorpe, Norfolk, NR15 2LG  
**Proposal**: Erection of new two storey ten bedroom extension wing with common room and conservatory accommodation

**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions

1. Listed Building Time Limit
2. In accordance with submitted amendments
3. External materials to be agreed
4. Specific details to be agreed

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1 – Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2 – Promoting good design

1.2 South Norfolk Local Plan  
EMP 6: Alterations and extensions to existing business premises  
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 **2011/0950 & 2011/0853**: Conversion of existing first floor staff accommodation to form 4 new self contained bedrooms with en-suite facilities and 2 staff bedrooms
2.2 Change of use from 1st floor staff accommodation into 4no en-suite bedrooms with new windows kitchen internal alterations and new side door - Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council : Approve

3.2 District Member : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : Amended plans required showing provision of passing bays on Brick Kiln Lane and improve visibility splay

3.4 Environmental Services Protection : Conditional support

3.5 Historic Environment Services : No objection in principle but object to the proximity of the extension to the boundary wall

3.6 Conservation Officer : Verbally no objections

3.7 Local Residents : 2 letters of objection:
   - Concern re the impact of the additional residents would have on quality of life
   - Toxic waste is burned on the site
   - No mains sewerage in this road
   - Increase in traffic
   - Additional noise
   - Brick Kiln Lane already used as a rat run and additional traffic will only cause more issues
   - Planning was rejected by highways for barn on basis of additional traffic.

4. Assessment

4.1 These applications relate to the Hollies in Morningthorpe, a Grade II listed building, and is in use as a residential care home. The site is accessed from Brick Kiln Lane a single track road. There are residential properties to the north of the site; otherwise open fields surround the site.

4.2 Consent is sought for the erection of a ten bedroomed wing which has been subject to pre-application discussions with the Conservation and Design Architect and the case officer. To the east and south of the application site is a boundary wall, which is considered to be extremely special. Originally it was proposed to remove the wall but following negotiations they are to be retained and incorporated into the scheme. Whilst this will mean the broad view of the walls will be lost, they will not be adversely affected and will still be able to be viewed. I attach a copy of the report carried out by Christopher North for member’s attention as Appendix 2.

4.3 The Historic Buildings Officer has objected to the proposal due to its proximity to the wall which he considers could be designated as a heritage asset in its own right. He considers the scheme will block any view of the principle face of the wall and condemn it to a dark passage. This resolution was agreed with the Conservation and Design Architect who raises no objections as the proposal integrates the wall without adversely affecting it. The proposal is considered to accord with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and policy IMP13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP).
4.4 In policy terms the proposal would accord with policy EMP6 of the SNLP relating to the ‘alterations and extensions to existing business purposes’. In accordance with this policy it is considered that the design of the extension wing is in keeping with the existing building and the existing landscape will not be adversely. The Hollies currently accommodates the resources to focus on the specialist treatment and care for people with mental health care needs. The agent has advised that due to demand for this type of care, the need to provide additional accommodation is urgently required. The scheme will also provide additional employment for 1 to 2 people.

4.4 2 letters of objection have been received from local residents as set out in paragraph 3.7 above. Whilst I fully appreciate the concerns raised, the proposed extension is located to the south of the existing buildings which separates the proposal from the northern boundary and the immediate neighbours. I therefore do not consider that the proposal will give rise to situation detrimental to their amenities via noise and disturbance form the new extension or the activities within it. I appreciate the potential highway issues raised and the Highway officer has requested that passing bays are provided, in view of this I do not consider that the application can be refused if satisfactory plans are submitted.

4.5 The conversion of the Hay Cart Barn to residential was refused due to the suitability of the barn for conversion and insufficient information being submitted to adequately assess the suitability of the access, not due to the additional traffic that would be created. The Environmental Health Officer has required the submission of full details in respect of the foul water drainage which is proposed to be dealt with via the existing treatment plan to ensure that it has the capacity to deal with the new development. I do not considered that the issues raised would be reasons to refuse the application.

