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Group Meetings

Conservatives: Blomefield Room 12.45 pm to 1.30 pm

Date

Wednesday 6 June 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

01/06/2012
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 2 May 2012; (attached – page 7)

5. Enforcement Reports (attached – page 17)

6. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
To consider the applications as listed below: (report attached – page 22)

<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>2012/0268/EA</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Land at Townhouse Road, Costessey</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2010/1377/F</td>
<td>SCOLE</td>
<td>Land adj The Reading Room, The Street, Scole</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011/1781/F</td>
<td>CLAXTON</td>
<td>2 Staines Barn, Church Lane, Claxton</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2011/1645/F</td>
<td>CLAXTON</td>
<td>1 Staines Barn, Church Lane, Claxton</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2012/0469/F</td>
<td>CHEDGRAVE/THURTON</td>
<td>Park Farm, Norwich Road, Thurton</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2012/0502/F</td>
<td>WICKLEWOOD</td>
<td>Sub-division of the garden of, Kecalde , 65 Church Lane</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2012/0634/H</td>
<td>WRENINGHAM</td>
<td>The Poplars, Ashwellthorpe Road</td>
<td>51</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 with the date and membership to be confirmed.

8. Planning Appeals (for information) (attached – page 55)
### 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>02/05/13</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>

<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.

<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>
<tr>
<td>Does the interest:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) affect your financial position or the financial position of a person or body described above? <strong>(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or any person or body described above? <strong>(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) relate to scrutiny by the Overview and Scrutiny committee of a decision you were party to? <strong>(If Yes the interest is prejudicial)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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. <strong>(If Yes the interest is NOT PREJUDICIAL)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

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

Do any relate to my interests?

Disclose the existence & nature of your interest

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

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?

PERSONAL INTEREST

PREJUDICIAL INTEREST
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 G Proposal by Government Department
AD Certificate of Alternative Development HZ Hazardous Substance
CA Conservation Area LB Listed Building
CU Change of Use LE Certificate of Lawful Existing development
D Reserved Matters LP Certificate of Lawful Proposed development (Detail following outline consent)
F Full (details included) O Outline (details reserved for later)
H Householder – Full application relating to residential property RVC Removal/Variation of Condition
C Application to be determined by County Council 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

Enforcement Report
Development Management Committee  
6 June 2012

Report of The Development Control Services Manager

1. **Enforcement Ref** : 2012/8030  
   **Parish** : PORINGLAND

   **Site** : 6 Stoke Road, Poringland, Norfolk, NR14 7JL  
   **Development** : Unauthorised boundary fence  
   **Developer** : Mr J Brown

1. **Background**

   1.1 It was brought to our attention that a conifer hedge had been removed and a close-boarded wooden fence had been erected in its place. The fence is 1.9 metres in height and set back approximately 1 metre from the highway. The owners of the property have been invited to do one of the following option; submit a planning application to try to regularise the situation; reduce its height, set it back further in to the site and provide a native hedge to lessen its impact; or remove the fence in it entirety.

2. **Planning Policies**

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Section 7: Design

2.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting Good Design

3. **Assessment**

3.1 The property is located in an area of linear development within the development boundary for Poringland. The street scene is open with low boundary treatments and hedges. There are no other close-boarded fences of this height and proximity to the road in the immediate vicinity.

3.2 It is therefore considered that the fence, by virtue of its height and proximity to the road will have a detrimental impact on the character and distinctiveness of the locality. In view of this the development in contrary to National Planning Policy Framework Section 7: Design and Joint Core Strategy Policy 2: Promoting Good Design.

4. **Recommendation**

4.1 That subject to legal advice enforcement action be authorised to secure the removal of the unauthorised fence.
2. Enforcement Ref : 2012/8141
Parish : HEYWOOD
Site : Woolsey Bridge Barns, Burston Road, Heywood, Diss IP22 5SX
Development : Erection of Structures and storage of vehicles
Developer : Ms D MARPLES
1. Background

1.1 The site comprises approximately 10 acres in total, including grassed fields and farm buildings converted to dwellings, within one of which the owner/developer lives. Planning permission was granted in 2004 to convert the redundant farm outbuildings to 3 residential dwellings. Permitted development rights were removed in respect of the erection of ancillary buildings within the curtilage of the dwellings. The developer’s dwelling and associated fields are located each side of the original farmhouse which is in separate ownership and occupation, as are the other two residential conversions.

1.2 It has been brought to the attention of the Council that a number of ancillary buildings have been erected on the land. When a site visit was carried out by the Enforcement Officer he found two timber buildings; a conservatory; a caravan; a temporary mobile building; 3 vehicles; and a workshop building. All the structures and also the vehicles which are stood outside the residential curtilage require planning permission and no application has been made.

1.3 A number of other small structures were also found on site but these have been established in excess of four years and are exempt from enforcement action.

2. Planning Policies

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   Section 7 – Design

2.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 2 – Promoting Good Design

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   IMP 9 – Residential Amenity
   ENV 8 Development in Open Countryside

3. Assessment

3.1 The two timber buildings are behind the dwelling and adjacent to the boundary wall with the neighbouring property with one of them attached to it. The developer claims one of the buildings has been there more than four years, but this has not been substantiated. Notwithstanding this, the buildings are modest in size and are not conspicuous, their design is typical of domestic buildings and they are well screened from neighbouring properties by a tall wall and I consider there is no significant harm to residential amenity. I conclude they do not cause any harm which justifies taking enforcement action.

3.2 The conservatory is attached to the rear of the dwelling and faces onto the rear boundary wall. The conservatory is modest in size and is not conspicuous. It is well screened from the neighbouring property by a tall wall, there is no harm to residential amenity and I conclude it does not cause any harm which justifies taking enforcement action.

3.3 The caravan and temporary mobile building are used in association with a small sauna building on fields to the rear of the dwelling. Although the sauna building is exempt from enforcement action (as it has been established for more than four years) this does not convey any lawful use to the remainder of the land. The only lawful use of the fields outside the residential curtilages is agriculture. The standing of the caravan and ancillary structure for purposes other than agriculture is consequently development requiring planning permission. I consider the caravan and ancillary building do add to the clutter in the field, but the field is not prominent from neighbouring sites and properties and they cannot be said to be causing significant harm to the surrounding area. I conclude they do not cause any harm which justifies taking enforcement action.
3.4 Three vehicles were seen on the agricultural field on the west side of the site and it is understood from the developer they are not there permanently and will be removed in the near future. The vehicles can be seen from the nearby highway and do affect the visual amenity of the area. If the vehicles are not removed within three months of the date of this committee then enforcement action should be taken to ensure their removal.

