First Wednesday Planning Committee

Members of the First Wednesday Planning Committee:

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

Group Meetings

Conservatives: Blomefield Room 12.45 pm to 1.30 pm

Date
Wednesday 2 May 2012

Time
1.30 pm

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

Contact
Caroline Heasley tel (01508) 533685
South Norfolk District Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE
Email: democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Website: www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

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

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

If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance
Large print version can be made available

25/04/2012
A G E N D A

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

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

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

4. Minutes of the First Wednesday Planning Committees held on Wednesday 7 March 2012;
   (attached – page 7)

5. Enforcement Reports
   (attached – page 25)

6. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   To consider the applications as listed below:  (report attached – page 31)

<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>2011/0476/O</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Land north of Shotesham Road, Poringland</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2011/0661/F</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>Land north of Shotesham Road Poringland</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2008/0271/CU</td>
<td>BROCKDISH</td>
<td>Land to rear of 37-47 The Street, Brockdish</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2011/1811/F</td>
<td>THARSTON</td>
<td>Land east of Plump Road, Tharston</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2012/0389/F</td>
<td>ROCKLAND ST MARY</td>
<td>Playing Field, Green Lane, Rockland St Mary</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2012/0433/H</td>
<td>CRINGLEFORD</td>
<td>3 Brambling Lane, Cringleford</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2012/0481/F</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Sub division of garden at 61 Lynch Green, Hethersett</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Sites Sub-Committee;
   Please note that the Sub-Committee will only meet if a site visit is agreed by the Committee. If required, the site visit will take place on Wednesday 30 May 2012 with membership to be confirmed.

8. Planning Appeals (for information)  (attached – page 67)
### Details of Planning Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservative Councillor</th>
<th>Accreditation Expiry Date</th>
<th>Liberal Democrat Councillor</th>
<th>Accreditation Expiry Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
<td>P Allen</td>
<td>18/04/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Bills</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
<td>V Bell</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Blake</td>
<td>18/04/13</td>
<td>T East</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Blowfield</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
<td>J Hardinge</td>
<td>25/10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Dale</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
<td>M Gray</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Dewsbury</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
<td>T Lewis</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Edney</td>
<td>4/07/12</td>
<td>B McClenning</td>
<td>18/04/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Ellis</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
<td>G Watt</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Foulger</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Goldson</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Gould</td>
<td>17/04/13</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>17/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Kemp</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Kemp</td>
<td>12/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Kiddie</td>
<td>18/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Legg</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Mooney</td>
<td>12/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Neal</td>
<td>17/04/13</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>17/04/13</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>17/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Savage</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Savage</td>
<td>17/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Spratt</td>
<td>18/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Thomson</td>
<td>18/04/13</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>17/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Ward</td>
<td>8/03/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Webster</td>
<td>25/10/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Wheatley</td>
<td>17/04/13</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>17/04/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Independent Councillor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Councillor</th>
<th>Accreditation Expiry Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K Weeks</td>
<td>17/04/13</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.
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

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

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

If not, whose well being or financial position is affected to a greater extent than the majority of other people in the ward?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your own</th>
<th>A family member</th>
<th>A close associate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any person or body who has employed or appointed your family member/close associate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any firm in which your family member/close associate is a partner or company of which they are directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any company in which your family member/close associate has shares with a face value more than £25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></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?

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.

Disclose the existence & nature of your interest

You have a personal interest in the matter

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

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

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?
# Planning Appeals

**Appeals received from 12 April 2012 to 24 April 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish/Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/1681</td>
<td>PULHAM MARKET Land west of Bungalow Farm, Wood Lane</td>
<td>Mr McDowall</td>
<td>Erection of new single storey bungalow and garage / carport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/1727</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM Abbey Cars, Harts Farm Road</td>
<td>Mr Lee Hornby</td>
<td>Proposed 18 residential flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/0232</td>
<td>FLORDON Land north east of Hill House, The Street</td>
<td>Nova Industry Ltd</td>
<td>Proposed erection of detached 3 to 4 bedroom bungalow chalet with double garage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appeal decisions from 12 April 2012 to 24 April 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish/Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Decision Maker</th>
<th>Final Decision</th>
<th>Appeal Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Advert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Certificate of Alternative Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Change of Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Reserved Matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Full (details included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Householder – Full application relating to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>residential property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Application to be determined by County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Proposal by Government Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HZ</td>
<td>Hazardous Substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Existing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Proposed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Outline (details reserved for later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVC</td>
<td>Removal/Variation of Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Proposal by Statutory Undertaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.P</td>
<td>Structure Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.N.L.P</td>
<td>South Norfolk Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.D</td>
<td>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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C.S</td>
<td>Joint Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.P.P.F</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enforcement Report

Report of The Development Control Services Manager

1. Enforcement Ref : 2011/8273
Parish : THORPE ABBOTTS
Site : Thorpe Hall, Scole Road, Thorpe Abbotts, Norfolk, IP21 4HS
Development : Wall not built in accordance with approval 2010/0877 & 2010/0878
Developer : The Blue Door Development Company

1. Background

1.1 Planning permission and listed building consent were granted in July 2010 for the removal of an old timber fence and replacement with new brick boundary fencing, gates and hedging along the curtilage to a listed building Thorpe Hall. A number of conditions were imposed, one of which required the agreement of the coping details prior to the commencement of the development, notwithstanding details on the drawings already supplied.

Within two months details of the bricks, stone and mortar were submitted to the Council but clarification was requested by the Conservation Officer regarding the coping details. The agents responded in writing on 7 October advising that the coping was to be an oversailing course and brick capping laid flat. However, unfortunately the letter was scanned to the file but was not seen by the Conservation Officer and was not responded to.

Work commenced in the spring of 2011 and a neighbour objected to the coping. The applicant was asked to provide details of the coping in accordance with condition 3 of the consents and replied that that the details had already been submitted in writing on 7th October. As a response to that letter had not been received from the council, he had been assumed that the details were acceptable.

The Conservation Officer was of the opinion that half round coping would be preferable and he would not have agreed to the oversailing course with bricks laid flat, so the wall had been built without agreement to the coping details, contrary to condition 3 and consequently did not have permission. The agent was advised that agreement should be sought on coping that would be acceptable and the wall rebuilt in accordance with the agreement or alternatively, submit new applications for listed building consent and planning permission for the wall in its current form which was unlikely to be successful.

2. Planning Policies

2.1 National Planning policy framework
   Section 7: Design
   Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

2.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 2 Promoting good design

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan 2003
   IMP 15 Setting of Listed buildings
3. **Assessment**

3.1 Policy 2 and IMP15 require any development to be of a high standard of design, respecting the local traditions of the area and preserve the setting of the listed building.