5. Reasons for approval 2011/1905

5.1 Subject to satisfactory amended plans the proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 - Promoting good design of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy EMP6 - alterations and extensions to existing business premises and IMP13 - Alterations to listed buildings of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

5.2 Subject to satisfactory amended plans, the development is considered to accord with the above policy EMP6 as the design and intended use would be in keeping with existing uses on the site, the existing landscaping of the site will not be affected of the proposal and County Highways are satisfied that all necessary parking, servicing, access and circulation for the existing and proposed uses.

5.3 The development is considered to accord with Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP13 as it has been designed to ensure that it would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the building.

6. Reasons for approval 2011/1906

6.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 1 - Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets of the Joint Core Strategy and policies IMP13 - Alterations to listed buildings of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

6.2 The development is considered to accord with Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP13 as it has been designed to ensure that it would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis, 01508 533788, ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Report on the Garden Walls at The Hollies, Brick Kiln Lane, Morningthorpe, Norfolk

for
Mr Orrick
at the request of Peter Codling Architects

September 2011

MSc (Distinction) in Timber Building Conservation
BA in Archaeology and History (Newcastle upon Tyne)
Member of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation
The Hollies, Morningthorpe, Norfolk

Introduction
The Hollies is a residential care-home in the rural parish of Morningthorpe. Standing at the back of the house and its associated out-buildings are two high walls set at right angles. Their design, constructed with a variety of terracotta products in a way that is both quite dramatic and mildly eccentric, is unique. They were clearly built as a special garden or landscape feature.

With the proposed extension to the home’s accommodation, there is some concern that the wall will be compromised. This brief report considers the historical and architectural importance of these walls.

Description
The walls are built of a mixture of brick, tile and curved terracottas, such as land drains, with the occasional lump of flint and large pebble. Their height is 2.81m (9ft 2 ½ inches) up to a single course of projecting brick with a bevelled upper surface. Each brick has a drip groove cut into its lower face to shed as much rain as possible. This line sits on a levelling brick course and is then capped with a further four courses of red-orange brickwork that are staggered back towards the top. The maximum total height is 3.3m (10ft 10 inches). The width of the lower level of the walls is 380cms (15 inches).

The upper courses of regular brickwork appear as if they have been a later addition, but the more likely interpretation is that they were laid to provide a neat capping to the random walling below and were put there as part of the original scheme. They are also there to protect the main wall from water ingress, reducing the risk of frost damage.

The main wall runs about for about 23 metres in a southerly direction from the most easterly of the converted outbuildings. It is butted up to this building with a short length of regular brickwork. At its southern end it turns at right angles towards the west, running for nearly 11 metres before it stops abruptly with a more recently built brick and cement pier. This forms the left jamb of a narrow archway with a short length of more recent brickwork further west. This wall forms the southern boundary of the house’s garden, though it stops short at its western end as if there had previously been another building here. The alternative is that the builders ran out of material or the client’s funds dried up.

Several of the bricks are overburnt and misshapen. The surface is flush pointed in lime mortar. The great attraction of these walls is the apparent random design, yet they have been constructed with an enormous amount of skill and artistic understanding.

These walls are a riot of colour, shape and texture. The client has given the builder an invitation to let his imagination fly.
There is a huge variety of materials used here, such as tiles, brick and small land-drains. Circular sections have been filled with pebbles, while horseshoe terracottas [in the centre of the photograph] have been overlapped to form patterns.

In the south-east corner where the two walls meet there is an area of more regular brickwork with three built-in niches. One [the top right in the photo] contains a 'nest' of mortared pebbles that contains a larger pebble crudely carved with a face.