3.5 A building has been erected to the east of the developer’s dwelling (within the residential curtilage) which is used as a workshop and stores. This is unauthorised because permitted development rights for ancillary buildings for the site were removed. Planning permission was granted in 2011 for a new cart-lodge and workshop building which was presented as a replacement for the unauthorised workshop and store. Work has commenced to clear the site for the new cart lodge and workshop but the unauthorised building remains. The developer has now indicated that an application will be submitted to retain the workshop as a summer house but this has not been received. The timber building has a temporary appearance and is not of a quality that would normally be expected within what is effectively the front garden of the dwelling. It is in a prominent position to the front of the dwelling and, taken together with the other buildings approved, creates a cluttered setting for the more substantial residential buildings. This causes material harm to the character and appearance of the site and to the amenities of the adjoining residential conversions (although no objections have been received from those particular dwellings). I do not consider that permanent planning permission would have been granted for the building had an application been made. I conclude that enforcement action should be taken to require its removal.

4. **Recommendation**

4.1 That no further action is taken with regard to the two timber buildings.

4.2 That no further action is taken with regard to the conservatory.

4.3 That no further action is taken with regard to the caravan and temporary mobile building.

4.4 That authority be granted to secure the cessation of the keeping of vehicles on the land outside the residential curtilage (except those reasonably required and used for the purposes of agriculture on the land) should the vehicles remain longer than 3 months from the date of this committee.

4.5 That authority be granted to secure the removal of the unauthorised workshop/store building to the east of the dwelling.
Screening Opinion Application

1. **Appl. No:** 2012/0268/EA  
   **Parish:** COSTESSEY  
   **Applicants Name:** Green & Norwich Consolidated Charities  
   **Site Address:** Land at Townhouse Road, Costessey  
   **Proposal:** Screening Opinion for residential development of 70 dwellings and associated works including a new access to the south  
   **Recommendation:** EIA not required

1. **Planning History**

   1.1 2012/0269/O Outline application for a residential development of 70 dwellings and associated works including a new access to the south  
      **Status:** Not yet determined

   1.2 2009/1996/O Proposed outline application for a residential development of 70 dwellings and associated works including a new access to the south  
      **Status:** Refused, appeal pending

   1.3 2009/0284/EA Request for screening opinion  
      **Status:** EIA not required

2. **Consultations**

   2.1 Parish Council: EIA required

   2.2 District Members (Mr T East & Mrs V Bell)): To Committee
      - Sensitive and vulnerable location in the River Tud valley including the long views of the wooded backdrop to the site
      - Proximity of the River Wensum (SSSI and SAC) – 600 metres
      - Adjacent to protected woodland (TPO on whole of Carrs Hill Wood)
      - Evidence of protected species – bats (conflicting reports from two sets of ecologists), therefore active season surveys required including nocturnal bat transect surveys along the woodland edge. Reptile surveys around the site using artificial refuges and following Froglife guidelines
      - Strategies to be investigated for non-domestic buffer zone along woodland edge to protect the full canopy of the trees and habitat of protected species
      - Requirement of European Species License
      - Impact on Green infrastructure policies of JCS
      - Impact of light, noise and traffic pollution on a quiet unlit area
      - Impact on the green corridor connecting river valleys to the Broads in the east and open countryside of Norfolk beyond
      - Impact of additional vehicle traffic generation on road network, including Norwich Road and Longwater Lane junctions and potential increase in rat running through New Costessey residential areas

   2.3 Townhouse Road Action Group: EIA required
      - Landscape and visual impact: site clearly visible from many local areas and will remove significant sections of...
• Noise: significant environmental impact from construction and day-to-day activities of completed development to the various species of wildlife dwelling within Carrs Hill Wood
• Air quality and light pollution: proximity to Carrs Hill Wood would certainly give rise to a significant increase in light pollution into areas of woodland currently not exposed to any significant source of light during nocturnal hours
• Ecology: the proposed site is located within 400m of the River Wensum, which is both designated as an SSSI and SAC, and is also in close proximity to various County Wildlife Sites
• The proposed application is for 70 houses in an area of Old Costessey where the property density is receding at the end of the community. The density of housing neighbouring the proposed site is approximately 8 houses per hectare in comparison to the proposed density of 28.1 houses per hectare.

2.4 Environmental Services (Protection): Information about surface water drainage requirements

2.5 Local Residents: 3 letters stating EIA is required
• Site is in sensitive and vulnerable location
• Visual impact on character of the Tud valley
• Strategic importance of the site as part of green separation between Old and New Costessey is under estimated
• Development of this site with new housing will set a precedent for other river valley sites
• Adjoining Carrs Hill Wood is protected by TPO and needs extensive buffer zone
• Effect on species such as bats, reptiles and butterflies
• Implications of proximity to the River Wensum SSSI and SAC has not been addressed
• The environmental implications of the additional traffic generated on the local road network and the environmental impact of traffic congestion in Norwich Road, Longwater Lane and rat running through New Costessey have not been fully evaluated
• It is not clear from the information supplied with the screening request whether the proposal will have a significant effect on a protected site under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulation 2010

3. Assessment

3.1 The site is currently the subject of a planning application and an appeal against an earlier refusal to grant planning permission. In determining the previous application, the Council judged that an Environmental Impact Assessment was not required for the proposed development and the Planning Inspectorate have not challenged this in accepting the appeal. However, this decision was made prior to the introduction of the new Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations last year and therefore the applicant has submitted a new screening opinion request.

3.2 A draft screening opinion has now been prepared which again concludes that an EIA is not required, which is attached as Appendix 2. The screening opinion concludes that an EIA is not required as the site is not subject to any national or international designations and is not of a scale which would normally require an EIA. In considering whether the scale of the development is sufficient to require an EIA, members should take into account a direction
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issued by the Secretary of State in relation to Phase 2 of Lodge Farm, in which around 500 homes are proposed, where the Council had issued a screening opinion that an EIA would be required (2011/0433). The direction, attached as Appendix 3, determined that an EIA would not be required. It is therefore not considered that an EIA can be required in this case.