3.2 The Conservation Officer has reviewed the wall as built and the neighbouring walls. Some of the neighbouring walls had in fact used ridge tiles for coping instead of traditional half round brick. To allow ridge tiles to match would produce an unfortunate effect on such a long expanse of wall. He has also satisfied himself as to the durability of the existing flat bricks and in the circumstances is of the opinion that we should accept the coping detail as built. It would be in equitable to insist upon half round coping bricks when the neighbouring property has used inferior ridge tiles. It is also unfortunate that the Conservation Officer did not get to see the letter providing details of the coping to be used prior to the commencement of the work on the wall.

4. **Recommendation**

4.1 No further action be taken
1. **Background**

1.1 It was brought to our attention in December 2011 that the owner of 70 Damgate Street had replaced the existing timber frame windows with UPVC double glazed windows in the front, side and rear elevations of the property. The owner of the property had also installed CCTV cameras to the front and side of the dwelling and replaced a flue in the side elevation.

1.2 The dwelling is a Grade II Listed Building and as such an application for Listed Building Consent should have been submitted prior to the works being undertaken to the property.

1.3 Following contact with the Council, the owner submitted two retrospective applications for Listed Building Consent. Planning application 2012/0061 related to the retention of 6 UPVC windows in the front and side elevations of the property. Planning application 2012/0062 related to the retention of all of the windows in the rear elevation, the UPVC rear door, the flue and the CCTV cameras.

1.4 The Conservation Officer assessed both of the planning applications and concluded that the changes to the fenestrations were detrimental to the special interest of the property and failed to preserve its historic and architectural interest. It was noted that the owner had made an attempt to match the original pattern of those windows in the front and side elevation of the property. The Conservation Officer recommended that the applications were refused on the basis that they were contrary to PPS5 (policies HE.1 and HE.2) and Local Plan policies IMP13 and IMP17.

1.5 A number of local objections were received to both of the planning applications. Many of the comments related to the adverse impact of the introduction of UPVC windows into a Listed Building and the resulting material harm to the character of the dwelling as well as the Conservation Area setting. Concern was also expressed that the owner appeared to be unfamiliar with the responsibilities of owning and maintaining a Listed Building.

1.6 The applications were determined under delegated powers and both applications were refused listed building consent in March 2012.

2. **Planning Policies**

2.1 **National Planning Policy Framework** – which replaces :-
National Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5): Planning for the Historic Environment
Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

2.2 **Joint Core Strategy**
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets

2.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**
IMP15: Alteration of a Listed Building
3. **Assessment**

3.1 The dwelling is a Grade II Listed Building located within the Wymondham Conservation Area. The property is semi-detached and forms the southern end of a range of dwellings dating back to the early sixteenth century. The windows in the front elevation of the property were noted by the Conservation Officer as being eighteenth century casements whilst the rear elevation had been subject to extension and alteration in the 1970’s.

3.2 The applications were assessed against the above policies, including national planning policy PPS5 which has subsequently been replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework. However Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment retains the considerations that relate to the protection and conservation of heritage assets.

3.3 Although the property is within the Conservation Area the applications were for Listed Building Consent and were therefore assessed against these principles only. It was noted in the assessment however that the change in window materials and forms has a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area setting also.

3.4 The use of UPVC materials in this sensitive context is not justifiable and whilst the owner has attempted to match the pattern of some of the windows this is not considered to be sufficient to preserve the special architectural and historical significance of the Listed Building. The windows to the rear of the property are not visible from public vantage points and although there have been alterations to the rear of the dwelling the extensions also form part of the Listed Building. The rear windows have little design detail and are not in keeping with the traditional window forms that would be more appropriate in this context.

3.5 The addition of the CCTV cameras and the replacement of the flue were considered as part of application 2012/0062 however these were not considered to form part of the reasons for refusal.

3.6 It was concluded that the significance of the heritage asset has been eroded by the changes to the windows and door. In view of this it is considered expedient to request authorisation to secure the replacement of the UPVC windows and door with appropriate fenestrations.

4. **Recommendation**

4.1 That subject to legal advice the serving of enforcement notice requiring the removal of:

(A) All of the windows in the front (east) elevation and the side (south) elevations within a period of 12 months from the date of the enforcement notice; and

(B) All of the windows and the door in the rear (west) elevation within a period of 24 months from the date of the enforcement notice.
Major applications submitted by South Norfolk Council (as joint applicant) on land partly owned by South Norfolk Council

1. **Appl. No**: 2011/0476/O  
   **Parish**: PORINGLAND  
   **Applicants Name**: Norfolk Homes Ltd & South Norfolk Council  
   **Site Address**: Land north of Shotesham Road, Poringland  
   **Proposal**: Residential & Commercial (office) Development  
   **Recommendation**: Approve

   1. Outline planning permission time limit  
   2. Approval of reserved matters  
   3. Surface water drainage to be agreed  
   4. Programme of archaeological works to be agreed and implemented  
   5. Details of roads, footways and cycleways to be agreed  
   6. Roads, footways and cycleways to be constructed in accordance with above  
   7. Roads to binder course before occupation  
   8. Roads to be surfaced in accordance with phasing plan to be agreed  
   9. Construction management plan to be agreed  
   10. Implementation of construction management plan  
   11. Wheel cleaning facilities to be agreed and implemented throughout the course of the development  
   12. Travel Plan to be agreed  
   13. Implementation of agreed Travel Plan prior to occupation  
   14. Full details of foul water drainage to be agreed prior to occupation  
   15. Materials to be agreed  
   16. Landscaping (including details of management)  
   17. Boundary treatments to be agreed – pre occupation  
   18. Tree protection – pre-commencement  
   19. Development to accord with masterplan drawing no. 6365 SK12

   **NOTE**: Details required to be submitted pre-commencement / pre-occupation for the Norfolk Homes land shall be submitted and approved before the commencement / occupation of that land. The same shall apply for the South Norfolk Land. This is so as not to unnecessarily hold up approved development on either land.

Subject to a S106 legal agreement providing for developer contributions towards education, libraries, travel plan, off-site highway works, and the provision of 25% affordable housing including a schedule confirming the type, tenure, mix and its affordability in perpetuity.

1. **Planning Policies**

   1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**

   Section 3 – Promoting a prosperous rural economy  
   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 5 – The economy
Policy 20 – Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan

POR 1: Housing allocation, west of The Street, Poringland
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. Planning History

2.1 2011/0661 Construction of Spine Road (Carr Lane to Shotesham Road), surface water lagoon and associated works

2.2 This site forms part (Area D) of the housing allocation POR 1 as set out in the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003. Area B has already been completed, and Area C is substantially completed. Works have recently started at Area A.

3. Consultations

3.1 Town/Parish Council : Approve

3.2 District Member : To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 NCC Highways : No objection, subject to suitable conditions requiring the completion of a Travel Plan and the submission of technical details.

3.4 Environment Agency : No objection, subject to a condition requiring the submission of full surface water drainage details.

3.5 Natural England : No objection.

3.6 SNC: Housing Strategy Manager : The proposal achieves the policy requirement of 25% affordable housing on site (as set out in local plan policy POR1). Final comments to be reported.

