Third Wednesday Planning Committee

Members of the Third Wednesday Planning Committee:

Conservatives:  Liberal Democrats:

Mr W Kemp  Mr T East
(Chairman)  Miss P Allen

Mr J Mooney  (Vice-Chairman)

Mrs Y Bendle

Mr T Blowfield

Mrs M Dewsbury

Mrs F Ellis

Mr C Foulger

Mr C Gould

Mr B Riches

Group Meetings

Conservatives: Blomefield Room  12.45 pm to 1.30 pm

Date
Wednesday 21 March 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

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

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.
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 Third Wednesday Planning Committee held on 15 February 2012;  
   (attached – page 9)

5. Enforcement Report;  
   (report attached – page 21)

6. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   To consider the applications as listed below:  
   (report attached – page 26)

<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>2011/2061/F</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH</td>
<td>Land near Hall Lane, Common Road, Dickleburgh</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2011/1697/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land at the former Cemex site, Rightup Lane, Wymondham</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011/0808/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Land for new offices on the site of R G Carter Central Plant, William Frost Way, Costessey</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2011/1577/F</td>
<td>GELDESTON</td>
<td>16 Station Road, Geldeston</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2011/2037/F</td>
<td>WRENINGHAM</td>
<td>Land north of Builders Merchants, Norwich Road, Wreningham</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2011/2050/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land west of Brittons Farm, Wramplingham Road, Downham</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2011/2059/F</td>
<td>BROCKDISH</td>
<td>Annexe at Haggle House, Scole Road, Thorpe Abbots</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2012/0132/LB</td>
<td>WACTON</td>
<td>Bretts Manor, The Common, Wacton</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2012/0133/F</td>
<td>WACTON</td>
<td>Bretts Manor, The Common, Wacton</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2012/0168/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land north of Rightup Lane, Wymondham</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2012/0228/H</td>
<td>WINFOARTHING</td>
<td>Goose Green Cottage, Goose Green Lane, Winfoarting</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2012/0229/F</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Villa Farm, Watton Road, Bawburgh</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2012/0235/F</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>16 Highlow Road, Costessey</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2012/0322/F</td>
<td>SHELFANGER</td>
<td>Sub-division of garden at Havencroft, Winfoarting Road</td>
<td>98</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 11 April 2012** with membership to be confirmed.

8. **Planning Appeals (for information)**

(attached – page 104)
## Details of Planning Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accreditation Expiry Date</th>
<th></th>
<th>Accreditation Expiry Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Councillor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Democrat Councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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></th>
<th>Accreditation Expiry Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Councillor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Weeks</td>
<td>4/07/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPLICATIONS

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

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

### Is (or should) the Interest be registered in the Register of Members' Interests?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If not, whose well being or financial position is affected to a greater extent than the majority of other people in the ward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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?
   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

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?

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

Personal Interest

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

YES

You have a personal interest in the matter

Disclose the existence & nature of your interest

NO

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

Prejudicial Interest

You may have a prejudicial interest

NO

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

YES

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?

NO

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

YES
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  
  (Detail following outline consent)
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)
RVC Removal/Variation of Condition
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).
Applications deferred from previous meeting

1. **Appl. No** : 2011/2061/F  
   **Parish** : DICKLEBURGH

   **Applicants Name** : Miss Samantha Falquero  
   **Site Address** : Land near Hall Lane, Common Road, Dickleburgh, Norfolk  
   **Proposal** : Change of use of land for the keeping of horses, erection of stables and tack room and construction of hard standing/access drive. Retention of post and rail fence, entrance gate and access.

   **Recommendation** : Approve with conditions

   1. Full Planning Permission Time Limit  
   2. In accordance with submitted amendments  
   3. New Access construction  
   4. Provision of Parking and Servicing Areas  
   5. No generators without consent  
   6. Full details of external lighting  
   7. Removal of manure  
   8. External staining to be agreed  
   9. Details of proposed permeable surfacing material  
   10. Retention trees and hedges  
   11. Stables for personal use only  
   12. Details of landscaping – native hedge on frontage  
   13. Use by two vehicles and one horse trailer only

**Update**

This application was considered by members of the 3rd Wednesday Planning Committee at their meeting on the 15th February 2012. Members resolved to defer the application for amendments to reduce the area of proposed surfacing on the site and the material proposed for the surfacing. Additionally Members requested the addition of a further condition to be placed on the proposal allowing a maximum of two cars and one horse trailer to be present on the site at any one time.

The applicants have sought to address these concerns through the submission of a letter of amendment. In this letter they agree to reduce the overall depth of hard standing on the site from 20 metres to 18 metres and for hogging to be applied to the surface of the hard standing. The Highways Officer has confirmed that this area is the minimum acceptable on site to allow turning of vehicles and safe access onto Common Road in a forward gear. The applicants have further agreed to the additional condition about vehicle use of the site and had confirmed that the site will be used by two small ponies which are prone to laminitis which require minimal grazing. It is the intention of the applicant to address water and electricity supply to the site in the future although the provision of utilities is not a planning consideration.

1. **Planning Policies**

   1.1 Joint Core Strategy  
      Policy 2: Promoting good design

   1.2 South Norfolk Local Plan  
      ENV 8: Development in the open countryside  
      IMP 2: Landscaping  
      IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
      IMP 9: Residential amenity  
      IMP 25: Outdoor lighting  
      LEI 14: Keeping of horses for recreational purposes
2. Planning History

2.1 None

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council: Object
- Excessive area of hard standing impacting drainage, use and character of the site. Hard standing for car and trailer parking unnecessary.
- Stabling sited in wrong location on site.
- Permanent stabling an inappropriate use of land, field shelter near site entrance suggested.
- Insufficient information re: location of muck heap, disposal and any impact on local drainage system.
- Paddock layout contrary to local field character.
- Close boarded fence inappropriate, hedging preferable.
- No information on electricity or water supply.
- Concern over permanent storage of trailers/cars on site.
- Site contrary to British Horse Society recommendations for horse keeping re pasture management, boundary hedging, planting, access to water and field shelters.

Additional comments on amended plans:
- Reduced hard standing still excessive.
- Provision of car and trailer parking unnecessary, concern that the area will be used for permanent storage of vehicles.
- Permanent stabling an inappropriate use and out of keeping with the character of open fields.
- Land not suitable for grazing horses.
- No information provided on water, electricity provision and waste management on the site.

3.2 District Member: To be determined by Committee.

3.3 NCC Highways: Approve subject to conditions
- Vehicular access.
- On site parking and turning.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection): Approve subject to conditions
- No generators without consent.
- External lighting.
- Removal of manure.

3.5 Local Residents: Letters of objection from 10 properties and an adjacent charity landowner:
- Fencing unsuitable for horses.
- Concern proposals could lead to horses trespassing on adjacent land and damaging crops leading to compensation claims.
- Fencing/gates more suitable for a residential use.
- Entrance gates too large for use proposed.
- Laurel hedging (now removed) poisonous to horses.
- Area of site inadequate for intended use.
- Relocated stable more prominent in site than original location and may cause traffic blind spot.
- Mobile field shelter would be more appropriate than permanent stabling
- Movable fencing should be used instead of permanent
- Too large an area paved with hardcore
- Parking vehicles would detract from the rural nature of the plot and surroundings
- Site unsuitable for horses without power or water
- Fencing obscures view from property
- Overdevelopment of rural area
- Contrary to policies ENV 8 and ENV 10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
- Application aims to conceal intended use of the land for caravans

Additional comments from 2 properties on amended plans
- Close boarded fencing not amended and unsuitable for site
- Hard standing still too large
- Stables now in more obtrusive location to front of site, parking in this area will obliterate views even more
- Stable block will cause blind spot exiting the site
- Site will expand beyond original criteria wherever the stables are located the site is still unsuitable for horses

4. **Assessment**

4.1 This proposal is for the change of use of a parcel of land on the northern side of Common Road, Dickleburgh from agriculture to horse keeping. The site is enclosed by native hedging to the western side with 2 metre close boarded fencing to the north and eastern boundaries of the site. The close boarded fencing does not form part of this application as it is classed as permitted development within the current planning regulations.

4.2 The application has been amended from the original submission to relocate the stable to the front of the site on the western boundary. This relocation reduces the scale of proposed hard standing and access driveway on the site considerably. This amendment was requested by Officers to reduce the encroachment of buildings into the field area and reduce significantly the overall area of surfacing on the site allowing more grazing space to be provided. The revised hard standing area now provided meets the standard required by the Highway Officer to allow on site turning of a vehicle and trailer enabling safe entry and exit from the site in a forward gear. As part of these amended plans the applicant has also removed the proposed post and rail fencing within the site dividing the space into paddocks and removed an existing laurel hedge to the front of the site which had been planted recently to screen the site. Electric fencing is proposed to divide the site for use.

4.3 The relevant policies in assessing this application are Policies ENV 8 and LEI14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) dealing with development in the countryside and the keeping of horses for recreational purposes. Policy ENV 8 seeks to protect the rural environment by restricting the forms of development that can take place there. However the policy acknowledges that some developments can be acceptable within the countryside where they are activities that respect the recreational value of the countryside and require a rural location for them to be undertaken. The keeping of horses for recreational purposes is covered specifically by policy LEI 14 which indicates that such uses are acceptable if there is no adverse effect on the character of the landscape, wildlife habitats, highway safety or residential amenity. The design, siting and materials used for animal shelters and boundaries are to be subject to careful attention in order to protect the amenity of the locality.
4.4 As amended this application is considered to conform to the above policies. The post and rail fence to the front of the site and the retained hedge on the western boundary are acceptable in the rural area. Additional native species hedging is also to be provided along the highway boundary via a suggested condition. The boundary fencing to the other two sides of the site was in place at the time of submission of the application and can be classed as permitted development. As such the style and type of enclosure provided is not a planning consideration. The proposed stables and tack room are constructed of wood and corrugated sheet in a standard pitched roof form with small front overhang and non-glazed ventilation openings. This is a standard design for stable buildings and is similar in form and site location to a number of other stable uses within South Norfolk including stables located at the junction of Harleston Road and Lakes Road, Dickleburgh approved under reference 2007/1166.

4.5 Eleven letters of objection have been received raising issues about the proposal. A number of these concerns relate to non-material considerations that are beyond the remit of the planning system including the suitability of the fencing and gates for enclosing horses, the size and suitability of the site for the use intended and the availability of power or water on the site for the animals. The assertion that in the future the site may be used for parking caravans or for purposes other than horse keeping should this application be approved cannot be used as a material consideration in the determination of this proposal.

4.6 A number of other issues raised have been addressed by the amended plans including the removal of fixed post and rail fencing dividing the site into paddocks and the reduction of the area of hardcore on the site (whilst still allowing sufficient turning for a vehicle and trailer). Of the remaining issues it is not considered that the application has a material effect on the residential amenity of properties within the area or that the development would obscure the view from a house over 200 metres away from the site. No alterations are being made to the historic hedge pattern in Dickleburgh by this application a condition is suggested requiring the planting of a native species hedge inside the post and rail fencing at the front of the site to screen the stable and hard standing area from the highway. Additionally in accordance with policy ENV 10 a condition is suggested for the retention of the hedge to the western boundary of the site to further assist in screening the development in the landscape. Given these comments I would therefore recommend approval of the proposal subject to conditions.

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 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies ENV 8 and LEI 14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

The development is considered to accord with the above policies as the proposal is for a recreational activity which demands a rural location. The stable building has been located within the site to minimise the impact of the proposal in the rural environment and the development has a minimal impact on the amenity of surrounding area.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Cross, 01508 533780, and E-mail: hcross@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

2. **Appl. No**: 2011/1697/F  
   **Parish**: WYMONDHAM

   **Applicants Name**: Ben Bailey Homes  
   **Site Address**: Land at the former Cemex site, Rightup Lane, Wymondham  
   **Proposal**: Proposed residential development comprising 28 dwelling units with associated access, car parking and landscape provision

   **Recommendation**: Authorise DCM to approve with conditions

   1. Full permission time limit
   2. Amended Plan
   3. Levels and Sections
   4. Landscaping
   5. Tree Protection
   6. Materials
   7. Road, footway, drainage details
   8. No occupation before road and footway
   9. Surface Water drainage details and implementation/maintenance
   10. Fire Hydrant
   11. Cycle/pedestrian link to edge of site
   12. Open Space detail and maintenance
   13. 10% renewable energy generation
   14. Code Level 4 water efficiency
   15. Bin collection area for plots 14-21

   (Subject to comments of NCC Highways and The Environment Agency)

   Subject to Sec 106 Agreement to secure payment/provision of:
   - Affordable Housing
   - Off-site adult open space
   - Contribution to Kett’s Park Community Centre facilities
   - Education
   - Library Services
   - Green Infrastructure
   - Monitoring

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **Joint Core Strategy**  
   Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
   Policy 2: Promoting good design  
   Policy 3: Energy and Water  
   Policy 4: Housing delivery  
   Policy 20: Implementation

1.2 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
   WYM 4: Housing allocation between Silfield Road and Rightup Lane, Wymondham (Continued)  
   ENV 15: Species protection  
   IMP 1: Design  
   IMP 2: Landscaping  
   IMP 7: Provision of infrastructure  
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
   IMP 9: Residential amenity
2. Planning History

2.1 2012/0371/O (On land adjoining to south) Mixed use development of up to 750 dwellings, up to 128 bed care home / homes (in one or two buildings), up to 250 square metres of retail / commercial floor space, a new primary school together with all other associated temporary and permanent infrastructure and green infrastructure, including new access arrangements, a sewage treatment plant, allotments and community orchard.

2.2 2009/0686/F (On land adjoining to north) Proposed residential development comprising 56no. dwellings with associated access, parking, open space and landscape provision.

2.3 2008/0790/O 3000 dwellings; 96,000 sqm employment development; access; landscaioing; public open space; education facilities and 3 local centres

3. Consultations

3.1 Wymondham Town Council : Original Submission.
   - Approve subject to storm and foul water drainage details being resolved.
   - Designs uninspiring.
   Amended Submission
   - To be reported

3.2 District Member : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : Technical objections on a range of detailed points – comments on latest revisions to be reported

3.4 NCC Strategic Planning (Developer contributions) See Appendix 2: Contributions required for:
   - Monitoring
   - Education
   - Libraries
   - Green Infrastructure

3.5 Anglian Water Services Ltd : Original Submission
   - Recommend conditions requiring details of foul and surface water drainage.
   - Foul water mitigation scheme required due to inadequate capacity in foul sewerage network
   Subsequently confirmed adequate flood mitigation storage has been provided.