4. Recommendation

4.1 That an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Tim Barker, 01508 533801,
and E-mail:              tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
CIRCULAR 2/99 : ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

SCREENING OPINION

App. No : 2012/0268
Parish : Costessey

Applicants Name : Green & Norwich Consolidated Charities
Site Address : Land at Townhouse Road, Costessey
Proposal : Screening Opinion for residential development of 70 dwellings and associated works including a new access to the south

1

Is the proposal in Schedule 1? No
If yes which section? :

2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2a</th>
<th>Is the proposal in Schedule 2?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>If yes which section?</td>
<td>Section: 10b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Is it in an environmentally sensitive area as defined in Regulation 2(1)? <em>(See Note 1)</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>Does it exceed the threshold in Schedule 2?</td>
<td>Yes Threshold: 0.5 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>Does it exceed C2/99 threshold</td>
<td>No Threshold: Major project of more than local importance; environmentally sensitive location; complex or hazardous effects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Characteristics of development

(Having regard to the size of the development; the cumulation with other development; the use of natural resources; the production of waste; pollution and nuisances; the risk of accidents, having regard in particular to substances or technologies used).

The site is 2.49 hectares in size, with 70 dwellings proposed. The site is behind existing development fronting on to Townhouse Road. Development of the site may cause waste, pollution and potential nuisance during the construction period. Costessey has been subject to a considerable amount of development with a nearby development of 22 dwellings under construction on the opposite side of the River Tud, although large scale development at Lodge Farm and Queens Hills are not in close proximity to the site. There is potential for at least a further 1000 dwellings in the Easton / Costessey area under the JCS.

4. Location of development

(The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by development must be considered, having regard, in particular, to *(see note 2)* Should consider the existing land use; the relative abundance, quality and regenerative capacity of natural resources in the area; the absorption capacity of the natural environment).
The site is located in land that is designated as river valley in the South Norfolk Local Plan and subject to policy ENV3. The site is not, however, subject to any national or international designation. To the rear of the site is an area of woodland known as Carrs Hill woodland which is protected by a Tree Preservation Order. The site is 400 metres from the Wensum Valley Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

5. Characteristics of the potential impact
(The potential significant effects of development should be considered in relation to details set out under sections 3 and 4 above, and having regard to the extent of the impact (geographical area and size of the affected population); the transfrontier nature of the impact; the magnitude and complexity of the impact; the probability of the impact; the duration, frequency and reversibility of the impact).

Potential impacts of the development to be considered are the impact on the local river valley landscape, the proximity to the woodland to the rear, any ecological impacts, and any adverse impact on the SSSI and SAC to the north-east. There are also likely to be impacts in terms of traffic generation and accessing the site.

6 Are there likely to be significant environmental effects? (See Note 2)

The existing development along Townhouse Road limits the visual impact of the proposed development. The wider impact can be assessed through a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment that the applicants have provided with the planning application.

A Phase 1 ecological report has also been provided with the planning application to address the proximity of the site to the SSSI / SAC and identify any potential impacts. Similarly, arboricultural information has been provided to consider the impact on the protected woodland to the rear.

A full assessment of the traffic impact including access issues have also been provided.

Taking into account that these issues have been able to be covered within the supporting information for the application, it is not considered that the proposed development is of a scale or in a site of such sensitivity that a full Environmental Impact Assessment is required.

7 Is an Environmental Statement required? No

Signed: Date:
Notes for Screening Opinion

1) “sensitive area” means any of the following -
(a) land notified under sub-section (1) of section 28 (areas of special scientific interest) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 [1981 c. 69, amended by the Wildlife and Countryside (Amendment) Act 1985 (c. 31), the Wildlife and Countryside (Service of Notices) Act 1985 (c. 59), the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads Act 1988 (c. 4) and the Planning (Consequential Provisions) Act 1990 (c. 11).]
(b) land to which sub-section (3) of section 29 (nature conservation orders) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 applies;
(c) an area to which paragraph (u)(ii) in the table in article 10 of the Order applies;
(d) a National Park within the meaning of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 [1949 c. 97. Relevant amendments were made by the Environment Act 1995 (c. 25), Schedule 10, paragraph 2.];
(e) the Broads [See the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads Act 1988 (c. 4).];
(f) a property appearing on the World Heritage List kept under article 11(2) of the 1972 UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage [See Command Paper 9424]
(g) a scheduled monument within the meaning of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 [1979 c. 46. See the definition in section 1(11).];
(h) an area of outstanding natural beauty designated as such by an order made by the Countryside Commission, as respects England, or the Countryside Council for Wales, as respects Wales, under section 87 (designation of areas of outstanding natural beauty) of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 [1949 c. 97. Section 87 was amended by paragraph 1(12) of Schedule 8 to the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (c. 43).] as confirmed by the Secretary of State;
(i) a European site within the meaning of regulation 10 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc.) Regulations 1994 [S.I. 1994/2716].

2) In considering whether significant environmental effects are likely, you should have regard to the Annex A of C2/99 and indicative thresholds and selection criteria in Schedule 3 of the regulations. You should also note that in certain cases other statutory and non statutory designations – not included in the formal definition of “sensitive areas” in the regs, but which are nonetheless environmentally sensitive may be relevant in determining whether significant environmental effects are likely and therefore whether EIA is required.
Dear Sir

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT) (ENGLAND AND WALES) REGULATIONS 1999
REQUEST FOR A SCREENING DIRECTION – 500 DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT ON LAND WEST OF LODGE FARM, DEREHAM ROAD, COSTESSEY, NORWICH

I refer to the request dated 13 May 2011 made on behalf of Taylor Wimpey Development Ltd and Hopkins Homes Ltd, made pursuant to regulation 7(4) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (S.I. 1999/293) ("the 1999 Regulations").

This request seeks the Secretary of State's screening direction on the matter of whether or not the application made to South Norfolk District Council is an 'EIA application' within the meaning of the 1999 Regulations.

The development proposed, namely an outline planning application for 500 dwellings and associated infrastructure, falls within the description at paragraph 10b (Urban Development Projects) of Schedule 2 to the 1999 Regulations, and exceeds the threshold in column 2 of that table, but in the opinion of the Secretary of State, having taken into account the criteria in Schedule 3 to the 1999 Regulations, would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its nature, size or location. In this instance there is not a significant impact from the development on any sensitive area, nor is there a significant impact on protected species. Whilst the development may have some noise and archaeology impacts, these are matters that can be fully assessed as additional field survey work as part of the planning application process and do not constitute significant effects necessitating EIA.

Accordingly, in exercise of the powers conferred on him by regulation 7(7) and 6(4) of the 1999 Regulations the Secretary of State hereby directs that the proposed development for which planning permission is sought by your client (South Norfolk District Council Ref no 2011/0433) is not EIA development.

Having regard to the above direction, the planning application mentioned may proceed without submission of an environmental statement.

You will bear in mind that the Secretary of State's opinion on the likelihood of the development having significant environmental effects is reached only for the purposes of this direction.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr P Witham, Development Control Services Manager at South Norfolk District Council.