3.7 Police Architectural Liaison Officer : None received.

3.8 Norfolk Wildlife Trust : None received.

3.9 NCC: Planning Obligations Co-Ordinator : Developer contributions towards Poringland Primary School will be required, equating to £2,958 per multi-bed house equivalent. A proportionate contribution towards a MUGA (Multi-Use Games Area) is also required.
3.10 Environmental Services (Protection) : No objection, subject to conditions requiring details of foul and surface water details to be submitted and approved, and any required foul drainage improvements within the local network to be implemented before occupation of any dwellings.

3.11 SNC: Design Officer : Generally the scheme has been well thought through and relates positively to the surrounding development and existing community facilities. I therefore have no objection in recommending this outline application for approval and reserving all other design matters to a subsequent application.

The following observations should however be taken into account at the next stage of the design process:

- The layout of new housing should aim to exploit the existing topography and landscape features of the site to help give it a strong sense of identity. The gently slope through the site provides an opportunity to position dwellings in a way that maximises solar gain and creates interesting views through the development. Mature hedge rows and existing trees should form a key part of these proposals.

- The commercial development in the south west corner of the site should aim to create an innovative 21st century ‘gateway’ into the development. In its current form the proposals appear to be caught in a ‘vernacular style’ without finding there own distinctive identity.

- The applicant should explore ways of integrating the lagoon into the overall design of the site so that it forms part of the landscape strategy, rather than being an isolated space between Shotesham Road and the proposed Type 2 access.

- The existing developments on the edge of Shotesham Road and Carr Lane should be carefully integrated into the proposals in terms of continuity of scale and form.

A Building for Life Assessment will be carried out at the reserved matters stage, assessed against Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.

3.12 Landscape Officer : None received.

3.13 SNC: Planning Policy : The proposals are in accordance with the location provisions of the South Norfolk Local Plan. Further consideration needs to be given to the policy requirements of the Joint Core Strategy.

3.14 Norfolk Historic Environmental Services : No objection, subject to a condition of any approval requiring a programme of archaeological works to be agreed and implemented prior to the commencement of development.
3.15 Local Residents: 1 letter of support received

7 individual letters of objection received
- Location of junction of the Spine Road and Shotesham Road will be detrimental to existing residents
- Loss of green space
- Service yard too close to 71 Carr Lane
- Link road should be away from properties
- Properties facing onto Shotesham Road should be bungalows
- Bellamy Way should be kept as a close
- Increase in traffic on roads
- Impact on existing local facilities
- Potential overlooking of properties in Church Close
- There should be no access to Church Close
- No need established for commercial units
- Commercial element of the proposal should be limited to offices only.

One petition against the development containing 14 signatures received.

4. **Background & Assessment**

4.1 This outline application seeks to establish the vision and agree design principles for the development of the 4th phase of this allocated housing land being developed by Norfolk Homes. The other areas within the allocation comprise Area B (103 dwellings, completed) - Area C (216 dwellings, substantially complete) - and Area A (232 dwellings, work just started). At the time of the original allocation, it was envisaged that 850 dwellings would be built.

4.2 All detailed matters are reserved, and the access to the site is proposed via a newly created spine road joining with Shotesham Road is the subject of a separate full planning application.

4.3 The original housing allocation for this area did not include the pre-fabricated dwellings that fronted Shotesham Road and Carr Lane. Although all of these dwellings have now been demolished (71 Carr Lane having since been rebuilt), this land is within the development boundary and has therefore been included within the developable area for this application. This land, and further land extending north between Carr Lane and Bellamy Way is within the ownership of South Norfolk Council (SNC). This land equates to approx. 1/3rd of the overall application site area.

4.4 The overall site extends to some 11.4 hectares, and is bounded to the north and west by Carr Lane, with recently built dwellings in Area C being visible to the north of this lane. Existing residential development including Church Close and Bellamy Way is located to the east of the site. Appendix 1 outlines the location of the site.

4.5 The application proposes the erection of 300 dwellings, along with associated access, garaging, visitor parking, open spaces and cycleway/footpaths. Approx. 1/6th of the site it is proposed to construct approx. 2000 square metres of office floor space. The propose density of the development (excluding the commercial area) equates to just over 30 dwellings per hectare. Indicative plans of the site are attached as appendix 2.
4.6 The principle of the development of Area D is already established, and, due to its location within 1km of all local facilities in the village, the proposal is clearly sustainable in terms of location. I feel that the main issues to be considered are the compliance of the proposal with the development plan having due regard to the recently published National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and any other material considerations.

**Design Approach (Residential Development)**

4.7 Both JCS Policy 2 and Section 7 of the NPPF require high quality design, and great importance is attached to the design of the built environment, with it being seen as a key aspect of sustainable development, indivisible from good planning and contributing positively to making places better for people. Although detailed aspects of the design are reserved for future submission, the applicants have, through the formulation of a masterplan for the site based on an appraisal of the context and constraints of the area, been able to show that the development will provide for a good mix of homes with a spread of densities that take account of the existing development and the amenities afforded by local residents.

4.8 Low density development is proposed fronting onto Shotesham Road, as well as Carr Lane and the ends of Church Close and Saxonfields, and there will be the possibility here of single storey development where appropriate. Carr Lane will become more of a green lane, with two sections of it being closed to vehicles, providing for a more pleasant environment to access the Community Woodland to the north west of the site. Generally the scheme has been well thought through and relates positively to the surrounding development and existing community facilities.

4.9 The comments of local residents are noted, however I am confident that concerns raised in respect of overlooking and loss of amenity can be satisfactorily address at the detailed design stage. The junction of the access/spine road with Shotesham Road, although the subject of a separate detailed application, has been located taking on board the views of local residents, and has been sited opposite an existing copse in order to minimise the impact on general amenity. NCC: Highways raise no objection to the position of this access pointing out that the development includes good pedestrian/cycle links to the north, to Shotesham Road and The Street; this includes a link to the east via Carr Lane. Detailed designs including proposals for off-site highway works are being considered as part of a separate full application.

4.10 Landscape and ecological impact has been considered by the applicants in an updated environmental statement submitted with the application. Although the environmental impacts of the development of the allocated site have already been considered, the findings in respect of landscape and ecology were felt to be out of date. The conclusions of the updated survey work found no additional material impacts, and Area D is considered to have a low biodiversity content. Any redevelopment of the site offers the opportunity of enhancing the biodiversity of the area through a carefully planned landscape scheme. This can be required by planning condition.

**Principle & Design Approach (Commercial Buildings)**

4.11 Although no needs survey has been undertaken in respect of the proposed commercial element of the scheme, the provision of rural employment in this 'sustainable' location accords with the requirements of section 3 of the NPPF in that it supports economic growth in rural areas. The provision of these units also accords with the aim of JCS Policy 5 through the potential of the allocation of small/medium starter office units. A new build development such as that proposed also provides the opportunity to create well designed modern buildings, perhaps even going as far as creating an innovative 21st century ‘gateway’ into the development.
In light of the above, I consider the principle of small scale commercial units in this location appropriate, and that their location allows for well design buildings to be developed at the detailed design stage.

