Third Wednesday Planning Committee

Members of the Third Wednesday Planning Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservatives</th>
<th>Liberal Democrats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr W Kemp</td>
<td>Mr T East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chairman)</td>
<td>Miss P Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Mooney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vice-Chairman)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Y Bendle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr T Blowfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs M Dewsbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs F Ellis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Foulger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr C Gould</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr B Riches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Meetings

Conservatives: Blomefield Room 12.45 pm to 1.30 pm

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

Date
Wednesday 18 April 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

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

13/04/2012
AGENDA

1. To report apologies for absence and identify substitute voting members (if any);

2. To deal with any items of business the Chairman decides should be considered as matters of urgency pursuant to Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act, 1972; [Urgent business may only be taken if, "by reason of special circumstances" (which will be recorded in the minutes), the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion that the item should be considered as a matter of urgency.]

3. To receive Declarations of Interest from Members;
   (Please see flowchart and guidance attached, page 5)

4. Minutes of the Third Wednesday Planning Committee held on 21 March 2012;
   (attached – page 7)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   To consider the applications as listed below: (report attached – page 23)

<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>2011/2058/D</td>
<td>CRINGEFLORD</td>
<td>Areas R3A and R3B Round House Park, Roundhouse Way, Cringleford</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2012/0423/CU</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Storage Land, Station Court Station Lane, Hethersett</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011/0600/F</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Hillside, Stocks Hill, Bawburgh</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2012/0284/F</td>
<td>WINFARTHING</td>
<td>Land north of Chapel Close, Winfarthing</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2012/0310/A</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>3 and 4 Navire House, Mere Street, Diss</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2012/0323/H</td>
<td>HINGHAM</td>
<td>Foxglove Cottage, 10 Copper Lane, Hingham</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2012/0338/H</td>
<td>GISSING</td>
<td>Malthouse Farm, Malthouse Lane, Gissing</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2012/0353/RVC</td>
<td>DICKLEBURGH and RUSHALL</td>
<td>Land east of New Lodge Farm, Common Road, Dickleburgh</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2012/0357/F</td>
<td>STOKE HOLY CROSS</td>
<td>Whiteford Lodge, Chandler Road, Stoke, Holy Cross</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2012/0379/F</td>
<td>REHENAHL WITH HARLESTON</td>
<td>Swan Hotel, 19 The Thoroughfare, Harleston</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2012/0411/F</td>
<td>ALBURGH</td>
<td>The Cartlodge, Mill Road, Alburgh</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Sites Sub-Committee;
   Please note that the Sub-Committee will only meet if a site visit is agreed by the Committee. If required, the site visit will take place on Wednesday 9 May 2012 with membership to be confirmed.

7. Planning Appeals (for information) (attached – page 86)
## Details of Planning Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Conservative Councillor</strong></th>
<th><strong>Accreditation Expiry Date</strong></th>
<th><strong>Liberal Democrat Councillor</strong></th>
<th><strong>Accreditation Expiry Date</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>25/10/12</td>
<td>P Allen</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Bills</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td>V Bell</td>
<td>4/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Blake</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td>T East</td>
<td>20/09/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Blowfield</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td>J Hardinge</td>
<td>25/10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Dale</td>
<td>08/11/12</td>
<td>M Gray</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Dewsbury</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td>T Lewis</td>
<td>25/10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Edney</td>
<td>4/07/12</td>
<td>G Watt</td>
<td>22/09/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Ellis</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Foulger</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Goldson</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Gould</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Herbert</td>
<td>20/09/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Hornby</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Kemp</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Kemp</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Kiddie</td>
<td>20/09/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Legg</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Mooney</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Neal</td>
<td>08/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Overton</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Palmer</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Pond</td>
<td>22/09/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Riches</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Savage</td>
<td>09/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Savage</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Spratt</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Thomson</td>
<td>08/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Tilcock</td>
<td>08/11/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Walden</td>
<td>26/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Ward</td>
<td>08/11/12</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><strong>Independent Councillor</strong></th>
<th><strong>Accreditation Expiry Date</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K Weeks</td>
<td>4/07/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applications will normally be considered in the order in which they appear on the agenda. Each application will be presented in the following way:

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

**GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE**

The following suggested guidelines are put forward to assist Members in providing a context in which to assess whether a Site Panel visit is required.

Site visits may be appropriate where:

(i) The particular details of a proposal are complex and/or the intended site layout/relationships between site boundaries/existing buildings are difficult to envisage other than by site assessment;

(ii) The impacts of new proposals on neighbour amenity eg shadowing, loss of light, physical impact of structure etc, visual amenity, adjacent land uses, wider landscape impacts can only be fully appreciated by site assessment/access to adjacent land uses/property;

(iii) The material planning considerations raised are finely balanced and Member assessment and judgement can only be concluded by assessing the issues directly on site;

(iv) It is expedient in the interests of local decision making to demonstrate that all aspects of a proposal have been considered on site.

Members should appreciate that site visits will not be appropriate in those cases where matters of fundamental planning policy are involved and there are no significant other material considerations to take into account. Equally, where an observer might feel that a site visit would be called for under any of the above criteria, members may decide it is unnecessary, eg because of their existing familiarity with the site or its environs or because, in their opinion, judgement can be adequately made on the basis of the written, visual and oral material before the Committee.
AGENDA ITEM 3

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is (or should) the Interest be registered in the Register of Members' Interests?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If not, whose well being or financial position is affected to a greater extent than the majority of other people in the ward?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.

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

YES

You have a personal interest in the matter

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

NO

You may have a prejudicial interest

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

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

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

YES

NO
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).
J.C.S Joint Core Strategy
N.P.P.F National Planning Policy Framework
Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

1. **Appl. No**: 2011/2058/D  
   **Parish**: CRINGLEFORD

   **Applicants Name**: Persimmon Homes Ltd  
   **Site Address**: Areas R3A and R3B Round House Park, Roundhouse Way, Cringleford, Norfolk, NR4 6UF  
   **Proposal**: Construction of 82 dwellings, associated estate roads, garaging, parking and landscaping.

   **Recommendation**: Approve

   1. In accordance with outline permission
   2. Materials
   3. Provision of parking and turning areas
   4. Archaeology – strip, map and sample
   5. Landscaping

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   Section 7 – Design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
   IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2008/2347/O Outline application for 626 units (Phase 2 of Round House Park development) Approved

2.2 2001/1852/O Outline application for 750 dwellings Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: Object  
   - Council is opposed to parking courts and the plans ignore the reality of residents’ parking on the road near to their houses  
   - The roads should be wide enough to allow 2 cars to pass safely without having to mount the footpath area  
   - The main road through the site is considered dangerous, with a difficult chicane  
   - No allowance has been made for safe access to the adjacent open space area.

3.2 District Member: To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 NCC Highways: To be reported.
3.4 Historic Environment Service : No objection, subject to a condition requiring the implementation of a scheme of archaeological works.

3.5 Police Architectural Liaison Officer : Original Plans
   Various comments made to improve layout of the scheme.
   Amended plans
   None received to date.

3.6 Environmental Services (Protection) : None received to date.

3.7 SNC: Design Officer : Final comments to be reported.

3.8 Landscape Officer : None received to date.

3.9 Local Residents : None received.

4. Assessment

4.1 This application for approval of reserved matters forms part of the second phase of this development site at Round House Park, Cringleford, which has gained recent outline permission for a development of 1000 dwellings (increased from 750 dwellings). To date, reserved matters approvals have been given for approximately 400 dwellings, the vast majority of which are within phase 1 of the development. As of December 2011, 374 dwellings were occupied.

4.2 Phase 2 of the development will comprise:
   - 626 dwellings
   - A mixed use neighbourhood centre, including retail units, pub/restaurant and sheltered housing
   - Community centre
   - Recycling facility
   - Recreational woodland
   - Open space and play areas

4.3 An approved Masterplan document seeks to guide development within the site, and in particular, aims to create distinctive identity throughout the site, contributing towards a sense of place. This reserved matters application has been assessed against the requirements of this document.

4.4 The main issues for consideration are:
   - Design and layout (compliance with Masterplan and relevant planning policy), and;
   - Highway impact.

4.5 The main part of the site falls within an area designated ‘The Core’ within the Masterplan, which allows for a varied more informal layout, and in this case at a higher density of 42 – 46 dwellings per hectare. The western edge of the site is within a character area known as ‘Round House Edge’, which calls for continuity of frontage. A small section of the south-east edge of the site also fronts a key area of open space in an area known as ‘The Spine’, where again a strong degree of continuous frontage is required.
Policy 2 of the JCS requires, amongst other things, development to achieve the highest quality design, and one that achieves a minimum score of 14 out of 20 (a Silver Standard) when assessed against the 20 criteria of the Building for Life checklist. The Government in its recently published NPPF also attaches great importance to the design of the built environment, stating that it is a key element of sustainable development and that it should contribute positively to making places better for people.

Design & Layout

Following a significant amount of negotiation with the applicant, this amended proposal now broadly accords with the requirements set out above, and is accompanied by a Design & Access statement and additional information that helps to explain how the scheme has responded to the Masterplan document. Whilst generally traditional in terms of form, scale and appearance, elements of the scheme include the use of more contemporary materials on specific house types (as required by the Masterplan). The scheme takes account of the proposed neighbourhood centre adjacent the site, and has been designed to take account of the likely 3-storey scale of this development. A site layout and street scenes are attached as appendix 2.

As required by Policy 2 of the JCS, the scheme has been assessed at three stages against the Building for Life criteria. The amended scheme now achieves the minimum score of 14 out of 20 (silver standard), and is considered to be acceptable when assessed against the key design considerations of ‘environment and community’, ‘character’, ‘streets parking and pedestrianisation’, and ‘design and construction’. A copy of the building for life assessment is attached as appendix 3.

The applicants have stated, in accordance with the Masterplan, that dwellings will be built in accordance with the current building regulations requirements. Whilst it is disappointing that renewable energies are not being used throughout the site, the application meets the JCS requirements regarding the Code for Sustainable Homes and on-site renewable energy/efficiency. It is also pleasing to note that the Round House Park achieves a high level of sustainability in terms of being well located for facilities, a good network of footpaths, cycle-ways and open space, as well as a new school and retail facilities to be built on site.

Having consulted with the Council’s Design Officer, we both now feel that the proposal has responded to the majority of the requirements of the Masterplan, and achieves the required Building for Life ‘silver standard’ (14 out of 20). The design and layout of the scheme is acceptable and the application therefore accords with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Highway Impact

It is noted that the Parish Council have expressed some concern in respect of the width or roads and parking issues. However, NCC: Highways raise no objection to the proposed scheme principle, although they did question the amount of the parking proposed for the parking courts, particularly those serving the flat blocks. Amended plans now received have provided more parking to the courtyard serving the main flat block, which goes some way to addressing these concerns. A total of 205 allocated parking spaces, plus 3 visitor spaces to plots 76 – 82 are being provided, and the scheme takes account of the Council’s adopted parking standards.