Yours faithfully

RAY COLBOURNE
Senior Planning Manager
Other Applications

2. Appliance No: 2010/1377/F
Parish: SCOLE

Applicants Name: Cripps Development Ltd
Site Address: Land adj The Reading Room, The Street, Scole
Proposal: Proposed residential development comprising 8 dwellings and garages and ancillary works

Recommendation: Authorise DCM to approve

Full - Planning Permission Time Limit
In accordance with submitted amendments
External materials and surfacing to be agreed
Specific details to be agreed
Archaeological work to be agreed
Slab levels to be agreed
No additional windows at first floor level
No PD for Classes ABCD & E
No alterations to lose garage for parking provision without consent
No PD for domestic Microgeneration Equipment
Landscaping scheme to be submitted (Full applications)
Tree protection
Landscaping management plan
Boundary treatment to be agreed
Reporting of unexpected contamination
New Water Efficiency level 4
Surface Water to be agreed
Standard Estate Road Conditions
Provision of Visibility Splays - Dimensioned in Condition
Provision of Parking and Servicing Areas - Where shown on plan
Highway Improvements - Offsite

Subject to a 106 agreement providing for a 'claw-back clause' for developer contributions towards affordable housing.

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
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
Policy 3 – Energy and water
Policy 4 – Housing delivery
Policy 15 – Service villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2 Planning History
2.1 2008/0074 - Proposed residential development comprising 8no dwellings & garages and ancillary works. Withdrawn

3 Consultations

3.1 Parish Council: Original scheme: Refuse
- Does not make a positive contribution to historic environment
- Interruption of wall will be detrimental to overall setting
- Highway safety concerns
Amended scheme: Refuse due to serious concerns regarding access
- Access onto a heavily used highway by villages and ‘rat run’ traffic for A140 & A143, bus route, parked traffic and delivery vehicles, concerned therefore the proposal will endanger the highway safety and prejudice the free flow of traffic onto highway network.

3.2 District Member: Can be delegated

3.3 NCC Highways: Original scheme: Refuse
- Inadequate visibility splays
Amended scheme:
- Conditional support

3.4 Historic Environment Service: Conditional support

3.5 Housing Strategy Manager: No objections subject to a ‘claw-back clause’ requiring contributions towards affordable housing.

3.6 Police Architectural Liaison Officer: No objections

3.7 Environmental Services (Protection): No comments received

3.8 Conservation Officer: Original scheme: Refuse
- Poor quality design
- Will not preserve or enhance the conservation area
- Inadequate information
Amended scheme:
- Conditional support

3.9 Landscape Officer: Conditional support

3.10 Planning Policy: No objections

3.11 Ecologist - David White: No comments received

3.12 Local Residents: Original scheme:
- 4 letters of support
  - Well designed and will enhance the village
  - Housing needed within the village
  - Will transform a neglected and unsightly area of the village
- 1 letter of objection
  - No spaces allocated to owners of Old Reading Room
  - Loss of light
  - Loss of privacy
  - Impact on existing wildlife
Development Management Committee  6 June 2012

- Traffic congestion and highway safety concerns
  Amended scheme:
  2 letters of support
- Scole will benefit from more housing
- Entirely appropriate for the area
- Housing is in keeping with local building structure and design
  2 letters of objection
- Cause considerable traffic congestion
- Highway danger
- Have not provided the Old Reading Room with parking
- Detrimental impact on residents of Old Reading room
- Overdevelopment
- Out of keeping with character of Scole

4 Assessment

4.1 This application seeks planning consent for the erection of 8 dwellings and garages, located off The Street and to the rear of the Old Reading Room, Scole. The site is considered to be a key site within the Scole Conservation Area, with listed buildings located to the west and opposite including the Grade I listed Scole Inn. An existing wall runs along the site frontage. Two storey residential terrace to the north, bungalow to northeast, cottage to the east, and the Old Reading Room which was converted to a residential property under 1998 planning consent. The site itself was it is believed to be a former nursery, is overgrown vacant land with mature trees running to the east.

4.2 The site falls within the development boundary for the village of Scole and is identified as a service Village under the JCS. and as such there is a principle in favour of residential development and the proposal is considered to accord with policy 15.

4.3 This application has been subject to a number of pre-application discussions following the withdrawal of the 2008 application. However the original submitted scheme still raised a number of issues in relation to design, layout and highway safety. There have been further negotiations with both the highway officer and ourselves which has resulted in the amended scheme being submitted. It is considered that the revised scheme represents a high quality design, which positively enhances the conservation area and will not adversely affect the setting of the nearby listed buildings. The scheme has been carefully designed to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties and with the imposition of the conditions as suggested, I do not consider that the proposal would give rise to a situation so detrimental to the amenities of the neighbours as to warrant refusal on this ground. The concerns raised by the highway officer have been resolved and he does not raise any objections to the proposed development subject to conditions.

4.4 During the time the application has been live there has been a change in policies with the adoption of the JCS and more recently the NPPF. JCS Policy 4 - Housing delivery requires a proportion of affordable housing provision with sites of 5-9 dwellings providing 20%. The JCS states that the proportion of the affordable housing sought may be reduced, where it can be demonstrated that site characteristics, including infrastructure provision, together with the requirement for affordable housing would render the site unviable. The applicant has been in discussions with us in respect of the provision and I am satisfied that the proposed scheme would not be viable/deliverable if there was a requirement to provide a commuted sum or affordable housing units on the site. It is considered important however that the consent is subject to a section 106 agreement with an uplift clause/claw back clause requiring a financial contribution for affordable housing should the open market property prices increase sufficiently to alter the current viability of the scheme at the time the proposed open market housing units are sold.

4.5 Whilst I fully appreciate the concerns raised by the Parish Council and local residents as set out above, the Highway officer has raised no objections to the amended scheme and I
therefore do not consider the proposal could be refused on highway safety grounds. As set out above, I consider the proposal is acceptable in terms of its design and layout; I do not consider it has a significant impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties and the none provision of parking for units that do not form part of the application site would not be reason to recommend refusal.