**Drainage**

Detailed drainage proposals can only be formulated once the residential layout has been designed, however the drainage principles put forward by the applicant accord with the original design philosophy for the whole allocation, already agreed with the Environment Agency, which was to take all surface water from the site as a whole into the main watercourse to the west, removing as much water as possible from the catchments draining east towards The Street. On site surface water run-off will be taken by a positive piped system and attenuated utilising a storage lagoon. The majority of the foul drainage is to be taken to a public system that has already been constructed to the north of the site; however the South Norfolk owned land will drain into a pumping station, and then connect to the Norfolk Homes existing sewers to the north. The Environment Agency has raised no objection the scheme, subject to detail drainage scheme to be submitted at the reserved matters stage.

Taking the above into account, I consider that in respect of flood risk, the application is in accordance with the requirements of section 10 of the NPPF, having demonstrated that the site can be developed without increase flood risk elsewhere.

### 5. Reasons for Approval

The proposed development is in accordance with the relevant sections and policies of the NPPF and the Joint Core Strategy in that it would provide for a sustainable development that would help to contribute towards the making of a better place for the community through a well planned layout concept. The delivery of commercial office floor space will also help to bring economic growth into the village, and will provide opportunities for new and existing residents alike. Specifically the application accords with Policies 2, 5 & 20 of the Joint Core Strategy, and saved policies POR 1, IMP8, and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003, which are given due weight as they 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
2. **Appl. No**: 2011/0661/F  
**Parish**: PORINGLAND

Applicants Name: Norfolk Homes Ltd & South Norfolk Council  
Site Address: Land north of Shotesham Road Poringland  
Proposal: Construction of Spine Road (Carr Lane to Shotesham Road), surface water lagoon and associated works

**Recommendation**: Approve

1. **Standard 3 year time limit for implementation**  
2. In accordance with approved plans  
3. Final details of surface water drainage to be agreed  
4. Construction Traffic Management Plan to be agreed  
5. Compliance with CTM for duration of the construction period  
6. Wheel cleaning facilities to be agreed and implemented for the duration of the construction period  
7. TRO for the prohibition of motor vehicles on specified sections of Carr Lane to be secured prior to occupation  
8. Archaeology – programme of works to be agreed and implemented

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Section 4 – Promoting sustainable transport  

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 6 – Access and transportation  

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
POR 1 – Housing Allocation, west of The Street, Poringland  
IMP8 – Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP9 – Residential Amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/0476/O Outline application for residential development Undetermined  

2.2 This site forms part (Area D) of the housing allocation POR 1 as set out in the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003. Area B has already been completed, and Area C is substantially completed. Works have recently started at Area A.

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council : Approve  
3.2 District Member : None received.  
3.3 NCC Highways : No objection, subject to appropriate conditions.  
3.4 Environment Agency : None received.  
3.5 Anglian Water Services Ltd : None received.  
3.6 Environmental Services (Protection) : No objection, although recognise that no information has been provided regarding the design, discharge rate, future ownership or management of the proposed lagoon.
4. Assessment

4.1 This full application seeks approval of the detailed design for the final section of the road linking Shotesham Road to Stoke Road, and connecting the Areas A – D of the Norfolk Homes development. (A location plan is attached as appendix 1.) This section of the link road connects into the existing portion of the link road constructed within areas B and C to the north of Carr Lane. The works also include the stopping up of Carr Lane in two places, one after no.71 Carr Lane, and the other after no.11 Carr Lane near its junction with the Street. Access to the community woodland and Dormer House will be retained from the newly created link road. Carr Lane effectively becomes a footpath/cycle way with limited restricted access.

4.2 The final part of the proposals would be the introduction of a 20mph zone to Shotesham Road at the point where the current 30mph zone begins just to the west of Carr Lane. This would be required to be implemented before the occupation of the houses within Area D (subject to a separate planning application).

4.3 The provision of the link road in the form submitted is in accordance with the requirements of saved local plan policy POR1, and is a required element of the allocation to be completed before the development of the houses to the south of Carr Lane. The proposal also meets the requirements of Section 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly in respect of providing for a safe and suitable access for all (e.g. pedestrians and cyclists).

4.4 Following consultation with the local residents, it was clear that there was concern with the placing of the junction with Shotesham Road opposite existing dwellings, and the potential impact on residential amenity. To minimise this impact, the junction has been placed opposite a small copse. This will mean that the headlights from stationary vehicles waiting to turn at the junction will not be shining directly into properties.

4.5 NCC: Highways have considered the proposals and raise no objection, subject to appropriate conditions requiring the imposition of the agreed construction traffic management route, drainage details, and the securing of the Traffic Regulation Order prohibiting vehicles using the designated areas of Carr Lane.

4.6 In light of the above, I consider that the proposal accords with saved policies IMP9 and IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposed development is in accordance with the relevant sections and policies of the NPPF and the Joint Core Strategy in that it would provide for a safe and suitable access for all. The arrangements of the junction will not give rise to issues of highway safety and will not cause undue disturbance to the amenities of neighbouring properties. The application therefore accords with saved policies POR1, IMP8 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Plan 2003, which are given due weight as they remain consistent with the published NPPF.

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

3. Appl. No : 2008/0271/CU
   Parish : BROCKDISH

   Applicants Name : Rebecca Lyne and Christopher Parr
   Site Address : Land to rear of 37-47 The Street, Brockdish
   Proposal : Use of land for public display of sculpture with associated works
               including a geodesic dome marquee and decking

   Recommendation : Approve with Conditions

   1 Full Planning Permission Time Limit
   2 Planting scheme to be submitted for new hedge
   3 Retention of trees and hedges
   4 Dome shall be erected for shows and exhibitions only

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   Section 3 – Supporting a prosperous rural economy
   Section 4 – Promoting sustainable transport

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 2: Design

1.2 South Norfolk Local Plan
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic

2. Planning History

2.1 No previous planning history

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council : No further comments received

3.2 District Member : No further comments received

3.3 NCC Highways : No objections to Sculpture Trail continuing without provision of
                    any legal agreement for car parking

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) : No further comments received

3.5 Countryside Access & Public Rights Way : No further comments received

3.6 Landscape Officer : No further comments received

3.7 Cultural Development Manager : No further comments received

3.8 Local Residents : No further comments received
4. Assessment

4.1 This application was originally heard by members of the former South West Area Planning Committee in March 2008 where it was resolved to approve the application subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement to provide parking for the sculpture park within the car park of the King’s Head public house close to the site. This was pursued until it became apparent that the conditions of the lease of the public house meant that a formal legal agreement would not be possible. The applicant sought alternative arrangements with Brockdish Primary School so that their premises could be used for parking when the school was closed. This proposal was put to members of the Committee in July 2010 where it was resolved to approve the application with a revised requirement requiring a section 106 agreement with the school to secure parking provision for the sculpture park.