3.6 Environmental Services (Protection) : Not received at time of writing

3.7 Conservation Officer : Not received at time of writing
3.8 Landscape Officer : Not received at time of writing

3.9 Housing Strategy Manager (SNC) : Accept offer of 9 units for Social Rent

3.10 Strategic Planning : Not received at time of writing

3.11 NCC Minerals & Waste Planning Officer : No objections

3.12 Local Residents : Original Submission. Objections.
  - Loss of natural habitat and Wildlife.
  - Parking likely on Rightup Lane.
  - Flooding under rail-bridge not resolved.
  - Concern about stability of boundary bank.

  Amended Submission.
  - Parking on Rightup Lane causes safety concern for walkers, runners and cyclists.
  - Safety concerns related to construction traffic and extraneous material on highway.
  - Query ownership boundary and responsibility for tree.

4. Assessment

4.1 The main issues arising from assessment of the proposal are addressed below in terms of the principle of development; layout and design; sustainability; highways; drainage; ecology and residential amenity.

Principle

4.2 The site is allocated for residential development in the SNLP by policy WYM4. The majority of the allocation has already been developed following the grant of planning permission 2009/0686/F on land adjoining to the north. This application proposal would complete development of the allocated land. I consider there is no reason to oppose the principle of development.

Layout, Mix and Design

4.3 There has been considerable negotiation and amendment of the scheme since its first submission. In particular, issues have been addressed regarding how the layout responds to the changing ground levels on the site, which result from its previous use for mineral extraction. Initial concerns about the relationship to neighbouring properties and trees on the site have also been addressed, together with a number of highway and parking concerns. I consider that, subject to the final comments from NCC Highways, the layout as amended is acceptable.

4.4 The scheme proposes 14, 4-bedroom units; 7, 3-bedroom units; 5, 2-bedroom units; and 2, 1-bedroom units. Of the 28 dwellings in this application, the proportion of 4 bedroom units seems high (50%). However, when taken with the first phase of the WYM4 allocated site, the overall proportions are 23% 4-bed; 46% 3-bed; 29%2-bed; and 2% 1-bed. I consider this is a reasonable mix. The 9 affordable units in the current scheme are 2, 3-bedroom; 5, 2-bedroom; and 2, 1-bedroom units.

4.5 As noted by the Town Council, the house designs could be described as “uninspiring”, however, I consider that they do generally follow the vernacular traditions of the area and are compatible with the designs of the dwellings on the adjacent site. With appropriate materials to be agreed via planning condition, I consider the designs should be approved.
Sustainability

4.6 The applicant’s Design and Access Statement makes no particular claims regarding the sustainability of the scheme beyond meeting the Building Regulations. However, conditions will be imposed to require the scheme to achieve 10% on-site renewable energy production and Code For Sustainable Homes Level 4 for water efficiency in accordance with JCS Policy 3. The majority of the dwellings in the layout have a south-facing roof slope, which will facilitate the use of solar panels and these are now shown indicatively on all dwellings in the scheme.

Landscaping

4.7 The application is supported by arboricultural, tree protection and landscape reports. The layout provides for the retention of good quality trees within the site, including some covered by tree protection orders. In addition to these trees, the proposals include new planting with hedges on the boundaries of the site. This includes a replacement hedge and shrub planting along the Rightup Lane frontage.

Highways

4.8 Of the 28 units, 5 are to have direct access from Rightup Lane and the remainder will be reached via the adjacent development. Parking for all units meets the NCC maximum standards. Adequate space exists within the layout for the collection of wheelie bins and a bin collection area has been provided near the entrance of the private drive which serves 8 of the units.

4.9 Although there has been no objection in principle on highway grounds, there have been a number of detailed objections. At the time of writing I am awaiting final comments from NCC, but I believe these have now been resolved.

Drainage

4.10 Despite an initial objection, Anglian Water have subsequently confirmed that the recent works carried out to accommodate the first phase of this allocation have also provided sufficient capacity in the foul sewerage system to serve the current proposal.

4.11 Surface water is to be managed on site via soakaways, including highway water, subject to final comment from NCC and the Environment Agency. With such a sustainable drainage system there is no reason why the development should add to the flooding that occurs off-site below the rail bridge, which has been commented on by some consultees.

Ecology

4.12 The site has been the subject of ecological assessment and a report is submitted as part of the application. The report concludes that the site is has low conservation value with limited biodiversity. There is no suitable habitat for protected reptile or amphibian fauna. Some bat roost potential is noted, but the major trees are to be retained. Hedge retention is recommended, but this conflicts with requirements for highway improvements. The proposed new tree, hedge and shrub planting should serve to mitigate this loss to some degree. I conclude that there will not be adverse ecological impact, sufficient to justify refusal of the application and no protected species are likely to be harmed by the development.

Residential Amenity

4.13 I consider that revisions to the layout and levels have addressed concerns regarding the impact on adjacent properties. The new units have been moved further from the site boundary so will not overlook their neighbours to an unreasonable degree. No significant changes to ground level or building works are now proposed that would threaten the stability of adjacent land.
4.14 Concerns have been raised regarding the impact of construction traffic and parking on Rightup Lane. Given the limited scale of the development however, I do not consider that these issues are likely to give rise to an unreasonable loss of amenity in this location and no objection from the Highway Authority on these matters has been made.

5. **Reasons for approval**

5.1 The proposed development complies with the allocation of the land for housing by policy WYM4 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP). The site is in a sustainable location and the details of the scheme will be consistent with the requirements of Joint Core Strategy policies 1, 2, 3 and 4. The development will not cause unacceptable harm to highway safety, flood risk, ecology, visual amenity or the amenity of local residents. The development consequently complies with SNLP policies IMP1, 2, 7, 8, 9 and ENV15.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Trett, 01508 533794, ctre@snorfolk.gov.uk
3. **Appl. No:** 2011/0808/F  
**Parish:** COSTESSEY

Applicants Name : Bullen Developments ltd  
Site Address : Land for new offices on the site of R G Carter Central Plant,  
William Frost Way, Costessey  
Proposal : Construction of a new three storey office building on part of the  
site currently occupied by RG Carter Central Plant facility, along  
with associated car & cycle parking, bin store & substation.

Recommendation : Approve with conditions

1. Full - Planning Permission Time Limit
2. In accordance with submitted amendments
3. External materials to be agreed
4. Existing Access - Closure
5. Access - Gradient
6. Access Gates - Restriction
7. Provision of Parking and Servicing Areas - Where shown on plan
8. Wheel Cleaning Facilities - Temporary for Construction Vehicles
9. Overarching Travel Plan
10. Landscaping to include replacement trees

2. Planning History

2.1 2004/0053 Renewal of unimplemented permission 2000/1781 for the erection  
of hotel and conference centre (revision of time limit condition) Withdrawn

2.2 2003/1824 Renewal of permission 2000/1288 – Undetermined development of land without  
compliance with condition 1

2.3 2000/1781 Renewal of permission 97/1202 – Approved Erection of hotel and conference  
centre including variation of condition 3

2.4 1997/1202 Erection of hotel and conference centre Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council : Original Plans  
Conditional support
- Building to be sets back
- Trees planted to replace any lost

Revised plans
Object
- Plans not correct
- Traffic congestion on roundabout – junction at capacity and  
fails to cope in peak periods
- Office block will add to problems
- If approved Section 106 Agreement required to improve  
junction
- Any trees lost should be compensated for
3.2 District Member
Mr T East : To be reported if appropriate
Mrs V Bell : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : No objections
• Content with site layout and access as revised
• Dedication of land

3.4 Highways Agency : Original plans
Object
• Insufficient highway information
Revised plans
No objections
Clear NCC has reached agreement with developer re dedication of land to provide slip road to alleviate congestion

3.5 Environmental Services (Protection) : No objections subject to contaminated land survey

3.6 Landscape Officer : No response received

3.7 NCC Minerals & Waste Planning Officer : No response received

3.8 Local Residents : No response received

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The site has an area of 0.51 ha and is situated at the junction of Dereham Road and William Frost Way. The site forms part of a larger area which was up till four years ago used by R G Carter as a depot with trade centre and plant. Since then the site has been used by Carter’s as their central plant of depot and is used for the storage of construction plant and site cabins. The site is screened on two sides by a tree belt which stretches along Dereham Road to the east. Nevertheless it occupies a prominent location and is visible from both William Frost Way and Dereham Road.

4.2 The application, which has been amended, proposes a three storey office block with a floor area of 2460 sq metres. The layout provides for access onto William Frost Way and 66 parking spaces. 75 people are expected to be employed on the site. The layout has been driven largely by existing site constraints. The building has been set at an angle to maximise views of the building from the slip roads. There are no objections to the layout of the site or the design of the building.

4.3 As would be expected given the location the major concern is the impact of the proposal on the Longwater junction. The site is a brownfield site with a lawful use from which traffic movements resulted. Following the repositioning of the access neither the Highways Agency nor Norfolk County Council’s highways officer object to the proposal. Their agreement is however dependant on the applicants dedicating land to the Highway Authority which will allow a dedicated left slip lane for outbound traffic from William Frost Way to be added to Norfolk County Council’s medium term improvement plan. The Highway Authority considers that this will significantly increase capacity of the interchange and far outweigh the impacts from the proposed office block.
4.4 A financial contribution towards junction improvements would normally be secured by a Section 106 Agreement; to be completed before the decision notice was issued. However in this instance the Highway Authority are prepared to agree to the dedication of land by the developer for the slip road in lieu of a cash payment. However to give the same degree of security as a Section 106 Agreement the Highway Authority would require the land to be dedicated before the decision notice was issued.

4.5 Whilst I can fully appreciate the concerns of Costessey Parish Council regarding congestion I consider that an objection on traffic grounds could not be supported given the comments of the Highways Agency and Norfolk County Council’s highways officer.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 In the opinion of the local planning authority 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 9 (Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area) and Policy (Promoting good design) of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP8 (Safe and free flow of traffic) of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the proposed development consolidates employment activity and has been designed to ensure it would compromise the safe and free flow of traffic.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Tim Barker, 01508 533801, and E-mail: tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Others

4. **Appl. No** : 2011/1577/F  
   **Parish** : GELDESTON  
   Applicants Name : Mrs Jackie Somani  
   Site Address : 16 Station Road, Geldeston  
   Proposal : Change of use from redundant former railway goods shed to new single dwelling and 2 bedroom holiday let.  
   Recommendation : Approve with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

   1.1 Planning Policy Statement 25 – Development and flood risk

   1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   **Policy 2** – Promoting good design  
   **Policy 5** – The economy

   1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   **HOU 10**: Adaptation and re-use of existing rural buildings for residential purposes  
   **TOU 7**: Conversion of buildings in the open countryside to self-catering holiday accommodation  
   **IMP 8**: Safe and free flow of traffic  
   **IMP 9**: Residential amenity

2. **Consultations**

2.1 Parish Council : Support
   - Very pleased to see the proposed renovation and preservation of such an important building in our villages history

2.2 District Member : Supportive of schemes which retain and reuse architectural buildings of merit, even if that means a change of use.

2.3 Environment Agency : Object on flood risk grounds
Third Wednesday Planning Committee  
21 March 2012

2.4 Broads Authority : Object
   • Consider that the proposed design of the conversion would have an adverse impact on the character of the building

2.5 Lower Waveney I D B : No comments received

2.6 Environmental Services (Protection) : Conditional support

2.7 Historic Environment services : Object
   • Proposed conversion detrimental to the special interest of the building

2.8 NCC Highways : Conditional support

2.9 Flood Defence Officer : Conditional support

2.10 Local Residents : 2 letter of support
   • Will transform a derelict building into an attractive residential accommodation
   • Will be great to see it back in use again within the community
   • Request that reasonable growth of trees and bushes be retained to maintain reasonable privacy
   • Maintenance of drainage dyke and ensure water run off drainage is sufficient

3. Assessment

3.1 This application seeks planning permission for the conversion of the redundant former railway goods shed to a single dwelling and 2 bedroom holiday let. The building is a C19 Goods Shed on the site of former station. The site is situated just outside the Geldeston Conservation Area. The former Station House which is now a residential property is located to the east of the goods shed with other residential properties to the south.

3.2 The principle of change of use is assessed under policy HOU10 and TOU7, it is considered that the building is permanent and substantial; soundly built and suitable for conversion, the proposal does not lead to the loss of a building suitable for continued agricultural use, and the conversion of part of the existing building to holiday let provides an economic reuse of an existing building.

3.3 This application has however raised two main issues, firstly the design approach and secondly its location within flood zones 2 and 3.

Design

3.4 The building is not in use and is in need of some repair. Efforts over the past few years to find a new use for the building have not been successful. A new use for the building would ensure its long-term future but this has to be balanced with its value as a heritage asset and the need to retain the original character and appearance of the building. The Historic Environment Service has indicated that the building may qualify for listed status because of its architectural detail and historic interest and have raised objections to the design approach taken. They consider that the intention to remodel and reposition the lunettes of the main elevation would destroy the symmetry and would be detrimental to the special interest of the building. The Broads Authority equally raise concerns regarding the repositioning and remodeling of the lunettes on the southern elevation, the altering heights interrupt the previous symmetrical layout and adversely affect the character of the building. They also have concerns regarding the landscaping and clear division proposed between the units, where the current situation sees the building sitting alone and within one site.
3.5 The key elevation of the building is to the south side. The design of this elevation with its arrangement of lunettes with windows is specific to the building's original use as a railway Goods Shed. The submitted scheme proposes to change the existing arrangement in order to allow sufficient light into the building for residential use, the design has been amended at the request of the Conservation Officer who raises no objections to the proposed development and considers that the character and appearance of the existing building will not be adversely affected. Therefore whilst I appreciate the concerns raised, I do not consider the design approach is unacceptable.

Flood risk

3.6 The whole site falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3 - high probability. PPS25 requires all new development to be guided to areas of low probability of flooding, this being Flood Zone 1 (i.e. all areas outside Zones 2 & 3), unless it can be demonstrated that no other more suitable and available sites exist. The PPS does advise that applications for minor developments and changes of use should not be subject to Sequential or Exception testing but still have to meet the requirements for FRAs and flood risk reduction. I have however carried out a sequential tests which states:

'The Goods shed is 150 years old and sits alongside the converted station masters house, a station on the Waveney Valley Line. Following the ceasing of the commercial use in 1997, the property has been marketed for alternative commercial uses in consultation with South Norfolk Council but unfortunately no commercial use has come forward. The building is a fine example of railway architecture and is one of only 2 stations on the Waveney line where both the former station house and goods shed still exist. The Historic Environmental Services have advised that the Good shed is worthy of designation as a heritage asset and is of special interest as a railway goods shed with architectural pretensions and historic interest. The site as a whole is considered to be an important undesignated heritage asset and almost unique and the Council has given material weight and consideration to this proposed change of use as it will enable the retention of The Goods Shed and will bring into use a redundant building. The Council is therefore satisfied this building can be developed in principle for the material reason stated above, notwithstanding the site being within Flood Zone 3.'