Beneath it is a neat 'doorway' with a rising curve of brick steps that lead upwards and round to the opening in the left wall. This feature is purely a creation of dreams because only the fairies in the garden would be small enough to ascend the staircase. Additionally, a ball could be thrown into the left niche and it would 'magically' appear bouncing down the steps. This corner has all the elements of being a fantasy area for small children, a special place where the offspring of the owner could indulge their imagination, just as their father had let his run riot over the rest of the structure.

On both walls several large 'Gothic' styled lancets or niches were created. They are not as neatly architectural as the 'fairy' entrance above, but constructed of various floor tiles, called pamments in Norfolk, and other decorative elements rendering each one unique [see front cover]. They are about 1.2m [4ft] tall and only 20cm [8 inches] wide internally. Most of them have been blocked with the same variety of materials that the walls are built of, so it would appear that they have always been 'blind' from the start. In the corner shown above, the blind niche on the left has a semi-round wall coving piece for its top. With flanking walls built in alternating vertical and horizontal bricks, known as 'long and short work', it has been designed in imitation of Anglo-Saxon church construction.
The main feature of the eastern wall is the large doorway just to the north of the wall's central point. This has an opening 1.07m [3ft 6 inches] wide and is capped by a low angled pediment set over and cut by a curved brick lintel. In the centre is an area bearing the date of 1852, presumably the construction date. Flanking the wide brick jambs are a pair of recessed niches, each with a unique design. Just below the projecting brick course are two shields.

The right-hand one bears the initials ἸΣ [A G]. Scattered around the walls are several other shields with initials, including one in the south wall of ΦΩ & [M G]. The apparently random variety of initials found suggests that there is no real significance in the choice of letters and that the shields are just another example of the wide selection of material incorporated into the walls. However, the documentary research set out below indicates that some of the shields may well have a significance, especially those with the above initials, pointing towards the names of the original owner of these walls.

Currently, the doorway is boarded up, but one surviving iron pintel hinge on the south side of the opening shows that there was a single door here that opened inwards towards the garden. Going round to the other side of this wall [below] reveals that the abstract patterns are present on both faces and that the quality of work is just as high on all surfaces. However, there are no niches in the outer faces. There is a small 'turret' at the southern end of this wall just visible on the left in the photo below, which is on the outside of where the children's corner is.
The Names of the Builders and the Date of Construction

Above the outer face of the doorway back into the garden is a white marble relief, which is flanked by two buff coloured terracotta shields bearing the names of James Perfitt, senior and junior.

The shield of James Perfitt Senior bears the symbols of a mason’s trowel and hammer. The shield of his son is damaged and the nature of his symbols are indeterminable, but it is clear that they are different. There is little doubt that these shields proudly carry the names of the builders of this spectacular pair of walls. This is so rare, as usually the names of builders are lost from memory and never recorded.

According to research on the Census, James Perfitt Junior was born in 1829. He was born in Long Stratton, from where it is most likely that his father was running his business and from where they came each day to carry out this highly unusual commission at Morningthorpe.
There is no datestone on the outer side of the wall, but on the garden side the date of 1852 sits just under the apex of the pediment over the doorway.

Amazingly, this is also constructed from specially cut pieces of tile and land-drains. Another example of the skill of the Perffits.

Interestingly, the father and son builders may not have been the only skilled men on site. To the north of this doorway there is a buff coloured tile set on one of its points carrying the initials 'E.Y.' stamped into it with the date of 1852 hand-written below.

It is not know who this person was, but these initials could be of another wall-builder or they could belong to the tile maker. The added date confirms the construction date of the walls and shows that 1852 was not just a random date chosen to add to the decorative elements of this 'folly'. This would make James Perffitt Junior 23 years of age when he was working here.

The Name of the Client

Even though the names of the builders are clear, the name of the client and owner is not written into the walls. Fortunately, there are a sufficient number of clues on the site that could lead to a fairly certain identification.

The walls wrap themselves around a garden area of grass and a few apple trees. A decaying stump shows that there were several more apple trees here at one time. The apples are very tart; these are cider apples. Only a few stand within the garden space, but the central door may well have led out to a much larger orchard containing many more. In White's Trade Directory of 1845 for Norfolk Morningthorpe is recorded as having just 192 people living in the parish. One of the commercial residents, Alfred Goldsworth, is identified as a cider maker and farmer. He is also recorded as a brickmaker. All the evidence then falls into place. The huge variety of brick and tiles that went into the building of these walls is immediately explained; these are the broken and distorted 'waste' from a brickworks. The supplier of this material is most likely to be Alfred Goldsworth.

It is possible, of course, that he was living at another address in Morningthorpe, but the terracotta shields set into these walls with the initials of 'AG' [A G] and 'MG' [M G], presumably those of Mrs Goldsworth, confirm that The Hollies was their residence. This means that the client for the building of these walls was Alfred Goldsworth, who chose to create a 'folly' within part of his cider orchard using his own waste building materials.
Conclusion

These walls are extremely special, but they could never be described as having any ‘architectural significance’ in the sense of what would be expected from ‘polite architecture’. However, the builders and the client have been identified and that is rare. Additionally, the date of construction has been left by the builders, so the historical context is extremely clear.

The builders were local men and the client has made use of freely-available material from his own local brick and tileworks. Therefore, the historical significance of these walls is very high. In the context of listed building legislation, these walls have great value and need to be retained and maintained.

Also, in a more modern perspective, these walls are a dramatic early example of recycling, turning apparent waste into a useful product in a spectacular and skilful way.

The proposed scheme respects the walls and plans to retain them. It has the new additions standing close to the walls, but set back far enough for pedestrian circulation, even making use of the space as a fire escape. This means that though the broad view of the walls from the garden will be lost, the walls themselves will not be adversely affected by the scheme.
9. **Appl. No**: 2011/1931/F  
   **Parish**: SWAINSTHORPE  
   **Applicants Name**: Mr and Mrs Black  
   **Site Address**: Sub-division of garden at 6 Church Close, Swainsthorpe, NR14 8PN  
   **Proposal**: Erection of two storey dwelling with detached garage  
   **Recommendation**: Approve with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **Joint Core Strategy**  
   **Policy 2**: Promoting Good Design  
   **Policy 3**: Energy and Water  
   **Policy 16**: The Hierarchy of Centres  

1.2 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
   **ENV 8**: Development in the open countryside  
   **IMP 8**: Safe and free flow of traffic  
   **IMP 9**: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 **2011/0257/O**  
   Removal of existing garage. Erection of dwelling in part of garden  
   **Approved**

2.2 **1988/3140/O**  
   Erection of dwelling  
   **Refused**

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council**: Comment that:
   - Parking on Church Close is prohibited
   - Question position of garage serving No 6
   - Garage disproportionate to house

3.2 **District Member**: To be reported if appropriate

3.3 **NCC Highways**: No objections subject to conditions

3.4 **Historic Environment Services**: No objection subject to a condition

3.5 **Local Residents**: 2 letters of objection to original details
   - Size of property squeezed into small site in central village location
   - Other properties have space which creates sense of order and tranquillity
First Wednesday Planning Committee 1 February 2012

- Will dominate outlook of neighbours
- Style of development out of keeping with surroundings
- East and West elevations are unappealing
- Will result in feeling of overlooking
- Reduced parking would be more appropriate
- Possible encroachment onto common land to make driveway
- Upgrade of existing access
- Concern about impact on surface water drainage.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application is submitted in full and follows the approval of an earlier outline application. The application includes details of the proposed finished levels of the property relative to the neighbouring properties and streetscene elevations. The design has been amended to reposition the garaging for the dwelling and this has also resulted in the property being set further forward to increase the rear private amenity area. The proposal will retain parking and access for No 6.