4.2 It has subsequently become apparent that the school also are unable to sign such an agreement, although as with the public house they are happy to provide parking on an informal basis. The applicant is therefore unable to provide any parking provision for the sculpture park which can be guaranteed in perpetuity. It should be noted, however, that the sculpture park has carried out events since the original resolution to approve the application with no concerns over parking raised, as far as the Council is aware. Norfolk County Council’s highways officer has been consulted and raises no objection to the application being permitted without a legal agreement as it is clear that the village school car park will still be available out of school hours and during the school holidays and that similarly the public house car park is available for visitors who wish to combine the events with using their facilities. It should also be noted that the recently published NPPF also notes that development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts are severe. There is no evidence to suggest that operation of the sculpture park has resulted in severe impacts on the local highway network.

4.3 There are no changes in other considerations of the site. The landscaping conditions requiring a planting of a new hedge and for the retention of trees and hedges on the site are still proposed to ensure the sculpture park will sit well in the local landscape and it is considered appropriate to ensure the geodesic dome is only erected on the site when there is an event. Copies of the earlier reports and assessments, including responses to the original consultation, are attached as Appendix 2 and Appendix 3.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposed scheme is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to accord with Policy IMP8 (Safe and free flow of traffic) of that Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policy in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because this policy remains consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker, 01508 533801, tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
South West Area Planning Committee

Parish: BROCKDISH

Applicants Name: Rebecca Lyne and Christopher Parr
Site Address: Land to rear of 37-47 The Street, Brockdish
Proposal: Use of land for public display of sculpture with associated works including a geodesic dome marquee and decking

Recommendation: Authorise HPS to approve with conditions

1. Full permission time limit
2. Planting scheme to be submitted
3. Retention of trees and hedges

Subject to section 106 agreement to allow car parking on Kings Head car park

1. Planning Policy
1.1 ENV1 - Protection of landscape
1.2 IMP1 - Design

2. Planning History
2.1 No relevant planning history

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council: Approve:
- Expected to be of benefit to the village
- Only concern was about parking and in the respect of this the agreement with the Kings Head for visitors to the sculpture display to use its car park seems to offer a viable solution

3.2 District Member: Can be delegated

3.3 NCC Highways: Conditional support:
- Formal agreement needs to be reached between the applicants and the owners of the King's Head PH to provide parking at the necessary times

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection): No comments

3.5 Leisure Services: To be reported

3.6 Countryside Access & Public Rights Way: To be reported
3.7 Cultural Development Manager : Approve

- Will help to address the limited cultural infrastructure in the Waveney valley, in particular the dearth of exhibiting space

3.8 Local Residents : 7 letters of support:

- Think that it will be a valuable addition to arts provision in South Norfolk
- Will also build on the area's reputation already in place through the Harleston & Waveney Art Trail
- There is strong potential for educational use by local schools and organisations
- Will be a facility likely to attract people to the village and so increase trade and tourism
- Will hopefully help the pub
- Sensitive landscaping and wildlife management would be of benefit to the local environment (already a conservation area)
- Appropriate signage should be used to direct cars to the generously offered pub car park

1 letter of objection:

- Concerned about the additional vehicles visiting the display
- Would be open at weekends and bank holidays which would coincide with the peak periods of parking at the public house where there have already been parking problems

4. Assessment

4.1 This application is for the change of use of a field on the edge of Brockdish into a landscaped sculpture park. The site is immediately adjacent to the development boundaries of Brockdish and is on land which rises significantly from the Waveney valley floor. The Angles Way public footpath borders the site on the east.

4.2 The Landscape Officer has no objection to the principle of the proposal. A more detailed planting scheme is required however, and it is considered that the scheme would benefit from the boundary alongside the footpath being fully hedged. The park would be hidden behind existing houses along The Street at its closest point, although it may be visible when approaching Brockdish from the north-east. The dome proposed to create a dry display area is of a small scale which would be at the bottom of the hill and therefore is not considered to be visually intrusive.

4.3 The main issue that has been raised is that of the parking provision for the park. There is no available parking on site, however the King's Head public house has offered use of their car park. This area is not included within the red line of the application site and is obviously not within the control of the applicant. Norfolk County Council's highways officer considers that whilst a few extra vehicles should not pose too much of a problem, issues could arise if many visitors are permitted to view the site at any one time or specific events are to be held.
4.4 The highways officer has therefore recommended that a Section 106 Agreement needs to be entered into by the applicants and the owners of the public house so that car parking is available at the necessary times, and that if for any reason the car park becomes unavailable the development should cease.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to accord with policy ENV1 (Protection of landscape) of that Plan as the park would not have an adverse impact on the local landscape.
South & East Area Planning Committee

Applications referred back to Committee

1. Appl. No : 2008/0271/CU
   Parish : BROCKDISH

   Applicants Name : Rebecca Lyne and Christopher Parr
   Site Address : Land to rear of 37-47 The Street, Brockdish
   Proposal : Use of land for public display of sculpture with associated works including a geodesic dome marquee and decking

   Recommendation : Approve with Conditions
   1. Full planning permission time limit
   2. Planting scheme to be submitted
   3. Retention trees and hedges
   4. Dome shall be erected for shows and exhibitions only

1. Planning Policies
1.1 ENV1 : Protection of Landscape
   IMP1 : Design

2. Planning History
2.1 No previous planning history

3. Consultations
3.1 Parish Council : Approve
   - Supported the original application for the sculpture park subject to suitable parking arrangements and this remains the Parish Council's position
   - It is assumed that there will only be a limited number of events a year as the school is located in a narrow residential street

3.2 District Member : Supports the revised proposal
3.3 NCC: Highways : No objections
3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) : No adverse comments
3.5 Michael Bentley – TEHC : No response received
3.6 Countryside Access & Public Rights Way : No further comments
3.7 Cultural Development Manager : No response received
3.8 Local Residents : 1 letter of support

4. Assessment
4.1 Members may recall that this application was discussed by the South West Area Planning Committee in March 2008 when it was resolved to approve the application subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement to provide parking...
for the sculpture park within the car park of the King’s Head public house. This was pursued until it became apparent that the conditions of the lease of the public house meant that this would not be possible. The applicant has sought alternative arrangements and has come to an arrangement with Brockdish Primary School that their premises can be used when the school is closed to provide parking for the park.

4.2 Whilst the unavailability of the King’s Head car park is regrettable given its close proximity to the site, the alternative provision of the school for special events is an adequate alternative arrangement. No objections are raised by Norfolk County Council’s highways officer to this arrangement. It is also noted that some events have been carried out in the intervening period and that the Council is not aware of any parking or other issues caused by these events. Parking was a concern raised by neighbours when the application was originally submitted but no such concerns have been raised to this revised proposal.