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 accordance with Policy 2 Promoting good design; Policy 3: Energy and water and Policy 15: Service villages of the Joint Core Strategy; and IMP18 Development in conservation areas, IMP8 Safe and free flow of traffic and IMP9 Residential amenity of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the layout of the site and form of dwellings is appropriate for the area; it will not have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of neighbouring properties or highway safety; and the development will enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis, 01508 533788,
and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3. **Appl. No.** : 2011/1781/F  
**Parish** : CLAXTON  
**Applicants Name** : Mr G. Hopkins  
**Site Address** : 2 Staines Barn, Church Lane, Claxton  
**Proposal** : Reconstruction of barn and conversion to residential.  
**Recommendation** : Approve with conditions  
1. Works to commence within six months  
2. In accordance with submitted amendments  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. No additional openings  
5. No satellite dishes, tanks etc  
6. No PD for fences, walls etc  
7. No PD for Classes ABCDE & G  
8. Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
9. Provision of parking and turning area

4. **Appl. No** : 2011/1645/F  
**Parish** : CLAXTON  
**Applicants Name** : Mr J. Fiander  
**Site Address** : 1 Staines Barn, Church Lane, Claxton  
**Proposal** : Reconstruction of barn to form a kitchen/dining room extension to Barn 1.  
**Recommendation** : Approve with conditions  
1. Barn Conversion - time limit  
2. In accordance with submitted amendments  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. No additional openings  
5. No satellite dishes, tanks etc  
6. No PD for Classes ABCDE & G

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Section 6 – Delivering a wide choice of quality homes

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 10: Adaptation and re-use of existing rural buildings for residential purposes (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/0181 Conversion of Agricultural Barn to Residential. New application, Works have started  
Approved

2.2 2011/0180 Conversion of use from Agriculture to Residential  
Approved

2.3 2005/2234/F Conversion of barns to 3no residential dwellings including proposals to regularise unapproved  
Refused
### 2. Development Management Committee Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Description of Application</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4 2005/1344/F</td>
<td>Conversion of barns to 3no residential dwellings</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 2002/2349/F</td>
<td>Conversion of barn to 3no residential dwellings</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 1995/0124/F</td>
<td>Renewal of permission 1993/0220, conversion of redundant farm buildings to 3 residential dwellings</td>
<td>Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 1993/0220/F</td>
<td>Conversion of redundant farm buildings to residential dwellings</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 1988/3437/F</td>
<td>Conversion of buildings to 3 residential units</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Consultations

#### 3.1 Parish Council
- Comments on original plans: Refuse
  - The barns have slowly deteriorated since the original approval in 2003, compounded by errors made by earlier contractors
  - The destruction of the barns has now reached the point where it is the considered view of the Parish Council that demolition is the preferred option
  - The Parish Council therefore objects to the approval of these applications on the grounds that the barns are no longer sustainable

#### 3.2 District Member
- To be reported if appropriate

#### 3.3 NCC Highways
- Comments on original plans
  - There is an issue with the site layout drawing in respect of the north side of the barns where the alignment of Slade Lane is shown incorrectly.
  - Comments on amended plan to be reported.

#### 3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)
- To be reported

#### 3.5 Conservation Officer
- Comments on original plans
  - Barn 2 has lost its roof, the structure that supported it and both gable ends leaving only the side walls in place – this is not reflected in the Design and Access Statement
  - Rebuilding would restore the group value of the barns but the proposals would be contrary to the policies normally applied to what would be a new building in the countryside as it could not be said to be a conversion

- Comments on revised plans
  - No issues with revisions to layout
  - Rebuilding is contrary to policy but would agree that reconstruction of Barn 2 would restore the group value of the barns and make for a better scheme if an
exception can be made under policy

- Would suggest a tight timescale for commencement if this is possible

3.6 Ecologist : No response received

3.7 Public Right of Way : No objection

3.8 Local Residents : On original plans

- 3 letters of objection
- Site should be returned to agricultural use
- The first application was in 1988 and over the years the barn complex has fallen into a dilapidated state whilst the last building phase in 2003 turned it into the total dereliction seen today
- The descriptions in the supporting statement gives the impression that there is a standing building when there is only a floor and partial walls
- The plans show parking and turning over the public right of way, whilst the position of the garage means the vehicles will be passing over the byway which is used regularly by farm vehicles, walkers and horses
- Residents cannot use the concrete pad which is needed by Claxton Manor Estate, does the scheme therefore meet parking standards for these three properties?
- Barn 2 has no access to the courtyard door, except to park and walk around the outside of the building
- Unusual parking arrangements with shared garages
- Spraying with tar and the spreading of pea shingle is not appropriate in this rural setting as the passage of farm traffic will break up the surface, the exact position of the road needs to be defined
- Use of the adjoining concrete pad incompatible with close proximity of residential units
- Foul sewerage plant is directly opposite access to neighbouring dwelling and discharges into a ditch which flows into an agricultural irrigation reservoir. Failure of the plant could there lead to pathogens introduced directly into the human food chain by normal agricultural activities, pathogen contamination of surface water where livestock is grazing and contamination of the environment on Claxton Marsh

4. Assessment

4.1 The application site has a history of a series of planning consents for conversion of a complex of barns into three dwellings. The most recent of these consents, granted in 2003, was commenced in 2004. However the works carried out were not in accordance with the approved plans and lead to the partial collapse of a significant part of the complex, poor quality rebuilds of another part of the complex, and neglect of the main landmark barn. Further applications to rectify the situation in regard to all three units were not satisfactory and the barns were left to decay with further failures of sections of the building. Consent was finally granted last year (planning consents 2011/0180 and 0181) in regard to two of the barns which are largely still standing, but omitted the southernmost barn which had almost entirely collapsed. This barn was to have provided some accommodation for unit 1 to the front of the site and almost all the accommodation within unit 2. These applications now seek to reconstruct the barn to provide the additional accommodation for unit 1 (planning application 2011/1645) and for unit 2 (planning application 2011/1781) as originally intended.
The works to reconstruct Barn 2 go well beyond what would have been considered acceptable under policy HOU10 and would normally be refused unless there were material reasons to justify a departure from policy. Whilst, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does support development which “would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting” it is questionable to whether this in itself could provide policy justification for the reconstruction of the barn. Approval could only be considered as a departure from policy where there are significant material planning considerations to do so.

4.3 In approving planning applications 2011/0180 and 0181 it was accepted that the conversion to residential use was the most feasible prospect for resolving the issues at Staines Barns. Although it is noted that the view of local residents is that the barns should be returned to agricultural use, there is no realistic prospect of this happening. Whilst the conversions approved in applications 2011/0180 and 0181 could be carried out without approval of the development proposed in the current applications, it is clear this would leave an incongruent gap in the site where Barn 2 once stood. Reconstruction of this barn as proposed would allow for the complex of barns to be restored to their original form with clear benefits for the setting of the buildings and local landscape. Therefore it is accepted on balance that a departure from policy can be justified in this instance and the principle of development is acceptable.

4.4 The original plans as submitted raised a concern regarding the extent of land that forms part of the public highway. This issue was raised with the applicant to resolve and they have submitted additional information accordingly. At the time of writing this report, Norfolk County Council’s highways officer has yet to respond to the revised information and therefore their comments will be reported to Committee. No objections have been raised by the highway officer to the level of parking provided. In terms of the detailed design of the building itself, the Conservation Officer has no objection to the revised plans.

4.5 Objections have been raised to the sewage treatment works. However, the position and type of treatment works were approved in the previous approvals 2011/0180 and 0181 and therefore are unlikely to be unacceptable for this proposal. Environmental Services comments on the application and the concerns raised will be reported to Committee.

4.6 There have been some revisions to the originally submitted plans and supporting information which include minor design alterations and revisions to the supporting information to reflect and justify the level of reconstruction proposed. Any further comments made in response to the consultation on these amendments will be reported to Committee.

4.7 Subject to confirmation that the highway and sewage treatment issues are resolved, it is considered that the detailed design of the proposal is acceptable. The other main concern of the local residents and Parish Council remains the decaying state of the site. If Members are minded to agree the recommendation to grant permission it is proposed that a revised time limit condition is attached to the consent to require works to commence within six months of the date of permission to encourage a rapid recommencement of works on site to prevent any further decay and resolve the derelict appearance of the site.

5. Reasons for Approval for 2011/1645 & 1781

5.1 The proposed development is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 as, although the reconstruction of the barn in question does not comply with policy HOU10, the proposed development supports the conversion of adjoining redundant rural buildings which contribute positively to the local landscape and restores the group value of the complex of barns as a whole, thereby justifying this departure from policy. 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 / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.
Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:

Tim Barker, 01508 533801, tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No:** 2012/0469/F  
**Parish:** CHEDGRAVE/THURTON

- **Applicants Name:** Mr & Mrs David James  
- **Site Address:** Park Farm, Norwich Road, Thurton, Norfolk, NR14 6BQ  
- **Proposal:** Replacement dwelling at Park Farm, Langley Park, to include the demolition of the existing bungalow and garage

**Recommendation:** Approve with Conditions

1. Full - Planning Permission Time Limit  
2. In accordance with submitted amendments  
3. No occupation of new dwelling until existing dwelling demolished  
4. External materials to be agreed  
5. Window details to be agreed  
6. Specific details t.b.a. specification of green roof  
7. Black Flue  
8. No PD for fences, walls etc  
9. No PD for Classes ABCDE & G  
10. No colourwash of buildings etc  
11. Domestic Microgeneration Equipment  
12. Levels  
13. Boundary treatment  
14. Parking and turning  
15. Water efficiency  
16. Foul drainage details  
17. Contamination during construction  
18. Reversion of previous curtilage to agricultural land

Subject to a S106 to ensure the removal of the existing dwelling and reversion to agricultural land.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   Section 6 Delivering a choice of high quality homes  
   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  
   Policy 3: Energy and water

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   HOU 11: Replacement dwellings (Part Consistent)  
   ENV 5: Historic parklands (Part Consistent)  
   IMP 9: Residential amenity  
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No relevant history

3. **Consultations**
Development Management Committee  
6 June 2012

3.1 Thurton Parish Council : Approve
  • An acceptable design and environmentally friendly and fits

  Chedgrave Parish Council : No comment

  Langley with Hardley Parish Council : No comment
  • Langley school have a right of way over the foot path

3.2 District Member : No response

3.3 Garden History Society : No response

3.4 NCC Highways : No objection

3.5 English Heritage : Do not wish to offer any comments, application should be
determined in accordance with national and local policy
guidance

3.6 Historic Environment Service : No objection

3.7 Environmental Services (Protection) : Advisory support

3.8 Conservation Officer : Conditional support

3.9 Local Residents : No response

4. Assessment

4.1 The application for a replacement dwelling within Langley Park which is Grade II listed
Historic Parkland. The site is accessed from the A146 though the grade II listed Thurton
Gate Lodges. The land slopes up from the road the existing modern bungalow is located
at the top of the slope. It is proposed to replace the bungalow with a new two storey
dwelling which has a contemporary design to the west of the existing curtilage.

4.2 Policy HOU11 in the South Norfolk Plan permits the replacement of existing dwellings in
the open countryside, as long as there is no increase in dwellings on site, the replacement
dwelling is in the same position on the site or in a position which is less intrusive, the scale,
bulk, massing, design and landscape impact of the proposed dwelling respects the scale
and character of the existing site and surrounds and represents an improvement on the
existing dwelling. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policy
HOU11 in the South Norfolk Local Plan because it remains partially consistent with the
National Planning Policy Framework which resists new dwellings in the open countryside,
but does not place any restrictions on replacement dwellings.

4.3 It is proposed to locate the replacement dwelling further to the west, which will mean that
the proposed dwelling would not be seen as you enter the park land through the listed gate
lodges. As the proposed dwelling is not within the existing curtilage of the dwelling it is
technically contrary to policy HOU11. However myself and the Conservation and Design
Architect consider that there are visual benefits to the proposed location which outweigh
the policy criteria.

4.4 The design of the proposed dwelling has been negotiated to reduce its bulk and the choice
of materials including a sedium roof will help it to blend into the landscape. The proposed
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 - Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets, Policy 2 - Promoting good design and Policy 3 Energy and water of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy HOU11 – Replacement dwelling, ENV 5: Historic parklands, IMP9 – Residential amenity and IMP8 - Safe and free of traffic of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policy HOU11 in the South Norfolk Local Plan because it remains partially consistent with The National Planning Policy Framework which resists new dwellings in the open countryside, but does not place any restrictions on replacement dwellings. Saved policy ENV5 has also been given due weight because it is partially consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework but the site is in nationally designated historic parkland. Saved policies IMP9 and IMP8 in the South Norfolk Local Plan have been given due weight because they remain consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The proposed location of the replacement dwelling to the west of the existing dwelling will ensure that the dwelling is less prominent when viewed through the listed gate house. The dwelling has been designed to blend into the landscape of the Historic Parkland and does not raise any highway safety or amenity issues.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number   Helen Bowman, 01508 533833,  
and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2012/0502/F  
**Parish**: WICKLEWOOD

Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs M Goodwin  
Site Address: Sub-division of the garden of, Kecalde, 65 Church Lane, Wicklewood, Norfolk, NR18 9QH  
Proposal: Erection of detached 1.5 storey dwelling with attached garage  
Recommendation: Approve with conditions

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  
Section 10 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

1.2 Joint Core Strategy (JCS)  
Policy 1 – Addressing climate change and protecting environment assets  
Policy 2 – Promoting Good Design  
Policy 3 Energy and Water

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP)  
HOU 6: Development within the defined Development Limits of specified large villages (Non Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. Planning History
2.1 No recent history

3. Consultations
3.1 Parish Council: Comments on amended plans  
- Proposal is a two storey dwelling not 1.5 as indicated  
- Electricity cables to move to new position also requires excessively tall pole to raise cable sufficiently to accommodate the increased span  
- New pole will dominate the area as it is 2 feet in diameter compared to the existing one of 8” and be intrusive to the views from all neighbours.  
- Invade privacy of neighbours and block out light

3.2 District Member: To be determined by Committee  
- Loss of privacy and amenities of the adjoining occupiers will be adversely affected, concerns over massing and sunlight.  
- Comments on amended scheme remain unchanged.