3.7 The Environment Agency raised an objection based on the original submission on flood risk grounds and placed the onus on South Norfolk Council to assess the safety of the building and safety of future occupants. Additional information has been provided by the agent and this has been assessed by Shirley Bishop the Flood Defence officer. No objections are raised subject to the measures set out in the Flood Plan and in respect of the protection of the building being carried out.

4. Reasons for approval

4.1 The proposal accords with the following South Norfolk Local Plan and Joint Core Strategy policies - IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic; IMP 9: Residential amenity; HOU10: Adaptation and re-use of existing rural buildings for residential purposes; TOU7 Conversion of buildings in the open countryside to self-catering holiday accommodation; Policy 2 Promoting good design; Policy 5 The economy and National policy Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 25 – Development and Flood Risk.

4.2 The proposed change of use accords with the above policies as the building is permanent and substantial; soundly built and suitable for conversion, the proposal does not lead to the loss of a building suitable for continued agricultural use; the conversion of part of the existing building to holiday let provides an economic reuse of an existing building; the design will not adversely affect the character and appearance of the existing building. The amenities of the nearby residential properties will not be adversely affected to a material degree.
4.3 The proposal has been designed to minimise the possibilities of flooding and has been submitted with a full flood risk assessment. The site as a whole is considered to be an important undesignated heritage asset and almost unique. Material weight and consideration is given to this proposed change of use as it will enable the retention of The Goods Shed and will bring into use a redundant building.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis, 01508 533788, ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No** : 2011/2037/F  
**Parish** : WRENINGHAM

Applicants Name : Mr Timothy Smith  
Site Address : Land north of Builders Merchants, Norwich Road, Wreningham, Norfolk, NR16 1BJ  
Proposal : Retrospective application for change of use of small area on agricultural land to agricultural storage to include fenced off area, storage unit and storage shelter.

Recommendation : Approve with conditions

1. In accordance with submitted drawings  
2. Agricultural use only

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design

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  
IMP 10: Noise

2. **Planning History**

2.1 There is no recent planning history which relates to this site

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council : Refuse  
- Is for new permanent construction of a shed in addition to other permanent structures (roofed storage areas, storage unit, fencing and gates)  
- Concerns about the longer term use of this good quality agricultural land

3.2 District Member : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : No objection subject to agricultural use

3.4 Public Right of Way : No objection

3.5 Local Residents : 1 letter of support  
- Not been inconvenienced by proposal  
- Should be no larger than now

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application is for the retention of structures which have been placed on the land for the storage of tools and equipment which is used on the associated field.
4.2 The site is in a countryside location where policies seek to restrict new development to that which requires a rural location. The applicant has confirmed that the storage area and structures are used for the storage of tools and equipment which is used and is planned to be used in connection with the agricultural use of the land. I therefore consider that the principle of the development is acceptable.

4.3 The storage area is located in the south west corner of the field and is adjacent to the boundary with the builders yard and the settlement boundary, as defined by the Local Plan. The land rises in a northerly direction, and the field is elevated above the adjacent road level. While there is a public footpath which runs along the access track, I consider that the storage area is not unduly prominent from public view points and is seen against the existing settlement.

4.4 The site is set away from neighbouring properties and I consider that given the scale of the field, activity at the site will be limited and unlikely to result in as loss of amenity to neighbouring uses. The Highway Authority has raised no objection subject to the use being restricted to agriculture.

5. Reasons for approval

5.1 In the opinion of the local planning authority 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 and Policies ENV8, IMP8, IMP9 and Imp10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the proposal is for an appropriate use and will not detract from the character of the area, the amenity of neighbouring uses or highway safety.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin, 01508 533796, and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2011/2050/F  
   **Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Mr David Richardson  
Site Address : Land west ofBrittons Farm, Wramplingham Road, Downham,  
Norfolk, NR18 0SB  
Proposal : Construction of a single dwelling; change of use to residential.  
Recommendation : Refuse

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Policies
   Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development  
   Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 1: Addressing Climate Change and Protecting Environmental Assets  
   Policy 2: Promoting Good Design  
   Policy 3: Energy and Water

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside  
   IMP 2: Landscaping  
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic

2. **Planning History**

2.1 None relevant

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Wymondham Town Council : Refused  
   - Contrary policy ENV8 – development in countryside not justified.  
   - Contrary PPS 7.

3.2 District Member : To be determined by Committee – to examine location and environmental issues.

3.3 NCC Highways :  
   - Request further detail of access to show visibility splays.  
   - Note location of dwelling is remote from any settlement with essential services and facilities. The nearest bus stops are in Great Melton and Wramplingham Village. The development would consequently conflict with PPS 1 as interpreted in Local Transport Plan Policy which encourages development to be located so as to minimise the need to travel and reduce the reliance on the private car.
3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) : • In absence of main sewer, would require details of foul water drainage to be agreed.  
• If biomass boiler is to be installed then further details should be submitted and agreed. (agent has advised ground source heat pump is now to be used instead) 
• Fully supports the sustainable surface water management proposed.

3.5 Conservation Officer : Refuse. 
• While the high level of sustainability is applauded, the design quality of the dwelling is not sufficient to justify approval contrary to policy under the provision of PPS7 paragraph 11.

3.6 Local Residents : 2 letters of support. 
• Design is sympathetic with the countryside and will enhance our small settlement around Brittons Farm.

4. Assessment

4.1 This is a full application for a substantial new dwelling. In addition to the forms and drawings, the application is supported by a Design, Access and Sustainability Statement; a Protected Species Assessment; and an Energy Performance Summary.

4.2 The application site is located approximately 1.5km from Wramplingham and 2km from the edge of the built up area of Wymondham. It is adjacent and to the rear of a group of 3 dwellings comprised of Brittons Farmhouse and two other dwellings created by conversion of farm buildings. This group of dwellings is set within a site with mature trees and vegetation in an area otherwise characterised by generally open arable land. The proposed dwelling would occupy a triangular area of uncultivated land with its eastern boundary against the rear curtilage of the existing dwellings and a hedge along its north boundary. The south-western boundary is open to the arable land beyond. Access would be via an existing field entrance and along a private drive passing along the north side of Brittons farm, then turning south into the site through a gap to be formed in the hedge line.

4.3 The erection of a dwelling in this comparatively remote, greenfield, countryside location is clearly contrary to SNLP policy ENV8 and runs counter to JCS Policy 1 and national policies (PPS1 and 7) which discourage isolated dwellings in the countryside and encourage development to be located where the need to travel is reduced, especially where such travel is likely to be by private car.

4.4 No special agricultural or similar need has been advanced for the dwelling, but the applicant suggests that the particular design of the proposal justifies granting permission, contrary to normal policy, by reference to paragraph 11 of PPS 7 which states as follows.

“Very occasionally the exceptional quality and innovative nature of the design of a proposed, isolated new house may provide this special justification for granting planning permission. Such a design should be truly outstanding and ground breaking, for example, in its use of materials, methods of construction or its contribution to protecting and enhancing the environment, so helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas. The value of such a building will be found in its reflection of the highest standards of contemporary architecture, the significant enhancement of its immediate setting and its sensitivity to the defining characteristics of the local area.”

(Although the Government has signalled its intention to replace Planning Policy Statements with a National Planning Policy Statement, the published Draft document includes a similar exception clause which has similar wording. It is consequently appropriate to continue to give due weight to this aspect of the PPS.)
4.5 The above extract contains a number of key words and phrases that are clearly open to interpretation. The extent to which any particular proposal satisfies the requirements will be a matter of judgement. It is clear, however, that the clause is intended only to be satisfied “very occasionally” and only by schemes which exhibit “exceptional quality and innovative nature”.

4.6 The proposed design exhibits a very high standard in terms of its sustainable features. Full details are given in the submitted documents but I have noted the following particular points claimed.

- Dwelling to achieve Code Level 6.
- Construction utilises ‘Mod Cell’, a systemised straw build system with hemp and lime render.
- Locally sourced materials and fabrication – ‘Mod Cell’ panels fabricated on local farm where the straw is grown. 70% of timber and roof shingles to be sourced within Norfolk.
- Carbon positive construction – materials used have captured more CO2 than is produced in their production (68 tonne net reduction).
- Water Harvesting for use to flush toilets and water garden, together with sustainable on-site surface water management.
- Energy – Utilises ground source heat pump and photovoltaic array – south orientation to maximise efficiency and solar gain.
- Design – acknowledges traditional barn form.
- Landscaping – creates parkland character with ‘ha-ha’ on south side of dwelling.

4.7 The Council’s Design Officer has noted the exception clause in PPS 7 quoted above, but comments as follows.

“While I feel the contemporary design and the intention to achieve a high level of sustainability are to be applauded, the design quality of the building in my opinion is not of sufficient quality to give planning weight to override the national policy. Furthermore, the landscape setting of this site, in what is a unique valley setting, should be protected from any development. I therefore feel that the scheme does not qualify under paragraph 11 of PPS7 and should not be recommended for approval.”

4.8 I consider that the exception clause in PPS7 is difficult to interpret and apply. For example, if a proposal uses sustainable construction techniques (however good) that have been used elsewhere, is it truly “innovative” or “ground breaking”? I understand that the current proposal utilises materials and techniques that may not be unique in themselves, but they would clearly serve as an exemplar of good practice and perhaps encourage more sustainable building techniques in this area if they prove successful.

4.9 The proposed design seeks to show “sensitivity to the defining characteristics of the local area” by adopting a traditional barn form, but the judgement of whether this particular scheme represents the “highest standards of contemporary architecture” is bound to involve a degree of subjective opinion. While the design clearly includes highly sustainable characteristics, the Design Officer does not consider that the overall quality of the design is sufficiently exceptional to justify approval under the PPS7 exception clause.

4.10 Detailed issues relating to the access and foul drainage have arisen, but these are not crucial to the principle of the development and could be resolved via planning condition if required.
5. **Reasons for Refusal**

5.1 The proposed dwelling would occupy an unsustainable location remote from facilities and services, and would intrude into any area of generally undeveloped countryside to the detriment of its character and appearance. Such a development would conflict with policies regarding the location of new development as contained in Planning Policy Statements 1 and 7, Joint Core Strategy Policy 1 and South Norfolk Local Plan Policy ENV8.

5.2 The proposed design is not of such exceptional quality that it justifies granting permission as a departure from normal policy as provided for in paragraph 11 of PPS7.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Chris Trett, 01508 533794,  
and E-mail:  ctre@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No** : 2011/2059/F  
**Parish** : BROCKDISH  
Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs C Lister  
Site Address : Annexe at Haggle House, Scole Road, Thorpe Abbotts, IP21 4HS  
Proposal : Use of existing residential annexe as a separate dwelling house.  
Recommendation : Refuse

1. Contrary to SNLP policies TRA13, IMP8, IMP9 and HOU10  
2. Impact on corridor of movement  
3. Inadequate visibility splays  
4. Unsatisfactory relationship with main dwelling

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2010/0563 Variation of condition 3 on planning permission 2007/2368/F & 2008/0467/F to allow short term letting Refused

2.2 2008/0467 Renovation of room as an en-suite to annexe to Haggle House (amendment to application 2007/2366) Approved

2.3 2007/2366 & 2367 Proposed change of use of redundant storage barn into 2 residential letting units & annexe Approved

2.4 2007/1505 & 1506 Proposed change of use of redundant storage barns into 5 residential holiday letting units Withdrawn

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council : Approve  
- As the original justification for the annexe was no longer applicable, it would be acceptable for short term lets to be allowed as proposed  
- Should continue to be tied to the main residence  
- Whilst there would clearly be an increase in traffic it was unlikely to be sufficient to be decisive

3.2 District Member : To be determined by Committee  
- Makes good use of an existing building

3.3 NCC Highways : Refuse  
- Impact of increase in turning traffic on corridor of movement  
- Inadequate visibility splays

3.4 Natural England : No comments

3.5 Environmental Services (Protection) : No response received

3.6 Conservation Officer : No response received
3.7 Local Residents : 1 letter of objection

- The application should be refused as the reasons that stipulated use of the subject unit as an annexe only hold good
- Enjoy the rural aspect of our home and consider the latest application to be truly a proposal too far. Occupation of the annexe by an elderly relative is one thing, by a four person family would be another thing altogether
- The distance to our house from the annexe is less than 18 metres and the annexe looks directly into our property
- Our house is listed and development of the site at Haggle House has changed the entire character of the site particularly given the number of parked cars which this proposal would increase further
- Use as a separate dwelling would create additional pressures on the access and pose new dangers to other road users
- Misleading to say there have been no accidents at the site entrance in last five years, we have been personally involved in one. This is an accident blackspot with a number of fatalities and near fatalities over the years

4. Assessment

4.1 The application relates to an annexe permitted in 2007 (2007/2366). The annexe was permitted to allow accommodation for the applicant’s mother, however she no longer plans to move to the property at this stage. The proposal is to convert the annexe into a separate dwelling until such time as she does wish to move to the property. A similar application for what is proposed (2010/0563) was refused, however the Planning Inspectorate subsequently found that the method in which that application was made was not valid. Consequently, a new application of a different type has been made which in effect applies for the same outcome.

4.2 The site is served by the A143, which is a Principal Route within the Norfolk County Council Route Hierarchy Plan. The route is a designated corridor of movement on which the principle function of the A143 is that of carrying traffic freely and safely between centres of population. Drivers on corridors of movement do not normally expect to encounter slowing, stopping and turning movements outside built-up areas. As such the hazards which can be caused by these movements are greatly increased, particularly where traffic speeds are high. The traffic levels and speeds at this location on the A143, are both high, with the road being subject to the national speed limit for single carriageway roads of 60mph. The site is rurally located well away from any centre of population.

4.3 The annex where used as such operates in much the same manner as adding a three bedroom extension to the main dwelling. As long as the annex and the main dwelling is in common use then linked trips will inevitably be made e.g. the occupiers of the main dwelling and their relatives occupying the annex will car share on shopping trips and leisure outings etc. In addition there will be common visitors to both – family members, etc. If the common use is severed, then these links will be lost such that there will inevitably be an increase in vehicle traffic.
4.4 Norfolk County Council’s highways officer advises that the use of the annexe as a separate dwelling house would potentially lead to an increase of some 8-10 vehicle movements per day onto a corridor of movement. In addition to the movements that are associated with the existing dwellings and two holiday units. Visibility from the site access onto the A143 is notably restricted in the easterly direction, owing to the rather overgrown vegetation along the frontage resulting in visibility being measured at 110 metres to the nearside carriageway edge. The appropriate vision standard contained in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges for a 60 mph road is 215 metres and therefore it is considered that visibility available is deficient and therefore contrary to the safe and free flow of traffic as required by policy IMP8.