4.3 There are no changes in regard to other considerations of the site. Two landscape conditions are still proposed to ensure the sculpture park will sit well in the local landscape and it is considered appropriate to ensure the geodisic dome is only erected on site when there is an event. A copy of the previous report and assessment, including responses to the original consultation, is attached as Appendix 1.

5. Reasons for approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to accord with policy ENV1 (Protection of landscape) of that Plan, as the park would not have an adverse impact on the local landscape.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker, 01508 533801, tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No**: 2011/1811/F  
**Parish**: THARSTON  

Applicants Name: Mr Colin Davison  
Site Address: Land east of Plump Road, Tharston, Norfolk NR15 2YR  
Proposal: Retention of small sheds and erection of new building on agricultural land. Planting of hawthorn hedge as screening from road.

Recommendation: Approve with conditions

1. Work to be carried out within 6 months  
2. On site parking area to be provided within 6 months  
3. Access gates to be moved within 6 months  
4. Visibility splays to be provided within 6 months  
5. Materials to be agreed  
6. Landscaping (hedge planting south boundary)

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Section 3 Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
Section 7 Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
EMP 5: Agricultural development (consistent)  
IMP 9: Residential amenity (consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic (consistent)

2. **Planning History**

2.1 None relevant

3. **Consultation**

3.1 Parish Council: Comments on original proposal
- Unable to discuss application due to there no longer being a quorate once interests had been declared  
- Strongly recommends that this application is considered by committee

3.2 District Member Mr Terry Blowfield: To be determined by committee  
- Received strong local representation objecting to this application  
- Caused vermin issues in local area which have been reported to environmental services
3.3 NCC: Highways

- No objection to the proposed shed subject to these being used for agricultural or domestic purposes
- Not clear whether a new entrance has been created into the site but it is poor and has limited visibility
- Conditions access gate to be set back five metres, on site car parking area to be set out

Visibility splay 2m x 43m needs to be provided

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)

- If approved the a Rodent Control Plan should be conditioned

3.5 Local Residents

Comments on original proposal
Eight letters of objection
- The corpse and small open area have been destroyed by the sheds made of differing materials.
- Resembles a shanty town
- Eyesore
- In appropriate development for Norfolk village
- Car parks in passing bay which causes an obstruction and makes it difficult to pass, vehicles have been damaged as a result on this and has lead to erosion of the opposite verge
- Blocking of a passing space
- Chickens have lead to an increase in vermin in the area
- Rubbish and feed bags are left outside the entrance which encourages vermin
- Chickens escape causing a hazard to traffic and some have been killed
- Goats on site are causing a smell
- Has permission been given by DEFRA to keep chickens on the site
- Development has caused a lot of distress to people living in Tharston.
- Rubbish on site increasing plastic bags, plastic bottles and CD hanging on canes and branches.
- Orange fencing makes appearance of the site worse
- Hedge will do little to improve the appearance of the site
- Concern on impact on wildlife
- General debris and rubbish lying around the site
- No attempt to improve the appearance of the site
- Are the buildings structurally sound
- Pot holes have been filled with rubble concern that this could damage cars
- Concern about quality of any products produced on site
- Concern about animal welfare
- Small plot of land not suitable for such an intensive use
- Sympathise with applicant reasons for wishing to pursue the venture, but this can not justify upset to peoples lives
- Activity on site late at night

One letter of support
- Erection of the sheds will have no significant impact on the surrounding area
- Planting of hedge will screen the site from the road
- Buildings temporary nature not permanent impact on the site for future generations
Comments on amended proposal
Six letters of objection from households which have previously written in.
- Amended plans have not changed my mind that this application should be refused
- No attempt to tidy up mess
- Why hasn’t the applicant already started to park his car off the road
- Chickens keep escaping
- Rats often seen
- Continues to leave rubbish outside site
- Smell from goat continues
- Farm in area does not cause the same issues
- No sanitary facilities on the site

4. Assessment

4.1 The application relates to a small piece of agricultural land to the south of small wooded area on Plump Road. There a number of properties on Plump Road, but the nearest is in excess of 60 metres from the site. There is hedging along the west (road) boundary but the site is open to the south.

4.2 The land is currently been used to keep chickens and a couple of goats which is an agricultural use and does not require permission. However, a number of structures/buildings have been erected on site, which do require planning permission. Netting type fencing and orange screening have been installed on south boundary. The fencing does not need planning permission.

4.3 The application originally was for:
- A Shed on north boundary with lean to roof 17.3mx 5.6 metres (Retrospective)
- B and C Two sheds to east 2.4m x 1.8 m 4x 2.4m (Retrospective)
- D and E Two sheds to located to the west of the site 2m x 1.5 metres and 4 metres x 1.8 metres - used to store feed and straw (Retrospective)
- It is also proposed to erect a new 5.5m x 2.8m timber shed with felt roof.

4.4 The existing sheds are of a primitive construction, made from a mixture of materials including wood, plastic and sheeting. The mix of different materials and construction methods along with general rubbish on the site gives the site a very untidy appearance which has an adverse impact on the local landscape and is clearly visible from Plump Road.

4.5 It is acknowledged that the use of the land does necessitate the need for a building on site. The application has been amended to try and improve the appearance of the development and overcome concerns.

4.6 The amended proposal is for:
- Shed A It is proposed to replace the front aspect of this building. The front aspect faced in natural timber with three opening with a green corrugated metal corrugated roof with some are of clear plastic sheeting to provide light into the building, west elevation to be clad in timber
- Shed B timber construction with felt roof is to be moved next to shed A
- Shed C to be removed
- Shed D is to remain
- Shed E new traditionally constructed shed.

4.7 A hedge is also being proposed along the southern boundary of the site and applicant has agreed to remove the orange netting.
4.8 I consider that the proposed changes in the amended proposal, along with tidying the site up and subject to agreeing the exact materials will result in the visual impact of the site being substantially reduced. As the hedge matures this will screen the site further in the wider landscape.

4.9 The provision of an on site car parking space will also help to alleviate residents highway safety concerns, the Highway Officer conditional supports the proposal.

4.10 An Environmental Health Officer has visited the site and given advice on rodent control. Although they have also requested that a rodent control plan is conditioned. This would pass the test required for conditions and therefore a note will be added to the permission.

4.11 With the improvements to the buildings and tidying up of the site this should help to improve the amenity of nearby properties.

4.12 Policy EMP5 in the South Norfolk Local Plan permits buildings required for agriculture, which respect the character of the surrounding landscape, where the road access is sufficient to serve the nature of the development. 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.