3.3 NCC Highways: Support subject to parking and turning
Development Management Committee 6 June 2012

3.4 Historic Environment Services: Support conditionally – Subject to a programme of archaeological works

3.5 Environmental Services: Additional information required to assess impact of Air Source Heat Pump.

3.6 Local Residents: 14 Letters of objection
- Plot size too small when compared with other gardens in the area
- Property is 2 storey not 1.5 as described
- Impact the proposal will have on the Walnut Tree, this is not adequately surveyed on the plans.
- The revised scheme to slightly reduce the size of the property still results in a property too large for the plot.
- Plot more suited to a single storey dwelling.
- The revised plan appears to move the dwelling closer to No 1 therefore off-setting the benefit of moving the proposed building forward on the plot. Property will still dominate neighbouring properties.
- First floor window on front elevation will overlook private rear garden of 63 Church Lane.
- All Saints Close was originally for only 13 dwellings, a further 6 have since been built all served by a narrow road, a further dwelling will result in more congestion, particularly during construction. Delivery lorries already block the road, this will only be made worse by another dwelling.
- The height of the property and proximity will mean it has a significant negative effect on the available light to No 1 All Saints and 54 Hackford Road, this is not changed by the amended proposal.
- Proximity to boundary of neighbouring properties is not in keeping.
- Air Source Heat Pump while proving benefits to the environment may produce significant noise; this has not been addressed by the revised scheme.
- Use of wood cladding as materials not in keeping with other properties in the surrounding area
- New electricity pole will be 11.5 metres above ground
- View of the sky is totally removed from North facing window and replaced by the proposed buildings.

4. Assessment

4.1 The site sub-divides the existing garden of No 65 Church Lane which is a two storey dwelling with an access off Church Lane and a vehicle access off All Saints Close adjacent to an electric sub-station. The property to the east of the site (No 1 All Saints Close) is a two storey property, as is No 63 which is directly opposite the site albeit orientated gable end onto All Saints Close and 54 Hackford Road which adjoins the south boundary of the site. Properties Nos 2 and 6 All Saints Close are both single storey properties.

4.2 The site is within the Development Limits of Wicklewood which is also designated as a Service Village in the JCS. Policies in the JCS, Local Plan and requirements of the NPPF seek to ensure that proposals are in an appropriate location, are of good design and do not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties 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 or part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.
4.3 Policy HOU6 is not consistent with the NPPF in terms of restricting the number of dwellings within a settlement, however the NPPF still requires development to be in sustainable locations and designed to be in keeping with the locality.

4.4 The plan as originally submitted proposed a dwelling measuring 7.4 metres to ridge with a small pitched roof dormer window on the front elevation, a lower gable wing on the east boundary dropping further to the double garage which was to have a hipped roof. On the rear of the property the windows were designed to minimise overlooking to the neighbouring properties comprising 4 velux windows to serve a dressing room, en-suite and two for the third bedroom. The only other window is a pitched roof dormer serving a bathroom with obscure glazing.

4.5 The siting of the property was set further back within the plot to allow space to access the garages and turn within the site. However, the position in the plot did cause concern regarding the impact on the neighbouring property.

4.6 At the request of the neighbours I met on site to assess the impact of the scale and bulk of the proposed dwelling and the loss of privacy to the properties to the side and rear of the proposed dwelling.

4.7 A conservatory is sited to the rear of No 1 All Saints Close, from this point and from the area of garden most used as a patio area, I considered that the scale and position of the proposed dwelling, while not resulting in any substantial loss of privacy, would result in development causing an overbearing feeling to the neighbouring property. The loss of light to a bedroom window was also raised. While I acknowledge that this would be unfortunate, I do not consider that on this issue alone there is justification to refuse the proposal, however, I did consider that the scheme needed to be amended to reduce the impact of the scale of the proposal.

4.8 Following discussion with the agent, an amended scheme has been submitted which removes the double garage from the front, allowing the property to be moved further forward within the plot and reduced the overall scale slightly therefore reducing the impact on the neighbouring property. The height of the property has reduced from 7.4 metres to 7.2, and now proposes a single hipped-roof garage on the west elevation of the property. In terms of the scale of proposal in the available plot, I consider that it is in keeping with other plots in the area and that the amended proposal accords with the principles of the NPPF.

4.9 The scheme has been designed to ensure that any overlooking to the neighbouring properties is minimal. First floor windows in the rear elevation are velux windows with the exception of a bathroom window which is obscure glazed. To ensure the future protection of privacy to the neighbours a condition is proposed to removed Permitted Development Rights for the further installation of any first floor windows in the rear elevation. This is not considered necessary for the side elevation as legislation already restricts the height and/or glazing required in any side facing windows. This aspect of the proposal is considered to accord with the principles of policy IMP9 which remains consistent with the NPPF.

4.10 The amended siting of the dwelling is slightly closer to No 1 All Saints Close. Originally it was 3.2 metres from the boundary at the widest point dropping down to 1 metre. The revised siting moves the dwelling closer by 1 metre at the furthest point and 1 metre at the closest point. However, the revised siting reduces the bulk and dominance of the new dwelling but I accept there is no difference in terms of the loss of light to the first floor window of No 1 All Saints Close. I now consider that although the new dwelling will be visible from the conservatory and garden of No 1 and the property to the rear of the site (No 54 Hackford Road) the scheme is now acceptable and accords with the principles of policy IMP9 which remains consistent with the NPPF.

4.11 Neighbours have suggested that the use of timber cladding would be out of keeping with
4.12 The Walnut tree is to be retained and protected during construction and thereafter. There is some question regarding the accuracy of the canopy shown on the drawing and whether the proposed protection zone is adequate to safeguard the tree. At the time of this report I have not received a response from the Landscape Officer however, this will be reported at Committee.

4.13 Concern has been raised by the local residents regarding a covenant which was imposed when permission was granted for the original 13 dwellings. Although the outline and reserved matters applications were for 13 dwellings (now forming All Saints Close), there is no planning restriction on further development in principle, subject to detailed assessment.

4.14 The access to the proposed plot is off All Saints Close, the kerb at this point is already lowered providing an access adjacent to the existing sub-station and the rear garden of No 65 Church Lane.

4.15 It is accepted that All Saints Close is narrow, however, the scheme as proposed is supported by the County Highways Officer subject to parking and turning being provided. I therefore consider that the scheme accords with the principles of policy IMP8 which remains consistent with the NPPF.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2 and 3 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies HOU6, 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 or part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework. While Policy HOU6 is not consistent with the NPPF, the scheme is in a sustainable location, and has been designed to be sympathetic to the surrounding location and the neighbouring properties and is therefore consistent with Sections 6 and 7 of the NPPF.

5.2 The sub-division of the plot still provides an adequate garden and parking for the existing property while providing a new dwelling on a plot that is in keeping with the general character of other dwellings in the close. The design and siting of the dwelling as amended minimised the loss of privacy and general impact on the neighbouring properties, while the condition restricting further first floor windows in the rear elevation will ensure the future privacy of the neighbouring properties to the side and rear of the proposed new dwelling.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson, 01508 533837, jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No** : 2012/0634/H  
**Parish** : WRENINGHAM  

**Applicants Name** : Mr Justin Grady  
**Site Address** : The Poplars, Ashwellthorpe Road, Wreningham, Norfolk, NR16 1AW  
**Proposal** : Replacement of window with doors to garden room.  

**Recommendation** : Approve with conditions  

1. **Full Planning Permission Time Limit**  
2. In accordance with submitted details and drawings  
3. **Specific details to be agreed**

---

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent with NPPF)

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/0635 Replacement of window with doors to garden room Pending determination  
2.2 2010/2208 & 2209 Proposed demolition of lean to roof and replacement with garden room. Addition of new porch Approved  
2.3 2010/1201 & 1202 Proposed demolition of lean to roof and replacement with garden room. Addition of new porch Withdrawn  
2.4 2003/2279 Proposed conversion of existing barn to garage with insertion of new windows & doors in main house Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council** : No comments received  
3.2 **District Member** : To be reported if appropriate  
3.3 **English Heritage** : Do not wish to comment in detail but offer the following observations:  
- The Poplars has been subject to a no. of applications for relatively small alterations to the south and east elevations  
- Present application continues this approach and is not objectionable in principle  
- In earlier advice on the proposed garden room EH noted that a proposed roof light would “spoil the simplicity and consistency of roof form and materials”  
  - Also concerned about the visual impact of [the rooflight] but more so as it affects the core historic building  
  - The attic room is already illuminated by gable end
windows but it may be that a traditional dormer window could sit comfortably in the proposed position (without the loss of primary historic fabric of significance)

- If that does not prove practical I would recommend the roof light is deleted before consent is granted
- Application should be determined in accordance with national & local policy guidance and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice

3.4 Conservation Officer : Original comments

- Recommend approval subject to condition to agree: new joinery details & finishes, colour finish of flue, new bricks, brick sample panel, material finishes and elevation details for fireplace

Updated comments

- No objection to the proposed rooflight
- At the size proposed it would not interrupt the simplicity of the existing form so as to be detrimental to the existing character and appearance
- Will not be visible in the more important views directly from the side and front garden areas
- To install a dormer would require more historic fabric to be removed
- Rooflight specified is from the Conservation Rooflight Company which would provide the best appearance compared with most other rooflight suppliers

3.5 Local Residents : No comments received

4. Assessment

4.1 The application dwelling is a Grade II* listed building dating from the late sixteenth century. The property is located within the Village Boundary of Wrenningham and is set back from the road frontage within a substantial plot. There is an equestrian site, with associated buildings, to the south and west of the application site.

4.2 Policies in the NPPF, JCS and Local Plan seek to ensure that the special interest of Listed Buildings is not harmed by development. Policy IMP13 is more restrictive than the NPPF, however the current proposal is considered to comply with national and local policy. 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 current proposal includes internal alterations to the layout of the main dwelling, the addition of a flue to the south elevation roof slope and the insertion of a conservation rooflight into the west elevation (rear) roof slope.

4.4 There have been no objections received to the internal alterations to the property or to the addition of the flue to the roof. The Conservation Officer has advised that the internal alterations would result in the removal of late twentieth century partition walls and that the development would result in an improved appearance to the internal ground floor area.

4.5 The Conservation Officer has noted that details relating to the new fireplace, including its finish, have not been specified but that these matters could be agreed by condition. A condition requiring the following details to be agreed is therefore suggested should planning permission be granted: an agreed specification for the new joinery details and finishes, colour finish of the flue, details of the new bricks and pantiles (including the
4.6 English Heritage has raised concerns about the insertion of the roof light and its impact on the core historic building. They have suggested that the roof light could be replaced with a traditional dormer window or alternatively should be removed from the current proposals.

4.7 The applicants have confirmed that they wish to retain the proposed roof-light and have advised that it has been positioned so that it would not require any alterations to the existing original oak purlins or rafters.

4.8 The Conservation Officer has subsequently advised that in his view the proposed roof light would be less visible than a dormer and would also have less of an impact on the historic fabric of the building.

4.9 On balance, I do not feel that works proposed to the Listed Building would result in harm to the character, appearance or fabric of the building as the alterations would not harm either key views of the Listed Building or its historic core. I therefore consider that the proposals accord with those policies set out in the NPPF, the JCS and the Local Plan and 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 1 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP13 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 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 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The alterations to the Listed Building will not result in harm to the special interest of the building and the external alterations will not be visible in key views of the property.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Kate Fisher, 01508 533985, kfisher@s-norfolk.gov.uk
# PLANNING APPEALS

Appeals received from 9 May 2012 to 25 May 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish/Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/2059</td>
<td>THORPE ABBOTTS Annexe at Haggle House, Scole Road</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs C Lister</td>
<td>Use of existing residential annexe as a separate dwelling house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/0115</td>
<td>KESWICK The Exchange, Mulbarton Road</td>
<td>Mr B Moss</td>
<td>Conservatory to side and dormer to side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/0339</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON 3 Lime Tree Avenue</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mr T Watts</td>
<td>Enlarged dormer to front of property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appeal decisions from 9 May 2012 to 25 May 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>