4.2 The site is located in a countryside location and is currently in an area without a defined Development Limit. Policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan seeks to restrict new development in such a location to that which requires a rural location and is needed in connection with an appropriate rural use. During the consideration of the outline application the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) was adopted and Policy 16 defined Swainsthorpe as an “other village” which will have a defined development boundary to accommodate infill or small groups of dwellings subject to form and character considerations. In the context of these revisions, the principle of a dwelling was considered acceptable.

4.3 Church Road is characterised by a mixture of property types with the dwellings on the south side being sited within generous plots and two storeys in form. The development along northern side of Church Road is more compact in form and is a mixture of bungalows and 1½ storey properties. The layout is predominantly of ribbon development, however Church Close does form an L shaped development which leaves an open area between No 21 Church Road and 6 Church Close.

4.4 The layout as now proposed follows the stepping forward of properties in the locality and in my opinion would not be unduly prominent in the streetscene. The properties on Church Close have a hipped roofed form with a single storey lean to on the side elevation and the dwelling has been designed to incorporate a hipped roof to reflect this. The eaves and ridge heights have taken account of the neighbouring dwellings and I consider that the massing of the dwelling respects the adjacent properties.

4.5 Concerns have been raised regarding the scale of the property and spacing around the dwelling and its relationship to neighbouring dwellings. The dwelling will be close to the boundaries but the stepped roof form reduces the mass of the building and retains a visual break between the proposal and No 6.

4.6 The neighbouring properties all have their side elevations facing the proposal and the main outlook from the dwelling is onto Church Road and the frontage of No 7 and 8 Church Close. I therefore consider that the proposal will not have a significant affect on the outlook or amenity of the adjoining properties. While properties on the opposite side of Church Road will look onto the proposal, I consider that given the separation that the proposal will not have a significant affect on the outlook or amenity of these properties.
4.7 The access will be to the frontage of the property and garaging will be to the side of the property. Access and parking will be maintained for No 6. The Highway Authority has raised no objection but due to the current condition of the junction onto Church Road has suggested that this should be surfaced. This area is not shown to be in the control of the applicants and as Church Close is a private drive I do not consider that it would be reasonable to require this access to be surfaced.

5. Reasons for approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with policies 2, 3 and 16 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies IMP8 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the proposal will be within the built up area of Swardeston and would not adversely affect the character of the area, the amenity of neighbouring properties or highway safety.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Stuart Pontin, 01508 533796, spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 Joint Core Strategy
- Policy 2 - Promoting Good Design
- Policy 3 – Water Efficiency

1.2 South Norfolk Local Plan
- HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic
- IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2009/0073/F Erection of single storey dwelling Approved

2.2 2008/1673/F Proposed single storey dwelling Refused

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Town Council : Approve

3.2 District Member : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : Support conditionally – parking and turning area to be provided prior to occupation.

3.4 Local Residents : 2 letters of objection, 1 petition of 8 signatures
- Inadequate parking already on the site
- Loss of area will result in more on street/pavement parking
- Parking on pavements causes hazard for visually impaired residents.

1 response of no comment.

1 response of conditional support -
Ensure that there is no additional overlooking to properties to the rear of the site.
4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application is for the extension of the time limit for a previously approved scheme for the erection of a single storey detached dwelling which is to be set adjacent to existing Saffron properties. The site is within the Development Limits of Wymondham. An area to the front of the site provides parking for residents and visitors.

4.2 Since the last application, the Joint Core Strategy has been adopted and policies 2 and 3 of the JSC are now relevant. The design remains unchanged from the previous approval and has been designed to maximise the use of natural light. An additional condition has been suggested to ensure the scheme accords with JCS Policy 3 regarding water use efficiency.

4.3 The main cause of concern from local residents relates to the loss of an area they claim is used for parking. I have spoken with Saffron and although this area was shown as a parking area on the original plan back in 1977 when the surrounding bungalows were approved, the area has not been used for authorised parking. There have, on occasions, been vehicles (including a caravan) parked on the site, which were there without the consent from Saffron, but these have since been removed. In discussions with Saffron, it has been highlighted that there are some issues with parking in the surrounding area, currently being addressed by the Housing Manager. The issues include one resident who regularly parks on the pavement outside her property (No16). However, Highways consider that the parking available within the immediate vicinity, and that proposed for the new dwelling is adequate and subject to the space and turning area being made available prior the occupation of the dwelling, no objections area raised by the County Highways Authority.

4.4 While I acknowledge the concern of the residents and appreciate that there may be issues with parking in the local area, it is not reasonable to require this application to resolve existing parking issues. I understand from discussions with Saffron and the Highways Authority that there are adequate parking spaces available within the complex for the number of properties. I therefore consider that, as there has been no change in planning policy or circumstances that would justify a different decision to the last approval and the scheme remains appropriate for the location, this application should be approved.

4.5 As already stated, the design of the property remains unchanged. As the proposal is for a single storey dwelling there will be no loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties to the rear of the site (Millway). The scheme accords with the principles of policy IMP9.

5. **Reasons for approval**

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 & 3 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies HOU4, IMP8 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

The scheme has been designed to respect the privacy of the existing neighbouring single storey dwellings. The layout of the proposed dwelling will maximise the benefits of the south facing aspect in terms of achieving natural light, while providing amenity space to the rear of the property. Although there are two storey dwellings to the rear of the site, the distance from these properties to the proposed dwelling is not unacceptable in an urban area and does not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the proposed dwelling. The scheme therefore accords with the principles of the above policies.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson, 01508 533837, jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
11. Appl. No : 2011/2070/F  
Parish : BARFORD

Applicants Name : Mr E Hughes  
Site Address : Caravans at Mud Walls Farm, Watton Road, Barford, Norfolk, NR9 4AR  
Proposal : Retrospective application for retention of 4 occupied standing residential caravans

Recommendation : Refuse

1. Insufficient justification for a dwellings in countryside location. Contrary to Policies ENV8, HOU9 of SNLP and advice in PPS7  

(Authorise Enforcement Action for the cessation of occupation and removal of the unauthorised caravans and all associated buildings from the site. Compliance period to be agreed)

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Guidance
PPS 7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1: Addressing Climate Change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2: Good Design
Policy 17: Smaller rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside
HOU9: Dwellings for Other Rural Enterprises
IMP8: Safe and Free Flow of Traffic

2. Planning History

2.1 No recent history

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council : To be reported

3.2 District Member : To committee – Not covered by specific policy

3.3 NCC Highways : To be reported

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) : To be reported

3.5 Local Residents : 1 Letter of Objection
- The arrival of 5 caravans has led to over population of the area creating activity and in disturbance to the surrounding land.
- The site is now used as permanent residence in the middle of what was one open countryside
- Although screened from the road it is unsightly and inappropriate for what was once a green meadow.
- Degrading the surrounding environment and creating population pressure in an area where the infrastructure is not sufficient.
• Site accessed by a Right of way along a farm track owned by Silfield Ltd experienced ongoing access and illegal car parking issues.
• SNDC has refused many applications for fixed and mobile caravan sites due to their local impact in line with policy and this application does not merit an exception.

1 form returned indicating support but no comments made.

4. Assessment

4.1 The application is for the retention of 4 caravans, 1 of which is within the curtilage of Mud Walls farm, the other 3 are in an adjoining paddock. The site is accessed from a private track which is outside the ownership of the applicant, but who has a right of way to Mud Walls Farm. The site is in an isolated location set to the east off the B1108.

4.2 It is understood that Caravan A which is in the garden of the main dwelling was in situ when the applicant purchased the property in 2004. The Design and Access Statement suggests that this caravan has been on site for in excess of 25 years. From our discussion with the applicant this caravan was used when he first purchased the property as a dwelling while he undertook works to the main house, since that time it has been an office until approximately 12 months ago. It has been occupied as a dwelling since April 2011.

4.3 Prior to April 2011, caravan A was incidental to the main dwelling and was considered to be one planning unit with the dwelling. At the time caravan A became a dwelling, it created a separate planning unit which is no longer incidental to the main dwelling and therefore requires planning permission.

4.4 The three remaining caravans situated on the adjacent paddock are also occupied as independent dwellings.

4.5 It is understood from the applicant that the caravans are usually occupied by local people who have found themselves in a position where they are unable to afford to rent a dwelling in the area, are unable to find a dwelling or indeed where they may have become homeless. The applicant advises that the occupants have generally stayed for limited periods of time before establishing their lives allowing them to get back into permanent residential accommodation. The caravans are advertised locally when the current occupants are due to leave and these vacancies are generally filled within two weeks. The applicant feels that this demonstrates the need for this type of accommodation in this area. An outbuilding on the site also provides laundry facilities for the occupants of the site.

4.6 PPS 7 sets out criteria against which residential accommodation may be justified when required to enable agricultural, forestry and certain other full time workers to live at or in the immediate vicinity of their place of work. Annex A Paragraph 15 notes that there may be instances where special justification exists for new isolated dwellings associated with other rural based enterprises. However, in these cases, the enterprise itself including any development necessary for the operation of the enterprise, must be acceptable in planning terms and permitted in that rural location, regardless of the consideration of any proposed associated dwelling. Local planning authorities should apply the same stringent levels of assessment to applications for such new occupational dwellings as they apply to applications for agricultural and forestry workers’ dwellings.
4.7 The justification for the retention of the caravans and their occupation contained in the application relates to the gap in the housing market for the type of accommodation provided by the caravans. However, the retention of the caravans is residential development in the open countryside and does not accord with either national or local policy. If there is a shortfall for affordable housing in the parish of Barford there are appropriate procedures in place to assess this need which is managed by the Strategic Housing Manager who’s role it is to work with Parish Council’s to assess the need in specific villages and locations within the district. In addition, I have had discussions with the Housing Options Team who advise that, had they been approached by anyone in the position described by the application to justify this application, they would have been able to offer some form of either temporary accommodation, or perhaps a more permanent form of accommodation depending on the situation, and the need of the individual.

4.8 Mention has been made in the Design and Access Statement about the availability of Public Transport. Although there is a bus from Hingham to Norwich, the only stop in Barford is at the pub in the main village, the access track is not a designated bus stop. Therefore I do not consider that the site of this application is in a position appropriate to benefit from public transport, is not within walking distance of any shop or other facility and therefore not in a sustainable location which would be expected if affordable housing were being provided.

4.9 In conclusion, I consider that the occupation of caravan A as an independent dwelling should cease, but the caravan itself can remain on site if it reverts to use incidental to the main dwelling. The standing of the 3 remaining caravans in the adjacent paddock is unauthorised, their occupation as dwellings should cease and they should be removed from the site. Enforcement action is requested to ensure that the unauthorised use of the land ceases. Prior to the serving of any Enforcement Notice a Human Rights Assessment needs to be carried out and assessed to establish an appropriate compliance period.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The site is located in the open countryside where National and Local Planning policies seek to restrict new dwellings to those required for agricultural, forestry and certain other full time workers to live at or in the immediate vicinity of their place of work. The justification submitted for this application to meet a housing need, does not justify a departure from these policies, particularly as there are alternative ways to meet this need, in a more sustainable manner. The site is not in a sustainable location and there are no public transport facilities, or local shops or other facilities conveniently accessible by sustainable means.

5.2 The development is located in an isolated, countryside location and, while its wider landscape impact may be limited, the development would incrementally add to development of the site and harm the undeveloped character of the area. The proposal is considered to be contrary to policies 1 and 17 of the Joint Core Strategy, Policies ENV8 and HOU9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003, and advice in Planning Policy Statement 7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Jacqui Jackson, 01508 533837, and E-mail: jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
12. **Appl. No**: 2011/2079/H  
**Parish**: Poringland

Applicants Name: Mr Stewart Langridge  
Site Address: 8 St Andrews Close, Poringland, Norfolk, NR14 7TB  
Proposal: Two storey and single storey rear extension and re-siting of existing conservatory

Recommendation: Approve with conditions

1. **Full Planning Permission Time Limit**
2. In accordance with submitted amendments
3. Matching Materials
4. Surface water disposal to water butts and surface water sewer

1. **Planning Policies**

1.2 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 19: Extensions to existing dwellings  
IMP9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 1982/1567/D Residential accommodation with ancillary roads and associated drainage works Approved
2.2 1981/3130/O Residential development Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: Refuse
   • Out of scale with neighbouring properties
   • Overdevelopment of site
   • Result in loss of visible amenity to neighbouring properties

3.2 District Member: To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Environmental Services: Protection: Approve conditionally

3.4 Local Residents: To be reported if appropriate

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The dwelling is situated in a cul-de-sac within a large development. The application proposes to erect two storey and single storey extensions to the rear of the dwelling, and relocate the existing conservatory on the rear of the single storey extension. The site is within the development boundary for Poringland and therefore the application is considered against policy HOU19 (Extension to Existing Dwellings) and Policy IMP9 (Residential amenity) of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP).

4.2 The rear wall of the dwelling is set forward from the rear of the adjacent dwelling number 6 to the east, and as such only approximately 2.5m of the re-positioned conservatory will project beyond the rear wall of number 6. Therefore do not consider the existing amenities of the occupiers of number 6 will be adversely affected to a material degree.
4.3 The proposed two storey element of the scheme is sited on the western side of the rear elevation with the dwelling to the west, number 10 sited with its front elevation facing the side gable of the application dwelling. The extension will be clearly visible, especially from the first floor windows of number 10, however, there is approximately 8m between the dwellings with a pitched roof garage building in between, serving both properties. I consider that the proposal will not result in an unacceptable dominance to number 10 or adversely affect the existing amenities of the occupier to a material degree.

4.4 With regards to the concerns relating to overdevelopment of the site and out of scale with neighbouring properties, the existing garden is larger than of a lot of the rear gardens in the vicinity. I consider that there is sufficient space between the dwellings, and that the proposal will not result in an unacceptable amount of amenity space for the dwelling. In addition, a very similar scheme has been approved and constructed at number 18 All Saints Road, which is clearly visible from St Andrews Close.

4.5 The original plan showed the extensions spanning the entire rear elevation, however, amended plans were submitted, setting in the two storey element from the side wall to provide a visual break in the side elevation. I consider the design and scale of the proposal to be acceptable.

4.6 Environmental Services has commented that this location would not provide effective infiltration for surface water disposal to soakaways. The existing roofs and hard surfaced areas discharge to the Anglian Water surface water sewer. It has been agreed with the agent that water butts will be fitted to the two new downpipes at the rear and then connected into the existing surface water drains. The third downpipe is situated in a narrow area that does not allow enough space for a water butt so will be connected direct to the surface water sewer. An appropriate condition is therefore recommended.

4.7 In view of the above, it is considered that the proposed development will not result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling or on the residential amenities of the neighbouring dwellings. The car parking for the property will not be affected. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval in accordance with policies HOU19 and IMP9 of the SNLP.

5. Reasons for approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with policies HOU19 (Extensions to existing dwellings) and IMP9 (Residential amenity) of that Plan as the extension has been designed to ensure that the parking and access to the dwelling will be maintained, and that neither the character and appearance of the dwelling nor the amenities of nearby residents will be adversely affected to a material degree.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Rachel Flaxman, 01508 533960, and E-mail: rflaxman@s-norfolk.gov.uk