4.13 It is hoped that working with the applicant we can ensure improvements are made to the site. The applicant has indicated that if approved the alterations to the building and clearing up of the site will take six months, it is therefore proposed to condition that the works are carried out within 6 months of the date of the permission. To help to ensure that this happens I suggest that members also agree enforcement action for the removal of the buildings on site and clearing up the site if the work is not carried out.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 – Promoting good design of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies EMP5 – Agriculture, IMP9 – Residential amenity and IMP8 – 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 amended proposal would result in a development which would significantly reduce the impact on the local landscape to an acceptable level. Improve highway safety and the amenity of nearby residents.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Helen Bowman, 01508 533833, hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No**: 2012/0389/F  
**Parish**: ROCKLAND ST MARY

**Applicants Name**: Rockland St Mary & Hellington Parish Councils  
**Site Address**: Playing Field, Green Lane, Rockland St Mary, Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Installation of two tarmac hardstandings for use as a skatepark and sports areas

**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Promoting healthy communities

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
LEI 2: Village halls and small scale leisure facilities  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 1987/1586 Change of use of horticultural to recreational  
Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: Make no recommendation as they are the applicants however comment  
- The proposal meets a local need for recreation facilities for young people in the Paris and surrounds

3.2 District Member: To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Broads Authority: No objections

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection): No comments received

3.5 Play and Amenities Area Officer: No comments received

3.6 Local Residents: 4 Letters of objection  
- Not properly consulted before application submitted  
- Increased traffic will exacerbate existing problems  
- No EIA carried out  
- Noise and disturbance from activates in the site and also vehicles racing up and down the lane  
- Will attract youths up to age of 20  
- Only have 324 houses and the demographics of the area suggests an older population so see no need for a facility of this size  
- A mile form the centre of the village
First Wednesday Planning Committee  2 May 2012

- Local youths already use area for drinking and playing loud music
- Overlooking
- Possible impact on ecology
- No information re supervision/community policing
- Has the Parish allocated funds for the maintenance and upkeep
- Opening hours – a barrier needs to be erected to control the opening hours

4. Assessment

4.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the installation of two tarmac hardstandings for use as a skatepark and sports areas, at Green Lane playing field. The site is an existing playing field with football pitch, play equipment such as swings, climbing frames and slide etc. The northeast and southeast parts of the site are presently grassed with hedging and trees to the boundaries. This part of the site is raised above the existing formal play area and football pitch. The Broads are situated to the east of the site.

4.2 The proposal is to add a skatepark area with fixed skate ramps for use by a variety of wheeled sports form scooters to BMX bikes and a ‘sports area’ which is a tarmac hardstanding for activities such as basketball. As noted, the site has a long standing use as a recreation ground. This allows for a potentially quite wide variety of activities occurring resulting in various levels of noise generation. It is accepted that the skatepark and sports area concentrate activities in one point and potentially increase the number of users of the ground, however these facilities are not immediately adjoining any residential property and it is not considered that the proposals are likely to generate significant amounts of extra noise over potential existing use of the ground.

4.3 It is considered that the additional facilities represent a positive improvement in terms of community facilities. I consider that the proposal will not harm the environmental characteristics and resource of the site and its surroundings; the additional equipment would not due to its size, increase noise and numbers of people using the playing fields to an unacceptable degree; the development would not be detrimental to highway safety; site is accessible by bicycle and on foot; and the amenities of nearby residential properties will not be affected to an unacceptable degree. The proposal accords with policy LEI2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003

4.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) under Section 8 positively supports the provision of community facilities to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments, Policy 8 of the Joint Core Strategy equally support the provision of community facilities. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the SNLP because policy LEI2 remains consistent with the NPPF

4.5 4 letters of objection have been received and the concerns set out above. Whilst I fully appreciate the issues raised, given that the site is a long standing playing field with formal play equipment and the distance from the distance from the nearby residential properties, I do not consider the application for two additional facilities would give rise to situation so detrimental to the amenities of the neighbours via noise and disturbance as to warrant refusal of the application on these grounds. The Parish Council’s funding and pre-application consultation are not a planning reason for refusal.
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 policy LEI2 Village halls and small-scale leisure facilities of that 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 LEI2 as the proposal will not harm the environmental characteristics and resource of the site and its surroundings; the development would not due to its size, increase noise and numbers of people using the playing field to an unacceptable degree; it has been carefully located and will not adversely affect the surrounding countryside; the development would not be detrimental to highway safety; site is accessible by bicycle and on foot; and the amenities of nearby residential properties will not be affected to an unacceptable degree.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number: Claire Curtis, 01508 533788,  
and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No** : 2012/0433/H  
**Parish** : CRINGLEFORD

Applicants Name : Mr M Brown  
Site Address : 3 Brambling Lane, Cringleford, Norfolk, NR4 7LJ  
Proposal : Conversion of garage to dining room and store

Recommendation : Approve with conditions

1. Full Planning Permission Time Limit  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Section 4: Transport  
Section 7: Design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Design

1.2 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 19: Extensions to existing dwellings  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2006/2571 Erection of 98 dwellings with roads, sewers and ancillary works  
Approved

2.2 2006/1406 Erection of 97 dwellings with roads, sewers and ancillary works  
Refused

2.3 2001/1852 Erection of 750 no. dwellings, school, local shop, community facilities, playing fields, open space, roads, cycleways and footpaths  
Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council : Recommend refusal  
- Concern over loss of parking on this tight plot

3.2 District Member : To be determined by Committee  
- Application raises an issue of principle which ought to be determined by members  
- Decision will set a precedent  
- Roundhouse Park designed with the intention that off-street parking would be provided for all of the houses  
- This application is inconsistent with that design principle

3.3 NCC Highways : No objection

3.4 Local Residents : 1x letter of support  
- No concerns with the proposal
4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application is for the conversion of a single garage to a dining room with small store room to the rear. The proposal relates to a 3-bedroom two-storey terraced property that forms part of a corner plot at the junction of Brambling Lane and Kingfisher Close. The dwelling is also approximately 20 metres from the T-junction with Dragonfly Lane.

4.2 Policies within the NPPF, JCS and Local Plan seek to ensure the safe and free movement of traffic. They also promote a high standard of design and seek to protect the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers. 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.

4.3 The garage currently provides accommodation for a single vehicle. Access to the garage is to the rear of the property, via Kingfisher Close. The garage is set within a small courtyard that provides the off-road parking and garage facilities for a number of different dwellings in the same ‘block’.

4.4 The current Norfolk County Council parking standards (updated 2007) require a maximum of 2 parking spaces for a 2 or 3 bedroom unit. The applicant has demonstrated that there would be sufficient space for off-road parking of two vehicles immediately in front of the garage (within the rear courtyard) following conversion of the garage.

4.5 The Highways Officer has not raised an objection to the loss of the garage in this location or the proposed parking arrangements for the property.

4.6 A single window to match the existing windows is proposed for the front north east elevation of the property. The existing garage door would be replaced with a pair of timber doors thus maintaining a similar appearance to the existing form.

4.7 The restrictive condition securing the retention of residential garages was considered necessary in order to reduce the impact of on-street parking within the Roundhouse Park development. The current application does not seek to vary or remove condition 7 of 2006/2571 but seeks a site specific assessment of the merits of the conversion of a single garage unit within the development. Any further proposals for the loss/ conversion of garages within the Roundhouse Park development would require the submission of a formal planning application and an individual assessment.