4.5 Use of the annexe as an entirely independent dwelling would raise a number of concerns relating to residential amenity and other issues. It is considered that this property would not be suitable as a separate dwelling as it is in effect in the curtilage of the main dwelling and it would be very difficult to separate the two properties due to the nature of the shared parking and their proximity. It could also conflict with the permitted holiday lets. It is therefore considered contrary to IMP9 and HOU10.

4.6 It is therefore recommended that the proposed application is refused due to the inadequacies of the access and impact on the A143 and in terms of the relationship of the annexe unit with the main dwelling.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 including, in particular, policies TRA13 (Corridors of Movement), IMP8 (Safe and free flow of traffic), IMP9 (Residential amenity) and HOU10 (Adaptation and re-use of existing rural buildings for residential purposes).

5.2 The proposed development would intensify the use of an existing access on a stretch of classified highway where the principle use is that of carrying traffic freely and safely between centres of population. The existence of an access in this location is a matter of fact and therefore some degree of conflict and interference to the passage of through vehicles already occurs, but the intensification of that interference which this proposal would engender would lead to the deterioration in the efficiency of the through road and be detrimental to highway safety contrary to the above policy TRA13.

5.3 Inadequate visibility splays are provided at the junction of the access with the County highway and this would cause danger and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway contrary to the above policy IMP8.

5.4 The development would be contrary to the above policies IMP9 and HOU10 as the relationship of the building with the main dwelling would be unsatisfactory due to the shared curtilage and access arrangements.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Tim Barker, 01508 533801, and E-mail: tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
8. **Appl. No** : 2012/0132/LB  
**Parish** : WACTON  
Applicants Name : Mr Walter Shave  
Site Address : Bretts Manor, The Common, Wacton, Norfolk, NR15 2UP  
Proposal : Addition of pitched roof to existing flat roof extension. Installation of door and small window to old section of house. New window and door to 1960's extension.  

Recommendation : Refuse

1. Contrary to SNLP policy IMP13, JCS policy 1 and PPS5  
2. Bulk, mass and scale would result over dominant structure detrimental to listed building.  
3. Poor quality of design would be detrimental to listed building.

9. **Appl. No** : 2012/0133/F  
**Parish** : WACTON  
Applicants Name : Mr Walter Shave  
Site Address : Bretts Manor, The Common, Wacton, Norfolk, NR15 2UP  

Recommendation : Refuse

1. Contrary to SNLP policies IMP13, IMP18 and HOU14, JCS policies 1 and 2 and PPS5  
2. Bulk, mass and scale would result over dominant structure detrimental to listed building and conservation area  
3. Poor quality of design would be detrimental to listed building and conservation area.

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  
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
HOU 14: Extensions to dwellings in the open countryside

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2010/1946 Remove Three tress (willow and two un-named)  
Approved Prune two trees (Beech and Lime)
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council:
- Work already undertaken at the property, has been done sympathetically
- Proposed timber building – support the erection of this building
- Replacement stable – felt to new location of the stable is a better position than the previous
- Construction of pond - Mr Shave is intending to attract wildlife to pond area and is taking advice on how to do this. Construction of the pond is supported
- Installation of door and small window in old section of house and new window and door in 1960’s extension. This work has already been done and in keeping with other windows and doors in the property
- Change of use to garden curtilage - support change of use
- Addition of pitched roof to existing flat roof extension – in principle in favour of the proposal, however 1960’s extension on the rear is large in comparison to the old house and councillors are keen that the new roof does not dominate the existing thatched property. Careful planning and the usage of the correct materials should avoid this, possibly using thatch instead of pantiles.

3.2 District Member
- Mr T Blowfield: To be determined by committee
  - IMP13 and IMP15 I believe the applicants desire to add pitched roof to the existing 1960’s flat roof extension will enhance the grade II listed building and improve the conservation area of Wacton Common.
  - The pitched roof will benefit all neighbours either side have agreed to this proposal.
- Mr Andrew Pond: To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Conservation Officer: Object
- Size of the extension would make the roof overly dominant
- Gables have wider span than existing house,
- Poor relationship between ground floor windows and gables
- Flat roof in front of proposed gable
- Adversely affect listed building

3.4 Landscape Officer: No objection

3.5 Local Residents:
- Two letters of support and one letter of support submitted with the application
  - No objection to the proposal
  - Credit to owners that care has been taken to sympathetically enhance the inappropriate 1960’s rear flat roof extension
  - This is a one off opportunity after 45 years to correct this planning mistake to bring the whole architectural edifice back into an ascetic whole.
  - Sensitive restoration and renovation which is being done here is to be encouraged and new roof will result in a visual improvement to this historical house.
4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application relates to a grade II listed building which is a rare example of a "Wealden" house of 14th/15th century origins, which is particularly significant. It is rendered with a thatched roof and has a very large flat roof extension to the rear of the property. The dwelling is one of a number of buildings spread around the Common which is a Conservation Area.

4.2 The applications seek to do a number of things:
- Erect a pitched roof extension on the existing flat roof rear extension;
- Erect barn type building in the rear existing garden (partially constructed);
- Extend the residential curtilage of the property into the adjacent paddock;
- Create a new pond;
- Erect a stable block;
- Install a small window and door to old section of house (retrospective);
- New window to flat roof extension part of building (retrospective).

4.3 The house has a rather large unfortunate flat roof extension to the rear of the property, which while not being overly prominent in the view of the house from the Common, is nevertheless a dominant structure from the side and rear. The extension appears to have had planning permission in the 1960’s but its scale and design results in it having a harmful impact on the special character of the listed house.

4.4 The applications propose to try and improve the situation by installing a pitched tiled roof with gables onto the flat roof. In most cases the construction of a pitched roof over a flat roof would normally be welcomed, but the Conservation Officer considers the large footprint of the extension would make the roof an over dominant feature and overwhelm the original listed house. Although efforts have been made to split the roof up with gables and retain part of the flat roof this does not resolve the issue. As a result myself and the Conservation Officer are very concerned that the proposal would be overly dominant and have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the listed building and adversely affect the visual amenity of the conservation area.

4.5 Furthermore in design terms the gables have a wider span than the original house and the retention of the ground floor window pattern also makes the gables sit uncomfortably on the building, in addition the lack of detail on the drawings makes it difficult to appreciate how these would work. The gable on the east elevation would have a section of flat roof in front of it, because the flat roof is not in one continuously line, which would create a rather uncomfortable relationship and poor quality design. I think it is important to note that the scale and poor quality of design of the new roof extension would not be acceptable on any building and more importantly not on this listed building.

4.6 Myself and the Conservation Officer therefore, consider that the proposal is contrary to policies IMP13, IMP18 and HOU14 in the South Norfolk Local Plan, polices 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment, which seeks to ensure that the special architectural or historic interest of the building is preserved, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is preserved or enhanced and that all development are of a good quality of design.

4.7 The roof terrace is some distance from the adjacent dwelling and is screened by trees; I therefore consider the terrace would not cause an unacceptable level of over looking.

4.8 The new barn which is partially constructed on the east boundary of the site, is timber construction with a pantile roof and has 4 bays. The building is a substantial structure, but given existing vegetation along the east boundary I do not consider that it would have a significant impact on the neighbouring property and would not adversely affect the setting of the listed building.
4.9 The application also proposes quite a large extension to the residential curtilage incorporating the existing paddock, there is an existing hedge to the north which follows the line of the curtilage of adjacent dwellings, I therefore consider that the extension to the curtilage would not adversely affect the local landscape.

4.10 A large pond is also proposed to the west of the dwelling, no details of the sections of the pond have been submitted but the application indicates that it would be of varying levels, this information could be provided by condition. I have no objection to this part of the proposal.

4.11 The proposed stable block which in the extended curtilage replaces one which is in a very poor state of repair. It is a simple design on the north west boundary which would not adversely affect the local landscape or the setting of the listed building.

4.12 The listed building application also seeks retrospective permission for a new window and door in the original part of the house and a new window in the flat roof section these alterations are acceptable and do not adversely affect the character and appearance of the listed building. The Conservation officer raises no objection to this part of the proposal.

5. **Reasons for Refusal 2012/0132**

5.1 The proposal is contrary to the provision of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan, Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk and Planning Policy Statement 15: including in particular policies IMP13 – Alterations and extensions to listed buildings and Joint Core Strategy Policy 1 – Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets.

5.2 The proposed roof extension would result in the scale and bulk of the rear extension being overly dominate which would detract from the character and appearance of the original listed building.

5.3 The design features of the proposed roof extension including wide gables, poor relationship between ground floor windows and the proposed gables and an area of flat roof in front of the proposed gable on the east elevation result in a poor quality of design which would adversely affect the character and appearance of the listed building.

6 **Reasons for Refusal 2012/0133**

6.1 The proposal is contrary to the provision of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan, Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk and Planning Policy Statement 15: including in particular policies IMP13 – Alterations and extensions to listed buildings, IMP18 – Development within Conservation Areas and HOU14 – Extension to dwellings in the open countryside and Joint Core Strategy Policy 1 – Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets and Policy 2 – Promoting good design.

6.2 The proposed roof extension would result in the scale and bulk of the rear extension being overly dominate which would detract from the character and appearance of the original listed building and the visual amenity of the conservation area.

6.3 The design features of the proposed roof extension including wide gables, poor relationship between ground floor windows and the proposed gables and an area of flat roof in front of the proposed gable on the east elevation result in a poor quality of design which would adversely affect the character and appearance of the listed building and the visual amenity of the conservation area.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman, 01508 533833, and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
10. **Appl. No** : 2012/0168/F  
**Parish** : WYMONDHAM  

Applicants Name : Mr James Richardson  
Site Address : Land north of Rightup Lane, Wymondham, Norfolk  
Proposal : Proposed residential development of 6 dwellings, works to include reduction of site level (removal of hoggin)  

Recommendation : Authorise DCM to approve with conditions  

1. Full - Planning Permission Time Limit  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Slab level to be agreed  
5. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
6. Landscaping scheme to be submitted (Full applications)  
7. Low maintenance planting for embankment  
8. Noise protection scheme to be agreed  
9. Contaminated land – remediation scheme  
10. Implementation of remediation scheme  
11. Contaminated land during construction  
12. Tree protection  
13. Water efficiency  
14. Surface Water  
15. Provision of Parking and Servicing Areas  

(Subject to clarification of s.w.drainage affordable housing and foul sewerage capacity)

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting Good Design  
Policy 3 : Energy and water  
Policy 4 : Housing delivery  

1.2 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise  

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/2051/F Proposed residential development of 6 dwellings, works to include reduction of site level (removal of hoggin) Withdrawn  

2.2 2004/1626/F Proposed erection of 6no dwellings with associated access road and landscaping etc. Withdrawn  

2.3 2002/1236/F Proposed 12no semi-detached /terraced 2no bedroom dwellings & associated access & parking and site remodelling Undetermined
2.4 1999/1012/F Retain storage yard for parking of commercial trailers and vehicles without compliance with previously imposed personal condition (07/79/0974/CU) Approved

2.5 1996/1736/F Mineral extraction to lower ground level to match adjoining Withdrawn

2.6 1996/1693/O Reduce site ground levels and erection of four dwellings Approved

2.7 1996/1385/O Erection of six dwellings & associated parking Refused

2.8 1996/7031/C Mineral extraction to lower ground level to match adjoining Withdrawn

2.9 1990/1387/O Erection Of 7 One-Bedroom Units. Refused – appeal dismissed

2.10 1990/0041/O Erection Of 9 No. 1 Bedroom Units. Refused

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council : Approve
   - Strong concerns over removal of hoggin and possible contamination
   - To be referred to NCC Highways, Env Services and Network Rail.

3.2 District Member : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : No objection subject to conditions
   - Layout of site has been amended and is now acceptable

3.4 Network Rail (South East) : No comments

3.5 Housing Strategy Manager : To be reported

3.6 Environmental Services (Protection) : No objection subject to conditions
   - Comment regarding noise impacts from railway and mitigation proposed
   - Comment with regard to potential contamination – details are acceptable

3.7 Landscape Officer : To be reported

3.8 Shirley Bishop : Drainage report indicates that soakaways will be effective – question the implications of removing surface materials.
   - Change in level at rear of site and position of soakaways may result in ground seepage.
   - Should encourage rain water re use and conservation

3.9 Kelly Lunness - Operations Manager : To be reported
3.10 Local Residents: 7 letter of objection

- Overlooking of gardens
- Loss of light, particularly in winter
- Noise during construction and following occupation
- Disability rights – should provide bungalows
- Impact on ecology through removal of trees
- Will exacerbate drainage problems under railway bridge
- Permission already granted for a further 28 dwellings
- Should wait outcome of LDF
- Comment regarding historic use of the site
- Consider design should reflect new dwelling at the station and be sympathetic to the Listed Buildings

4. Assessment

4.1 The application is a revised scheme for 6, two storey semi detached properties accessed off Right Up Lane. The properties will be orientated such that their gable elevations face the railway and properties on High Banks to the north and Exige Way to the south.

4.2 The site is located within the development limit for Wymondham and as such the principle of development on the site is acceptable. Policies in the JCS and Local Plan seek to ensure that proposals are of a scale, form and character in keeping with the locality, do not adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring properties and have a suitable access to the highway.

4.3 The site is linear in form and is bordered to the north by the railway line, beyond which are dwellings and public house on High Banks which are built at a lower level than the site. The site is elevated above the level of Right Up Lane which runs to the south, especially at the western end adjacent to the railway bridge. On the opposite side of Right Up Lane is the new development, with properties on Exige Way being elevated above the level of the application site.

4.4 The layout of the site has sought to take account of these differing heights and the relationship between the properties. The properties will be orientated such that their gable elevations run north/south, which results in the main outlook being east / west. This results in the gable elevation facing the majority of the neighbours and windows looking away from the majority of the existing properties. The layout proposes the access road to run along side the railway which results in the properties being located away from dwellings on High Banks.

4.5 Sections have been provided to show the height relationship between the properties and I consider that from the information submitted, the dwellings will not be unduly prominent from longer views from the north, or in the outlook of the neighbouring properties.

4.6 The dwellings are a similar scale and mass to other properties in the locality and while the floor plans of the properties are repetitive, there is variety in the roof form and materials. While properties to the north and south tend to be orientated such that their ridge lines run east / west, I consider that due to the relationship with existing properties, and to minimise the massing of the properties when viewed from the wider area, that the layout and form as proposed is acceptable.

4.7 Concerns have been raised that due to the differing levels, the proposed dwellings will result in overlooking of existing dwellings, particularly on High Banks and 9 Right Up Lane. The side elevations of the proposed dwellings will be a minimum of 38m from the rear of dwellings on High Banks, with views from windows (taking account of a 45 degree outlook) being a minimum of 39m. While I acknowledge the difference in height, which could increase the feeling of scale of these properties, I consider that due to the distance between the properties, they will not result in significant overlooking, overshadowing or dominate the outlook of properties on High Bank.
4.8 Plot 2 will look towards No 9 Right Up Lane but will be 18m from the site boundary and there will be 25m between the properties. In addition there is a degree of landscape screening along the boundary and while there will be an increase in overlooking, I do not consider that it is sufficient to warrant refusal of the scheme.

4.9 The dwellings will be adjacent to the railway line and there is potential for noise disturbance. A noise survey was undertaken in connection with a dwelling recently constructed to the west of the station and the findings of that survey have been referred to in this application. A detailed scheme of mitigation has not been included, however I consider that the layout and form has taken account of the principle recommendations and that the details relating to acoustic treatments and boundary forms can be addressed by conditions.

4.10 As part of the proposal is it intended to lower the site by removing hoggin which has been historically deposited on the site. A contaminated land assessment has been undertaken which as been considered by Environmental Services. They have raised no objection subject to conditions.

4.11 The highway boundary of the site is bordered by semi mature landscaping which helps to soften the appearance of the site. An arboricultural assessment has been undertaken, which indicates that the development can be undertaken without adversely affecting the majority of these trees. The report makes recommendations relating to the protection of the trees during the removal of the hoggin and I consider that this should be covered by conditions. I consider that the maintenance and enhancement of the planting on the embankment should also be required by condition.

4.12 Concerns have been raised about the drainage of the site and capacity of existing systems, particularly in view of flooding which occurs under the bridge. The application has been accompanied by an assessment of the site for soak aways which concludes that this would be feasible. The Flood Defence Officer has commented on the potential position of these and the possibility of seepage through the bank, particularly for the western plots. The agent is to submit additional details in relation to this matter and this will be reported at committee. With regard to foul drainage, Members will be aware that this has recently been upgraded with regard to the sites allocated in the Local Plan to the South Of Right Up Lane. The agent is seeking confirmation from Anglian Water regarding the available capacity within this system and additional details submitted in relation to this matter will be reported at committee.

4.13 Policy 4 of the JCS relates to housing delivery and sets out that on sites of between 5 – 9 houses (or 0.2 – 0.4 Ha), 20% should be provided as affordable properties with the tenure agreed on site by site basis. The proposal is for 6 dwellings and the site is 0.22 Ha, and consequently 1 of the dwellings should be affordable. In the Design and Access Statement the agent refers to the additional text in this policy, which sets out that “The proportion of affordable housing sought may be reduced and the balance of the tenures amended where it can be demonstrated that the site characteristics, including infrastructure provision, together with the requirement for affordable housing would render the site unviable in prevailing market conditions, taking account of the availability of public subsidy to support affordable housing”.

4.14 Further details have been sought from the agent to confirm whether it is proposed to incorporate 1 affordable property or to provide further details relating to the development costs to justify not providing an affordable property in this case. Any additional details in relation to this matter and this will be reported at committee.

4.15 The site will be served from the existing access point and the internal layout has been amended to provide adequate off street parking for each dwelling and turning for service vehicles. The Highway Authority has raised no objection to the proposal subject to conditions.
5. Reasons for approval

5.1 In the opinion of the local planning authority 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 HOU4, IMP8, IMP9 and IMP10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the proposal has been designed to take account of the character of the area, the amenity of neighbouring uses and has a suitable access to the Highway network.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin, 01508 533796, and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
11. Appl. No : 2012/0228/H
Parish : WINFARTHING
Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs Cox
Site Address : Goose Green Cottage, Goose Green Lane, Winfarthing, IP22 2ET
Proposal : Extensions and associated alterations to dwelling. Erection of stable building
Recommendation : Refuse

1. Planning Policies

1.1 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 2: Design:

1.2 South Norfolk Local Plan
HOU 14: Extensions to dwellings in the open countryside
HOU19: Extensions to existing dwellings
LEI14: Keeping of horses for recreational purposes

2. Planning History

2.1 No recent planning history

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council : No objection
• Note that there was once a ditch along the back of the property where the extension is now planned

3.2 District Member : May be a delegated decision if minded to approve
• Development will result in an enhanced property
• Provision of shelter for horses is essential for their welfare and is in keeping with the rural setting

3.3 Local Residents : No comments received

4. Assessment

4.1 The application site is a two-storey dwelling set in an isolated position outside of any Development Limits. The property is set within a substantial plot and is positioned along the road frontage. Open agricultural land surrounds the site and there are no near neighbours. A public footpath traverses the opposite side of the field to the south-west of the application site and runs parallel to Goose Green Lane.

4.2 The applicant proposes a two-storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling and a single storey extension to the north-west elevation of the property. A stable building comprising three stables is also proposed for the south corner of the garden area.

4.3 The existing property is simple in form with grey pantiles and cream render. There is a small front porch in closest proximity to Goose Green Lane, an existing glass lean to along the north-west elevation and an earlier single storey side extension along the south-east elevation.
4.4 The two-storey rear extension would extend the full width of the original dwelling and would significantly increase the footprint of the existing building. The extended area proposes a double gable with a central valley in order to maintain the ridge height of the original property. In my opinion, the height, depth and length of the proposed extension results in a scale, bulk and massing which does not respect the scale and appearance of the original dwelling. I consider that the proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy HOU14 which requires development in the open countryside to be subordinate to the existing dwelling.

4.5 The proposed single storey side extension also represents a substantial addition to the property, being of the same depth as the existing dwelling and 7 metres in width. Although this element of the proposal is stepped back from the principal elevation of the dwelling I consider its size to be excessive and to the detriment of the existing character and appearance of the dwelling, particularly when viewed in conjunction with the proposed development to the rear of the property.

4.6 The final element of the proposal is a stable block located to the south of the dwellinghouse, set back approximately 12 metres from the boundary of the property and the highway. The applicant proposes stained timber weatherboarding with clay pantiles and ridge tiles to match the dwelling. The addition of a stable block in this location is acceptable and would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the landscape, highway safety or residential amenity.

5. **Reasons for Refusal**

5.1 The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2003, in particular Policies HOU14 – Extensions to dwellings in the open countryside and HOU19 – extension to existing dwellings. The proposal involves extensions which, due to their character, massing, bulk and design are incompatible with the scale and appearance of the original dwelling and are not subordinate to it.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Kate Fisher, 01508 533985, and E-mail: kfisher@s-norfolk.gov.uk
12. **Appl. No**: 2012/0229/F  
**Parish**: BAWBURGH

Applicants Name: Ben Kemp  
Site Address: Villa Farm, Watton Road, Bawburgh, Norfolk, NR9 3LQ  
Proposal: Concrete hard standing to allow external storage for potential occupiers of adjacent approved employment units

Recommendation: Approve with conditions

1. **Full - Planning Permission Time Limit**
2. **In accordance with submitted drawings**
3. **Boundary treatment to be agreed**
4. **Landscaping scheme to be submitted**
5. **Details of earthworks**
6. **External storage**
7. **Full details of external lighting**
8. **Reversing sirens**
9. **Hours of use – deliveries and vehicle movements in the storage area**
10. **Details of surface water drainage**

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Policies  
Planning Policy Statement 7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas  
Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 – Transport

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 5: The economy

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
EMP 4: Employment development outside the Development Limits and Village Boundaries of identified towns and villages  
ENV1: Protection of landscape  
ENV 6: Areas which contribute to maintaining the landscape setting of the Southern Bypass of the City  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2009/0910/F Change of use of piggery building to a dwelling and change of use of redundant agricultural buildings to B1 (a), (b), (c) and B8 uses (60% limit on B1(a) floor space), car parking, landscaping and associated access improvements: Refused  
Appeal - Allowed

2.2 1997/0700 Erection of two agricultural cattle & storage buildings: Refused  
Appeal Allowed

2.3 1997/0157 Construction of new vehicular access from B1108: Refused  
Appeal Allowed
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council: Does not object to the principle of some provision for external storage but concerned that the area proposed is very large in proportion to the buildings since there are no current occupants of the buildings or what is going to be stored.
   - Should restrict storage height to height of screening.
   - Should be no audible or visual intrusion to neighbouring properties – ie from forklift trucks
   - Hours of use should be restricted to week days 8:00 – 17:00

3.2 District Member
   Cllr Wheatley: To be determined by committee
   - Seeks to overturn the original conditions that there should be no outside storage
   - Appeal considered that as car parking would be sensitively located within the site Policy ENV6 would not be compromised
   - The Inspector considered that it was reasonable to control external storage, lighting and remove permitted development rights.
   - Inspector recognised the prominence of the site which is situated on the crest of the hill between Bawburgh and Little Melton.
   - It is within sight and sound of dwellings, which will suffer intrusion from such a large storage area.
   - Would represent a considerable industrialisation of the site. Do not consider that sufficient mitigation can be achieved by fencing and planting. Such treatment will emphasise the scale of industrial operation taking place

Cllr C Kemp: To be determined by committee
   The conditions which the applicant seeks to vary were imposed by the Inspector as a result of a public, open and transparent process. On principle, any change in them should be dealt with similarly.

3.3 NCC Highways: Approve subject to:
   - Outside storage area shall be used in connection with adjacent approved employment units or for agricultural use
   - Conditions on previous permission being met before outside storage area being brought into use

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection): To be reported

3.5 Local Residents: None received

4. Assessment

4.1 The application was initially submitted to form a concrete hardstanding area to allow storage for potential occupiers of the approved employment units. This initially appeared to be a speculative proposal, however during the consideration of the application, further details have been submitted by the agent regarding the need for the storage area and the intended use, together with likely levels of employment associated with the proposal. This is attached at Appendix 2.
4.2 Planning permission was allowed on appeal for the change of use of the farm group to employment uses and the current application site was shown on the approved drawings as “open meadow land”. The appeal decision, associated conditions and site layout plan are attached at appendix 3.

4.3 The site is in an open countryside location where national policies seek to balance safeguarding the character of the area with sustainable forms of development while sustaining the rural economy. Planning Policy Statement 7 (PPS7) seeks to direct new development to existing settlements and this is reflected in policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan, however, both PPS7 and Policy EMP3 of the Local Plan allow for the re use of redundant rural buildings and encourage economic uses to help sustain the rural economy.

4.4 In addition, Policy EMP4 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (Appendix 4) relates to employment development outside the Development Limits and sets out that exceptionally planning permission may be granted, if the proposal is:
   vii) “Un neighbourly”, and therefore unsuitable for locations within an existing built-up area; or
   viii) Reliant on large areas of open storage, and would therefore represent an inefficient use of serviced employment land

4.5 The additional information submitted sets out that the proposal would be related to the use of two of the adjacent buildings and that the nature of the business proposed requires a large area of external storage for larger items which can not be accommodated within the buildings. The proposal could therefore be considered in the context of the exceptions set out in Policy EMP4.

4.6 The site is in a prominent ridgeline position and is within the area covered by Policy ENV6 which seeks to safeguard the landscape setting of the Southern Bypass. In considering the previous application, the layout of the site sought to position parking areas within the existing group to limit the visual impact of the on the wider landscape. It was also proposed to undertake further landscaping works and to re profile an existing bund to enhance the visual effect of the proposal and on this basis the Inspector considered that the proposal did not conflict with the aims of Policy ENV6.

4.7 I consider that the scheme as proposed does have potential to be prominent in the landscape and will be visible from the Watton Road, but in seeking to balance the economic benefits with landscape impacts, discussions have taken place with the agent to amend the front boundary treatments to increase the width of the landscaping area and to provide a screen fence to the rear of the landscape area. While I recognise that this landscaping will take a number of years to mature, I consider that in time the use of this area for storage which could be limited in height, could be assimilated into the landscape.

4.8 The application does not at present propose any external lighting associated with the storage area, however, I consider that it is likely that lighting would be needed to address health and safety issues and security of the site. This has the potential to increase the prominence of the site and while there is streetlighting to the east of the site I consider that it would be reasonable to control any future lighting.

4.9 The site is in a relatively isolated location, however there is a dwelling 181m to the west and a group of dwellings 105m to the east. The proposal will be visible, particularly from the east, and there is potential for disturbance to the occupiers of these properties, particularly from vehicle movements. The agent has indicated that the proposed tenant envisages that deliveries to and from the storage area would taken place between 7am and 4pm, with staff being on site until 5pm. The Parish Council have suggested controls on the hours of use of the storage area and given that the proposal relates to the supply of the construction industry which could result in early morning activity, I consider that it is reasonable to control the hours of use associated with vehicle movements within the site and deliveries to and from the site.
4.10  The Highway Authority has raised no objection subject to the previous conditions being complied with and the use of the storage area being restricted to being used in connection with the adjacent units. While the application indicates that the current proposal is to use it in connection with two of the units, it is necessary to consider whether its use independent to these is acceptable. In the context of Policy EMP4, if the use of this site for a large area of external storage is considered to be acceptable as an exception, then I consider that it would be unreasonable to restrict its use independent to the other units.

5.  Reasons for approval

5.1  In the opinion of the local planning authority 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 5 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies EMP4, ENV6, IMP8, IMP9 and IMP10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the proposal is for a large area of external storage which meets the exception criteria of Policy EMP4 and subject to additional landscaping will not adversely affect the objectives of Policy ENV6 or significantly detract from the amenities of neighbouring uses or highway safety.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Stuart Pontin, 01508 533796,
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Third Wednesday Planning Committee
21 March 2012
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Application No: 2012/0229
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South Norfolk Council, Long Stratton, Norwich, Norfolk, NR15 2XE Tel (01508) 533633 Fax (01508) 533625
South Norfolk Council Planning Department
South Norfolk House
Swan Lane
Long Stratton
Norfolk
NR15 2XE

For the attention of Mr S Pontin – Senior Planning Officer

Dear Sirs

Villa Farm, Bawburgh
Proposed Concrete Hardstanding

Thank you for your e-mail of 16th February sent following a visit to Villa Farm, Bawburgh and a meeting with Mr L Allison of Newall Civil Engineering.

Our client acknowledges that he has carried out certain activities beyond those currently permitted and apologises for the concern this has caused. However as has now been explained a potential tenant has expressed significant interest in occupying a part of the development for a civil engineering materials supply depot, and there had been a wish to demonstrate progress when he visited the site on 15th February.

The potential tenant has indicated a likelihood of 30 to 40 new jobs, (not relocated jobs), being created by this new depot and it is hoped that such an important benefit can be taken in to account as part of the determination of Planning Application 2012/0229.

Notwithstanding the explanation it is clear that there are Planning Conditions from Planning Permission APPL/L2630/A/09/2115934 requiring details to be submitted to allow consideration of these conditions for discharge, prior to commencement of work on site. These details are actively in preparation and will be the subject of further correspondence shortly.

Additionally, on reflection, our client agrees it was inappropriate to have removed the former sugar beet storage pad, piles of crushed concrete and topsoil from the proposed hardstanding area for which you have only recently received a Planning Application.

On behalf of the owners of the land we apologise for the fact that the wrong trees have been felled on the site. The client accepts this is a serious matter and wishes to work with South Norfolk Council to enhance the current landscape proposals for the site, in accordance with the Appeal APP/L2630/A/09/2115934 recommendations item 12, as compensation for the tree removal if this is an acceptable way forward.

Plandescl Ltd Connought Road Attleborough Norfolk NR17 2BW
Telephone: (01953) 452001 Fax: (01953) 456955 E-mail: pdoll@plandescl.co.uk www.plandescl.co.uk
Registered in England No. 1447/113
civil, structural, environmental, surveying
Initial concerns were itemised in the telephone conversation Allinson / Pontin on 16th February 2012 as:

1) Why does the hardstanding area need to be so large?
2) The proposed palisade fencing is not in keeping with the rural environment.
3) What is to be stored on the hardstanding area and to what height?
4) The site lies within the ENV6 Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone.

It was not known at the time the application was submitted, however the news that a potential tenant is a nationally established civil engineering materials supplier looking for a suitable depot location in the area explains the size of storage hardstanding applied for. The height to which materials will be stored is typically a maximum of 3.0m as stacking over this height would damage materials in store and would be more difficult to handle with a forklift truck. Such depots are typically laid out on a grid pattern to facilitate fork lift access routes to stored materials and although a layout is still to be considered in detail, it is the availability of a storage area of the size applied for that makes the site an attractive proposition.

Palisade Fencing is perhaps an inappropriate description; however it will be necessary to provide a security fence to deter the potential for theft that such a depot would attract. A 2.0 metre high fence was proposed to be sensitive to the need for security but minimise the involvement of Planning where height could become an issue. If the main concern of the Planners is the appearance of the fence within the environment then a number of options exist and the Paramount Steel Fence Security Fencing Range summarises many of these (www.paramountsteelfence.co.uk). Perhaps the two most valuable features that could be considered for the Villa Farm site are the use of powder coated elements, e.g. green in colour as opposed to galvanised, to blend in with surroundings and/or the use of either mesh or vertical bars that would give a less industrial feel to the appearance. The Vertical Bar, Guardsman and Paramesh Ranges of fencing would all seem to have features that would soften the appearance without compromising the security.

At the end of the day however there is no disguising the fact that the potential tenant is looking for a suitable site to meet an identified demand for his product range with favourable links to the highway network and a secure storage area is part of his requirement. In granting permission for Industrial use on this site security fencing is enviable in this location.

With regard to ENV6 it is accepted that the site lies within this sensitive landscape area. It is also noted however that the Appeal Inspector recorded his view on the site development and whether he shared the concern of nearby Parish Council’s that it was contrary to ENV6.

In the ‘Other Matters’ section of his report item 26 noting ‘... given the scope for landscaping, the fact that the scheme would utilise existing buildings and accesses and car parking would be sensitively located within the site, I do not share that concern’.
While there was not hardstanding in the 2009 granted application, there was also no certainty at that time of the clients who would show an interest in the site and the specific requirements they would have. It is considered that the Inspectors view of ENV6 could reasonably be extended to and accommodated within Application 2012/0229 and it is hoped that South Norfolk will also see it this way. We therefore ask that South Norfolk give due consideration to the use of the previously designated Open Meadow Area as hardstanding for external storage of goods or materials under Condition 13 of the granted Planning Permission. There will be additional landscaping to help mitigate the visual intrusion.

We will submit with separate correspondence details for consideration with regard to the discharge of Planning Conditions associated with APPL/L2630/A/09/2115934 and trust that the details included in this letter will allow the current application to be considered further. This information will be dispatched by the 9th March 2012.

If you have any further queries regarding the application, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours faithfully

Eur Ing J.R. Riley, B.Sc (Hons) C. Eng, MICE, MCIWEM
Director
For and on behalf of Plandescl Ltd.


Copy to: Leigh Allison – Newall Civil Engineering
Ben Kemp - Client
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2010

by John Murray LLB, Dip.Plan.Env, DMS,
Solicitor
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Apell Ref: APP/L2630/A/09/2115934
Villa Farm, Watton Road, Bawburgh, Norwich, NR9 3LQ

- 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 Gable Developments Ltd against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
- The application Ref 2009/0910/F, dated 8 June 2009, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2009.
- The development proposed is described as the change of use of former piggery building to one dwelling; change of use of former agricultural buildings to B1(a), (b), (c) and B8 uses (60% limit on B1(a) and (b) floor space), car parking, landscaping and associated access improvements.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted subject to conditions set out below in the Formal Decision.

Procedural matters

1. As originally submitted, the application proposed a 60% limit on B1(a) floor space only. However, prior to determination of the application, this was amended, so that B1(b) uses would also be included within that 60% limit.

2. As well as the conversion of former agricultural buildings, the proposal involves the conversion of the dwelling known as Villa Farm House to business use. The description of the development should therefore include reference to "...change of use of former agricultural buildings and existing dwelling..." However, the description need not refer to the limit on B1(a) and (b) floor space, as this can be covered by a condition.

Main issues

3. There are 3 main issues, namely:
   - the effect of the proposal on the safety and free flow of traffic;
   - whether the proposed business uses are acceptable having regard to policies aimed at promoting sustainable development; and
   - whether the conversion of the piggery building to a dwelling is acceptable, having regard to policies aimed at protecting the countryside.

Reasons

The safety and the free flow of traffic

4. The proposed B1 and B8 units would be accessed from the B1108 via the existing bell-mouthed, kerbed and metalled farm access. The B1108 is a main distributor route within the Norfolk Route Hierarchy and its principal purpose is
to provide essential cross country links. In particular, it is a direct link from Watton in south-west Norfolk to Norwich.

5. In the vicinity of the appeal site, this road is subject to a 60mph speed limit but, using an automated traffic counter (ATC), the appellant established that the 85th percentile speed in both directions is between 50 and 54mph. For these speeds, the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) indicates that visibility of 162.4m in either direction should be achieved, measured from a point 2.4m back from the carriageway edge. The appellant’s evidence is that this is achievable in both directions, within land under its control, and the Highway Authority (HA) suggests a condition requiring visibility splays of 160m x 2.4m. Based on the evidence and my own inspection, I am satisfied that visibility at the access point is sufficient.

6. The concern of the Council and the HA is based on the intensification of the use of the access and resulting interference to the safe and free flow of traffic on the B1108, including the possibility of parking on the highway. Based on the ATC data, the appellant estimates the annual average daily traffic flows (AADTF) along the B1108 at 5,403. By reference to the latest version of the Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS) database, it contends that the number of two-way trips into the site during the morning peak would be 21 and 16 during the evening peak and that the AADTF along the site access would be 88. Based on a “parking accumulation exercise”, the appellant also says a maximum of 29 cars would be parked on the site at any time. The proposal includes 42 parking spaces in line with the HA parking standards, which are the same as those in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) Note 13 (Transport).

7. However, the HA points out that the 3 comparison sites selected from TRICS by the appellant are not truly comparable in terms of bus and other non-car mode accessibility. The appeal site is located in the open countryside, with no footways or cycleways in the vicinity and an extremely limited bus service, the nearest bus stop being in excess of 1.4km away in the village of Little Melton and more than 2km away on the B1108 itself. Given the speed of traffic on this main distributor route, walking and cycling would be unattractive. By contrast the sites used by the appellant in the TRICS analysis are all located on a business park, or in a commercial zone. They all have good footway/cycleway links and good public transport connections with a minimum bus service level of 4 buses an hour and a maximum of 15 buses an hour. All the sites have a bus stop within 400m and one even has a train station within 1km, providing a service of 2 trains per hour.

8. For these reasons, I am not convinced that the TRICS information can be relied upon to indicate the number of vehicle movements and parking demand likely to be generated by this proposal. Indeed, the appellant acknowledges in its final comments that there are no suitable sites included in the TRICS database.

9. In principle, whilst an end user is not known, I consider it more realistic to base the assessment on the potential number of employees, having regard to employee/floor space ratios. The HA says that for B1 development in this location, one can expect between 1 employee per 15sqm and 1 employee per 20sqm. Although the basis of this expectation is not clear, in the Transport Assessment as originally submitted with the application, the office sites identified had employee floor space ratios as high as 1 per 9sqm. On this
basis, the development would accommodate between 62 and 83 employees, depending on the split between B1(a), (b) and (c), or between 108 and 116 employees, if the higher ratio is used. Accordingly, given the 42 car parking spaces provided, the HA suggests that between 20 and 41 employees would not be able to access the site by car, even if the lower ratio is adopted, and this could lead to parking in undesignated areas, or even on the highway.

10. However, the HA's analysis ignores the fact that, following amendment of the application, B1(a) and (b) uses would be restricted to 60% of the floor space. It also assumes that everyone employed would come by car, with no car sharing. Notwithstanding the limited availability or attractiveness of alternative means of travel to this site, this seems unduly pessimistic.

11. Furthermore, based on studies undertaken throughout the country\(^2\), the appellant contends in its comments on the Council's evidence that appropriate employee/floor space ratios are: 1:21 for B1, except for B1(c), for which the ratio is between 1:34 and 1:40; and between 1:47 and 1:50 for B8. Given that no more than 60% of the floor space would be occupied by B1(a) and (b) uses and assuming the remaining 40% would be split evenly between B8 and B1(c) uses, the appellant says that a total of 47 to 48 employees would be accommodated by the development. Both the appellant and the HA say that, based on statistical travel to work information, 84.3%\(^2\) of employees would normally be expected to travel by car, which would equate to 40 drivers per day. I acknowledge the HA's concern that, given the lack of alternatives, a higher percentage might come by car and of course there may be other visitors to the site. However, against this, it is unlikely that all employees would all be on site all of the time, given the possibility of off-site meetings, holidays, sickness and so on, and a requirement for a travel plan could encourage sustainable transport choices, including car sharing.

12. In the circumstances, I am satisfied that 42 car parking spaces would be adequate and, even if occasionally they were not, this would be more likely to lead to parking on undesignated areas within the site, rather than actually on the B1108. Furthermore, given that the AADTF along the B1108 is 5,403 vehicles and right turn movements will already take place at the junctions with Stocks Hill and Green Lane nearby, I consider that the relatively minor increase in traffic movements proposed through the main access point into the site would not cause any significant interference with traffic on the B1108.

13. For the reasons given, I conclude on the first main issue that the proposal would not harm highway safety or interfere with the free flow of traffic to a material degree. In this regard, it would comply with saved Policies IMP 8 and TRA 13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (LP), adopted March 2003 and there is no indication that the other criteria in Policy TRA 13 would not also be satisfied.

\textit{Whether the proposed business uses constitute sustainable development}

14. PPG13 indicates that walking is the most important mode of travel at the local level and offers the greatest potential to replace short car trips, particularly

---


\(^2\) The HA refers to DfT guidance indicating 1.2 persons per vehicle.
under 2km. However, whilst the site is within 2km of the villages of Bawburgh and Little Melton, it is in the open countryside and there is no footway provision or street lighting within the vicinity, where vehicular traffic is relatively heavy and fast. Even assuming significant numbers of employees would come from those villages, it is unlikely that they would consider walking to work an attractive option. Cycling is more likely, even from further settlements such as Bowthorpe, West Earlham and Cringleford but, given the nature of traffic on the B1108 and the absence of dedicated cycleways, it may still be an unattractive option for many. Indeed, the applicant recognises that only a small proportion of employees would be likely to walk or cycle to the site.

15. There are no bus stops within 1.4km of the site. Whilst the applicant says that it is in negotiations with a bus operator to agree an “on-demand” stop within easy walking distance, there is nothing to indicate that this will be achieved. The evidence suggests that the majority of employees would be likely to get to and from the site by private car, notwithstanding the fact that the applicant has drafted a travel plan to encourage sustainable transport choices. In this regard, whilst the Council cited Policy T1 of the East of England Plan, which no longer forms part of the development plan and carries no weight, the proposal conflicts with saved LP Policies TRA 1, TRA 3 and TRA 4, which seek to encourage access on foot, bicycle and by public transport.

16. Census data indicates that Little Melton has a total population of 620 people, with 375 of these being economically active. Bawburgh has a population of 340, with 213 economically active. The proportion of residents who travel to work by car is 73% for Little Melton and 71% for Bawburgh. Average trip lengths to work are 15.05km for Little Melton and 14.97km for Bawburgh, suggesting that the majority probably travel to work either in Norwich city centre or other employment areas on the edge of the city.

17. Given the size of these settlements, it is unlikely that a large proportion of those employed at the proposed development would come from Little Melton or Bawburgh. However, in addition to settlements such as Bowthorpe on the edge of Norwich, there are others to the west, such as Barford and Hingham, from where people probably commute into Norwich. Whilst I am not convinced that there is significant scope to access the proposed development by non-car modes, it is likely that the employment opportunities it would provide could reduce commuting distances for local people, whilst re-using existing buildings. This reduction in distances travelled by private car is arguably consistent with the thrust of Policy 4 of the Local Transport Plan for Norfolk 2006 – 2011, which states that new development should be located so as to minimise the need to travel and reduce reliance on the private car.

18. Furthermore, notwithstanding contrary views expressed by the Little Melton and Bawburgh Parish Councils, the commercial property market report prepared by Roche Chartered Surveyors indicates that there is a demand for employment space in converted farm buildings in locations such as this. In particular, such sites suit businesses which have a necessity for county wide travel and therefore look to locate close to a major highway network whilst avoiding city centre congestion and costs. The appeal site is located close to the B1108 junction with the A47 Norwich Southern Bypass.

---

\(^3\) The Secretary of State revoked Regional Strategies on 6 July 2010.
19. Saved LP Policy EMP 3 indicates when the adaptation and re-use of rural buildings for employment purposes will be permitted outside development limits and village boundaries. The structural report submitted with the application indicates that the buildings are structurally sound and capable of re-use without significant rebuilding. The scheme for the conversion of the brick buildings would substantially use existing openings, retaining the buildings' form and character and the steel framed buildings would be clad in sympathetic materials. There is no indication that the conversion of these redundant buildings would cause demonstrable harm to the viability of the farm and I have concluded that the road access is of a sufficient standard to serve the development without causing demonstrable harm to the safe and free flow of traffic. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the proposal would lead to the dispersal of activity on such a scale as to prejudice the vitality of local towns and villages. The scheme therefore complies with saved LP Policy EMP 3.

20. Policy EMP 3 is specifically concerned with proposals such as this and I therefore consider it to be the dominant policy in relation to this main issue. Accordingly, notwithstanding the conflict with saved LP Policies TRA 1, TRA 3 and TRA 4 referred to above, I consider that the scheme complies with the development plan as a whole on this issue. In my view, it is also consistent with Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth), which generally encourages the re-use of buildings in the countryside for economic purposes and recognises that a site may be an acceptable location for development, even though it may not be readily accessible by public transport.

21. For the reasons given, I conclude on the second main issue that the proposed business uses are acceptable, having regard to policies aimed at promoting sustainable development.

**Whether the conversion of the piggery building to a dwelling is acceptable**

22. The Council is concerned that, given the functional appearance of the piggery building, it does not make a positive contribution to the character of the area and therefore considers that, having regard to paragraph 17 of PPS7, the creation of a new dwelling does not outweigh the disadvantages of creating a new dwelling in an unsustainable location. However, in December 2009, that paragraph of PPS7 was cancelled by PPS4 and, in any event, it did not say that conversion should only be allowed if the building was of historic or architectural importance or interest, or otherwise contributed to local character; that was merely one criterion to take into account.

23. In terms of the development plan, the adaptation and re-use of existing rural buildings for residential purposes is addressed by saved LP Policy HOU 10. Having regard to the criteria laid down by that policy, I am satisfied from the structural report submitted with the application and from my own inspection that the structure of the piggery building is both permanent and substantial. I accept that the building is of functional appearance, with little architectural merit. However, whilst there would be no significant changes to its overall form, the building would be repaired, rendered and generally tidied up. Given the ability to control the use of materials by condition, I consider that the fabric and character of the building would be enhanced. The scope for landscaping and the removal of permitted development rights would also prevent the
scheme having an overly domestic appearance in public views. I am satisfied that the building is no longer suitable for continued agricultural use and indeed such use, or even alternative business use, could be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of the nearby dwelling know as Villa San Lorenzo.

24. In these circumstances, I am satisfied that the conversion to a dwelling would comply with LP Policy HOU 10. In addition to converting the piggery to a dwelling, the proposal involves conversion of the existing dwelling on the site (Villa Farm House) to a business. Whilst I have seen no evidence to indicate that the conversion of the piggery is absolutely necessary to facilitate the conversion of Villa Farm House, the appellant indicates that it would enable the Villa Farm complex to be converted to employment uses and conditions could ensure that the proposal does not result in an additional dwelling on the site. Furthermore, a suggested condition requiring a minimum of 40% of the proposed employment floor space to be available before the former piggery is occupied would safeguard the provision of that employment space and the attendant benefits to the rural economy.

25. For the reasons given, I conclude on the last main issue that the conversion of the piggery building to a dwelling is acceptable, having regard to policies aimed at protecting the countryside.

Other matters

26. The site lies within the “Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone” as identified on the LP Proposals Map. The Little Melton and Bawburgh Parish Councils suggest that this development could be contrary to saved LP Policy ENV 6, which seeks to protect the landscape quality and openness of that zone and to prevent the bypass becoming the outer development boundary of the city. However, given the scope for landscaping, the fact that the scheme would utilise existing buildings and accesses and car parking would be sensitively located within the site, I do not share that concern.

27. The occupier of Villa San Lorenzo says that she owns a major part of the access to the piggery and is concerned that traffic associated with the business units might also use it. A planning condition can ensure that the access does not serve the commercial development and ownership of and rights over the access are not planning matters; if there is no right to use that access, the grant of planning permission will not change that.

Conditions

28. I will impose the usual condition regarding commencement of development. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, I shall also require that, otherwise than as set out in this decision and conditions, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

29. Suggested conditions requiring approval of external materials, window details, landscaping, earthworks, tree protection measures, the control of external storage and lighting and the removal of permitted development rights are all reasonable and necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. I impose them, subject to minor amendments to ensure precision in accordance with Circular 11/95.
30. Conditions requiring 40% of the employment floor space to be available prior to occupation of the former piggery and ensuring that no more than one dwelling is occupied on the site are reasonable and necessary in the interests of ensuring sustainable development and the delivery of benefits to the local economy. To limit the number of people likely to be employed on the site in the interest of highway safety and the free flow of traffic, I will restrict Class B1(a) and (b) uses to 60% of the total floor space.

31. To avoid risk to public health and the environment, I shall require the implementation of an approved scheme to deal with contamination. In order to prevent harm to biodiversity, I will require ecology mitigation measures to be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations set out in the Bat Survey Report submitted with the application.

32. To safeguard the living conditions of the occupiers of the former piggery and of Villa San Lorenzo, I shall require the submission of a scheme to ensure that the access track between Villa Farm and the former piggery is only used by farm traffic. Whilst this was not addressed in the Council or HA’s lists of suggested conditions, the appellant indicated in its grounds of appeal that the existing central access points would be stopped up once the commercial buildings have been converted. Given the nature of those accesses and the need to avoid closely grouped, multiple accesses onto the B1108, I consider this necessary in the interests of highway safety and the free flow of traffic. For the same reasons, the HA’s suggested conditions concerning the construction of the accesses, provision of visibility splays and gates, on-site parking, servicing and turning areas, and the provision and use of wheel cleaning facilities during the construction period are all reasonable and necessary.

33. In the interests of sustainability, and having regard to the thrust of LP Policies TRA 1, TRA 3 and TRA 4 and advice in PPG 13, I will require the implementation of an approved travel plan. Whilst I note the appellant’s evidence that its draft travel plan contemplates off-site improvements to link bus services and the proposed provision of a bus stop “subject to operators’ agreement”, it is not clear whether this is achievable. On balance, I have found the scheme acceptable in the light of current bus service provision and, on the evidence before me, I am not persuaded that conditions requiring a bus stop and connecting footways are reasonable or necessary.

Overall conclusion

34. Having regard to my conclusions on the main issues and to all other matters raised, I am satisfied that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted subject to conditions.

Decision

35. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for the change of use of the former piggery building to one dwelling; change of use of the former agricultural buildings and the existing dwelling to B1(a), (b), (c) and B8 uses, together with car parking, landscaping and associated access improvements at Villa Farm, Watton Road, Bawburgh, Norwich, NR9 3LQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2009/0910/F, dated 8 June 2009, subject to the following conditions:
1) The development hereby permitted must be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

2) Subject to conditions 6, 7 and 9, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 4731 101F; 4732 105E; 4732 108D; 4732 121; 4732 109; 4732 100A; 4732 107C; 4732 111C; 4732 02; 4732 05; 4732 04A; 4732 03B; 4732 102A; drawing No 10 (Proposed Access Arrangements (Feb 09)); drawing No 11 (Villa San Lorenzo Residential Access Arrangements (Feb 09)); Tree Survey and Arboricultural Implications Plan, dated 30/04/09; and Landscape Layout Plan, dated 21/05/09.

3) The former piggery shall not be occupied until such time as a minimum of 40% of the proposed employment floor space is available for employment use.

4) No more than one dwelling shall be occupied on the site and once the piggery is occupied as a dwelling Villa Farm House shall no longer be occupied as such.

5) No more than 60% (747 sq m) of the total floor space shall be occupied for B1(a) and B1(b) purposes.

6) No works or development shall take place on each building until details, including samples where required, of the materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This condition shall apply notwithstanding condition 2 above and any indication as to these matters that have been given in the application or on the approved plans. The materials to be used in the development shall be in accordance with the approved details.

7) Notwithstanding condition 2 above and details shown on the approved plans, no works or development shall take place on each building until the following details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority: detailed drawings of the proposed windows at a scale of no less than 1:20 and timber profiles of a scale no less than 1:5. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details as approved.

8) With regard to the dwelling hereby permitted through the conversion of the former piggery, notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) (with or without modification), no enlargement, improvement or other alterations of the dwelling; no additions or alterations to the roofs; no provision of porches; nor the provision within the curtilage of the dwelling of any building or enclosure, swimming or other pool, or chimneys, flues or soil and vent pipes or any other works as defined by Classes A, B, C, D, E and G of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of that Order shall be erected or brought onto the land unless an appropriate planning application is first submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.

9) Notwithstanding condition 2 above and the details shown on the Landscape Layout Plan, dated 21/05/09, no development shall take place until further details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out as approved. These details shall include:
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a) means of enclosure;
b) hard surfacing materials;

Soft landscaping works shall include:
c) planting plans;
d) written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment);
e) schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate; and
f) an implementation programme.

If within a period of FIVE years from the date of planting, any tree or plant or any tree or plant planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or is destroyed or dies, or becomes in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective another tree or plant of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the local planning authority gives its written consent to any variation.

10) No development shall take place on the commercial units until details of earthworks and a timetable for implementation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include the proposed grading and mounding of land areas including the levels and contours to be formed, showing the relationship of proposed mounding to existing vegetation and surrounding landform. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

11) No works or development shall take place on the commercial units until all existing trees have been protected by the erection of a one metre high chestnut pale fence to be positioned beneath the extremities of the crown spread, or in the case of fastigate trees in a position to be agreed with the local planning authority. All such fencing shall be retained and maintained in good condition for the duration of the construction period. During the construction period:

(a) the storage of vehicles, fuel, materials, site huts or other buildings or ancillary equipment will not take place within the fenced areas.

(b) the existing ground levels within the fenced areas will not be raised or lowered;

(c) no services shall be laid within the fenced areas; and

(d) no trees shall be topped, topped or felled without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

12) No trees or hedges shall be cut down, uprooted destroyed, topped or topped, other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the previous written approval of the local planning authority. Any trees or hedges removed without consent shall be replaced during the next planting season November/March with trees of such size and species as agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
13) No external storage of goods or materials shall at any time take place outside the commercial buildings on the application site, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

14) No external lighting shall be erected unless full details of its design, location, orientation and level of luminance (in Lux) provided have first been submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. Such lighting shall be kept to the minimum necessary for the purposes of security and site safety and shall prevent upward and outward light radiation.

15) No development shall take place until a scheme to deal with contamination of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This scheme shall include an investigation and assessment to identify the extent of contamination and the measures to be taken to avoid risk to the public/environment when the site is developed. No development shall take place on the site until the measures in the scheme as approved have been implemented and completed.

16) Ecology mitigation shall be undertaken in accordance with the Mitigation and Recommendations as set out in Section 6.3 of the Bat Survey Report dated February 2009 and undertaken by Aspect Ecology and shall be retained as such thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

17) Before any works or development commences on the commercial units a scheme to restrict the use of the access track between Villa Farm and the Piggery to farm traffic only shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, prior to any of the units being first brought into use the approved scheme shall be implemented in full and shall be retained as such thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

18) Before any works or development commences on the commercial units a scheme for the stopping up of the two central access points, marked “ACCESS RETAINED FOR RESIDENTIAL USE ONLY” on drawing No 10, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include a timetable for implementation following cessation of the use of Villa Farm House as a dwelling and shall be implemented as approved. The accesses shall not be used thereafter.

19) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the vehicular access at the eastern end of the site shall be constructed in accordance with the Norfolk County Council industrial access construction specification, and additionally to accord with details to be approved in writing by the local planning authority, for the first 15 metres into the site, as measured back from the near edge of the adjacent carriageway.

20) Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted any access gate or gates, shall be hung to open inwards and shall be set back a minimum distance of 15 metres from the near edge of the adjoining highway carriageway. Any sidewalls/fences/hedges adjacent to the access shall be splayed at an angle of 45 degrees from each of the (outside) gateposts to the front boundary of the site.
21) Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted visibility splays measuring 2.4 metres x 100 metres shall be provided to each side of the accesses at the eastern and western ends of the site, shown in grey on drawing Nos 10 and 11 respectively, where they meet the highway and such splays shall thereafter be maintained free from any obstruction exceeding 0.6 metres above the level of the adjacent highway carriageway.

22) Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted the proposed access, on-site car and cycle parking, servicing and turning areas shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plans and retained thereafter available for that specific use.

23) The accesses at the eastern and western ends of the site, shown in grey on drawing Nos 10 and 11 respectively, shall be constructed with adequate drainage measures to prevent surface water run-off onto the adjacent public highway, in accordance with a detailed scheme submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority.

24) The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until an Interim Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority, such plan to accord with the Norfolk County Council document "Guidance Notes for the Submission of Travel Plans" or by producing using the Workplace Travel Plan Generator Tool, www.worktravelplan.net.

25) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied prior to implementation of the Interim Travel Plan approved under condition 24 above. During the first year of occupation a Full Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with the Highway Authority, such plan to include a timetable and targets. The approved Full Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable and targets contained therein and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development used for B1(a), B1(b), B1(c) or B8 uses is occupied, subject to any modifications approved by the local planning authority, in consultation with the Highway Authority, as part of an annual review.

26) No works shall commence on site until the details of wheel cleaning facilities for construction vehicles have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. For the duration of the construction period all traffic associated with the construction of the development hereby permitted will use the approved wheel cleaning facilities.

J.A Murray
INSPECTOR
Policy EMP 4: Employment development outside the Development Limits and Village Boundaries of identified towns and villages

Employment development outside the Development Limits and Village Boundaries defined on the Proposals Map under policy ENV 7 will only be permitted if:

i) There are no alternative sites or premises within the identified Development Limits or Village Boundaries which are either suitable or available; and

ii) The proposed site is on land adjacent to a town, village or other area of development with a defined Development Limit or Village Boundary; and

iii) Road access is of a sufficient standard to serve the scale and nature of development proposed without causing demonstrable harm to the safe and free flow of traffic;

And the proposal is:

iv) For small businesses, modern growth industries, or would specifically address local unemployment problems; and

v) Small in scale and designed to blend with the setting of the settlement concerned;

Or, exceptionally, if the proposal is:

vi) For agriculturally related industry, which must be located close to the farms to which it relates; or

vii) “Unneighbourly”, and therefore unsuitable for locations within an existing built-up area; or

viii) Reliant on large areas of open storage, and would therefore represent an inefficient use of serviced employment land

Subject to the foregoing requirements being first satisfied, the re-use of existing or previously developed land will be preferred to the use of green field sites.
13. **Appl. No**: 2012/0235/F  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY

**Applicants Name**: Mr D Harding  
**Site Address**: 16 Highlow Road, Costessey  
**Proposal**: Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of chalet style bungalow, garage and shed.

**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions

1. **Full - Planning Permission Time Limit**  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Windows to be obscure glazed  
5. No additional windows at first floor level

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **Joint Core Strategy**  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 3 : Energy and water

1.2 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
HOU 11: Replacement dwellings  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 **2011/0590/H** Proposed extension, alterations, double garage and shed  
**Approved**

2.2 **2006/2339/O** Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of two dwellings  
**Refused**

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council** : To be reported

3.2 **District Member** : To be determined by committee  
- Building will be more prominent than the current bungalow and on higher ground  
- Will give rise to shadowing and loss of light especially on winter mornings  
- Will impact on solar panels on neighbouring property.

3.3 **Local Residents** : 1 letter of objection  
- Overshadowing due to height and width of proposal  
- Will be on higher ground than neighbour  
- Have monitored sun during winter and realised impact this will have on sunlight and effectiveness of solar panels which were arranged to be installed prior to approval of previous application.  
- As dwelling is now to be demolished it could be repositioned to reduce impact on shadowing and dominance  
- Not comparable with other properties in locality due to difference in levels.
4. **Assessment**

4.1 The proposal is an amended scheme and follows planning approval to alter and extend an existing bungalow to provide a chalet form of dwelling together with a detached garage and shed. Following investigations of the existing foundations it has been established that these are insufficient to support the additional loading associated with the approved scheme. It is therefore now proposed to demolish the existing building and erect a new dwelling.

4.2 The form and design of the dwelling as now proposed is substantially as previously approved although the front gable will be 400mm narrower and the lounge will be 200mm deeper.

4.3 The scheme shows ground floor accommodation, however the design statement sets out that the roof form has been designed to reflect the neighbouring chalet and to allow for future use of the roof space for accommodation. Two first floor windows are shown to be included in this application (which will be obscure glazed), with further windows indicated to be part of a future planning application.

4.4 The site is within the Development Limit for Costessey and as such the principle of development is acceptable. Policies seek to ensure that proposals are of a scale form and character which is in keeping with the locality and do not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties or highway safety.

4.5 The area is characterised by a mix of property types and scales. There are a number of properties which are situated in backland locations, such as the application site and there are significant changes in levels both in an east / west direction and north / south direction which results in varied ridgelines.

4.6 The property at present is a small bungalow with an asymmetric roof form with a ridge height of approximately 5.2m and a frontage width of 8m. The proposed dwelling will increase the width of the frontage to 14.8m and raise the ridge height to 7.2m. The front elevation will incorporate a gable with a first floor window which is shown to obscure glazed with the side wing having a ridgeline running parallel to Highlow Road.

4.7 The proposals will increase the prominence of the dwelling in the streetscene of Highlow Road and when viewed from Gurney Road. It will be seen in the context of No 14 which is a similar form dwelling and I consider that it will be in keeping with the character of the area.

4.8 It terms of the relationship to neighbouring properties, No 14 and 18’s primary outlook is east / west and while the dwelling will be larger from their amenity areas I do not consider that it will dominate their outlook or result in a significant loss of amenity.

4.9 The properties which front Highlow Road are at a lower level. In considering the earlier application concerns was raised that the increase in scale of the dwelling, particular with the addition of the garage, will significantly increase the built mass of the dwelling and adversely affect the outlook of the property and amenity area due to overshadowing.

4.10 Since that permission, the neighbours have noted the position of the sun relative to the existing dwelling and consider that it will overshadow their garden and rear elevation particularly in the winter. They have also installed solar panels and are concerned that the proposed dwelling will overshadow these reducing their effectiveness. To address these concerns, they have suggested that as this is a new build it could be relocated.

4.11 This has been explored with the applicant who has commented that the resiting of the dwelling would result in the loss of existing trees and reduce the garden space. He also comments that it would move the dwelling closer to properties which have been approved to the rear of 107 Gurney Road, and would increase the area of garden overshadowed and result in overshadowing of No 18. It is also considered that the degree of overshadowing of the solar panels would not be significantly changed by resiting the proposal. I therefore consider that the application should be determined as submitted.
4.12 The proposal will increase the scale of the built form on the site and prominence of the dwelling from the neighbour. While the change in levels will increase the presence of these works I consider that due to the separation between the properties that it will not dominate the outlook of the neighbouring property.

4.13 I recognise that there will be an increase in overshadowing, particularly during the winter months, however from shadow diagrams this will predominantly affect the rear section of the garden and will relate to the morning. I understand from the neighbour that they consider that the shadow will be greater than this and they have submitted photographs which show the position of the sun relative to the existing ridge line. Notwithstanding this, I consider that overshadowing will be predominantly during the winter period and during the morning and that during summer months this will be reduced. I therefore consider that overshadowing of the neighbours would not be sufficient to justify refusal of the application.

4.14 Windows are shown at first floor and are shown to be obscure glazed. I consider that this is necessary to restrict overlooking and that permitted development for further windows in the south, west and north elevations should be removed in order that a planning application would need to be submitted to consider any future windows and their potential for overlooking.

4.15 The garage will be close to the western boundary and is likely to result in boundary landscaping being reduced, however, it will be stepped down from the main dwelling and will be 17m from the rear of the neighbouring dwelling. While I acknowledge that there will be a cumulative effect I consider that the garage is acceptable.

4.16 The outbuilding to the rear boundary will not be unduly prominent from outside the site and is set away from neighbours.

5. Reasons for approval

5.1 In the opinion of the local planning authority the proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan and in particular is considered to be in accordance with policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies IMP8 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the design is in keeping with the character of the area and due to the separation and orientation of neighbouring properties the proposals will not have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of neighbouring properties.
14. **Appl. No** : 2012/0322/F  
**Parish** : SHELFANGER  

Applicants Name : Mr Harry Peacock  
Site Address : Sub-division of garden at Havencroft, Winfarthing Road, Shelfanger, Norfolk, IP22 2DQ  
Proposal : The erection of 2 new 4 bedroom detached dwellings with garages to rear of Havencroft  
Recommendation : Refuse  

1. Backland location detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring dwellings. Contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies IMP9, IMP10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting Good Design  
Policy 3 : Energy and water  

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  
IMP 10: Noise  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/1588/F The erection of 1 new 4 bedroom detached dwelling & 2 new 3 bedroom semi-detached dwellings with 3 double garages to the rear of Havencroft, Winfarthing Road, Shelfanger. Refused  

2.2 1990/0719 Erection Of One Two Storey Dwelling And Garage As Approved 07/88/4069/O. Approved  

2.3 1988/4069 Erection Of Dwelling And Garage. Refused Appeal Allowed

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council : To be reported  
3.2 District Member : Can be Delegated for approval  
- Local Plan specifies Shelfanger as an infill development area. This is therefore a most appropriate application for approval  
- Reduction from 3 to 2 negates the argument of cramped development.  
- The design is not out of keeping for the area  
3.3 NCC Highways : To be reported
3.4 Local Residents : 3 letters of objection

- Loss of rural aspect
- Loss of privacy afforded by trees
- Nearest dwellings are grade 2 listed buildings and have character and architecture reflecting their age
- Encroachment of modern properties is inappropriate and detracts from character
- Access is still located as in the refused application and will still result in a loss of amenity
- Not much difference in the amount and size of the buildings. Covers same area as refused scheme.
- Still cramped layout
- Still concerned about future of pond and potential for flooding.

4. Assessment

4.1 The application is a revised scheme for residential development and follows the refusal of 2011/1588 which was for a 4 bedroom detached dwelling and two, 3 bedroom semi-detached dwellings and associated garages (see appendix 2).

4.2 The scheme as now submitted is two 4 bedroom detached properties. The Design and Access Statement sets out that these will support the village by providing family dwellings. The layout of the site has been influenced by the highway requirements and provision of parking and garaging and the agent considers that this will provide a buffer to existing dwellings. (appendix 3)

4.3 To address previous concerns the agent sets out that the density of the development is similar to other modern developments near the site. In addition, the dwellings will now have longer amenity spaces to the front and rear. He states that the position of the proposal to the rear of existing properties is not uncharacteristic of the locality and is similar to other recent developments in Shelfanger and Winfarthing.

4.4 The site is located within the Development Limit and is located on the northern boundary of the village and as such the principle of the development is acceptable. The majority of properties in the area front onto Winfarthing Road or The Street and a significant number of these are Listed Buildings. Policies in the Joint Core Strategy and Local Plan seek to safeguard the character of the area, the setting of the listing buildings and the amenities of existing neighbouring uses.

4.5 While the number of properties has been reduced, the layout and built mass on the site is similar to the refused scheme. It will provide a new double garage to Havencroft, with dwelling 1 running along the northern boundary of the site occupying a similar position and footprint to the refused pair of semi detached properties.

4.6 Dwelling 1 will be approximately 2m from the garage for Havencroft, and approximately 3m to dwelling 2 at its closest (5.3 at the rear). The rear garden for dwelling 1 will have a garden approximately 5m deep although it will be wider than that associated with the refused scheme. Building 2 will have a garden approximately 6m deep. The garage to dwelling 2 will be close to the site’s south western boundary

4.7 The site is on the northern boundary of the settlement and due to the layout of the settlement, the built form along the northern boundary of the Development Limit is sporadic in character. While views of the site are limited, I consider that the revised layout has not addressed the previous reason for refusal and will still result in a dense built form which will detract from the character of the area.
4.8 In addition, while the properties back onto open countryside, I consider that the layout will be cramped in appearance and will still provide limited amenity areas for the properties which I consider to be poor design.

4.9 To the south and west of the proposal are a number of properties which look onto the site. Several of these are listed buildings, however the Conservation Officer previously considered that development on the site would not adversely affect important views of the listed buildings or their setting.

4.10 Concerns have been raised by the neighbouring properties regarding the impact on their outlook, due to the proximity of the buildings to the site boundaries and removal of existing landscaping. I consider that the main impact will relate to South View and Gunn House in particular, which will result in a built form along the majority of their eastern boundary. Due to the orientation of the properties and the separation, I consider that there will not be significant overlooking. However I consider that the revised scheme has not addressed the previous concerns relating to the built mass on the boundary and the adverse affect this would have on the outlook and amenity of the neighbours.

4.11 The proposal will still be served by a long access which passes to the side and rear of neighbouring dwellings. While the reduction in numbers will reduce traffic movements associated with the development, I consider that the proposal will still result in vehicle movements and activity in close proximity to the private amenity areas of the neighbouring properties and that this disturbance will result in a loss of amenity for the existing properties.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The proposed development of two dwellings will result in a cramped layout on the northern edge of the settlement and will be served by a long access which will result in vehicle movements and activity to the side and rear of neighbouring dwellings detracting from the character of the area and resulting in a loss of amenity for existing properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies IMP9 and IMP10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Stuart Pontin, 01508 533796, and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Enforcement Report

Report of The Development Control Services Manager

Enforcement Ref : 2009/8106
Parish : Redenhall with Harleston & Earsham
Sites : land off A 143 at Harleston & Earsham
Development : Unauthorised advertisements for Waveney Farm Shop, Wortwell
Developer : Mr & Mrs Guyton

1. Background

1.1 A report was taken to the Planning Committee on the 8 June 2009. (Attached as Appendix 2). It was resolved that enforcement action be deferred until the Scrutiny Signage Task Group had made its report. As a result of the task group guidance notes were produced for ‘Advertisements and business signs in the open countryside’. A copy of this document has been sent to the owners inviting an application for Advertisement Consent for new signage in line with the Guidance. The owners have informed the Council they do not wish to change the signage for the time being as they are essential to the viability of the business which is reliant on passing trade.

2. Planning Policies

2.1 IMP23 – Control of Advertisements in the Open Countryside

3. Assessment

3.1 The current signage does not accord with Policy IMP23 or the ‘Advertisements and business signs in the open countryside’ guidance.

3.2 Whilst the current signage does not accord with policy IMP23 or the Guidance Notes the Council acknowledges small businesses are in difficult economic times and as the Farm Shop is reliant on these signs to attract the passing trade do not wish to compound the situation. In view of this it is considered that any action to remove the signs be deferred for a further two years. This would avoid setting a precedent but equally allow the business to further establish itself and continue attracting passing trade during these difficult economic times.

4. Recommendation

4.1 That subject to legal advice the matter be deferred for two years.
Enforcement Report

Report Of Director of Planning, Housing and the Built Environment

Enforcement Ref - 2009/8106
Parish - REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON
Site - Land off A143
Development - Erection of Sign

1. Background

1.1 It has been brought to our attention that a large yellow sign has been placed by the side of the A143. The sign contains an advertisement for the Waveney Farm Shop, which is situated at High Road, Wortwell. The sign does not have deemed consent under the Control of Advertisement Regulations 2007 and is consequently unauthorised.

2. Policy

2.2 Policy 23: Control of Advertisements in the Open Countryside of the South Norfolk Local States

In the open countryside outside existing defined towns and villages and other areas allocated for development the display of outdoor advertisements will be firmly restrained. Express consent will only be granted for signs which are:

1. the minimum necessary for the identification of the building on land on which it is displayed and any trade or business carried on there from; or
2. are required for public safety; and exceptionally for:
3. temporary poster advertisements for agricultural shows and similar rural events, activities or entertainments; or
4. specially designed signposts for isolated country businesses.

In all cases advertisement proposals should respect the natural contours, landscape features and background against which they will be seen. Care will also be taken to ensure that a proliferation of individually acceptable advertisements does not spoil the appearance of the countryside.

3. Assessment

3.1 As members will note from the above the policy relating to signage in the open countryside is restrictive. The sign does not meet any of the criteria listed and is consequently contrary to policy. I am also concerned that granting consent to a sign of this nature, which many businesses would find desirable, would set a precedent for further such signs by main routes and cumulatively spoil the appearance of the countryside.

3.2 Whilst I cannot support the sign I am conscious that in the current economic climate fledgling businesses need support and PPG 18 – Enforcing Planning Control also advises that Councils should be sensitive to the needs of small businesses when considering enforcement action. I would, therefore, suggest a discontinuance
notice be served but that a lengthy compliance period of two years is allowed. Such an action would avoid setting a precedent but would equally allow the business to establish itself and become better known.

4. **Recommendation**

4.1 That subject to legal advice that a discontinuance notice is served with a compliance period of two years.
1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (continued)

The following members declared an interest in the matters listed below. Unless indicated otherwise, they remained in the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/0665</td>
<td>Topcroft</td>
<td>M Gray</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice (Lobbied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/0676</td>
<td>Pulham Market</td>
<td>B Greenway, W Kemp, J Wilby</td>
<td>Local Planning Code of Practice (Lobbied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/0677</td>
<td>Thurton</td>
<td>C Gould</td>
<td>Personal Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/0704</td>
<td>Gillingham</td>
<td>C Gould, A Thomas</td>
<td>Prejudicial Interest (Board member of Saffron Housing Trust) left the room for this item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings of the East Area Planning Committee held on 14 May 2009 and the South-West Area Planning Committee held on 19 May 2009 were confirmed as correct records and signed by the Chairman.

3 ENFORCEMENT

Members considered the report of the Director of Planning, Housing and the Built Environment regarding the enforcement case at land off the A143, Redenhall with Harleston, (ref. 2009/8106).

It was RESOLVED by 7-0 that enforcement action be deferred until the Scrutiny Signage Task Group had made its report.

4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

The Committee considered the report (circulated) of the Director of Planning, Housing and the Built Environment. The Officers presented applications listed in the report and members of the public addressed the Committee on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006/0930</td>
<td>Brockdish</td>
<td>Ms P Frost, objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr A Ronaldson, applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/0578</td>
<td>Diss</td>
<td>Mr C Walsh, objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr C Burnard, applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/0559</td>
<td>Woodton</td>
<td>Mrs J Cook, objector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Item 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr R Slade, applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>