Taking into account the above, the amended plans are considered to accord with saved policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.
5. **Reasons for approval**

5.1 The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design and layout, and is broadly consistent with the requirements of the outline planning permission and the approved Round House Park Phase 2 Masterplan. Furthermore, the development will not harm the character and appearance of the area or the amenities of neighbouring properties. The application accords with saved policies IMP8 (Safe & Free Flow of Traffic) and IMP9 (Residential Amenity) of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003, and Policy 2 (Promoting good design) of the Joint Core Strategy. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number    Gary Hancox, 01508 533841,
and E-mail:                        ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
## Building for Life Evaluation

**Scheme name:** Round House Way, Cringleford, Areas R3A & R3B  
**Application Number:** 2011/2058  
**Date:** 07/02/2012  
**Accredited Assessor:** C Watts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation 07/02/12</th>
<th>Evidence (comments of Persimmon Homes in blue 24/02/12)</th>
<th>Evaluation 09/03/12 26/03/12 &amp; Final Comments</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the development provide (or is it close to) community facilities, such as a school, parks, play areas, shops, pubs or cafes?</td>
<td>The development is located on the south west edge of Cringleford village approximately 4.8km from the centre of Norwich. The existing village of Cringleford offers a good range of services and facilities, including easy access to those located in Norwich. The site is located immediately adjacent to the proposed Neighbourhood Centre, which is likely to be constructed towards the later phases of the overall development. A Community Centre is also proposed southeast of the site in OS6. Public Open space is provided outside of the site boundary (OS6) immediately to the east of R3A.</td>
<td>DAS and Site Layout.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there an accommodation mix that reflects the needs and aspirations of the local community?</td>
<td>The development provides a good mix of dwelling types and sizes, ranging from 1 bed flats to 4 bed detached houses.</td>
<td>DAS and Site Layout.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is there a tenure mix that reflects the needs of the local community?</td>
<td>The development proposes 25% affordable homes in accordance with the approved masterplan. This is below the target set out in the adopted JCS.</td>
<td>The development proposes 25% affordable housing in line with the requirements in place at the time the original outline planning permission was granted and subsequently the approved masterplan. This predates the JCS policy and so it seems unreasonable to score this down on that basis. The tenure mix and house types precisely meet the needs of the local community in that context, however.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the development have easy access to public transport?</td>
<td>The site is located within walking distance of a bus route, which forms part of the primary street network for the Round House Park development. It is however unclear where bus stops are located and how easy they are to access from the proposed site via direct footpaths/ cycle routes. The masterplan states that a Travel Plan will be prepared. There is no evidence or reference to this at this stage.</td>
<td>The permanent provision of three bus stops within the development is subject to agreement with the service provider. Direct access to the Spine Road (along which buses will run, on completion of development) is available through the north and east of the proposed scheme. Wherever the bus stops are located, they will be easily accessible by foot or cycle, from all parts of the application site. We feel that this should be scored 1 accordingly.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environment and Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Streets Parking and Pedestrianisation</th>
<th>Design and Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the development have any features that reduce its environmental impact?</td>
<td>The site proposes to achieve a minimum of Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes on all affordable dwellings and Level 4 for water efficiency across the whole development. On-site renewable energy will be generated through a solar thermal technology, managed through conditions on the reserved matters application. Buildings have been orientated in such a way as to maximise potential for solar gain.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>We believe the comments here to be somewhat derogatory. The masterplan elaborated upon the contextual work undertaken at the outline stage for phase 2. The masterplan form for the assessment of wider and site specific character and the links to these (respects) are made clear in the adopted masterplan and Design Guidance. We do not accept that the design concept misses the opportunity to build on the principles of the masterplan; indeed, the proposal adheres closely to the approach set down in that document. The suggestion that the scheme should involve ... analysis of the character of Cringleford to create a design that is specific to site' seems to handle the whole purpose of the masterplan and the work that led to it. The masterplan has evolved from that very process and the reserved matters submissions should reflect that, not start again in a piecemeal fashion. The question 'is the design specific to the scheme' must reflect the context of the masterplan and the wider character appraisal and established through the masterplan process. Nevertheless, to assist the Council...</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the scheme exploit existing buildings, landscape or topography?</td>
<td>Again, it seems unreasonable to mark the scheme down (indeed, to give it no points at all under this heading) because of an absence of existing character features. The site was allocated in the full knowledge that this was the case. Arguably, the existing site features are off-site (the mature trees and hedgerows to the west side); the development as a whole effectively exploits these, together with the new, strategic planting in place for some years. The only existing on-site feature is the hedge along Round House Way; this too to be retained and will therefore provide a landscape buffer to those units facing it, which in turn will enjoy the privacy and outlook created.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the scheme feel like a place with a distinctive character?</td>
<td>See response to Q8, above. And in particular the reference to character established through the masterplan and preceding work. Phase 1 was approved relatively recently by the Council; we feel strongly that any retrospective change of view by officers on the suitability of phase 1 should not prejudice the current proposals.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the buildings and layout make it easy to find your way around?</td>
<td>Additional information has been submitted to illustrate how the approach to design and the use of materials will aid design legibility.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment notes: 0.5 additional point awarded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are streets defined by a coherent and well-structured building layout?</td>
<td>The building layout struggles to create a continuous built frontage onto the central road or establish clearly defined building lines. The distinction between public and private spaces is confusing, particularly where blocks of garages and parking bays are combined with housing in shared surface courtyards.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The orientation of key buildings has been designed to support the street scene, which is created through a mix of flats and houses of differing heights. The scheme has also been designed to accommodate buildings arranged in blocks of no more than three, allowing each of the dwellings to have active frontages formed either by windows or doors. Buildings located on the internal, central road have been designed and sited to provide active frontages along the road throughout. Those dwellings to be sited on corners are to be either dual aspect or have additional windows located in the gable walls to ensure activity and to eliminate any blank gable walls. We believe that there is a clear distinction and legibility between private, semi-private and public space, on both the internal street frontages and those fronting Round House Way, the Spine Road and the public open space. We have suggested changes to surface treatment to aid distinction (see Q12 below).</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets, parking and pedestrianization</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the building layout take priority over the streets and car-parking, so that the highways do not dominate?</td>
<td>The use of shared surfacing cut-de-sacs help to reduce the overall dominance of the highway by creating spaces for all types of movement. It is unfortunate that the central access road is designed around the highway requirements of the masterplan, rather than being designed around buildings and spaces that balance the needs of people and cars. DAS and Site Layout</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the car parking well integrated and situated so as to support the street scene?</td>
<td>Car parking is mostly well integrated into the street scene using a combination of garages, in-curtilage parking and private driveways. Where parking courts have been proposed they lack attractive pedestrian over locked spaces with a clear distinction between what is private and public space.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the streets pedestrian, cycle and vehicle-friendly?</td>
<td>Footpaths are provided along both sides of the central access road and connect to other phases of the development. Shared surfacing help to encourage pedestrian and cycle movement throughout the site and reduce traffic speeds.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the scheme integrate with existing streets, paths and surrounding development?</td>
<td>The scheme has been designed to integrate with other parts of the development in accordance with the masterplan.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are public spaces and pedestrian routes overlooked and do they feel safe?</td>
<td>The application has been subject to consultation with the Norfolk Constabulary Architectural Liaison Officer. A number of factors have been taken into account in the design of the scheme based on principles of Secured by Design. Comments made by Norfolk Constabulary regarding overlooking and security have been addressed through the revision and submission of amended drawings.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Is public space well designed and does it have suitable management arrangements in place?</td>
<td>The masterplan includes an area of public open space outside of the site to the east of the area abutting FGA. While this does not form part of the application site it provides an attractive area of amenity space for dwellings facing onto the development. It is however felt that the layout of housing around this key space described in the masterplan as &quot;The Syme&quot;, should take more care to adopt the principles set out in the character matrix i.e. 'predominantly terraced, or short terraced; typically townhouse forms providing a strong degree of continuous frontage'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Do buildings exhibit architectural quality?</td>
<td>An assessment of the building forms and materials in the area has not been made. House types appear to be caught between standard volume house types and vernacular style, without finding their own distinctive character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Do internal spaces and layout allow for acceptance, conversion or extension?</td>
<td>20% of the market units and 15% of the overall development will be built to meet the Lifetime Homes standard. All of the proposed houses offer the option of being extended or converted, according to the occupant’s needs, subject to the receiving the requisite permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Has the scheme made use of advances in construction or technology that enhance its performance, quality, and attractiveness?</td>
<td>Solar thermal technology is proposed that will meet 10% of annual energy demand from the site. The location and appearance of the thermal panels will be managed through conditions on the reserved matters application. DAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Do buildings or spaces outperform statutory minima, such as Building Regulations?</td>
<td>The site proposes to achieve a minimum of Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes on all affordable dwellings and Level 4 for water efficiency across the whole development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The Council’s evaluation focuses on the buildings around the open space and is scored to reflect that evaluation. However, our understanding of Q16 (based upon the Building for Life detailed criteria) is that this question is specific to the provision, design and management of open space itself. We would not dispute the importance of the buildings surrounding open space but believe that this is not an issue for question 16 specifically. As part of the masterplan for this 2nd phase community partland, comprising playing fields and woodlands, have all been designed to form a key part of the plan which allows the most benefit to the residents. The adjacent open space forms part of this bull is not within the current application site.</td>
<td>Elements of architectural detailing have been improved with the submission of amended plans, however it is still felt that the buildings lack a distinctive character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>All units need to demonstrate how they will be built to the Lifetime Homes standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The application meets the JCB requirements regarding CRSH and on-site renewable energy efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applications by South Norfolk Council

   Parish : HETHERSETT

Applicants Name : South Norfolk Council
Site Address : Storage Land, Station Court Station Lane, Hethersett, Norfolk
Proposal : Change of use of land for storage of plastic refuse bins and overnight parking of approx. 10 commercial vehicles and day parking for 10 commercial vehicle operatives cars. Application is for temporary period of only 2 years.

Recommendation : Approve with conditions
   1. Temporary Uses – 2 years
   2. In accordance with submitted drawings
   3. Personal permission

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   Section 1 : Building a strong, competitive economy
   Section 3 : Supporting a prosperous rural economy

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   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
   EMP 6: Alterations and extensions to existing business premises
   ENV 2: Areas of open land which maintain a physical separation between settlements within the Norwich Area
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside

2. Planning History

2.1 2006/2414/F Revised details to conversion of farmhouse to offices with extension Approved
2.2 2006/1807/F Revised details to conversion of farmhouse (previous approval 2004/2611) Refused
2.3 2005/2751/F Extension to office units 1 and 2 Approved
2.4 2005/2747/F Extension to offices and alterations to office and flat Approved
2.5 2004/2611/CU Proposed change of use of outbuildings to offices, change of use of farm house to offices and single dwelling flat with relocation of modern farm buildings to agricultural machinery stores Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council : To be reported
3.2 District Member : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : No objection

3.4 Highways Agency : No objection

3.5 Environmental Services (Protection) : To be reported

3.6 Local Residents : To be reported

4. Assessment

4.1 The application is for the use of an area to the south of existing buildings for the external storage of refuse bins and commercial vehicles by the Council. The proposal relates to the current operation of the Ketteringham depot which is a congested site and this gives rise to various health and safety issues that need to be resolved relatively quickly. The temporary relocation of refuse bins and some vehicles will allow these issues to be resolved. A long term solution is currently being investigated but it could be 12 months before this is in place.

4.2 The proposal is therefore for a temporary period of two years which is to allow for the reordering of the existing depot site on Station Lane, Ketteringham, after which time the storage will revert to the existing depot site.

4.3 The site is in a countryside location and is within an area covered by Policy ENV2 which seeks to retain the openness between settlements. The site is immediately adjacent to a range of buildings which are used for commercial purposes, although the buildings immediately adjacent to the proposal are restricted to agricultural storage (condition 2 of 2004/2611).

4.4 Policies in the National Planning Policy Framework promote sustainable employment opportunities while safeguarding the character of the area.

4.5 Policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan and Joint Core Strategy do allow for the alteration and extension of existing business premises provided that the proposal is in keeping with the site and its surroundings, landscaping would not be compromised and there is adequate access and parking. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.6 The application site is in a prominent position which is clearly visible from the A11. The proposal will be seen in the context of the existing group of buildings which are used for commercial purposes, however the use of the buildings immediately adjacent to the proposal were restricted by that planning permission. In addition, external storage was restricted by the same planning permission. The site is also in a location where policies seek to safeguard the character of the area.

4.7 The application has included additional information to justify the short term need for an area of external storage and that relates to the operation of the depot site on the opposite side of the A11. The Council is implementing a programme of improvements to the depot and this will require the temporary use of the application site for the storage of bins and commercial vehicles.

4.8 I consider that, while the permanent use of this area for external storage is unlikely to be supported, given its relationship to the nearby depot and the wider community benefit from the operation of that depot, that a temporary, personal permission is appropriate in this case.
5. Reasons for approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with aims of Policy 5 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies EMP4 and EMP6 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. In terms of the objectives of Policies ENV2 and ENV8 it is considered that the relationship to the nearby depot and the wider community benefit from the operation of that depot and the temporary and restricted nature of the proposal outweigh the harm to the character of the area.

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

3. **Appl. No** : 2011/0600/F  
   **Parish** : BAWBURGH  
   Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs T and J Hubbard  
   Site Address : Hillside, Stocks Hill, Bawburgh NR9 3GG  
   Proposal : Sub-division of garden and change of use, including extension of outbuilding to dwelling and ancillary works.

Recommendation : Approve with conditions

1. Full - Planning Permission Time Limit  
2. In accordance with submitted amendments  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Details of external joinery  
5. New brickwork to boundary wall to match existing including coursing, bond joints, pointing and mortar mix  
6. Removal of permitted development (Classes ABCDE & G)  
7. Ecology Mitigation  
8. New Access - Construction over verge  
9. Access Gates - Configuration  
10. Provision of Visibility Splays  
11. Provision of Parking and Servicing Areas  
12. Surface Water  
13. In accordance with sound attenuation scheme  
14. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
15. Levels to be agreed  
16. Details of retaining works  
17. Water efficiency

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework – which replaces:-  
   National Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5) : Planning for the Historic Environment  
   National Planning Policy Statement 9 (PPS9): Biodiversity and Geological Conservation  
   Section 7 – Design  
   Section 11 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
   Section 12 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 1 – Climate Change  
   Policy 2 – Promoting Good Design  
   Policy 3 - Water Efficiency  
   Policy 16 – Other Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   HOU7 –Development within Defined Boundaries of Small Villages  
   HOU 10: Adaptation and re-use of existing rural buildings for residential purposes  
   ENV14: Habitat Protection  
   ENV15 : Species Protection  
   IMP2 – Landscaping  
   IMP3 Protecting of important spaces  
   IMP4 – important Frontages  
   IMP6 Visual Impact of Parked Cars  
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
   IMP 9: Residential amenity  
   IMP 10: Noise  
   IMP15: Setting of listed buildings  
   IMP17: Alterations and extensions in Conservation Areas  
   IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.
### Planning History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/0457/F</td>
<td>Erection of two storey dwelling and garage</td>
<td>Not Yet Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/0904/F</td>
<td>Erection of one two storey dwelling</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/1128/F</td>
<td>Erection of two single storey dwellings</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/1966/F</td>
<td>Erection of 2 single storey dwellings</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/0122/F</td>
<td>Renewal of permission 94/0081/F – Erection of 2 storey dwelling and garage</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/0081/F</td>
<td>Renewal of permission 89/0271/F Erection of 2 storey dwelling and garage</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989/0271/F</td>
<td>Erection of one 2 storey dwelling and garage as approved on 07/87/1580/F</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987/0580/F</td>
<td>Erection of new house and garage</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish Council</td>
<td>In view of the complexity of the application the Parish Council decided it was unable to put a decision forward to the South Norfolk Planning Committee on this occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Member</td>
<td>To be reported if appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC Highways</td>
<td>The amended plan provides the requested improved visibility splay, and subject to other conditions relating to parking and turning and the construction of the access, the scheme is now considered acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>No objections are raised following the revised Acoustic Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNC Building Control</td>
<td>No objection to revised Acoustic Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRE</td>
<td>Original comments withdrawn; Following further detailed consideration of the issues involved CPRE Norfolk Branch is not able to provide a definite opinion either for or against the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk County Council Historic Environment Officer</td>
<td>The scheme will have a detrimental effect on the significant historical assets of the area and the proposal will put at risk the Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk Conservation Officer</td>
<td>The opening in the wall to create a new access and the re-building of the Coach House to create a new dwelling is not considered to have an adverse impact on the overall character of the Conservation Area. In addition, following the conclusion from English Heritage on the proposal, together with their findings that Forge Cottage, The Coach House and the wall are not of significant interest to add to the statutory list and remains of local interest only, the scheme is considered to be an acceptable proposal for the Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.9 English Heritage: No objections raised. Site area significantly less than 1000 sq metres and would expect schemes of this scale to be considered by South Norfolk’s in house specialist and in accordance with National and Local Planning Policies. Any specific aspects of the scheme can be raised and if necessary English Heritage would discuss these direct with Mr Edleston.

3.10 Ecologist: No objection
- Bat roost is present in the adjacent property known as Hillside, no evidence of bats was found in any of the buildings affected by the proposal. The proposal is unlikely to adversely affect this maternity colony.
- Mitigation measures suggested and the inclusion of 4 bird boxes, 2 being open fronted.

3.11 Local Residents:
- 2 letters of no objection
- 76 Letters of objection
- 371 Signature petition

Reasons of objection:
Conservation Area Impact
- Application has not assessed the heritage assets of the site and surrounding area. Submitted details appear to be a series of subjective and often misleading opinions in favour of the development. Conclusion of minimal impact of the proposed development and enhancement of the Conservation Area is not supported by the evidence provided.
- Heritage analysis takes no account of the impact of the proposed development on the listed buildings in close proximity to the development.
- The existing wall is an important feature within the village and the conservation area, the breaking through the wall and the erection of a new dwelling and parking will ruin this ensemble.
- Wall of development should be part of the protected character of the conservation area
- The Conservation Area Character Appraisal 2001 clearly illustrates and marks “significant views” in and around the area of the proposed development, part of which would appear to include the wall of which a substantial section is to be demolished to create a new entrance for the new dwelling. It is difficult to see how this action accords with The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Section 72, which requires special attention to be paid to preserving or enhancing the nature of a Conservation Area. The scale and scope of the proposed development will significantly and permanently alter the views on Church Street and on a prominent corner at the entrance to the village which the whole community enjoys.
- The existing structure is proposed to be substantially rebuilt i.e. the eastern gable and the roof will have to be taken down so the height of the building can be increased, therefore this warrants an application to be made for conservation area consent.
- The development and improvement of Church Street has been done over the years with strict adherence to the ethos of conservation of the village. The current proposal is not for domestic/family home improvement, but for commercial exploitation of a country garden.
- Many visitors to Bawburgh come not only to enjoy the riverside, but to stroll up Church Street on the way to visit the Church and historic St Walstan’s Well.

Design issues
- Design of new dwelling out of character with the conservation area and Forge Cottage. The overall height will be the same as Forge Cottage, but wider. Historically the barn attached to forge Cottage has been subservient and formed the historical relationship of the two buildings. The new dwelling will dominate the views of this corner of the Conservation Area.
- Forge Cottage will lose its detached importance and become a semi-detached dwelling, which it has not historically been.
- The erection of a car port attached to Forge Cottage does not as suggested “restore the architectural heritage and leave a reference to the historical layout for all to see” it will be clearly visible over the wall.
• The modern glazed bay area and contemporary style will appear completely out of keeping with the period buildings that surround it and those in the nearby locality. How does this add interest to the Conservation Area?
• Even with the use of sensitive materials, it will adversely affect the appearance of the adjoining flint cottage.
• Scale of development too large. No objection to an extension to existing dwelling.
• Noise from air source heat exchanger
• Loss of light and privacy to adjacent properties
• Layout of new dwelling is insensitive as the kitchen and bathroom are adjacent to quiet living area of the adjoining property.
• Proposed construction method of stud walls will not provide full noise insulation.
• Destroys the detached aspect of the adjacent property
• Gutters extend over neighbouring property
• New major retaining wall behind Forge Cottage. The soil behind Forge Cottage is not stable and therefore the wall and associated construction for the new dwelling may have unforeseen consequences for the transmission of water and structural stability of adjacent land and foundations.
• Shadowing diagrams relate to only one month ie March, not the usual 3 different months 21 March, 21 June and 21 December, so cannot be considered a thorough shadow and daylight assessment.
• No assessment been given to the effects of the garden and associated private amenity space of Forge Cottage. Due to the location of the proposal and the increase in height of the new fence the development will adversely affect the amount of daylight and sunlight enjoyed by the garden of Forge Cottage. A material consideration to the scheme.
• Party wall issues remain outstanding.

Access Issues
• Wall is an important feature in this location and the partial demolition to create a new access for 6 cars will be detrimental to the character of the area and highway safety.
• Increase in traffic movements to and from the new access will result in further traffic hazards in this location on a blind bend
• Church Street is a narrow historic street with occasional parking, which helps to slow traffic on the approach to the junction.
• Noise of shingle proposed for drive will cause disturbance to neighbours

Other issues
• Application promoted as a consequence to a previous application in 2009 for a new dwelling adjacent to the existing house. This scheme is being promoted by the applicant’s agents as a preferred option.
• In June 2010, PPS3 was amended to provide Local Planning Authorities greater powers to refuse so called “Garden Grabbing” ie back garden development
• Proposal is behind the building line and may set a precedent for other neglected sheds and barns for which planning has previously been refused.
• Contrary to policies of South Norfolk Local Plan
• Heritage Asset report submitted by the agent does not take account of the requirements of PPS5 which, together with other opposing expert opinions and the overwhelming negative response of local people needs to be given full consideration when deciding the proposal.
• Loss of value to adjoining property (Forge Cottage)
• No Ecology survey with application: Bats occupy the building and the development would have a detrimental impact on the bats
• Loss of trees on site
• Localism Bill and PPS5 (paragraph HE7.2) identify the importance of considering the views of local people. Given the number of objections raised and the petition provided to the Council, this is another materials consideration officers and members need to give due weight to when determining the application.
10 letters of Support

- Outline planning permission already granted for adjacent building plot. Building should be designed to be in keeping with the area. Accept that changes to the area will take time to get used to.
- Design although modern, existing materials will also be reused. Opening and rebuilding of the wall will screen much of the dwelling from view
- Care has been taken in the design of the proposed extension to the building.

4. Assessment

4.1 Members may recall that a previous application for the renewal of a planning application for the erection of a detached two storey dwelling and garage was submitted in 2009 (2009/0457). The 2009 application was presented to Planning Committee but was deferred for further discussion regarding design. Members should be aware that the 2009 application remains undetermined, however the current application is to be considered on its own merit and not as an alternative to the scheme proposed in the 2009 application.

4.2 The proposal is for the conversion / rebuild of an existing coach house within the curtilage of Hillside, currently used as a store/workshop and is attached to the rear elevation of an adjacent property known as Forge Cottage off Church Street. The scheme also includes the removal of a section of boundary wall on Church Street to facilitate a new access for the proposed dwelling and provides up to six parking spaces and turning space within the site.

4.3 The site is within the Development limits of Bawburgh and within the Conservation Area. The properties are not listed buildings. It should be noted that a number of separate reports have been submitted with this application which deal with specific aspects and these have been publicly available. These have not been reproduced as part of this report, but have been taken into account through out the assessment and in consultation with other officers.

Policies

4.4 The main policies against which the proposal was assessed by consultees are listed above, including PPS5, Policy HE7 which sets out the principles for determination of applications relating to heritage assets, in particular HE7.1 relating to significance, HE7.2 on the consideration of impact and HE7.5 regarding the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment.

4.5 Policy HE9.1 notes a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets with any harmful impact on significance being justified in accordance with Policy HE9.2 (substantial harm or total loss) or Policy HE9.4 (less than substantial harm).

4.6 These Planning Policy Statements have now been replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework, however Section 12 : Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paragraphs 126 – 141) retain the above considerations.

4.7 Policies 2 & 3 of the Joint Core Strategy which seek to ensure that all new development is of a high standard and that measures are taken within the design to promote efficient use of renewable energy and water use. With regard to saved Policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan, HOU7 permits new dwellings within the Defined Boundaries of Small Villages if in keeping with the form and character of the village and its setting, while HOU10 permits the adaptation and re-use of existing rural buildings for residential purposes. Other important policies are IMP15, IMP17 and IMP18 all of which seek to ensure that development which affects Conservation area or listed buildings respects the historical character and context of the buildings and surrounding area. Policies IMP8, IMP9 and IMP10 seek to ensure that development have no significant adverse impact on the safe and free flow of traffic, or the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 referred to because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.
Conservation

4.8 One of the key assessments to be made regarding this proposal is its impact on the heritage assets and Conservation Area and this particular aspect has raised a significant number of objections from the local residents. Appendix 2 shows the extent of the Conservation Area and position of listed buildings in the vicinity of the site.

4.9 Although not a Statutory Consultee the Norfolk County Council Historic Buildings Officer became aware of the application and as a result of noting the absence of a Heritage Assessment State with the application provided a “report to fill this requirement”. With the exception of photographs and maps the following text is the direct quotes taken directly from the report from the Historic Buildings Officer. The full report can be viewed on the Council’s website.

4.10 “Forge Cottage is on the South side of Church Road which rises away from the river valley, the property cuts into the hill slightly and the land is held back by a ha-ha which is in a state of collapse. Adjacent to Forge Cottage is the reading room belonging to the adjacent Methodist Chapel; the reading room now forms part of Forge Cottage. Attached to the back of Forge Cottage is a derelict Coach House, which forms the site of the application being considered.

4.11 The cottage is a good example of a simple 3-cell house with gable-end stacks a central straight stair and a symmetrical façade of three bays. The fabric is of knapped flint with brick dressings. The large flints are roughly knapped to reveal a smooth surface and area carefully laid in a random bond. The brick dressings are keyed and form the quoins as well as the opening reveals. The central doorway has a small porch with a roof of pan tiles and latticed sides in keeping, in keeping with the date of the cottage. The roof is of shallow pitch with a covering of pantiles. The fenestration is of 3-light mullion-and transom windows mostly original apart from the glazing which would have been leaded. The ground floor windows are beneath fine deep segmental arches. On the west gable-end is a raised cement panel which looks as if it displayed an advertisement.

4.12 Attached to the north east corner of the cottage is a tall brick boundary wall which curves round towards Stock’s Hill. It is of tightly joined brickwork with occasional black headers and has a moulded brick coping. At present it is overgrown.

4.13 Forge Cottage is not officially designated yet it is clearly a heritage asset in its own right and especially as a key building in the Church Street Section of the Bawburgh Conservation Area. It furnishes the narrow part of the lane with the officially designated buildings opposite and is an important element in the group of attractive and historic buildings focussing on this section of the street. The boundary is also an important part of the Conservation Area as it borders the splayed opening to the street emphasising it and announcing the village street appearance of the buildings with Forge Cottage in the forefront.

4.14 The proposed development would put at risk the Conservation Area by removing a section of boundary wall and by revealing a rebuilt, greatly enlarged and heightened former coach house. Attention is drawn to the Government’s Planning Policy Statement 5, in particular policy HE6.1 where local planning authorities should require an applicant to provide a description of the heritage assets affected by the proposed development. The assessment reveals that Forge Cottage and the boundary wall adjoining it are significant heritage assets in a sensitive and valuable part of the Conservation Area. The proposed development would have a detrimental effect on the assets
- By demolishing part of the boundary wall
- By converting a derelict former coach house to residential which involves the rebuilding and enlargement which will make it prominent in the streetscape.
- By overshadowing and further enclosing Forge Cottage which is a significant heritage asset.
In relation to the lack of information provided with the application attention is drawn to policy HE6.3: Local Planning Authorities should not validate applications where the extent of the impact of the proposal on the significance of any heritage assets affected cannot adequately be understood from the application and supporting documents. It is hoped that this report helps to redress the lacuna and is of assistance to the local planning authority when it comes to make a decision”.

4.15 South Norfolk’s Conservation Officer has also assessed the Conservation area, the listed buildings which are in close proximity to the site and how the proposal will impact on the overall character of the heritage assets of the area. The following text forms the Conservation Officer comments on the proposal:

4.16 “The development site and Forge Cottage are located within the Bawburgh Conservation Area. Although not listed, both Forge Cottage, including the attached coach house to the rear and the brick boundary wall to Hillside are identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal dated January 2001 as being of townscape significance, i.e. they make a positive contribution to the character of the area. The appraisal also notes that Church Street is of mixed character with a number of listed buildings as well as more modern dwellings, with a predominance of pantile as the roofing material.

4.17 In July 2011, an application was submitted to English Heritage requesting that Forge Cottage, adjoining wall and attached outbuilding be assessed for adding to the statutory list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest. However, on 9 August English Heritage confirmed that they were not considered to be of sufficient interest to add to the statutory list. The structures therefore remain of local interest only in terms of their contribution to the character of the Conservation Area.

4.18 The proposal involves the conversion and in part rebuilding of the existing attached outbuilding, reconstruction of the mono-pitched structure to the east end of Forge Cottage and the formation of an opening in the existing boundary wall to create a new vehicular access. Key considerations will be the significance of the Conservation Area as a designated heritage asset along with the significance of the structures affected, being of local interest (non-designated heritage assets). The impact of the proposal on this significance will need to be assessed against policies in PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment and saved policies IMP17 : Alterations and extensions in Conservation Areas, IMP18 : Development in Conservation Areas and IMP15 : Setting of Listed Buildings of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.19 Following several discussions and negotiations have now been submitted to address the issues raised along with a report setting out the significance of the heritage assets affected and the impact of the works proposed. Neither the boundary wall nor the structures affected by this proposal are designated heritage assets in their own right, as confirmed by the response from English Heritage to the request for additions to the statutory list. However, it is acknowledged that they are of local interest and make a contribution to the character of the Conservation Area which is a designated heritage asset.

4.20 Policy HE7 of PPS5 sets out the principles for determination of applications relating to heritage assets, in particular HE7.1 relating to significance, HE7.2 on the consideration of impact and HE7.5 regarding the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment.

Policy HE9.1 notes a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets with any harmful impact on significance being justified in accordance with Policy HE9.2 (substantial harm or total loss) or Policy HE9.4 (less than substantial harm).

This does not therefore mean that any change is unacceptable, but a critical assessment has to be made on the degree of harm (if any), on the character of the Conservation Area, balanced alongside any benefits of the development proposed as well as any harm caused to the setting of adjacent listed buildings, as follows :-
**Impact of proposed works to building and lean-to**

4.21 The existing attached outbuilding to the rear of Forge Cottage is currently in a poor state of repair and the former lean-to adjacent to the eastern gable of the cottage has been dismantled, leaving the area in a particularly untidy state. The proposal involves reconstruction of the lean-to to create a car-port and following negotiation, its height has been reduced so that the view from the street will be similar to the former structure. Although it is proposed to increase the height of the ridge to the gable of the outbuilding, this is no greater than the height of the ridge to Forge Cottage and will not dominate the cottage when viewed from the street due to its increased distance away from the street. Although the design of the building has a more contemporary approach to some elements, such as the glazed facade to the dining area, this reinforces the existing mixed character of the street, particularly as the development uses traditional materials including pantiles, noted as being the predominant roofing material within the street. With these issues in mind and in particular the benefits that will be derived from a positive use of this building and the visual improvements that will be achieved in comparison with the existing situation, my conclusion is that it will enhance the character of the Conservation Area.

**Impact of new opening in boundary wall**

4.22 The existing boundary wall does form a strong degree of enclosure at the entrance to Church Street. However, the extent of removal of brickwork is restricted to the minimum required to form a vehicular access and the position of the opening has taken account of the existing brick buttresses as features on either side and a substantial part of the wall will remain in place. Furthermore, when viewed in perspective the sense of enclosure will remain and the design of the curved walls reduces the apparent width of the opening. Although this does involve the loss of some historic fabric and it could be argued that there is some minor harm as a result, taking the above issues into account, my view is that the proposals are acceptable on the basis that the creation of an access facilitates the positive re-use of the building which will enhance the character of the area.

**Impact on setting of adjacent listed buildings**

4.23 There are a number of listed buildings on the opposite side of Church Street. However, it is necessary to walk some distance away from the site before the proposed works can be seen in the context of the listed buildings. At this point the visual impact of the new opening and the alterations to the building will be minimal and accordingly, in my opinion will not adversely impact on the setting of the listed buildings. My conclusion is that the proposals are in accordance with policies in PPS5 and saved policies IMP15, 17 and 18 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and I would therefore recommend approval.”

4.24 Having assessed the comments made by The County Historic Buildings Officer the assessment appears to focus on the character of Forge Cottage and the general street scene of Church Lane rather than how the proposal will impact on the heritage assets of the Conservation Area. I acknowledge that Forge Cottage is important within the street scene, this point is also acknowledged by the South Norfolk’s Conservation Officer, however I also note that the English Heritage consider that the building is of local importance and not of significant interest to be added to the statutory list. There are wider issues which need to be given weight in line with the requirements of policy in terms of the proposal and its impact on the Conservation Area, the setting of the listed buildings within the area situated immediately opposite the proposed access and to the west of the junction of Hockering Lane.
4.25 I have given full consideration to the visual contribution the existing Coach House and the boundary wall make to the overall character of the area. The loss of the Coach House as seen at the present time and how the proposed scheme will impact on the heritage assets of the locality in line with National Policy. On balance I feel that the scheme although making changes to the visual appearance of the Conservation Area, is sympathetic in terms of design and scale to the heritage assets of the area and will enhance the existing site from its current appearance. I therefore consider that the views of South Norfolk Council’s Conservation Officer are based on a more in depth assessment of the character of the area as a whole and in the wider context and his conclusions are based in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, the JCS and the saved policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Design

4.26 The attached outbuilding to the rear of Forge Cottage is currently in a poor state of repair and the former lean-to adjacent to the eastern gable of the cottage has been dismantled, leaving the area particularly untidy state.

4.27 The scheme is for the part conversion, part re-building of a derelict Coach House which is attached to the rear wall of Forge Cottage and for a section of the adjoining boundary wall to be removed to allow for a new vehicular access. The proposal will provide a single, one and a half storey dwelling with front facing dormer windows, a sunroom which projects into the rear garden and a glazed aspect to the front (east) elevation. In addition the scheme includes a free standing mono pitch roof car port on the east elevation of Forge Cottage. However, this will appear when viewed from the street to be attached to Forge Cottage. The existing garden of Hillside will be sub-divided which will involve extensive engineering works including a retaining wall due to the development cutting into a steep bank at the rear of the site.

4.28 The scale of the proposal includes an increase in the ridge height of the main dwelling when compared to that of the existing coach house, however the resulting ridge height is no greater than Forge Cottage and will not dominate the Forge Cottage or the immediate area when viewed from the street due to its increased distance away from the street.

4.29 The re-construction of the lean-to on the east elevation to create a car-port been reduced in height from 4.4 metres to 3.8 metres following negotiation. This amendment to the scheme is now considered to relate more sympathetically to that of the original structure and not have a significant impact on the overall character of the Conservation Area.

Residential Amenities

4.30 With regard to the residential amenities of the proposal and how this will impact on the neighbouring property consideration has been given to the scale of the proposed dwelling, the position of the rear facing velux windows and any necessary boundary screening.

4.31 There is an increase in the ridge height of the proposed dwelling to that of the existing coach house, however, the increase is approximately 0.5 of a metre in height moving the resulting ridge to the south and away from Forge Cottage. For this reason I do not consider that this increase will have an unacceptable impact on either privacy or loss of light to the existing dwelling, or the adjacent courtyard area.

4.32 The proposal when first submitted included six roof lights in the rear roof which adjoins Forge Cottage, two of which would have opened directly opposite an existing roof light serving the kitchen of Forge Cottage. These have been replaced with sun tubes allowing the same natural light levels for the new dwelling, but without the impact on the neighbouring property. I consider that by virtue of the design and orientation of the proposal relative to the neighbouring dwellings that there will not be significant overlooking of habitable rooms or amenity areas.
4.33 At present an existing hedge forms the boundary between the courtyard area of Forge Cottage and the elevated garden area of Hillside. The existing retaining wall has partly collapsed and the new scheme proposes to erect a new retaining wall to be built in front of the existing wall, on top of which will be erected a new fence to the same height as the existing hedge. I consider that this will continue to provide privacy to the adjacent neighbouring property and should be conditioned to be complete prior to the occupation of the property.

4.34 At the time of submission the scheme included amongst other sustainable methods of insulation and light, an Air Source Heat Pump. Consideration was given to the potential of noise impact on the neighbouring property and as no suitable alternative location for the Air Source heat Pump could be found this has now been deleted from the scheme.

4.35 The new access is proposed to be surfaced with shingle, this has raised concern with the neighbour with regard to the level of noise resulting from traffic movements to and from the site. On balance, I consider that the level of noise resulting from the gravelled drive would not result in a sufficient level of disturbance to require an alternative surface material. I would expect the first 2 metres from the carriageway edge to be of a solid surface to prevent gravel from being dragged onto the highway. No objections on this point have been raised by the Highways Officer.

Highway

4.36 It is acknowledged that a new access in this location causes concern on safety grounds for the local residents. However, following an amended plan to adjust the section of wall to be removed and improve the visibility splays in both directions, the revised scheme now meets the requirement of the County Highways Officer. Subject to the suggested conditions above which ensure that there is adequate turning space within the site and that the access point is constructed in the manner shown on the plans, the Highway Authority now considers the scheme acceptable.

Ecology

4.37 At the time the application was submitted no Ecology Survey was included. The Council received reports of bats being seen in the vicinity of the application site and as a result of this, the agent was requested to commission an Ecology Survey. As a result of this survey bats and any other protected species were assessed. The survey noted that a Soprano Pipistrelle maternity roost is present in the adjacent property (Hillside), but no evidence of bats was found in any of the outbuildings affected by the proposal. The proposal is therefore unlikely to adversely affect this maternity colony.

4.38 Mitigation measures are suggested, which relate to clearance work on site and provision of bird boxes. The report, mitigating measures and the enhancement opportunities are supported by the District Ecologist, and therefore comply with the requirements of policies ENV14, and ENV15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Landscaping

4.39 Concern has been raised by some of the local residents to the loss of trees on the site, and that no survey has been submitted. From my site visit I note that the only trees which have been removed are either fruit trees, or other smaller trees which do not make a significant contribution to the overall landscape of the site and do not need any form of consent to be removed.

4.40 With regard to the large area of wall to the front of the site which is currently covered in Whisteria, this is considered by many to be an asset within the locality. While I acknowledge that this does contribute to the area, it should be noted that no permission is required to either cut or remove this should the applicant so wish and although the loss of this shrub would be unfortunate, it cannot be controlled through the planning process.
Drainage

4.44 Drainage from the proposed site has been designed to include three soakaways to accommodate all the surface water from the site. These are to be positioned to the east of the new access. A slot / channel drain will be constructed around the patio to take all surface water and feed into the soakaway system. Full details of this will need to be submitted as part of the Building Regulation process. The foul drainage will connect to the main sewerage system.

Noise

4.45 Significant consultation has taken place on the acoustic levels which can be achieved to ensure that the new dwelling will have no unacceptable impact on the amenities of the adjacent property as the rear wall of Forge Cottage will adjoin the new dwelling. An acoustic report has been submitted which included the repair of cracks to the existing flank wall between the two properties, however, concerns raised by Environmental Services regarding the potential for the repairs not to meet the required standards lead to a revised Acoustic system being designed and a revised report submitted.

4.46 The revised scheme proposes a free standing wall in addition to the existing wall. The level of attenuation required by Building Regulation for a new build scheme is 45dB. Environmental Services comment that the new report, demonstrates that the proposed party wall can exceed the noise attenuation performance for new dwellings by a significant margin, to give protection to the amenities of the neighbours from noise generated within the new dwelling. Based on the comments from Building Control and Environmental Services, I consider the scheme now accords with the principles of policy IMP10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

5. Reasons for approval

5.1 The site forms an important part of the Conservation Area, however at the present time the poor state of the Coach House detracts from the overall appearance of the area. The scheme as submitted has been designed to take account of the character of the Conservation Area and the surrounding Listed Buildings and takes into account the impact the proposal will have on the adjoining property. The scheme is considered to accord with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies in the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan and will enhance the character of the Conservation Area by re-building an existing derelict building.

5.2 The alterations to the existing boundary wall have been designed to ensure that there is adequate visibility for traffic to access and egress from the site and to ensure that there is adequate space within the site to allow vehicles to turn and leave the site in a forward gear. The scheme is acceptable in terms of the requirements of highway safety and accords with the principles of policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

5.3 The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson, 01508 533837, jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No**: 2012/0284/F  
**Parish**: WINFARTHING

- **Applicants Name**: Saffron Housing Trust  
- **Site Address**: Land north of Chapel Close, Winfarthing, Norfolk  
- **Proposal**: Erection of six dwellings for affordable rent

**Recommendation**: Approve

1. Standard 3 year time limit for implementation  
2. Materials  
3. Landscaping  
4. Tree protection  
5. No development to commence until future management arrangements for the amenity green and general landscaping have been submitted and approved  
6. Boundary treatment  
7. Access details to be agreed  
8. On site parking and turning details to be agreed  
9. Levels  
10. Scheme for the provision of affordable housing to be agreed  
11. No external lighting unless first agreed in writing  
12. Foul and surface water drainage

Subject to a S106 Legal Agreement confirming the type, tenure and mix of affordable housing, including its affordability in perpetuity.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  
Section 6 – Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes  
Section 7 – Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 17: Smaller rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 None relevant.

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: Approve  
3.2 District Member: Can be a delegated decision if recommendation is to approve.  
3.3 NCC Highways: No objection.  
3.4 Environment Agency: No objection.  
3.5 Anglian Water Services Ltd: None received.
3.6 SNC: Housing Strategy Manager : Fully supports the proposals.

3.7 Environmental Services (Protection) : None received.

3.8 Landscape Officer : None received.

3.9 Local Residents : 1 letter of objection received
- Do not consider that these homes are being built for local people
- Detrimental impact on a rural setting
- Negative impact on the aspect and peacefulness of the Close
- Traffic congestion will increase
- Light pollution
- Loss of mature trees

4. Assessment

4.1 The application site is located at the northern edge of the village, adjacent to Chapel Close, and set back from Hall Road. The main site is approx. 0.3 hectares in size, but a ‘village green’ is also proposed which adds a further 0.09 hectares to the site. Although relatively level, the site does have a fall east to west of approx. 0.6 metres and north to south of approx. 0.3 metres. The current use if the site is arable, and there is a small group of trees to the south of the site, adjacent to the neighbouring built development, Chapel Close, a small development of bungalows. The site is wholly outside the development boundary.

4.2 The proposal would result in dwellings being located outside the development boundary, contrary to policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. However, where affordable housing is proposed to meet a specific local need, JCS Policy 17 allows a departure from the general presumption against new development in the open countryside, particularly where sites are adjacent to villages and are in sustainable locations.

4.3 The recently published National Planning Policy Framework states that in rural areas authorities should be ‘responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs’. Local needs affordable housing helps to sustain and enhance small villages and to promote sustainable development in rural areas, the NPPF requires ‘housing to be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities’. In my view, the application fully accords with these aims.

4.4 JCS Policy 16 allocates Winfarthing as an ‘other village’, and is therefore considered to have only basic facilities, and where development of this type would not normally be permitted. However JCS Policy 17 allows small scale development adjacent villages where a local housing need can be demonstrated. The Housing Enabling Officer has confirmed that the proposed scheme is based on the results of regular monitoring of Winfarthing-related data available from the South Norfolk Housing Register by South Norfolk Enabling Officers, and detailed discussions between Saffron Housing Trust and Winfarthing Parish Council.

4.5 The scheme can provide 6 much needed new affordable homes for the village, comprised of a bungalow and house for smaller households and a range of family-sized homes, all of which will be able to help meet the affordable housing needs of local single households, couples and families in Winfarthing. Furthermore, each home will be legally protected by means of an Affordable Housing Section 106 Agreement to ensure it is made available first and foremost to households who have a local connection to Winfarthing and who are in need of affordable housing; and also that the homes remain affordable in perpetuity.
4.6 Taking the above into account I feel that the proposed development accords with the requirements of JCS Policy 17 and is acceptable in principle.

The remaining issues to be considered are:

- Design, layout & impact on the character of the area;
- Highway Impact, and;
- Impact on residential amenity.

**Design, Layout & Impact on the Character of the Area**

4.7 The applicants have submitted a design and access statement, which adequately assess the context of the site and the character of the surrounding area. The proposed mix of 1, 1.5 and 2 storey dwellings reflects the scale and character of existing mix of development within the village and in particular Chapel Close/Hall Lane. To help create a sense of place, the buildings are tied together by the use of the same materials, utilising cream render and terracotta pan tiles.

4.8 A striking element of the proposal is the ‘village green’, or amenity grassed area that forms the central feature of the group of houses. This design element helps to create a focal point and to add character to the development, as well as providing for a publically accessible amenity space for both new and existing residents in the local area. The future management of this space can be required to be submitted by condition of any approval. The Design Architect raises no objection to the scheme, which also has the full support of the Parish Council, and has benefitted from substantial pre-application negotiation.

4.9 A contextual assessment of the local area has been undertaken by the applicants, and the scale, form, design and proposed building materials reflect on the appearance of many of the older properties in the village. This approach is considered appropriate. In terms of sustainability, it is proposed that the buildings are highly insulated and will have air source heat pumps providing heating and hot water, giving a 1:3 return on electricity used.

4.10 Taking the above into account I feel that the design, siting and layout of the proposal, and its relationship with adjoining development is considered acceptable and in accordance with JCS Policy 2.

**Highway Impact**

4.11 The highway impact of this proposal has been assessed by NCC: Highways, who consider that the proposal would not give rise to significant levels of traffic, and do not raise any concerns in respect of highway safety. The application therefore accords with the requirements of saved policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

**Impact on Residential Amenity**

4.12 It is only number 14 Chapel Close that is directly affected by the proposal, being located along side proposed plot 1. To reflect its scale (single storey), plot 1 is proposed to be a bungalow, and has been angled away from the existing dwelling to further reduce any potential for amenity impact. The location of the proposed dwellings around a ‘horseshoe’ results in the building line being between 35 metres and 50 metres away from Chapel Close. I do not consider that there will be any significant disturbance to general amenities currently afforded by the residents of Chapel Close.

4.13 Although a local resident has objected to the development, no address details have been made available, and as a result I have been unable to fully assess the issues they have raised. Reference has been made to the loss of mature trees, however the proposals put forward do not propose the loss of any trees.
4.14 Taking the above into account, I am satisfied that there will not be a significant impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties and the application accords with saved policy IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

5. Reasons for approval

5.1 The proposed development of affordable housing is in a sustainable location, adjacent to a village, and provides affordable housing for a defined local need. The proposal therefore accords with Policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (March 2011). The design, siting and layout of the proposal, and its relationship with adjoining development is considered acceptable and in accordance with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (March 2011), and saved policies IMP8 (Safe & Free Flow of Traffic), and IMP9 (Residential Amenity) of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Gary Hancox, 01508 533841, ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No**: 2012/0310/A  
**Parish**: DISS  

Applicants Name: Mr J Hawkins  
Site Address: 3 and 4 Navire House, Mere Street, Diss, Norfolk, IP22 4AG  
Proposal: Erection of new fascia signs - one at ground floor level and 4 at second floor level  

Recommendation: Approve with conditions  

1. **Planning Policies**  

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Section 7 – Design  

2.2 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 19: Advertisements  

2. **Planning History**  

2.1 2007/1791 Erection of 4 fascia panel signs (William H Brown)  
Approved  

3. **Consultations**  

3.1 Town Council: Refuse  
- Number of signs is excessive in the Conservation Area.  
- One sign over the entrance as per the previous tenant is considered to be sufficient and appropriate  

3.2 District Members  
Mr Keith Kiddie: Can be delegated  
Mr G H Walden: Can be delegated  
Mr Tony Palmer: To be reported if appropriate  

3.3 NCC Highways: No objections  

3.4 Conservation Officer: Conditional support  
- Would prefer the signs reduced in number on the eastern elevation but would not object if they were not reduced  

3.5 Local Residents: 2 letters  
- This is an ugly building and to put boards of no merit or design appeal onto the building will make it look worse  
- No issue with signs per se as we have them but make them look more classy  
- It is important that the building is let and happy to leave to Diss Town Council to decide
4. **Assessment**

4.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of 4 signs on Navire House located at the southern end of Mere Street adjacent to the roundabout with Morrison’s. PIP Professional Training Services are looking to occupy the top floor of the building which has William H Brown, Diss Pet Shop and Fine & Country occupying the ground floor with their associated signage.

4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes under Section 7 that the control of advertisements should be efficient, effective and simple in concept and operation. Policy IMP19 in the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) requires advertisements to be well designed, in scale, appropriate to the building and its use and positioned so as to preserve or enhance the overall appearance of the building. As such the assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the SNLP because this policy remains consistent with the NPPF.

4.3 The application is a prominent site clearly viewed along Victoria Road and falls within the conservation area. The signs are not illuminated and there is evidence that signage was located in a similar position in the past. The Conservation officer has verbally raised no objections but has asked for the applicants to consider the reduction of the two signs on the east elevation to one; given the context of the site he does not consider the proposal would have any adverse impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. I have requested the applicants to reduce the signage as required by the Conservation officer. It is considered that the signs are well designed, in scale, appropriate to the building and its use. On balance I do not consider that there positioning will adversely affect the overall appearance of the building, particularly taking into account the signage for the existing business in the premises.

4.4 Whilst I fully appreciate the comments raised by the Town Council and local residents, as set out above, I consider that the signage is acceptable.

5. **Reasons for approval**

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, South Norfolk Local Plan and the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk and in particular is considered to be in accordance with policies IMP19 – Advertisements of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because this policy remains consistent with the published National policy Framework.

5.2 The development accords with the above policy IMP19 (given the existing signs already on the premises) as the advertisement is in scale; appropriate to the building and its use; and positioned so as to preserve or enhance the overall appearance of the building.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis, 01508 533788, ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2012/0323/H  
**Parish**: HINGHAM

Applicants Name: Mr R Healy & Mr M Grapes (Business World Travel Ltd)  
Site Address: Foxglove Cottage, 10 Copper Lane, Hingham, Norfolk, NR9 4JS  
Proposal: Alterations to existing cottage with proposed extension

Recommendation: Approve

1. Full permission time limit  
2. Amended Plans  
3. Materials to be agreed  
4. PD Rights for 1st floor windows removed (S and E)

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Section 7 – Design  
Section 12 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 1: Environmental assets and climate change  
Policy 2: Design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 19: Extensions to existing dwellings  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 17: Alterations and extensions in Conservation Areas  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No recent planning history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Town Council: Recommend refusal
- Large extension that doubles the size of the cottage  
- 2-storey extension will bring the property closer to the neighbouring bungalow  
- New windows will look directly into the neighbours bedroom and lounge  
- Extension is detrimental to the neighbour’s amenity and is out of keeping with the surrounding properties  
- No objection to a single storey extension

3.2 District Member: No comment as District Member is neighbour

3.3 Landscape Officer: No objection  
- No significant trees or vegetation on site

3.4 Local Residents

2 letters of objection to the original submitted plans:  
- Extension will overlook property (12 Copper Lane)  
- Windows on the first floor extension will provide views into garden & conservatory  
- Already overlooked by several houses in the vicinity  
- Extension is virtually the same size as the existing house making the new development out of proportion with neighbouring properties in the Conservation Area
• Would ask that the application goes to committee unless officers are recommending refusal
• Property is in the Hingham Conservation Area and in keeping with other cottages in the town – this proposal would destroy the ‘chocolate box’ image
• Roadside parking not possible & proposed parking is not sufficient for a 3-double bedroom family home
• Current parking proposals will not enable vehicles to turn and re-enter the site in forward gear
• Construction traffic presents a real hazard to highway users (road and pedestrian) & there would not be any roadside parking for workmen’s vehicles or construction traffic
• Proposal destroys privacy enjoyed by 8 Copper Lane
• 8 Copper Lane has restrictive condition relating to the insertion of ground floor windows in the east elevation
• All proposed first floor windows face directly into the front garden of no. 8 as well as directly into the ground floor master bedroom window in the west elevation and the forward bay window to the lounge and the front door in the north elevation;
• Proposed ground floor windows and door in east elevation would also overlook the same areas and rooms
• First floor windows in the south elevation would overlook the garden of no. 8 & kitchen/ diner window to the rear
• If planning consent granted no windows should be allowed on the first floor in the south and east elevations & ground floor openings should be frosted glass
• Changes in ground levels on site would mean foundations for the extension would rise towards no. 8 and 12 & as a result scale and mass of a 2-storey extension would dominate the surrounding properties and affect the light and views of St Andrew’s Church from no. 8
• Increased footprint of building & use of hard surfacing would reduce permeable drainage to east and make matters worse when water runs off and towards nos. 8 & 6
• In favour of bringing the property back into use as it has fallen into a sad condition and requires substantial repair however a 2-storey extension is far too large & a more sensible single storey with repair to the existing clay lump construction would make it a lovely small cottage home in keeping with its Conservation Area status
• No attempt made by the owners or the agents to discuss the plans with the neighbours

3 letters of objection to the amended plans:
• If the building is not listed it should be
• Concerns about the additional window in the upstairs of the north elevation – many windows at one end compared to one for the rest of the building fronting Copper Lane
• Site is not big enough to sensibly allow double the existing building footprint
• All a bit cramped when the inevitable garage is erected
• Careful modernisation of the existing house would be a better alternative
• Location of windows has been changed which does help a little
• 150 year old cottage is surrounded by new developments
• Allowing another application for a 2x storey extension would be out of keeping with the rest of the bungalows adjacent to it in Copper Lane & make us feel more “hemmed in” than we do already
• In order to maintain some sort of view we would only really be happy for a single storey extension to be built
• We understand the need/ desire to modernise the property but please bear in mind the effect on the surrounding properties
• Don’t relish another roof to gaze at whereas a single storey would be much more unobtrusive
• Proposal to remove the first floor windows in the east and south elevations improves the overlooking to some degree
• Object to any ground floor windows in the east elevation – the kitchen/diner is quadruple aspect and sufficient light would be obtained from the planned windows in the south, west and north elevations
• We ask for a condition requiring any ground floor windows/ doors in the east elevation to be frosted glass to preserve neighbour privacy (and concur with the condition imposed on 8 Copper Lane)
• The hedge on the east boundary of the site is currently 1.9-2.15 metres (not 1.6 as indicated on the plans) – we ask that a condition is applied requiring the hedge to be grown and maintained at a height of 2.5 metres to screen 8 Copper Lane from overlooking
- Scale and mass of the proposal has not been redressed
- The proposed extension is still far too large for the size of the plot
- The plot is approximately 20m² and the proposed extension would mean the footprint of the outer walls would be 15m x 9m
- The slope of the site would mean that the mass of a 2x storey building would appear even worse from 8 Copper Lane (bungalow) and destroy the open view and amenity currently enjoyed
- Effect on the Conservation Area would be totally out of keeping with the existing cottages at nos. 1, 12 & the clay lump outbuildings to the rear of 23 Market Place
- Copper Lane has great historical interest
- The only modern buildings are along the gravelled part which provides access to the south side of the Market Place
- Proposed relocation of large first floor window to the north elevation—the predominant view to the north from the rest of the Conservation Area—unbalances the original cottage design in a highly visible wall
- Previous objections on the grounds of parking facilities, massing and drainage problems remain valid

4. Assessment

4.1 The application site is a detached two-storey dwelling within the Development Limits of Hingham. The property is of modest proportions and narrow width and has a single storey mono-pitched addition along the east elevation. The dwelling occupies a corner location at the edge of Copper Lane and is within the Hingham Conservation Area. The dwelling is of clay lump construction and is finished with a pink render. It is not a Listed Building.

4.2 The application was submitted following initial pre-application discussions with the agent. Officers were raised at this time by officers about the scale and massing of the proposed development, as well as the possible impact on the neighbouring properties. Some changes were made to the form of the proposed extension, however, as the applicant did not wish to reduce the floorspace created it was felt that the proposals should be assessed by the submission of a formal planning application.

4.3 Policies in the NPPF, JCS and Local Plan seek to ensure that proposals are in keeping with the character of the existing building and its environs, do not adversely affect the character of the Conservation Area, or have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of neighbouring use or highway safety. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.4 The application that was initially submitted included a large first floor window in the proposed south facing gable as well as two first floor windows in the east elevation. Following concerns about potential overlooking of the neighbouring properties from these windows the proposals have been amended. As a result the first floor window in the south elevation has been deleted and one of the east facing windows relocated to the north elevation. It was suggested that a high level window in the south elevation may provide detail to the south end gable however the applicant has incorporated the east elevation roof light instead.

4.5 The development proposed would significantly increase the size of the existing property and would create an ‘L’-shaped dwelling on the application site. The extended area would be set in closest proximity to the neighbouring property, 8 Copper Lane, a single storey dwelling that is set further back in its plot than the application dwelling. The property would also extend towards 12 Copper Lane, a 2-storey dwelling to the rear of the application site.
4.6 Other works to the site would include the removal of the existing detached garage and car port as well as the relocation of a shed to the south east corner of the site. Some trees on the site would be removed as part of the proposals however the Landscape Officer has not raised an objection to their loss. The existing vehicular access into the site would be maintained although an additional pedestrian entrance would be created in the west boundary wall.

4.7 In design terms, the width of the proposed extension would be larger than the span of the existing dwelling by 600mm and would result in a ridge height that exceeds the ridge line of the original dwelling by 200mm. The current proposal follows design discussions which included a shallower but lower roof pitch to avoid a reduction in the floorspace however this was considered to be less compatible with the roof form of the existing dwelling than the current proposal.

4.8 The property occupies a prominent location within the streetscene and the alterations that are proposed would be highly visible. As such, the changes to the property would alter the public views in this part of the Hingham Conservation Area. As a procedural matter I have noted that the applicant has not referred to the impact of the development on the Conservation Area in the Design and Access Statement which has been submitted with the application.

4.9 There are also some changes in ground levels in and around the application site which would result in the application dwelling appearing to sit higher in the street-scene than the two-storey dwelling to the rear of the site.

4.10 Whilst the increase in the scale and massing of the property would be prominent within the Conservation Area setting I do not consider that the changes to the dwelling would have a material adverse effect on the overall character and appearance of the area. On balance therefore, although the changes to the appearance of the property would alter its character, I do not feel that the effect of the alterations that are proposed are sufficient to justify recommending refusal of planning permission.

4.11 I am satisfied that the changes to the windows, resulting from concerns about loss of privacy and the impact of the development on the existing residential amenities, have reduced the potential for overlooking of the neighbouring properties to an acceptable level.

4.12 The extension adds to the scale and massing of the building and will increase the sense of enclosure to adjacent properties. The extension would be approximately 5 metres from the mutual boundary with 8 Copper Lane to the east however, and about 11 metres from the boundary to 12 Copper Lane to the south. Given this relationship, I do not consider that the impact of the extension in terms of light or outlook would be so harmful as to warrant refusal of the application.

4.13 I do not consider that there would be insufficient parking on the site following its redevelopment and whilst I am aware of the comments that have been received about construction vehicles accessing the site I do not feel that redevelopment of the site may be restricted for this reason.

5. Reasons for approval

5.1 The proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the dwelling itself, nor the amenities of nearby properties to an unacceptable degree. Consequently the proposal is consistent with policies IMP17, IMP18, HOU19 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Kate Fisher
and E-mail: kfisher@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2012/0338/H  
   **Parish**: GISSING

- **Applicants Name**: Mr B & Mrs C Smith  
- **Site Address**: Malthouse Farm, Malthouse Lane, Gissing  
- **Proposal**: Provision of garage

**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
   - Section 7 – Design
   - Section 12 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**
   - Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
   - Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**
   - HOU 14: Extensions to dwellings in the open countryside
   - IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings

2. **Planning History**

**Holiday Units**

2.1 **2012/0368/CU**  
   - Change of Use of Holiday Cottages to residential, new cartlodies and new access  
   - **To be determined**

2.2 **2002/1174/F**  
   - Variation of condition and Section 106 Agreement  
   - **Approved**

2.3 **2000/1328/F**  
   - Erection of pool house/gym recreation building for use by holiday let tennants  
   - **Approved**

2.4 **2000/0475/F**  
   - Revision to earlier planning permission Ref 07/99/0045/F - Alteration to design of relocated & extended barn to form holiday unit.  
   - **Approved**

2.5 **1999/0046/F**  
   - Repairs & extension to house, relocation of part of barn conversion & extension of former cottage to holiday units & rebuild unit to form stable & storage  
   - **Approved**

2.6 **1999/0045/F**  
   - Repairs & extension to house, relocation of part of barn, conversion & extension of former cottage to holiday units & rebuild unit to form stable & storage  
   - **Approved**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malthouse Farm</td>
<td>2.7 2005/2766/LB</td>
<td>Rebuild of 'Hovel' outbuilding to form a detached, residential annexe ancillary to dwelling</td>
<td>Refused Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8 2005/2765/H</td>
<td>Rebuild of 'Hovel' outbuilding to form a detached, residential annexe ancillary to dwelling</td>
<td>Refused Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9 2005/1185/LB</td>
<td>Provision of garage</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.10 2005/1184/H</td>
<td>Provision of garage</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.11 2004/0410/F</td>
<td>Residential annexe</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Barn</td>
<td>2.12 2010/1327/F</td>
<td>Variation of condition 3 of permission 2001/0449/F - revision of window positions, removal of some roof lights and adjustments to layout to suit needs of owner</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.13 2010/0707/LB</td>
<td>Proposed alterations to scheme approved under ref: 2001/0450/LB</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.14 2008/0479/LB</td>
<td>To Erect a Timber and brick garage with Pantile roof and Fire escape windows to Black Barn.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.15 2008/0472/H</td>
<td>Erection of New Garage and alterations to barn windows to allow for Fire escape.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.16 2001/0450/LB</td>
<td>Conversion of barn to dwelling</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.17 2001/0449/F</td>
<td>Conversion of barn to dwelling and erection of double garage</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.18 2000/1302/LB</td>
<td>Retention of 2no small windows to east elevation of listed barn</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquaponics</td>
<td>2.19 2012/0367/RVC</td>
<td>Removal of condition 5 of planning permission 2011/0101/CU</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.20 2011/0101/CU</td>
<td>Change of use of stables to office accommodation</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.21 2010/1467/F</td>
<td>Proposed two polytunnels plus storage building</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.22 2007/1377/F</td>
<td>Alteration to approved Stables building all in association with the Black Barn.</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.23 2002/1173/CU</td>
<td>Change of use from study to small office and retention of hedge and temporary fence</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council : Approve
- Should be used for garaging / storage only
- Appropriate for main house to have garage
- To promote sustainability, garage should be reduced to two vehicles
- Garden also smaller so shed element should be reduced

3.2 District Member : Can be delegated for approval
- Request for renewal of previous permission. No change in circumstances

3.3 Conservation Officer : No objection

3.4 Local Residents : 2 letter of objection
- Comment on the three applications and development on the property as a whole.
- Object to provision of an additional access
- Cumulative effect of buildings and proposed uses on the character of the area.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application is for the renewal of a planning application for the erection of a garage and store building to serve the main dwelling on the site and there has been a number of changes since the approval of the previous application (2005/1184).

4.2 The property comprises 4 main elements and the following outlines the main changes since the previous approval of the garage building:

1) A range of buildings to the north which are used as holiday units. There is a current application for the use of these as permanent dwellings (2012/0368), which incorporates new garaging and a new vehicular access. This application is currently undetermined.

2) Malthouse Farm
Applications were submitted for the retention of a Hovel building. These were refused and elements of the building were incorporated into the stable building to the south of the property.

3) Black Barn
The garage for the barn was originally indicated to be along the northern boundary of the curtilage for the conversion. Planning permission was granted in 2008 for this to be re sited to the southern boundary. A revised conversion scheme was approved in 2010 but does not materially change the relationship of the uses.

4) Land to the south which incorporates stable building and Aquaponics proposal.
Alterations were approved to the stable building in 2007 which was subsequently approved for office use in 2011 in association with the aquaponics use which was approved in 2010. There is a current application (2012/0367) to allow the office use in the stables to be sold independently in connection with the aquaponics use.

4.3 The site is in a countryside location and incorporates a number of listed buildings. Policies in the NPPF, JCS and Local Plan seek to ensure that proposals are for an appropriate use, are of a good design and do not adversely affect the setting of listed buildings, the amenity of neighbouring uses or highway safety. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.
4.4 While the northern boundary of Black Barn is now more open than when the previous application was approved. I consider that the relationship to the extant permission for the garage would have been taken into account when the barns garage was re-sited. In addition, due to the orientation and outlook from the barn conversion, I consider that the garage in the proposed position will not have a significant adverse effect on their outlook or amenity.

4.5 The design, scale, position and relationship of the garage to the adjacent listed buildings and their setting has not materially changed and I consider that it is reasonable to allow for a garage and associated storage to serve the main dwelling on the site.

4.6 While the number of buildings in the vicinity of the proposal has increased since the 2005 permission, I consider that the cumulative effect of these does not warrant refusal of this application. The Parish Council have recommended that the building should be reduced in scale, however I consider that there has been no significant change in circumstances which would justify refusal on this ground. The previous permission was conditioned so that the use of the building remained ancillary to the main dwelling and I consider that it is reasonable to re-impose this condition.

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 1 and 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies HOU14 and IMP15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The development is considered to accord with Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as it has been designed to ensure that it would preserve the special architectural or historic interest and setting of the adjacent listed buildings.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Stuart Pontin, 01508 533796, spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
8. **Appl. No**: 2012/0353/RVC  
**Parish**: DICKELBURGH and RUSHALL

Applicants Name : Mr Martin Wilby  
Site Address : Land east of New Lodge Farm, Common Road, Dickleburgh  
Proposal : Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 2011/1544/F - to substitute approved drawings 311-01B, 311-02B, 311-04C, with revised drawings 311-01D, 311-04E, 311-05A indicating/incorporating plant room

**Recommendation**: Approve with Conditions

1. Full - Planning Permission Time Limit  
2. Conditions on previous permission must be met  
3. In accordance with submitted drawings

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   Section 7 – Design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 2 – Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   HOU14 – Extensions to dwellings in the open countryside  
   IMP9 – Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/1544 Managers residence with Study/Office  
     Approved

2.2 2010/0784 Erection of mobile home for use as fishery managers temporary dwelling and erection of a toilet block (amended proposal)  
     Temporary Approval – 3 years

2.3 2009/0276 Erection of two storey dwelling/office  
     Refused

2.4 2007/2715 Proposed fishing lake, stock pond and associated works  
     Approved

2.5 2003/1873 Proposed enlargement of existing pond for commercial use  
     Approved

2.6 1993/0109 Erection of agricultural building  
     Approved

2.7 1974/1332 Living accommodation for agricultural employee  
     Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council : Approve

3.2 District Member : The applicant

3.3 NCC Highways : No objections

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) : Conditional support  
   • reporting of unexpected contamination  
   • foul drainage to private treatment plant
3.5 Landscape Officer : No objections

3.6 Local Residents : 1 letter of support
- understand extension is on opposite side of building to Lodge Farm, if this is the case then no objection

4. Assessment

4.1 The application relates to a site at New Lodge Farm on Common Road in Dickleburgh. Members of the First Wednesday Planning Committee gave consent for a Managers Residence with study/office on the 4 January 2012. This permission is seeking to amend the approved drawings to include a small single storey extension on the west elevation, including chimney, to provide a ground source plant room.

4.2 As this permission is only seeking to amend the approved drawings, the principle of the dwelling does not need to be re-assessed as this was established and justified as part of the approved scheme (2011/1544). The design of the extension is in keeping with the design of the dwelling approved and will not cause any impact on the amenity of the adjacent residential property. Policies within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) support extensions to existing dwellings that are of a good design and which do not impact on residential amenity. The proposal therefore accords with policy 2 of the JCS and policies HOU14 and IMP9 of the SNLP. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the SNLP, referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Policy Framework.

5. Reasons for approval

5.1 The proposed extension has been designed to be subordinate to the dwelling, is in keeping with the overall scale and design of the approved dwelling and will respect its landscape setting. The proposal will not have any impact on the amenity of the adjacent residential property. The proposal therefore accords with the aims of the NPPF, policy 2 of the JCS and policies HOU14 and IMP9 of the SNLP. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the SNLP, referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published NPPF.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Helen Mellors, 01508 533789, hmellors@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No**: 2012/0357/F  
**Parish**: STOKE HOLY CROSS

Applicants Name: Mr R Clough  
Site Address: Whiteford Lodge, Chandler Road, Stoke, Holy Cross, Norfolk, NR14 8RQ  
Proposal: Replacement dwelling

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

1. Full Planning Permission Time Limit  
2. In accordance with submitted amendments  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Slab level t.b.a.  
5. Foul drainage to sealed system or private treatment plant only  
6. New Water Efficiency  
7. Retention trees and hedges

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Section 7 – Design  

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 11: Replacement dwellings  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 1984/0536 Erection of open car port Approved  
2.2 1983/0815 Proposed extensions to existing bungalow Approved  
2.3 1977/2488 Extension to existing dwelling Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: Refuse  
No objection to the replacement dwelling but concerns with auxiliary buildings.  
Large garage should be increased in width to accommodate both vehicles, or small garage re-sited in line with dwelling.  
Discrepancies in the plans and application form.  
Existing septic tank is on adjacent property – will need to be sealed up after filling.

3.2 District Member: To be reported if necessary

3.3 NCC Highways: No objections  

3.4 Environmental Services: Protection  
Recommend sewage treatment plant be installed

3.5 Fisher German: No comments
3.6 Local Residents

- 3 letters of objection received
  - Horrified at the scale of the proposal. Enormous and of executive style.
  - 3 dormer windows at front will overlook, and bear down on us, invading our privacy.
  - Discrepancies in plans and application form.
  - Existing septic tank is on our land and inadequate for the increase in bathrooms and occupants.
  - Exceptionally large garage building – plans deceptive.
  - Buildings substantially larger and taller than existing tending towards greater urbanisation of a rural area.
  - Appreciated gains to adjacent occupiers of the removal of the Cypress trees but site has been subjected to a ‘slash and burn’ approach.
  - Find it hard to believe the stated aims of the application to ‘respect the scale and character of the mature garden site’.

- 1 letter of support received
  - Seems most practical option is for a replacement house but facing the road this time.
  - Feel design is sympathetic to the area and surrounding houses.
  - Would like to see trees planted to screen garage from road.
  - Pleased the enormous Monterey Cypress trees have been removed as inappropriate and no longer safe.

4. Assessment

4.1 The existing dwelling is a bungalow with a hipped roof and a range of flat roof additions. The property is set back from the road in a large plot, with a number of dwellings within the vicinity, all of individual designs. The site is outside the development limits of any of the surrounding villages. Both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Joint Core Strategy (JCS) support proposals of a good design. Policy HOU11-Replacement dwellings of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) can also be considered as this policy remains consistent with the published NPPF.

4.2 The orientation of the existing dwelling is unusual in the fact that it is sideways on to the road with the principle elevation facing the adjacent bungalow to the east (Sherbrooke). Some distance to the southwest is a residential barn conversion, and on the opposite side of the road is a large, two storey dwelling set in a large, mature plot.

4.3 The proposal seeks to replace the existing bungalow and garaging, with a two storey dwelling, a large garage to the side, and a single garage to the front. The principle elevation is to face the road to the north with a gabled roof. The original plans showed the ridge height being approximately 1.4m higher than the existing hipped roof. I considered that the dormers did not sit comfortably at eaves level. As such, amended plans were submitted raising the height of the eaves, which also resulted in the ridge height being approximately 2m higher than the existing. I consider that this provides a more acceptable front elevation, and that overall the proposed development is an improvement to the existing dwelling and respects the form, character and appearance of the site and will not adversely affect the local distinctiveness of the locality.
With regards to the scale of the development, the footprint of the existing bungalow is very similar to the proposed dwelling. I acknowledge the increase in height, change of roof design and consequently the bulk of the building, and that the closest dwelling, Sherwood is somewhat lower. However, I consider that due to the distance between the properties, the existing trees and hedges along the front boundaries providing an element of screening, and the siting and height of the proposed garage between the dwellings, providing a gradual increase in height, the development will not have an adverse impact on the existing site and the streetscene.

I acknowledge the concerns of the occupiers of the dwelling on the opposite side of the road, Highfields, in relation to overlooking and loss of privacy. However, the properties are not directly opposite each other and at an angle to each other, there is approximately 40 metres between the properties, and there is screening provided from mature hedgerows and trees between the properties. I therefore do not consider the existing amenities of the occupiers of Highfields will be adversely affected.

The siting and size of the proposed garage close to the side boundary with Sherbrooke will result in some overshadowing, however, due to the distance between the proposed garage and the adjacent dwelling this will mainly be onto the existing garage and rear of the existing garage, rather than the garden area at the rear of the dwelling. The first floor of the east elevation of the proposed dwelling has been designed with only 1 rooflight facing the adjacent bungalow. I therefore do not consider the existing amenities of the occupiers of Sherbrooke will be adversely affected to a material degree.

With regards to the concerns of the ancillary buildings, although the proposed garage at the side is large it has been designed to have an appearance similar to agricultural buildings in the locality, as has the single garage at the front. I consider that the size of the plot is sufficient for both the garages and will not result in overdevelopment of the site. The existing hedgerow and trees along the front boundary will also provide an element of screening. In view of this, I have suggested a condition be imposed for the retention of existing trees and hedges. NCC: Highways has not raised an objection to the scheme.

Following comments from Environmental Services: Protection, and concerns locally regarding the means of waste water disposal from the dwelling, the applicant has confirmed the installation of a package sewerage treatment plant.

In view of the above, I consider the application to be acceptable.

The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the NPPF and JCS and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 - Promoting Good design, of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies HOU11 - Replacement dwellings and IMP9 - Residential amenity of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the SNLP referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Policy Framework.

The development accords with the above policies, as there will be no increase in the number of dwellings on the site, the replacement dwelling is located in a similar position to the existing dwelling, its scale, bulk and mass, design and landscape impact respects the character of the existing site and local distinctiveness of the area, and is an improvement to the existing dwelling, and, the existing amenities of the adjacent neighbours will not be affected to a material degree.
10. **Appl. No**: 2012/0379/F  
**Parish**: REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON  
**Applicants Name**: Mr R Twigge  
**Site Address**: Swan Hotel, 19 The Thoroughfare, Harleston, Norfolk, IP20 9AS  
**Proposal**: Retrospective application for retention of market store trading within the grounds of the Swan Hotel car park  

**Recommendation**: Approve with Conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Section 1 – Building a strong, competitive economy  
Section 2 – Ensuring the vitality of town centres  
Section 12 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 5: The Economy  
Policy 13: Main Towns

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
SHO 4: Town centres  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Consultations**

2.1 Town Council: Refuse  
- Negative impact on the future viability and vitality of the Town Centre  
- Concern would set a precedent for future applications for market stalls

2.2 District Member  
Mr B Riches: To be determined by committee  
- Consider local issues need to be addressed with regard to other retail outlets

Mr J Savage: To be reported if appropriate

2.3. NCC Highways: No objections

2.4. English Heritage: No objections  
- Would request that consideration was given to a 5 year consent

2.5. Conservation Officer: No objections

2.6 Local Residents: 10 letters of objection:  
- Will have a disastrous effect on local traders as it will encourage more market stalls to attend therefore effecting local shop trade  
- Discourage current shop keepers to renew their shop leases and set up market stalls  
- Result in lots of empty shops  
- Stall holders do not pay business rates so can sell goods at reduced prices which under cuts legal traders
• Very difficult to keep trading in present economic climate
• Harleston already has a market day on Wednesday
• Number of empty shops in Harleston
• Could set a precedent for other PH to do the same
• Better to fill a vacant shop rather than a market stall in a car park
• Should support our local shop keepers
• Unfair competition

10 letters of support
• Trader is curtailing her hours for valid personal reasons
• Friday/Saturday trading is providing an invaluable service to long standing customers many who are elderly and/or living alone
• Appreciate being able to buy small amounts
• Should be supporting local enterprise
• Competition is good
• Provides additional retail opportunities
• Partially replaces recently-closed retail premises and is most welcome
• Applicant has been trading for 26 years from the Salad Bowl
• Stall trades Fridays and Saturdays, the shop opened five and half days per week
• Harleston has a long tradition of market trading
• Been market stalls on various days for many years, also some in car park of J D Young’s PH

4. Assessment

4.1 This application seeks retrospective planning permission for the standing of a fruit and vegetable market stall Fridays and Saturdays between 8am and 2pm, at The Swan Hotel, Harleston.

4.2 The stall is located to the rear of the listed public house (PH) to the southwest of the existing smoking shelter. The stall which is a metal frame with covering is erected and taken down on the same day.

4.3 The site is within Harleston Town Centre and the conservation area. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – 2 Ensuring the vitality of town centres paragraph 23 supports competition in Town Centres and markets. The South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) and Joint Core Strategy (JCS) policies support employment and retailing subject to normal planning requirements. The SNLP polices referred to above can be given due weight and consideration because those policies remain consistent with the published NPPF.

4.4 Given the sites location I consider the main planning issues are impacts on the setting of the listed building, potential loss of parking and any adverse impact on amenities of neighbouring residential properties. Both English Heritage and the conservation officer have raised no objections in respect of the proposal. The location of the stall would not give rise to a loss of significant parking spaces and the highway officer has raised no objections. Given the siting of the stall close to the PH smoking area and outside seating, normal activities associated with the PH, I do not consider the market stall would give rise to noise and disturbance of a level to adversely affect nearby residential properties.
4.5 Whilst I fully appreciate the concerns raised by the Town Council and local residents/business as set out above, however an application can not be refused on competition grounds or whether or not rent/business rates are being paid. I understand the concern with respect to precedent but each application should be assessed on its individual merits. English Heritage has suggested a 5 year temporary consent, however since the stall is not permanent, I do not consider it is necessary and nor does the conservation officer.

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 5 The Economy and Policy 13 Main Towns of the Joint Core Strategy and SHO4 Town Centres, IMP15 Setting of listed buildings and IMP9 Residential amenity of the South Norfolk Local Plan. It accords with the National Planning Policy Framework – 2 Ensuring the vitality of town centres paragraph 23.

5.2 The market stall is considered to accord with the above policies SHO4, IMP13, IMP9, Policy 5 and Policy 13 as the site is within the central business area and Town Centre for the Town of Harleston, it creates/retains employment; it will not adversely affect the setting of the listed building and the amenities of nearby residential properties will not be affected to a material degree. These SNLP policies remain consistent with the published NPPF.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis, 01508 533788, and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
11. **Appl. No**: 2012/0411/F  
**Parish**: ALBURGH

Applicants Name: Mr Paul Whymark  
Site Address: The Cartlodge, Mill Road, Alburgh, Norfolk, IP20 0DS  
Proposal: Proposed conversion of the barn for residential use.

Recommendation: Approve with conditions

1. Barn Conversion - time limit
2. In accordance with submitted drawings
3. External materials to be agreed
4. Window and door details to be agreed
5. Roof lights to be agreed
6. No PD for Classes ABCDE & G
7. Details of domestic microgeneration equipment
8. No PD for fences, walls etc
9. New Access - Construction over verge
10. Provision of Visibility Splays - Dimensioned in Condition
11. Provision of Parking and Servicing Areas - Where shown on plan
12. Landscaping
13. Boundary treatment to be agreed
14. Water efficiency
15. Contamination during constructions
16. Tree protection

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
Section 6 Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
Section 7 Requiring good design
Section 11 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 2 Promoting good design
Policy 3 Energy and water
Policy 5 The Economy

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
HOU 10: Adaptation and re-use of existing rural buildings for residential purposes
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic
ENV 15: Species protection

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/2086  Proposed conversion of the barn for residential use. Approved

2.2 2010/1494  Retrospective application for renewal of 3 field gates and posts to secure livestock. Refurbishment and repair of existing track and creation of part new track. Creation of earth bank. Approved

2.3 2010/1495  Variation of condition 3 of permission 2007/1660/F - to now read 'Reference to Abbey Farm to be changed to North Barn, to reflect changed circumstances' Approved
2.4 2007/1660 Proposed rear roof extension, alterations and change of use of cart lodge/barn and land to be used as stables and store for horses and other livestock  Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council : To be reported

3.2 District Member : To be determined by committee
  • I am surprised to see this application since this structure was until recently, a modest, open fronted cart shed

3.3 NCC Highways : Conditional support

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) : To be reported

3.5 Public Right of Way : No objection
  • Alburgh footpath no 3 would not be adversely affected.

3 Local Residents : No response

4. Assessment

4.1 The application relates to a cart lodge building which is located on the north west side of Mill Road opposite to a number of barns which have already been converted. The building is red brick construction with pan tile roof. The building is screened from the road with mature hedging and trees.

4.2 Retrospective permission was granted in 2007 (application number 2007/1660), for alterations which included re-roofing the building and open sided extension to the north side of the building to the barn to be used for the keeping of horses or livestock.

4.3 This application is to convert the building to a residential dwelling the proposal includes small extensions to the existing building and the erection of a detached cart lodge/ garden store.

4.4 The site is within the open countryside and is the conversion of an existing rural building. Policies in the NPPF, JCS and Local Plan permit the conversion of redundant or disused buildings to residential as long as the local landscape, residential amenity or highway safety are not adversely affected. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. Although the preference for the conversion rural building for commercial use over residential use in Planning Policy Statement 4 has not been carried forward in the NPPF, Policy 5 in the Joint Core Strategy does still give preference to commercial uses. The applicant however, has put forward a justification for the use of the building for residential, due it size and location close to residential properties. The local road network is also not particularly suitable for increased commercial use, I therefore consider that the conversion to residential can be justified in this instance.

4.5 Although it is proposed to extend the building, it is capable of being converted to a dwelling without the need to extend it and structural report indicates that the building is permanent and substantial and capable of conversion without the need for reconstruction.
4.6 The size of the extension has been substantially reduced from what was proposed in the withdrawn application. The smaller extensions remain subordinate to the original barn and do not over dominate the agricultural character of the building creating a mix of traditional and more contemporary design. The proposed detached cart lodge/ garden store has a pantile roof and weather boarding finish which reflects the character of the main building.

4.7 The building is set away from the boundaries so does not cause any amenity issues for nearby properties.

4.8 It is proposed to access the barn off an existing access, which the highway officer raises no objection to. The proposal would also not adversely affect the nearby public right of way.

4.9 A satisfactory ecological survey has been carried out on the site and concludes that the proposal would not cause any harm to any protected species. A condition for Tree Protection is proposed to ensure that the mature tree along the boundary is not damaged during construction.

5. Reasons for approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 Promoting good design and Policy 3 Energy, water and Policy 5 The Economy of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy HOU 10: Adaptation and re-use of existing rural buildings for residential purposes, IMP 9: Residential amenity, IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The development is considered to accord with Policy HOU10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the building has been shown to be permanent and substantial; the development is considered unlikely to harm the countryside; the fabric and character of the original building will be preserved and enhanced; and the proposal is not likely to lead to the loss of a building suitable for continued agricultural use and the proposal would not adversely affect highway safety, the amenity of surrounding uses or any protected species.

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