4.8 I have noted that the applicant has advised that they currently only have a single vehicle however this should not be considered as a material consideration in the determination of the current planning application as later occupiers of the property may have more than one vehicle.

4.9 Notwithstanding the above point, the applicant has demonstrated that there is sufficient parking on the site for two vehicles in accordance with the current maximum parking standards of Norfolk County Council. The parking provision would be to the rear of the dwelling, which is also where the current garage is accessed from. There is no off-street parking provision to the front of the property and the proposal would not change that situation. In these circumstances I do not consider it could be successfully argued that the loss of the garage alone would be likely to result in additional on-street parking. Furthermore, the development would not materially harm the character or appearance of the existing dwelling and would not materially harm the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

4.10 I therefore consider the proposed development accords with those policies set out above and I recommend the application for approval.
5. Reasons for approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies HOU19, IMP8 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.

5.2 The conversion of the garage is not likely to result in additional on-street parking because sufficient space for two vehicles, as required by the Council's adopted parking standards, can be provided within the curtilage of the dwelling. The conversion of the garage will therefore not prejudice the safe and free flow of traffic in this location. The development will not materially harm either the character or appearance of the dwelling, or the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupants.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Kate Fisher, 01508 533985, kfisher@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2012/0481/F  
**Parish**: HETHERSETT

Applicants Name : Mrs C De Falco  
Site Address : Sub division of garden at 61 Lynch Green, Hethersett, NR9 3JT  
Proposal : Proposed erection of single storey dwelling, garage and access of Henstead Road

Recommendation : Refuse

1 Cramped appearance which relates poorly to neighbouring dwellings. Contrary to Policy 2 JCS, Policies

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
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

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

2. **Planning History**

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

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council : Refuse  
- Additional entrance will add to hazardous situation for pedestrians and road users  
- Over development of site

3.2 District Member  
Cllr Bills : To be determined by Committee  
- If at all possible applicant should be allowed to remain in the location she has grown up in.  
- Applicant is prepared to discuss how land at the junction can be incorporated into a path if this will help the application.

3.3 NCC Highways : To be reported

3.4 Local Residents : 2 letters of objection  
- Additional access close to junction  
- Existing highway safety issues around junction  
- Property will appear “crammed” into the space  
- Impact on existing boundary hedges  
- Disturbance between properties  
- Storage of a caravan should be restricted  
1 letter of support
4. **Assessment**

4.1 The proposal is for the erection of a two bedroom bungalow within the existing garden area of 61 Lynch Green. The dwelling will be 9.5m wide with the northern side being 14m in length and the southern side (adjacent to No 61) being 10m in length. The property will have an eaves height of 2.5m and a ridge height of be 5.2m.

4.2 The site is located within the Development Limit for Hethersett and as such the principle of development is acceptable. Policies in the JCS and South Norfolk Local plan seek to encourage a mix of housing types which take account of the character of the site and their surroundings and do not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties or highway safety. Policies in the JCS and the NPPF also promote good design. 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.

4.3 The area is characterised by a predominantly detached properties but of mixed design, scale and form. The properties to the north of the proposal are mainly bungalows which are elevated above the application site. To the east is a row of terraced properties which are below road level. The site itself is bordered by hedging to the road side and north with fencing to the west. It is elevated approximately 1m above the road level of Henstead Road.

4.4 The bungalow will be set forward of No 61 and will be gable end onto Henstead Road. To the south of the property it is proposed to erect a detached garage and both the garage and dwelling will be prominent in the streetscene. Properties in the locality have a relatively spacious feel to their setting, particularly to the north of the site. The proposed dwelling will involve development tight to the southern boundary and within 1.5m of the northern boundary. The southern elevation of the dwelling will overlap the rear elevation of No 61 by 4.5m and I consider that the proposal will appear cramped within the site and will be out of keeping with the character of the locality.

4.4 The proposal will be approximately 28m from properties to the north and will incorporate 3 windows (2 bathrooms and 1 bedroom). It is proposed to erect a 2m fence along the boundary and due to the separation between properties, the rise in levels and the proposed boundary treatments, I consider that the dwelling will not have a significant impact on the outlook or amenities of the dwellings to the north.

4.5 The dwelling will be immediately to the rear of No 61 and will be within 7m of the rear elevation of that property. The proposed dwelling will have a limited private garden area to the rear of the property, however this will be significantly overlooked by first floor windows in the rear of No 61. In addition, the remaining garden area for No 61 will be to the east of the dwelling and will be bounded by Lynch Green and Henstead Road. This area is currently open in character, however, as it is the only amenity area for No 61, I consider that it would result in pressure to enclose this space, eroding the character of the area. I therefore consider that the layout as proposed results in a poor relationship between the properties and a low level of amenity for future occupiers of both properties.

4.6 The proposal will incorporate the provision of a new vehicular access onto Henstead Road and concerns have been raised regarding the impact of this on highway safety in the locality, particularly with regard to its proximity to the junction with Lynch Green. The details submitted show the works necessary to provide the access together the required visibility splays. The formal views of the Highway Authority were outstanding at the time of preparing the report, but they had verbally indicated that they had no objection to the proposed access on highway safety grounds.

4.7 It is noted that discussions have been taking place to facilitate the provision of a continuous footpath along the western side of Henstead Road and this would require the provision of land which currently forms part of the curtilage of No 61. The path at present runs to the front of the application site and then forms a cross-over to the eastern side of Henstead Road, with a further crossing point to the south of Lynch Green.
4.8 While I recognise that there may be merit in the provision of a continuous path along the western side of Henstead Road, the application proposal does not adversely affect the existing arrangements and I consider that it would be unreasonable to require the applicant to provide additional footway which is not required to enable this development to proceed.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The proposal is within an area characterised by a mixture of property types with properties in the locality having a relatively spacious feel to their setting, particularly to the north of the site. The proposed dwelling will involve development tight to the southern boundary and within 1.5m of the northern boundary. The southern elevation of the dwelling will overlap the rear elevation of No 61 by 4.5m and will appear cramped within the site and will be out of keeping with the character of the locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy HOU4 of the South Norfolk Local Plan together with advice in Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The dwelling will be immediately to the rear of No 61 and will be within 7m of the rear elevation of that property. The proposed dwelling will have a limited private garden area to the rear of the property, which will be significantly overlooked by first floor windows in the rear of No 61. In addition, the remaining garden area for No 61 will be to the east of the dwelling and will be bordered by Lynch Green and Henstead Road which is likely to result in pressure to enclose this space, eroding the character of the area. The layout as proposed therefore results in a poor relationship between the properties and a low level of amenity for future occupiers of both properties contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies HOU4 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan together with advice in Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:

Stuart Pontin, 01508 533796, spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk