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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

11/07/2012
The Development Management process is primarily concerned with issues of land use and has been set up to protect the public and the environment from the unacceptable planning activities of private individuals and development companies.

The Council has a duty to prepare Local Development Documents (DPDs) to provide a statutory framework for planning decisions. The Development Plan for South Norfolk currently consists of a suite of documents. The primary document which sets out the overarching planning strategy for the District and the local planning policies is the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. The Strategy is broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and accompanying technical guidance and was adopted by South Norfolk Council in March 2011. It is the starting point in the determination of planning applications and as it has been endorsed by an independent Planning Inspector the policies within the plan can be given full weight when determining planning applications. South Norfolk Council is also in the process of preparing its Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD, Area Action Plans and Development Management DPD. These documents will allocate specific areas of land for development, define settlement boundaries and provide criterion based policies giving a framework for assessing planning applications.

In accordance with legislation planning applications must be determined in accordance with the policies of the Development Plan, unless material considerations which are relevant to planning indicate otherwise.

The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to achieve sustainable development. The core planning principles contained within the NPPF are summarised as:

- To be genuinely plan-led
- To drive and support sustainable economic development
- Seek high quality design
- Conserve and enhance the natural environment
- Encourage the effective use of land
- Conserve heritage assets

The factors to be used in determining applications will relate to the effect on the “public at large” and will not be those that refer to private interests. Personal circumstances of applicants “will rarely” be an influencing factor, and then only when the planning issues are finely balanced.

**THEREFORE we will:**

- Acknowledge the strength of our policies,
- Be consistent in the application of our policy, and
- If we need to adapt our policy, we will do it through the Local Plan process.

Decisions which are finely balanced, and which contradict policy will be recorded in detail, to explain and justify the decision, and the strength of the material planning reasons for doing so.

**LOCAL COUNCILS**

**OCCASIONALLY, THERE ARE CONFLICTS WITH THE VIEWS OF THE PARISH OR TOWN COUNCIL. WHY IS THIS?**

We ask local parish and town councils to recognise that their comments are taken into account. Where we disagree with those comments it will be because:

- Districts look to ‘wider’ policies, and national, regional and county planning strategy.
- Other consultation responses may have affected our recommendation.
- There is an honest difference of opinion.
AGENDA

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

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

3. To receive Declarations of Interest from Members;
   (Please see flowchart and guidance attached, page 7)

4. Minutes of the Development Management Committee held on 6 June 2012, 20 June 2012 and 22 June 2012;
   (attached – page 9)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;

   To consider the applications as listed below:

<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>2011/2050/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land west of Brittons Farm, Wramplingham Road, Downham</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2012/1068/RVC</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Costessey Transfer Station, Longwater Business Park</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2007/1560</td>
<td>PULHAM ST MARY</td>
<td>Old Maltings, Pulham St Mary</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2010/0014/F</td>
<td>HEMPNALL</td>
<td>Queens Head, Mill Road</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2012/0498/RVC</td>
<td>BERGH APTON</td>
<td>Anteros Arts Centre, Loddon Road, Bergh Apton</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2012/0509/F</td>
<td>THARSTON &amp; HAPTON</td>
<td>Saffron Barn, Swan Lane, Tharston</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2012/0645/F</td>
<td>GREAT MOULTON</td>
<td>Land at Little Orchard, Woodrow Lane</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2012/0789/F</td>
<td>STOKE HOLY CROSS</td>
<td>Roger Johns, Long Lane, Stoke Holy Cross</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2012/0791/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>9 - 11 Town Green, Wymondham</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2012/0792/LB</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>9 - 11 Town Green, Wymondham</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2012/0903/A</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>121 Computers Services Ltd, 105 Victoria Road</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2012/0959/F</td>
<td>GREAT MOULTON</td>
<td>Meadow View, The Haulage Yard, Broadgate Lane</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2012/1003/A</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Loddon Water Mill, 45 Bridge Street</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2012/1004/LB</td>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Loddon Water Mill, 45 Bridge Street</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Sites Sub-Committee;

Please note that the Sub-Committee will only meet if a site visit is agreed by the Committee with the date and membership to be confirmed.

7. Planning Appeals (for information) (attached – page 100)
1. GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING THE NEED TO VISIT AN APPLICATION SITE

The following guidelines are to assist Members 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 or relationships between site boundaries/existing buildings are difficult to envisage other than by site assessment;

(ii) The impacts of new proposals on neighbour amenity e.g. shadowing, loss of light, physical impact of structure, 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, e.g. 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.

2. PUBLIC SPEAKING: PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

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

**TIMING:** In front of you there are two screens which tell you how long you have left of your three minutes. After four minutes the circle on the screen turns amber and then it turns red after 5 minutes, at which point the Chairman will ask you to come to a conclusion.

**MICROPHONES:** In front of you there is a microphone which we ask you to use. Simply press the button to turn the microphone on and off

**WHAT CAN I SAY AT THE MEETING?** Please try to be brief and to the point. Limit your views to the planning application and relevant planning issues, for example: Planning policy, (conflict with policies in the Local Plan/Structure Plan, government guidance and planning case law), including previous decisions of the Council, design, appearance and layout, possible loss of light or overshadowing, noise disturbance and smell nuisance, impact on residential and visual amenity, highway safety and traffic issues, impact on trees/conservation area/listed buildings/environmental or nature conservation issues.
HEALTH AND SAFETY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire alarm</th>
<th>If the fire alarm sounds please make your way to the nearest fire exit. Members of staff will be on hand to escort you to the evacuation point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phones</td>
<td>Please switch off your mobile phone or put it into silent mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td>The toilets can be found on your right and left of the lobby as you enter the Council Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>There will be a short comfort break after two hours if the meeting continues that long</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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 |
### 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 (Detail following outline consent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Full (details included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Householder – Full application relating to 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

- **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
Application referred back to Committee

1. Appl. No     : 2011/2050/F
   Parish       : WYMONDHAM

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

   1. Unsustainable location and intrusion into countryside contrary to JCS Policy 1, SNLP policy ENV8 and NPPF paragraph 55.
   2. Design not of sufficient exceptional quality to justify approval under paragraph 55 of NPPF.

Background

This application was considered by the Third Wednesday Planning Committee on 21 March 2012 when it was resolved to refuse permission. Before the decision notice could be issued however, the Government issued the National Planning Policy Framework which had immediate effect, including the cancellation of previous Policy Guidance on which the resolution to refuse had been based. As a result, the decision notice was not issued and the application was consequently not formally determined. The applicant has taken the opportunity offered to submit amended proposals for further consideration. The following report has been updated with the result of re-consultations, updated policy and assessment of the revised proposal.

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework

   Previous national policy guidance (PPS 7) on dwellings being allowed in the countryside as an exception to normal policy has been replaced with paragraph 55 of the NPPF (see assessment section).

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

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

2. Planning History

2.1 None relevant

3. Consultations

3.1 Wymondham Town Council : Original Proposal:
   Refused
   - Contrary policy ENV8 – development in countryside not justified.
   - Contrary PPS 7.
Revised Proposal:
• Views have not changed. Accept may accord with policy if Design Officer is satisfied.

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

Revised Proposal:
No further comments received

3.3 NCC Highways :
• Request further detail of access to show visibility splays.
• Note location of dwelling is remote from any settlement with essential services and facilities. The nearest bus stops are in Great Melton and Wramplingham Village. The development would consequently conflict with PPS1 as interpreted in Local Transport Plan Policy which encourages development to be located so as to minimise the need to travel and reduce the reliance on the private car. (Not re-consulted as access has not changed)

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection):
• In absence of main sewer, would require details of foul water drainage to be agreed.
• If biomass boiler is to be installed then further details should be submitted and agreed. (agent has advised ground source heat pump is now to be used instead)
• Fully supports the sustainable surface water management proposed.

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

Revised Proposal:
• Refuse – see para 4.8.

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

Revised Proposal:
No further comments received

4. Assessment

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

4.2 The revisions to the original submission involve a reduction in the footprint of the building by 30cm all round. The highest part of the roof has been reduced in height by 70cm, the lower section by 20cm and the garage element has also been reduced to further break the massing of the elevations. The gross floor area of the building has reduced from 305sqm to 290 sqm. Elevation treatments have been simplified with the use of render rather than exposed timber framing around the wall modules.
4.3 The application site is located approximately 1.5km from Wramplingham and 2km from the edge of the built up area of Wymondham. It is adjacent and to the rear of a group of 3 dwellings comprised of Brittons Farmhouse and two other dwellings created by conversion of farm buildings. This group of dwellings is set within a site with mature trees and vegetation in an area otherwise characterised by generally open arable land. The proposed dwelling would occupy a triangular area of uncultivated land with its eastern boundary against the rear curtilage of the existing dwellings and a hedge along its north boundary. The south-western boundary is open to the arable land beyond. Access would be via an existing field entrance and along a private drive passing along the north side of Brittons farm, then turning south into the site through a gap to be formed in the hedge line.

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

4.5 No special agricultural or similar need has been advanced for the dwelling, but the applicant suggests that the particular design of the proposal justifies granting permission, contrary to normal policy, by reference to paragraph 55 of the NPPF. Although the wording has been altered, this paragraph contains a similar policy to the exception policy previously contained in paragraph 11 of PPS7. The new policy in paragraph 55 of the NPPF states as follows.

“To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Local Planning Authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as:

- the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside; or
- where such development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets; or
- where the development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting; or
- the exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design of the dwelling. Such a design should:
  - be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas;
  - reflect the highest standards in architecture;
  - significantly enhance its immediate setting; and
  - be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.”

4.6 The above extract (of which the final bullet point is most relevant) contains a number of key words and phrases that are clearly open to interpretation. The extent to which any particular proposal satisfies the requirements will be a matter of judgement. It is clear, however, that the clause is intended only to be satisfied as an exception and should consequently be applied with care to avoid undermining the normal restrictive approach to isolated dwellings in the countryside.

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

- Dwelling to achieve Code Level 6.
Development Management Committee 18 July 2012

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

4.8 The Council’s Conservation, Design and Landscape Manager did not support the original submission when assessed against PPS7. He has noted the exception clause now in NPPF paragraph 55 quoted above, and comments on the revised submission as follows.

“A revised Design & Access Statement has been submitted in support of the proposal. However, this has been presented in a confused manner by quoting both paragraph 55 of the NPPF and Clause 11 of PPG7 which has now been superseded. Although the approach to the design in terms of sustainability, construction methods and proposed materials is commendable as previously acknowledged, I remain unconvinced that the changes which have now been made have resulted in a design which is of ‘exceptional quality’ and ‘truly outstanding’. Limited changes have been made to the scale of the building which is still relatively large for a single storey dwelling, particularly in relation to the existing buildings on the adjacent site, along with some revisions to the architectural treatment of the elevations including the omission of the timber framing to the panelling, which in my view, is a retrograde step, resulting if anything, in a less distinctive design. There is little in the way of analysis of the site and its context and the character of the existing, adjacent buildings and how the design has evolved in response to this. There continues to be a reference to a random selection of photographs of ‘Norfolk Barns’ rather than the more specific form and character of the existing buildings which have a less dominant roof form for example.

The scheme does not in my view satisfy the stringent requirements of para 55 of the NPPF and I cannot therefore support the proposal and would recommend refusal.”

4.9 I consider that the new exception clause in the NPPF is difficult to interpret and apply (as was the previous policy). For example, if a proposal uses sustainable construction techniques (however good) that have been used elsewhere, is it truly “innovative”? I understand that the current proposal utilises materials and techniques that may not be unique in themselves, but they would clearly serve as an exemplar of good practice and perhaps encourage more sustainable building techniques in this area if they prove successful. The applicant’s agent points out that only 55 of 115,000 houses built in 2011 achieved Code Level 6, so that the proposed Code 6 dwelling should still be regarded as innovative. They also stress that the NPPF introduces a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

4.10 The proposed design seeks to be “sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area” by adopting a traditional barn form, but the judgement of whether this particular scheme “reflects the highest standards in architecture” is bound to involve a degree of subjective opinion. While the design clearly includes highly sustainable characteristics, the Conservation, Design and Landscape Manager does not consider that the overall quality of the design is sufficiently exceptional to justify approval under the NPPF exception clause.
4.11 Detailed issues relating to the access and foul drainage have arisen, but these are not crucial to the principle of the development and could be resolved via planning condition if required.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The proposed dwelling would occupy an unsustainable location remote from facilities and services, and would intrude into any area of generally undeveloped countryside to the detriment of its character and appearance. Such a development would conflict with policies regarding the location of new development as contained in the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 55, the Joint Core Strategy Policy 1 and South Norfolk Local Plan Policy ENV8.

5.2 The proposed design is not of such exceptional quality that it justifies granting permission as a departure from normal policy as provided for in paragraph 55 of the NPPF.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Trett, 01508 533794, ctrett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Application to be determined by Norfolk County Council

2. **Appl. No**: 2012/1068/RVC  
   **Parish**: COSTESSEY

   **Applicants Name**: Mr Mat Nicholson (FCC Environment)  
   **Site Address**: Costessey Transfer Station, Longwater Business Park, Costessey  
   **Proposal**: Variation of conditions 2, 5, 8, 15 and 16 of permission C/7/2012/7015 to allow alterations of building and site layout

   **Recommendation**: That the County Council be advised that this Council raises no objection to the application.

1. **The Proposal**

   1.1 At the present time this Transfer Station takes in waste from which recyclable materials are extracted and the residue is sent to land-fill. This application proposes to introduce additional processing of the waste to extract more recyclable material and produce a combustable material from the residue (Refuse Derived Fuel or RDF). The extra process would take place inside the building, but the RDF, after being baled and wrapped in plastic, would be stored externally.

   1.2 To accommodate the additional process various changes are required to conditions of the existing planning permission, a copy of which is attached as Appendix 2.

   - Revised plans to be approved revising the site layout and alterations to the building to add 2 extra roller doors and a conveyor to the external storage bays. (Condition 2)
   - Revised scheme of working to include the RDF production process. (Condition 5)
   - Permit handling and loading of RDF bales outside the building. (Condition 8)
   - Permit external storage of RDF bales in external areas in addition to other reclaimed materials currently permitted. (Conditions 15 and 16)

2. **Consultations**

   2.1 The County Council are the determining authority for this type of application and they undertake the consultations rather than South Norfolk Council who are a consultee.

   2.2 District and County Councillor Mr Tim East has provided comments however, which raise objections to the application, summarised as follows.

   - Increased dust and odour.
   - Hazard from storage of combustable RDF bales, including flammable gas.
   - Additional traffic.
   - Alternative treatments of waste residue such as digestion, fermentation and composting are more sustainable.

   2.3 I am also aware that Costessey Parish Council has raised similar objections with the County Council.

   2.4 Advice has been sought from our Environmental Services Team and they raise no objection to the proposal. Their comments are incorporated into the pollution section of the assessment below.
3. **Assessment**

3.1 In considering what response to give the County Council, I suggest the main issues are, the principle of RDF production at this site; visual impact; traffic impact; potential fire hazard; and pollution including noise and odour.

**Principle of RDF production**

3.2 This report does not attempt a detailed waste policy analysis. However, the main thrust of waste policy is to move waste up the Waste Hierarchy as set out below.

- Waste Prevention
- Re-use
- Recycle/Compost
- Energy Recovery
- Disposal

3.3 The application documents suggest that the current Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) at the site is no longer viable because more recyclable materials are being removed at source, so that the value of the waste arriving at the site is reduced. The increase in Land-Fill Tax is another contributory factor. The proposed new process enhances the recovery of recyclables and produces RDF for use at ‘Energy from Waste’ (EfW) plants elsewhere, rather than sending the non-recyclable material to landfill.

3.4 The Local Member argues that there are more sustainable methods of treating non-recyclable waste than sending it to EfW plants. This is clearly part of a wider strategic debate and is dependant on alternative technologies, and facilities to operate them, being available and viable. Energy from waste is at least one step up the Waste Hierarchy from the current practice of landfill and I do not consider the production of RDF can be said to be contrary to planning policy in principle. The merits or problems of EfW plants are not part of the assessment of the application before us.

**Visual Impact**

3.5 The external storage of RDF bales would be within external bays which are already used to store reclaimed materials. An overflow storage area is also proposed where stack height would be limited to 4 metres. Alterations to the building are minor in nature.

3.6 In view of the location of the site within the industrial area, the screening effect of buildings, and the current appearance of the site, I do not consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable appearance or harm the character of the area.

**Traffic Impact**

3.7 The applicants indicate that the type of waste processed, the sources of waste and the total volume of waste will not change as a result of the new proposal. They consequently argue that the volume of traffic to and from the site will not change since the vehicles currently exporting waste to landfill will simply be replaced by vehicles exporting RDF bales (there is still some residue from the process which will continue to go to land-fill). This appears a logical argument and suggests an objection on traffic grounds could not be sustained.
Fire Hazard

3.8 The applicant suggests that past instances of fire associated with RDF storage have involved much larger sites where RDF has been stored in greater bulk and for longer periods. It is pointed out that materials already stored at the site are also combustable.

3.9 This appears to be a matter of site management and there are obviously other Regulations that govern fire hazards on such sites. The potential hazard appears to be known and should consequently be controlled through other legislation. Although a relevant consideration, I do not consider this issue amounts to a reason to object to the planning application.

Pollution

3.10 As with the potential fire hazard issue, potential noise, odour and other pollution falls within the remit of the Environment Agency (EA) as a permitted facility under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010. The National Planning Policy Framework (para. 122) states that local planning authorities should not endeavour to control processes or emissions where these are subject to approval under pollution control regimes and should assume these regimes will operate effectively. Given proposed changes to the management of waste at the facility it is likely that it will require a revised permit. There are also existing planning conditions which provide controls at the site and this includes noise emissions in particular which will remain unaffected.

3.11 From the information provided by the applicant the RDF will be produced within the existing buildings from waste materials which are delivered as part of existing permissions. There is no evidence to suggest that the proposals are likely to increase emissions. It has been suggested that the proposed external storage creates additional risk. Again given proper levels of control and the plastic wrapping proposed for the bales this is not considered significant given baling is another way of managing existing waste types that are accepted on the site.

4. Conclusion

4.1 Although the County Council will consider the application as both the Waste Authority and Highways Authority, I find no reason for South Norfolk Council to object to the application.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chris Trett, 01508 533794, ctrett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL

Town and Country Planning Act, 1990

Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995

To: Waste Recycling Group: Katy Waller
    Ground Floor West
    900 Pavilion Drive
    Northampton Business Park
    Northampton
    NN4 7RG

Particulars of Proposed Development

Location: Costessey Transfer Station, Longwater Business Park

Applicant: Waste Recycling Group: Katy Waller

Agent: Waste Recycling Group: Katy Waller

Proposal: Variation of Condition 4 of Planning Permission C/7/08/7015 to allow additional plant and machinery to operate within the existing building

The Norfolk County Council hereby gives notice of its decision to PERMIT the development specified in the application and particulars deposited on the 26 April 2010, subject to compliance with the conditions set out on the attached sheet.

The reasons for the grant of permission and for the conditions are also set out on the attached sheets.

Signed: David Callinan Date: 23/07/10

For DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND DEVELOPMENT

Norfolk County Council
County Hall
Martineau Lane
Norwich
NR1 2SG

SEE NOTES ON ATTACHED SHEET
Schedule of Conditions & Reasons

Planning Ref. No. C/7/2010/7004

Location: Costessey Transfer Station, Longwater Business Park, Costessey, Norwich, Norfolk NR5 0TL

Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall commence not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.

2. The development must be carried out in strict accordance with the forms, the supporting statement, the letters received from the applicant’s agent on 8 April 2010 and 26 April 2010, attached to this notice and the following drawings:

   a) Site Location Plan drawing ref. 605T002 dated 12.05.06, received 26.04.10
   b) Planning Boundary plan drawing ref. 605A005 dated 18.11.09, received 26.04.10
   c) Ownership plan drawing ref. COS 001 dated 28.06.03, received 26.04.10

3. No material other than waste falling within categories 1, 2a, 2b and 3 shall be brought onto the site.

4. Noise caused by operations shall be attenuated and in any event shall not exceed 85 dB LA eq. (1 hour) at the boundaries of the site.

5. No operations shall take place except in accordance with the scheme of working submitted to the County Council on 31 July 2002 and approved on 22 August 2002, as amended by the details hereby approved.

6. No operation authorised or required under this permission shall take place other than during the following periods:

   - Trade waste:
     07.00 - 17.00 hours Mondays to Fridays
     07.00 - 13.00 hours Saturdays
     07.00 - 13.00 hours Sundays
     save that deliveries of waste from local authorities may be received between 13.00 - 17.00 hours on the Saturday immediately before and immediately after each public holiday.

   - Civic Amenity site:
     08.00 - 18.00 hours 1 January - 31 March & 1 October - 31 December
     08.00 - 20.00 hours 1 April - 30 September

7. No material shall be stored in the skips approved pursuant to planning permission C/7/2005/7007 other than waste falling within categories 1 and 2a and cement bonded asbestos within the two lockable containers approved pursuant to planning permission C/7/2009/7003.

8. There shall be no loading or unloading of vehicles save within the waste transfer building approved pursuant to planning permission C/7/1998/7015, except for

/Continued
Schedule of Conditions & Reasons

Planning Ref. No. C/7/2010/7004

Location: Costessey Transfer Station, Longwater Business Park, Costessey, Norwich, Norfolk NR5 0TL

Reasons:

9 - 12 To safeguard hydrological interests, to accord with the Minerals Local Plan Policy MIN 10.

13 - 16 To protect the amenities of the surrounding area, to accord with the Minerals Local Plan Policy MIN 6.

Reasons for the grant of permission:

The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Norfolk Waste Local Plan (saved policies) and the South Norfolk Local Plan (saved policies) set out below, and to all relevant material considerations. The introduction of additional machinery within the waste transfer building would not be detrimental to general levels of amenity and would be acceptable in all other respects including highway safety.

Waste Local Plan policy WAS 3 Industrial Land and Brownfield sites

South Norfolk Local Plan EMP 2 Distribution, nature and scale of employment development on unidentified sites

Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management
Application to Vary Section 106 Agreement

3. Request to be discharged of S106 legal agreement planning obligations in respect of planning permission 2007/1560 – the conversion of the Old Maltings, Pulham St Mary to 30 residential units.

1. Background

1.1 Planning permission was granted on 29 April 2008 to convert the Maltings to 30 dwellings. The permission was subject to a Section 106 agreement requiring contributions to be made in respect of education, libraries, Community Centre and Safer and Healthy Journeys to School.

1.2 Work commenced in 2008 and the trigger for some of the contributions was reached in November 2009. The developers at that time should have informed us that they had reached the trigger but did not do so. We first became aware that the trigger had been reached in January 2010 when we carried out our 6 monthly monitoring of the site.

1.3 The developers were contacted and advised they needed to pay the outstanding monies. Following further correspondence the developers requested that they be allowed to defer payment. We did not agree to that request.

1.4 Shortly after that the original developers went into administration and work ceased on site. In those circumstances there was no further action we could take at that time and, following legal advice, it was decided that we should wait until the site was sold to a new developer, who would be liable for the outstanding contributions.

1.5 Between October 2011 and March 2012 discussions took place with agents acting for potential new owners. An informal request was again made as to whether the Council would agree to the Section 106 contributions being waived. Following the submission of financial information from the agents we informed them that, although the final decision would be taken by the Planning Committee, we considered that such a request could not be supported by officers.

1.6 Work recommenced on site in May and once we became aware of this we contacted the agent for the new owners (Area Estates Ltd, part of the William Pears Group) seeking the outstanding monies. An e-mail was received from the agent accepting that the new owners were liable and requesting updated figures. These were provided and an invoice issued.

1.7 It was at this time that the agents acting on behalf of the developers made a formal request to be relieved of the outstanding obligations on the grounds of non-viability.

2. Consultations

2.1 Parish Council : To be reported.

2.2 District Member : To be reported if appropriate.

2.3 Pennoyers Community Centre : To be reported.
3. Current Position

3.1 Work is now continuing on site. The payments in respect of libraries and safer journeys to school were made in early 2010 before the previous developers went into administration. The affordable housing has also been provided as required.

3.2 Following the threat of the serving of an Injunction, authorised by members of Development Management Committee on the 20th June 2012, the following payments have now been received from the developers:

- Contribution to the Community Centre - £48,943.10
- First instalment of Education contributions - £32,331.00

3.3 A further payment of £32,331.00 is required in respect of education, but the trigger for this second payment is the occupation of the 20th dwelling on site, and this trigger has not yet been reached.

3.4 The threat of the serving of an Injunction has now been removed, and work continues on site.

3.5 An application to be discharged from the planning obligations (including those already paid), under s106A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) has now been made. It is requested that monies recently paid be refunded. This is attached as appendix 2 to this report.

4. Assessment

4.1 In requesting to be discharged from planning obligations, a clear case has to be made to satisfy us as to the economic and financial case. Indeed the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 205 states:

4.2 "Where obligations are being sought or revised, local planning authorities should take account of changes in market conditions over time and where appropriate, be sufficiently flexible to prevent planned development being stalled."

4.3 Whist the Council acknowledges the above advice, we are no longer dealing with the original developer, now in administration. The site is now in new ownership, having been purchased in full knowledge of the outstanding planning obligations and that works had been dormant on site for some time. The outstanding monies have been paid by the new owners of the site, and development continues on site.

4.4 Notwithstanding the above, the Council’s consultant valuer has considered the financial information and development appraisal submitted in support of the application, and whilst he does not agree with all aspects of the appraisal in overall terms, it is agreed that it represents a reasonable assessment of the likely outcome of the scheme based upon the information currently available. The appraisal shows a developer return of 19.84% on cost and 16.56% on the gross development value which is below the normal acceptable return of 20% on value.

4.5 However, I concur with the view of the valuer that it is unreasonable for the new owner to claim that the scheme is unviable to the extent that the s106 agreement should be varied, as a reasoned buyer will undertake proper due diligence. In this case this would have included taking account of outstanding and future s106 liabilities and the price paid should have reflected these. Based upon the information supplied and case made in support of the application I do not agree that that the price paid should not have taken full account of the s106 liabilities.
4.6 Taking into account the above I have concluded that the planning obligations should remain unchanged, and that there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to allow the public interest to be harmed through the loss of Community and Education contributions.

5. Recommendation

5.1 That members do not agree to the request to be discharged from the s106 planning obligations, and that the monies paid to date by the developer are not refunded.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number: Gary Hancox, 01508 533841, ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk

and E-mail:
JRT/RMF/12.07

8th June 2012

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

For the attention of Gary Hancox

Dear Gary

RE: S106 Agreements - The Old Maltings, Pulham St Mary

Further to the various correspondence and discussions regarding the outstanding S.106 payments for the above site, please accept this letter as formal notification of our application to discharge the obligation commitments.

As required under Section 106A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 the following information is provided.

1. the name and address of the applicant.
2. the address or location of the land to which the application relates and the nature of the applicant’s interest in that land.
3. sufficient information to enable the authority to identify the planning obligation which the applicant wishes to have modified or discharged.
4. the applicant’s reasons for applying for the modification or discharge of that obligation.
5. such other information as the authority consider necessary to enable them to determine the application.

C R Tanner FRICS
R Marsh-Foley BA (Hons)
Dip Arch RICS
Assessor
R J Hollins MCIty
Matthew Payne MCIty
Planning Consultants
Stuart P Reid
1. **Name and Address of Applicant**

Area Estates Ltd

Clive House

2 Old Brewery Mews

Hampstead High Street

London NW3 1PZ

2. **Site Address and Interest**

The Old Maltings

Station Road

Pulham St Mary

Norfolk IP21 4QT

A Site plan is attached at Appendix C.

The applicant is the owner of the site.

3. **Obligation to be discharged**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Centre Contribution</th>
<th>£49,076</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Contribution</td>
<td>£64,662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Reasons for Discharge**

We are applying to discharge the above financial contribution obligations on the grounds of economic non-viability.

The original contribution amounts were negotiated in early 2008 when the economic climate had a very different outlook than it does today. The original developer has since gone into liquidation and the current owners purchased the site from receivers Leonard Curtis & Co, appointed by Allied Irish Bank.
We have prepared a residual development appraisal (Appendix A) that demonstrates the scheme shows a profit on cost of only 16.72% with a land cost of £950,000 – the appraisal excludes the outstanding S106 payments as a cost line item. The figures were calculated using optimistic end sale values based on the units that have been sold at market value. The reality is that these levels are probably not achievable in the current market where there are limited mortgage options available to prospective purchasers.

In previous discussions with South Norfolk District Council’s property consultant Stuart Bisley, there was a broad agreement in cost and sale assumptions used. Mr Bisley adopted an approach that calculated an acceptable profit figure of 20% of GDV by inserting a land price of £500,000.

This is a notional land price and the reality is that the site has been purchased for £950,000. A report was commissioned by the receiver in June 2011 by Colliers International (Appendix B) to advise on the value of the site. The valuation range was between £850,000 and £1.2m, after negotiation the sale was agreed at £950,000 to Area Estates.

The site was marketed for a 12 month period prior to sale and after various offers from interested parties the transaction was concluded at £950,000. This must therefore be considered the market value of the site and incomplete development, reinforced by the advice of Colliers International.

5 Other Factors

The site has already provided a large contribution to the local community via the social housing allocation as required under the original S106 agreement. Eight units were provided to Flagship Housing Group for £620,000 which reflects a discount to market value in the region of 50%.

In deteriorating market conditions we are of the opinion that providing these units as part of the planning obligation was a major contributing factor to the failure of the original developer.

I hope the contents of this letter are satisfactory to register our application for discharge and I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

R Marsh-Feiliey BA (Hons)
Dip Arch RIBA

encs
Other Applications

Parish : HEMPNALL

Applicants Name : Mr P Ellis
Site Address : Queens Head, Mill Road, Hempnall
Proposal : Proposed change of use of public house to dwelling

Recommendation : Approve with conditions
1 Full – Planning Permission Time Limit
2 Details of boundary treatment and parking arrangements

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
Section 1: Achieving Sustainable Development – the presumption in favour of sustainable development
Section 3: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
Section 8: Promoting healthy communities

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Objective 6: To make sure people have ready access to services
Policy 5: The Economy
Policy 15: Service village
Policy 19: The hierarchy of centres

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
EMP7: The retention of rural employment services (Part consistent)
IMP8: Safe and free flow of traffic
IMP9: Residential amenity

2. Planning History

2.1 No recent planning history

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council : Original comments
Refuse
- Ensure viability is fully assessed taking into account further funding options, such as sole/development of surplus property. In addition the business/property is to be marketed at a realistic price as pub/restaurant for at least a further 6 months
- Within environment lighting zones policy

Comments on additional information
- Made enquiries to list as Community Asset under Localism Act (LA) with a further possibility of facilitating a community right to buy
- Current status of LA Legislation prevented us receiving a clear understanding
- Made enquiries to Mr Stuart Shortman and Tim Horspole, Norfolk and National Association of Local Councils and Richard Bacon MP- who has referred to Minister responsible. Not able to advise, therefore consider no decision should be made on change of use until such a time as procedures in place under the LA
- Feel marketing the property without granting at least a percentage of any development gain to any potential purchaser of property un-saleable i.e with no uplift clause
- Should be on market on same terms he bought it
- Received response from Greg Clark MP (via Richard Bacon MP) confirming The Community Right to Bid (or Assets of Community Value) provisions in the Localism Act give communities more initiative to save greatly valued assets, such as a community centre, former library building, last pub or shop in the village or a local green space. Currently completing the regulations which we are aiming to lay before Parliament as soon as possible.

3.2 District Member
- Endorse request by Hempnall Parish Council that no decision should be made on change of use until procedures in place under the Localism Act (LA), which will enable the Queens head to protected as Community Asset
- Feel marketing exercise suffers from a significant flaw – Mr Ellis purchased property as a pub with uplift development rights and yet has marketed it for sale with out offering the same uplift rights to potential purchaser
- Led to believe this ‘authorised’ by the Council’s Solicitor – would like to know what if any comfort was offered to Mr Ellis on this matter

3.3 NCC Highways
: No objection

3.4 Conservation Officer
: Could not justify refusal on Conservation Area grounds

3.5 Economic Development
: Original comments
Not supported – need additional information, expect premises to be marketed for 6 months, need to agree detailed marketing plan, difficult to assess viability without being able to assess previous years actual accounts

Comments on additional information
- reasonable effort made to market property, by a reputable company which has resulted in no tangible and credible interest at the present time
- this could be down to a number of factors, not least prevailing economic conditions relating to the profitability of pubs and the apparent cost of refurbishment
- on basis property has been closed for 4 years with a likely deterioration in its condition, it would appear unlikely and probably unviable, for it to re-opened as pub at the price it is being marketed

3.6 Planning Policy
: Original comments
Raise objection, without more effort to fully explore/market the retention of the public house

Comments on additional information from Parish Council with respect to Localism Act (LA)
- the provisions in the LA referred to as the Community Right to Bid, allows a community organisation a chance to bid to take over assets and facilities. However, these powers have yet to be established and the Coalition
Government has yet to publish the regulations that set out the procedures for this process. However, from what has already been published in the LA, I would suggest that these regulations will include the need to allow owners the right to appeal.

- Given that the regulations have yet to published, which means the Council cannot start the process that will need to be undertaken, I cannot at this stage give an opinion as to the potential for registering.
- I suggest it is likely to be some considerable time before the Council can compile its register of community assets.
- In my opinion, the Community Right to Bid, is a material consideration but one that must be seen in the context of not being available at the moment. I consider you as case officer are best paced to advise members whether the determination of the application can be deferred for an indeterminate length of time.

### 3.7 Norfolk & Suffolk CAMRA Pubs Group

**Object**
- note been suggested Queens Head could be developed subject to planning permission, should be strongly discouraged
- understand there may be restrictive covenant – this been denigrated in Parliament
- serious investigations should be carried out into the viability of re-opening

**Comments on additional information**
- loss of village amenity
- loss of possible employment centre
- PPS7 - support retention of rural public house
- could other community uses be incorporated into the pub? Has any feasibility been undertaken
- last remaining public house in a village with few facilities – nearest one at Hempnall Green

### 3.8 Local Residents

20 letters of objection expressing the following concerns:

- I was previous tenant, confirm was profitable, left pub for reasons – restriction of opening in so called 24 hour license, lack of investment promoted by Punch Taverns for upgrade of premises, firmly believe with food facility and some refurbishment work, Queens Head as freehold would be profitable
- did research majority did not feel could support pub as stood (Punch Taverns unsupportive to refurbish), residents said if full refurbishment and a restaurant with pleasant surroundings, would use
- we increased barrelage and broke even
- figures quoted make the business viable, I believe grossly inflated
- believe Punch Taverns did not do enough to promote sale
- did not seem to seek advice re: viability before purchasing, suggests always intention to develop the property as a dwelling
Development Management Committee 18 July 2012

- spoken to several previous tenants who claim to have made a profit
- closure has ripped heart out of village and ruined the social spirit
- believe could be viable, bought at highly inflated price
- former resident and spent many enjoyable evenings, used to have huge community spirit
- village needs to keep pub – a place to meet, socialise and keep village spirit alive
- had a pool team, darts team and a meeting place after football/cricket matches
- in right hands, this would be a profitable business
- know number of potential landlords to procure lease but nearly all dissuaded by lack of support for upgrading kitchen facilities

4 letters of support with following comments:
- for as long as lived here, not appeared to be a viable business
- Parish Council had time to sort out any village/group purchase, Mr Ellis should be backed in wish to improve premises

Comments on additional information

2 letters of support with following comments:
- listened to Parish Council, building is eyesore, put up for sale previously and no buyer came forward
- sent letter to Parish after meeting, do not believe viable
- do not agree with Parish Council proposing further delays, i.e. until the Localism Act is published
- a further 6 months would have given ample time to make a collective approach

4. Assessment

4.1 The application relates to the Queens Head Public House (PH) on Mill Road and is located with the development limits and Conservation Area for Hempnall. There are TPO’d trees to the east of the site and listed properties to the north (The Chequers) and east (Poplary). The PH closed down in February 2008, it operated as small village pub with two bars, selling beer, wine and spirits. It had no facilities for the preparation of meals. Following its closure the owners, Punch Taverns, having not found a new tenant, placed the property on the market and sold to the applicant, Mr Ellis, in May 2009. When sold, Punch Taverns placed a restrictive covenant on the premises preventing the Queens Head opening/operating a public house or restaurant (this is discussed in more detail, later in the report).

4.2 This application is for the change of use of the premises to a single dwelling. The upper floor landlord accommodation (currently lounge, 3 bedrooms and bathroom) will remain as bedroom accommodation and bathroom and the ground floor (two bars, kitchen, ‘cellar’ and public toilets) will be used as lounge, dining room and kitchen. The cellar will be used as a general store.
4.3 In policy terms there have been a number of changes with the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Joint Core Strategy (JCS), since the application was originally submitted in 2010. The NPPF promotes the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the retention and development of local services and community facilities, in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship (Section 1 and Section 3, Para 28, bullet point 4). Objective 6 of the JCS seeks to make sure people have ready access to services which are reflected in Policy 5: The Economy, Policy 14: Service villages and Policy 19: The hierarchy of Centres. Due and weight and consideration can still be given to policy EMP7 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP), relating to “The retention of rural employment services” as this is still partly consistent with the NPPF (the main difference being the NPPF does not make any distinction between rural and urban areas). All these policies seek to retain uses such as public houses, especially in rural locations.

4.4 It is this latter policy (EMP7 of the SNLP) that the application should mainly been assessed against which requires, at bullet point (iv), that a change of use to non employment uses will only be permitted “if the retention of the site for employment use has been fully explored without success”.

4.5 As already mentioned, the application was originally submitted in January 2010 with a Design and Access Statement, including a case that the property had already been satisfactorily marketed. Officers, including the Economic Development Officer (at the time), advised that the property needed to be satisfactorily marketed, at an agreed price with the District Valuer (DV). Although after some time the applicant forwarded the marketing carried out by Punch Taverns, it was considered that as the property had been marketed as a public house and bought via this marketing exercise, this marketing had succeeded and as such did not demonstrate that the retention of the site had been fully explored.

4.6 A valuation was undertaken by the DV (agreed freehold price of £165,000) a marketing strategy agreed with officers (advertised in local press; internet; web sites and advertising board on premises) and was placed on the market from 2 August 2011, for six months.

4.7 The results of the marketing exercise were submitted in April 2012 and the application re-consulted on. A copy of the marketing strategy and results can be viewed on the Council’s web site and show that the property was viewed on 3 occasions with no offers made. Another party made a number of offers, including the asking price, but did not view the property or respond to a number of requests to confirm availability of funds and this offer did not proceed any further.

4.8 The Council’s Economic Development officers have been consulted throughout the process and have confirmed that a reasonable effort has been made to now market the property, by a reputable company which has resulted in no tangible and credible interest at the present time. He states that this could be down to a number of factors, not least prevailing economic conditions relating to the profitability of pubs and the apparent cost of refurbishment and on the basis the property has been closed for 4 years with a likely deterioration in its condition, it would appear unlikely and probably unviable, for it to be reopened as pub at the price it is being marketed.

4.9 I am therefore satisfied that in accordance with policy EMP7 of the SNLP the property has been fully explored for its retention as a public house, which could include a number of other employment uses (note, it is permitted to change from a public house to Class A1 (shops) and Class A2 (financial services) without a further application.) The use of the property as a dwelling house is also acceptable in residential amenity terms (policy IMP9) and highway terms (policy IMP8). Both these policies remain consistent with the NPPF and can, therefore, be given due weight and consideration. A condition is proposed to be attached to any permission to agree boundary treatment and parking arrangements.
4.10 There remain a number of concerns raised from the Parish Council, District Member, CAMRA and local residents. It should also be noted there has been local support for the change of use. There are two main areas of concerns, the first one relating to the marketing exercise which it is felt suffers from a significant flaw – Mr Ellis purchased property as a pub with uplift development rights and yet has marketed it for sale with out offering the same uplift rights to potential purchaser. The second issue, being a request made by Hempnall Parish Council and the local member that no decision should be made on the change of use until procedures are in place under the Localism Act (LA), which will enable the Queens Head to be protected as Community Asset

4.11 With respect to the issue on marketing, as already stated, this exercise was agreed by your officers and follows similar cases (e.g. the Wherry Public House, Langley - application number 2009/1376/F). Advice was sought from the Council’s Solicitor (at the time), Mr Shortman, and a subsequent opinion from Mr Shortman at Nplaw. The Council was aware of a restrictive covenant placed on the premises when the applicant, Mr Ellis, bought the property from Punch Taverns, i.e. prohibiting the sale of alcohol. Mr Shortman made it clear that a full marketing exercise needed to go ahead notwithstanding the imposition of the covenant. For the purpose of the marketing exercise, the presumption would be that the procurement of the release of that could be achieved by the Vendor (and was detailed in the particulars), thus clearing the way for pub use to be re-commenced, if desired.

4.12 There was also an “up-lift” clause placed on the property and the Parish Council in particular feel this flaws the marketing exercise. However it should be noted that the marketing exercise was for the purpose of the use as public house, and accordingly the price for purchase reflected this (as agreed by the DV). Mr Shortman has advised there is no reason why the ability to redevelop for something else should be permitted by the Vendor. If it’s not to be re-opened as a public house, - then it is the current owner/Vendor who would wish to have the benefit of any redevelopment value rather than a purchaser and that is not unreasonable.

4.13 With respect to the second issue in relation to the Localism Act (LA). This relates to provision which will allow a community organisation a chance to bid to take over assets and facilities that are important to them, which could include a public house. However these powers have yet to be established, but from what has already been published these regulations are likely to include the need to allow owners the right to appeal the local authority’s decision to list their property on the Community Asset Register.

4.14 The Council’s Planning Policy Manager, Mr Horspole, has confirmed that the Community Right to Bid is a material consideration but one that must be seen in the context of not being available at the moment. As such, although a material consideration I consider limited weight can be given to putting this application on hold until the regulations have been published, especially in view that the applicant has followed an agreed marketing exercise. They have quite rightly pointed out, in response to the views expressed by the Parish Council, that prior to their purchase and subsequent marketing, neither the Parish Council nor any community group within Hempnall came forward to purchase the property.

4.15 Although the loss of community facility such as public house is disappointing I am satisfied the use as such has been fully explored. The NPPF has a presumption in favour of sustainable development and Hempnall is classified as service village in the JCS (Policy 15). It should be noted even with the change of use of the public house, Hempnall would still retain its classification as a service village as it still has a school, village hall, food shops, garage, outdoor recreation, local businesses and a doctors.
5. **Reasons for Approval**

5.1 It is considered the marketing exercise carried out by the applicant satisfies the objectives and aims of the NPPF (Section 3 and 8) and JCS (Objective 6 and policies 5 and 19) and policy EMP7 (iv) of the SNLP which has been given due weight and consideration as this policy remains consistent with the aims of the NPPF. Material consideration has been given to the Localism Act and Community Right to bid, but given this is not available at the moment, limited weight can given to this consideration, in light that the retention of the property has been fully explored as required by policy EMP7.

5.2 The use of the property as a single dwelling is acceptable in amenity and highway terms and accords with policies IMP8 and IMP9 of the SNLP which have been given due and weight and consideration as they remain consistent with the aims of the NPPF.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Helen Mellors, 01508 533789, hmellors@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. Appl. No : 2012/0498/RVC
Parish : BERGH APTON

Applicants Name : Mr John Hemmant
Site Address : Anteros Arts Centre, Loddon Road, Bergh Apton, Norfolk, NR15 1BT
Proposal : Variation of condition 9 of planning permission 2006/2404/F - change of opening times from 09:00 - 17:00 to 08:00 - 18:00 Monday to Sunday

Recommendation : Refuse

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
Section 3: Supporting a prosperous rural economy

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 5: The economy

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic
IMP 10: Noise
LEI 2: Village halls and small scale leisure facilities

2. Planning History

2.1 2011/1013 Re-cladding of existing building and new timber doors Approved

2.2 2011/1012 Retrospective application to show revised access road within site and revised gravel car park and grassed area to accord with as-built situation Approved

2.3 2011/1010 Retrospective application for retention of 900mm & 1500mm high reed fencing and new 5 bar timber gate Approved

2.4 2008/1539 Amendment to condition 9 of planning permission 2006/2404 to extend opening hours from 9.30am to 23.00pm Monday to Sunday Refused

2.5 2006/2404 To covert, by way of renovation, plus extension of outbuilding into a community arts centre. Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council : Refuse:
- Excessive opening hours
- The noise disturbance
- Additional traffic
- The disturbance and detrimental to the life of people living around the arts centre
3.2 District Member: To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Local Residents: 4 letters of objection
- Parking facilities right outside bedroom and noise of cars would be very intrusive especially at 8am and weekends
- Unable to leave window open as noise ricochets into bedroom
- Loss of privacy
- Detrimental to way of life as most functions take place over the course of a weekend
- Concerned if any extended hours would be adhered to
- Concerns at increase in vehicle movements
- Instead of school bus dropping and picking up in term time, it is proposed to have a 7 day situation of dropping off 8am and collecting at 6pm
- Current hours are normal working hours
  1 letter of support
- Not experienced any disturbance or noise from the centre

4. Assessment

4.1 This application seeks to amend the present approved hours of 9:00 to 17:00 Monday to Sunday to allow extended opening from 8:00 to 18:00. This is to allow preparation time and clearing up time for art courses, particularly in relation to art classes for children whose parents work in full time jobs, allowing those parents travel time to deliver and pick up children.

4.2 The Anteros Centre is a community arts centre located in the open countryside outside any development boundary for the surrounding villages. The supporting documents with the 2006/2404 application stated the aim of the proposal was to provide a centre of excellence for example, drawing, water colour, acrylic and oil painting courses; providing expertise in etching and ceramics; attract young people and local schools; and provide creativity and team building courses for local businesses. The neighbouring residential barn conversions (which original formed part of the farm complex) are located to the southwest western boundary of the site. It is due to the close proximity of the neighbouring properties to the centre as to why the hours of opening have been limited to 9am to 5pm.

4.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Section 3: Supporting a prosperous rural economy supports the growth of business and leisure in the rural areas. The South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) and Joint Core Strategy (JCS) policies support employment subject to normal planning requirements. The SNLP polices referred to above can be given due weight and consideration because those policies remain consistent with the published NPPF.

4.4 In view of the applicants reasoning for the increased hours to allow parents of youngsters attending courses to deliver their children and then go to work and pick up their children after work, plus setting up and clearing away, I suggested a compromise of half an hour either side of the permitted opening hours. The applicant however has advised that a trip from Loddon to Norwich takes him 45mins and therefore he is only prepared to consider the time change to 8.15am to 5.45pm Monday to Friday and 8.30am to 5.30pm Saturdays and Sundays. 3 neighbours have commented on this and whilst they do not wish to see any extension of the hours of use, if the Council was minded to allow half an hour, this should only be Monday to Friday and for courses for children.
4.5 White House Barn is situated very close to the boundary of the application site with windows to the east elevation and north. It is considered that given the very close proximity of the residential properties to the site, that the increased hours of opening, particularly the morning, would by virtue of noise associated traffic and people movements, give rise to a situation detrimental to the amenities of the adjacent residential properties.

5. **Reasons for Refusal**

5.1 The proposed variation of the existing opening hours would be detrimental to the residential amenities of adjacent occupiers by reason of noise and general disturbance from the use of the centre and its grounds.

5.2 The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 including, in particular, policies IMP9 - Residential amenity, IMP10 - Noise.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis, 01508 533788, ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
6. **Appl. No**: 2012/0509/F  
**Parish**: THARSTON & HAPTON

Applicants Name: Saffron Housing Trust Ltd  
Site Address: Saffron Barn, Swan Lane, Tharston, Norfolk, NR15 2XP  
Proposal: Installation of a single small scale wind turbine (14.97m to hub, 5.6m diameter blades)

Recommendation: Authorise Director of Development & Environment to approve with conditions

1. Full - Planning Permission Time Limit  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
3. Accord with turbine specification  
4. Mitigation

Subject to the views of the Ministry of Defence.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Part 10 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 3 Energy and water

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
UTL 13: Renewable energy  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise

2. **Consultations**

2.1 Tharston & Hapton Parish Council: No comments received  
Long Stratton Parish Council: Approve

2.2 District Members  
Mr Andrew Pond: No comments received  
Mr Terry Blowfield: No comments received

2.3 Environmental Services – (protection): No objections

2.4 Local Residents: 5 letters of objection and insufficient information:  
- Concern at the noise will disturb the sleep patterns of the children and the negative impact this will have on their behaviour (Trafalgar lodge Children's home)  
- Visual impact  
- Noise and disturbance  
- Negative impact on house sales and value  
- Unsuitable for a residential area
• Risk of cumulative effect due to financial incentives
• Sound levels should be produced via loud speakers so that objections can be properly determined
• What is the reason for one – is it to make way for many others?
• Who is paying for this?
• Is it going to benefit local people?
2 letters of support

3. Assessment

3.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of a wind turbine to the north of Saffron Barn which will be 14.97 metres to the hub and 17.5 metres to the tip of the blades. The tower is a matt grey colour and the blades are matt white. The proposal is to provide Saffron Housing Trust with a sustainable and efficient electrical energy with an expected annual carbon saving of 3.39 tonnes and annual energy of 7.32 MWh.

3.2 The National Planning Policy Framework, Part 10 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change supports and promote the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy.

3.3 Policy 3 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out that development will where possible aim to maximise the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy sources and sustainable construction technologies. Policy UTL 13 of the Local Plan promotes renewable energy projects provided that the benefits are not outweighed by demonstrable harm to the locality in terms of visual intrusion, noise or the safe and free flow of traffic.

3.4 Concerns have been raised by local residents as set out above. Whilst I fully appreciate the concerns raised, it is not considered that the proposal would have such an adverse impact on the character of the village or the surrounding countryside, to warrant refusal on this ground. The concerned residents are a reasonable distance from the turbine and as such I do not consider that the proposal would be so detrimental to their amenities via noise and disturbance to refuse the application on amenity grounds.

4. Reasons for Approval

4.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Joint Core Strategy and the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 as the proposed development has taken account of the character and constraints of the site and its surroundings and are not considered to have a significant impact on the character or ecology of the area or adversely the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis, 01508 533788, ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2012/0645/F  
**Parish**: GREAT MOULTON  
**Applicants Name**: Mr Roger Burrows  
**Site Address**: Land at Little Orchard, Woodrow Lane, Great Moulton, NR15 2DX  
**Proposal**: Development of land at Great Moulton to provide: 1 x 3 bedroom Chalet dwelling with double Garage 1 x 4 bedroom Chalet dwelling with double garage 1 x double garage to existing bungalow (Little Orchard)  

**Recommendation**: Refuse  

1 Contrary to JCS Policy 2 and SNLP Policy IMP9 as out of character with surrounding properties and overbearing on property to south

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

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
IMP8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
HOU7: Development within defined boundaries of small villages

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/1518/F Development of land to provide 3 new 3 bedroom chalet dwellings with a double garage to each property and a double garage to the existing property Little Orchard  
Withdrawn

2.2 2003/0122/D Renewal of permission 1998/0088/D for the erection of bungalow & garage  
Approved

2.3 1998/0088/D Renewal of permission 1993/0101/D – erection of bungalow and garage  
Approved

2.4 1993/0101/D Erection of bungalow and garage  
Approved

2.5 1989/2125/O Erection of single storey dwelling and double garage  
Approved

2.6 1989/1615/O Erection of one dwelling and garage with shared access to Little Orchard  
Refused
3. Consultations

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

3.2 District Member: To be determined by Committee
- Reduced scale of development appropriate for surrounding area

3.3 NCC Highways: Conditional support
- Reduction in number of new properties to two additional dwellings is considered acceptable

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection): Conditional support

3.5 Local Residents: 2 letters of objection
- Not in keeping with the surrounding properties and is overdevelopment of the site
- Application is incorrect as it states there is no change to the vehicular access to the highway which is not the case
- Will increase traffic as all three properties will have double garages and will probably treble the vehicular access to Station Road close to a tight bend and very close to a bus stop
- Access shown for the use of The Lodge is for exclusive use of Copper Beach and has never been used by Little Orchard or The Lodge and there is a discrepancy between the site delineation in the Design and Access Statement and the site and location plan.

4. Assessment

4.1 The proposal is for a site within the development boundaries of Great Moulton consisting of two parts, the garden of Little Orchard and a grassed area to the south of Little Orchard. Planning approval has in the past been granted for the erection of a bungalow on the grassed area to the south of Little Orchard. More recently, an application was submitted (2011/1518) which sought to develop the site with semi-detached chalet-style properties on the grassed area to the south of Little Orchard and a detached chalet-style property in the garden of Little Orchard. This application was withdrawn due to concerns raised regarding the number of dwellings proposed and their scale. This application seeks to address some of these concerns by reducing the number of dwellings, but does not reduce the scale of the dwellings.

4.2 The nature of the surrounding area currently consists of bungalows closest to Station Road with larger houses to the rear. The proposed development would be within the area currently comprising of single storey dwellings. The proposal to introduce chalet-style properties which are not considered to be in keeping with the character of this area and would appear incongruous with the existing surrounding development.
4.3 The introduction of first floor accommodation into such a location also has the potential to introduce overlooking of private amenity space where none existed previously. It is accepted that the windows have been designed to minimise overlooking, with rooflights of sufficient sill height to prevent overlooking used on the south elevation of the southern of the two dwellings proposed. Nonetheless, as with the previous scheme, the height of the building has an overbearing impact on the neighbour to the south (No7A) due to its proximity to the boundary and therefore it is still considered that the proposal continues to conflict with policy IMP9.

4.4 In response to the previous application, Norfolk County Council’s highways officer have raised concerns with the level of development proposed and the resulting intensification of use of the access onto Station Road. The level of development was also considered overdevelopment of the site. By reducing the level of development to two additional units it is considered that this concern has been addressed. However, it remains our view that two single storey dwellings, which would overcome both the concerns relating to the character of the surrounding development and the impact on the neighbour to the south, would be the acceptable solution for this site and therefore the scheme as proposed is recommended for refusal.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the adopted Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 including, in particular, Policy 2 (Promoting good design) of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP9 (Residential amenity) of the Local Plan as the chalet-style nature would be out of character with the adjoining bungalows, with the southernmost of the two proposed dwellings having an overbearing impact on the amenities of No7A Station Road. 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
8. **Appl. No**: 2012/0789/F  
**Parish**: STOKE HOLY CROSS

Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs P Williamson  
Site Address: Roger Johns, Long Lane, Stoke Holy Cross, Norfolk, NR14 8LY  
Proposal: Rear extension to existing hair salon, to form beauticians suite

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Achieving sustainable development  
Section 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
EMP 6: Alterations and extensions to existing business premises  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 2: Landscaping

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/1431 Rear extension to existing hair salon to form beauticians suite Refused

2.2 2010/1907 Rear extension to existing hair salon to form beautician’s suite Withdrawn

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: Approve  
3.2 District Member: To be reported if appropriate  
3.3 NCC Highways: Conditional support  
- Because of loss of parking/ turning area. Extension will need to be tied to dwelling so staff parking can be provided there.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection): No objection

3.5 Landscape Officer: Object  
- Trees subject to TPOs  
- T1 has been re-pollarded re try and ensure that the tree is less likely to fail.  
- Contrary to BS5837  
- The report does demonstrate mitigation to limit the impact on the tree
3.6 Local Residents : Two letters of support

4. Assessment

4.1 The application relates to Roger Johns hair salon which is a small red brick hipped roof building located adjacent to the road; the site forms part of the garden of Treetops. There is a large pond in the garden. There are a number of trees on the site in particular there are two mature Oak Trees in the neighbour’s garden. These trees are now subject to a Tree Preservation Order.

4.2 An application 2011/1431 was previously refused because of the development would result in increased pressure to cut back or remove trees worthy of tree preservation orders.

4.3 Policy EMP6 in the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 permits extensions to existing business premises as long as the size and design of the proposal would be in keeping with the existing building and its surrounding, the existing landscaping on the site would not be seriously compromised and all necessary parking, servicing, access and circulation can be accommodated on site for both the existing building and the proposed extension.

4.4 It has since been found that the tree has been subject to some decay and permission has been given for works to reduce the branches by 4-5 metres which will help to ensure the tree’s survival in the long term (tree works application number 2012/0383). This work has now been carried out.

4.5 The Landscape Officer does not feel able to judge whether or not there is an overriding justification for construction, especially as the same proposal was previously refused by Committee; and considers that the application should be refused as it is contrary to BS5837. For information, the 2012 version of BS5837 paragraph 5.3.1 states: “The default position should be that structures are located outside the RPAs of trees to be retained. However, where there is an overriding justification for construction within the RPA, technical solutions might be available that prevent damage to the tree(s).” However, he also adds that if, however, the case officer and/or Committee conclude that there is sufficient justification, then the submitted arboricultural information does demonstrate adequate technical solutions that limit the potential impact on the tree.

4.6 The extension would result in the expansion of an existing business and is in keeping with the existing building. Although it would be preferable to locate the extension outside the root protection zone of the tree there is not a suitable alternative solution. On balance given the works carried out to the tree in this instance I consider that the extension can be justified in this location especially as adequate mitigation can be carried out to limit the impact on the tree.

4.7 The design of the extension which includes a hipped roof is in keeping with the existing building and due to its position, does not raise any amenity issues.

4.8 The extension would result in a decrease in parking and turning area, which although customers car parking can be provided it is unlikely that there is sufficient space to accommodate staff parking, this is not a problem if staff parking can be accommodated at the dwelling, which is in the same ownership and occupation. The applicant has no objection to the business and dwelling being linked by a condition.

4.9 The Council’s Ecologist commented on the previous withdrawn application and considered that an ecological report was not necessary in this instance; I do not consider that circumstances have changed since this advice.

4.10 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. **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 EMP 6: Alterations and extensions to existing business premises, IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic, IMP 9: Residential amenity and IMP 2: Landscaping 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 proposed development will result in the extension to an existing business which is in keeping with the existing building and surroundings, all the necessary parking and access can be achieved by tying the business to the adjacent house and appropriate mitigation can be put into place to limit the impact on the trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order and without causing any significant loss of amenity to surrounding properties.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman, 01508 533833,
and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No**: 2012/0791/F  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM  

**Applicants Name**: George Reeve Ltd  
**Site Address**: 9 - 11 Town Green, Wymondham, Norfolk, NR18 0PN  
**Proposal**: Partial demolition with conversion and extension of remaining building to create 2 dwellings plus erection of 2 further new dwellings.

**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions

1. Planning Permission Time Limit  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
3. Archaeological work to be agreed  
4. Treatment and protection of wall paintings  
5. Scheme of stripping out of existing buildings to be agreed  
6. Extent of timber repairs to be agreed  
7. Internal wall finishes to be lathe and lime plaster  
8. Provision of Parking and Servicing Areas - Where shown on plan  
9. Materials to be agreed  
10. Coping details for parapet roof  
11. Details of sheds  
12. Brickwork panel  
13. Mortar to be agreed  
14. Window / roof light details to be agreed  
15. Slab level to be agreed  
16. Boundary treatment to be agreed  
17. New Water Efficiency  
18. Construction traffic management plan

10. **Appl. No**: 2012/0792/LB  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM  

**Applicants Name**: George Reeve Ltd  
**Site Address**: 9 - 11 Town Green, Wymondham, Norfolk, NR18 0PN  
**Proposal**: Proposed demolition of modern alterations and extensions and conversion of existing offices to two dwellings.

**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions

1. Listed Building Time Limit  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
3. Treatment and protection of wall paintings  
4. Scheme of stripping out of existing buildings to be agreed  
5. Extent of timber repairs to be agreed  
6. Internal wall finishes to be lathe and lime plaster  
7. Materials to be agreed  
8. Coping details for parapet roof  
9. Brickwork panel  
10. Mortar to be agreed  
11. Window / roof light details to be agreed  
12. Boundary treatment to be agreed
1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
- Section 6: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
- Section 7: Requiring good design
- Section 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- Section 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- 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 6: Access and transportation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic
- IMP 9: Residential amenity
- IMP 11: Demolition of Listed Buildings
- IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)
- IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings
- IMP 16: Demolition in Conservation Areas
- IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2002/1554 Retention of CCTV camera on front of building Approved

2.2 2002/0923 Change of use of derelict land to additional car parking. Demolition of concrete and brick walls Approved

2.3 1997/0785 Construction of car park & cycle shed at 9/11 and rear of 5 Town Green and demolition of wall Approved

2.4 1997/0784 Construction of car park & cycle shed at 9/11 and rear of 5 Town Green Approved

2.5 1985/2913 Necessary Demolition And Re-Building Of Gable End Approved

2.6 1984/2105/01 Extension To Provide New Entrance And Reception Area To Existing Shop And Offices Approved

2.7 1984/2105 Extension To Provide New Entrance And Reception Area To Existing Shop And Offices Approved

2.8 1981/3777 Extension To Existing Car Park Approved

2.9 1980/1102 First Floor Extension Approved

2.10 1980/0171 Extension To Printing Works Approved

2.11 1979/3264 Extension To Printing Works Addition Of Ground & First Floor Store Rooms Withdrawn
2.12 WY\1897\ Extension and alterations to existing printing works at No. 9, and use of house No.11 as office (ground floor) and store (first floor). Approved

2.13 WY\0159\ Extension of existing printing works. Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council : Refuse
- Over development of the site contrary to IMP18 in terms of scale, form, massing affecting the character and appearance of the area
- Traffic concerns. Lack of suitable visibility splays
- Vehicle movements prejudice free and safe flow of traffic onto the main road.

3.2 District Member : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : No objection subject to condition.
On the basis of previous traffic levels, the level of development proposed is acceptable. Existing access is narrow and visibility is severely restricted, however the site is within the 20mph area of the town which is backed up with traffic calming. Suggest that a construction traffic management plan should be required by a condition.

3.4 Historic Environment Service : No objection subject to a programme of archaeological works in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

3.5 Norfolk Fire Service Station Master : To be reported

3.6 Landscape Officer : No objection

3.7 Local Residents : 1 letter of support

5 letters of objection
- Over intensive use of small area
- No assessment of the impact on flats at Westgate Court
- Plot 4 is located directly opposite first floor lounge window to flat 6
- Application site is approximately 1m higher than Westgate Court grounds and development will therefore result in significant over shadowing / overlooking of flats and communal patio area
- Landscaping was planted in 1997 in relation to extension to print works
- Access to the site is by a narrow alley with limited visibility.
- Access requires vehicles to drive on the wrong side of the road to manoeuvre into the site
- Position of refuse store
- Noise disturbance from vehicles and activity at dwellings
- Relationship of new dwellings to adjacent beer garden and potential for future complaints from proposed houses
- Question how construction traffic will enter the site
4. **Assessment**

4.1 The applications relate to the demolition of a range of modern extensions and alterations to a group of listed buildings which front Town Green and the division of these buildings to two dwellings together with the erection of two new dwellings on the former yard area.

4.2 9 – 11 Town Green is situated in the Wymondham Conservation Area and front onto the main street. No.9 is a grade II listed timber frame building with first floor jetty and dates from the early c15. No. 11 is a Victorian red brick building with sash windows and both buildings are currently used as offices associated with the print works.

4.3 The site is located within the Development Limit for Wymondham and as such the principle of development is acceptable. The site is also within a Conservation Area where policies in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS), South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) seek to ensure that proposals preserve or enhance the character of the area. In addition, the site is in the vicinity of several listed buildings and the proposal directly affects No 9 and 11, both of which are listed. Policies seek to ensure that proposals safeguard the historic integrity and setting of such buildings.

4.4 The site is bordered by residential properties to the east south and west with a public house to the north. Policies seek to ensure that proposals do not have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of neighbouring uses and have a suitable access to the highway network.

4.5 Part of the proposal is for the removal of a single storey lean-to at the front which links the buildings and a large flat roof extension that links the buildings to the rear. These elements are visible from the adjacent highways and have a considerable adverse impact on views of the listed building and its setting and I consider that their removal would enhance the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the listed buildings.

4.6 A comprehensive heritage assessment of no.9 has been provided with the application explaining the significance of the building. Historic Environment Service have commented that recording of the existing building will need to be carried out prior to the commencement of works to no.9. Further recording may also be required during the stripping out process and this can be required by conditions.

4.7 I consider that the proposals for the existing buildings, as part of their conversion to two dwellings, will greatly improve the appearance of both the street frontage and rear elevations. Proposed internal alterations to no.9 retain the important character and appearance of the existing interior and do not involve the removal of important historic fabric.

4.8 Within the frontage buildings are internal wall paintings and these will need to be protected during the programme of internal works and, as is advised in the heritage assessment, a trained conservator would need to provide a report on the wall paintings and recommendations on their treatment. Again, this can be required by conditions.

4.9 To the rear of the main buildings, it is proposed to erect two detached dwellings with associated garaging. The appearance of the existing rear courtyard area does not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. The Conservation Officer considers that the proposed pattern of development would not look out of place and comments that the house on plot 2 has a more distinctive historic style that picks up on the appearance of existing buildings along the main street.

4.10 The layout provides rear amenity areas for each dwelling together with a garage parking space and off street parking space for each dwelling. The new development will be visible from adjacent properties and from the public car park area off Town Green to the north. While there will be a dense built form on the site, it will comprise a mixture of built forms and heights which is not uncharacteristic of the locality. While I note the Town Council’s comments, I do not consider that the proposal appears over-developed.
4.11 The dwelling on plot 3 will incorporate windows in the north and south elevations, with a small garden area to the north adjacent to the beer garden of the public house. The property will be elevated above the level of the beer garden with open views beyond. I recognise that there is potential for some disturbance to the occupiers of the proposed dwellings from the adjacent public house, but future occupiers will be aware of its presence. Windows in the south elevation will look onto the communal parking area beyond which is the garden area of adjacent properties. While there will be some overlooking of these gardens, I consider that it will not result in a significant loss of amenity.

4.12 Plot 4 will be located along the western edge of the site and has been designed such that the principle outlook is to the north and south. Concerns have been raised regarding the impact of this dwelling on the amenities of neighbouring properties, particularly Westgate Court, with regard to their outlook, overshadowing and overlooking.

4.13 The dwelling does not incorporate habitable room windows in either the east or west elevations and I therefore consider that it will not result in a significant loss of amenity for neighbouring uses. The property will be elevated above the properties to the west and while it will be prominent from the rear elevations, the design has sought to reduce the massing by accommoding rooms within the roof space which has reduced the height of the eaves and ridge.

4.14 The site will be accessed by the existing vehicular access point. Concerns have been raised regarding the suitability of this given its limited width and visibility. The Highway Authority have recognised these constraints but consider that on the basis of previous traffic movements and limited vehicle speeds on Town Green, that the use of the site for 4 dwellings is acceptable.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2, 3, 4 and 6 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies IMP8, IMP9, IMP11, IMP13, IMP15, IMP16 and IMP18 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the removal of the modern extensions and alterations and renovation of the existing buildings will enhance the character of the conservation area and setting of the listed buildings. The new development will be of a scale, form and character which takes account of the setting of the site and will not have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of neighbouring uses or highway safety.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Stuart Pontin, 01508 533796, spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
11. Appl. No : 2012/0903/A
Parish : DISS

Applicants Name : Mr S Jones
Site Address : 121 Computers Services Ltd,105 Victoria Road,Diss,Norfolk, IP22 4JG
Proposal : Erection of internally illuminated totem sign
Recommendation : Refuse

1. Contrary to SNLP policy
2. Size and level of illumination adverse impact on conservation area
3. Detrimental to highway safety

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
Section 7: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
IMP 19: Advertisements (Part Consistent)
IMP 21: Illuminated advertisements (Part Consistent)
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic

2. Planning History

2.1 2012/0656 Replacement Garden Centre sign to entrance (Adjacent site) Approved

2.2 2011/1164 Erection of internally illuminated totem sign Approved

2.3 2010/1587 Proposed two-storey link to provide an emergency fire escape, staircase, lift, stairwell for the first floor to 104 and 104a Victoria Road, Diss. Replacing the existing two storey and single storey link. Approved

2.4 2010/1223 Proposed two storey link with emergency fire escape staircase, lift, stairwell, replacing the existing two storey and single storey link building between 104 and 104a Victoria Road, Diss Refused

2.5 2010/0690 Proposed new vehicle access and rear extension for new workshops and dispatch area Approved

2.6 2009/1180 Part change of use of office to residential with amended vehicle access, demolition of existing single storey link and rebuild to a two-storey link. Extension to offices, storage and amenity area Refused

2.7 2008/1771 Change of use from offices to residential use with amended access Withdrawn

2.8 2007/0294 Replacement and enlargement of existing rear extension to office Withdrawn
2.9  2006/2119  Replacement and enlargement of existing rear extension to office  Withdrawn

2.10  2006/1706  Demolition of existing workshop/garage  Approved

2.11  2006/1692  Amendments to previous planning consent 2006/0699  Approved

2.12  2006/0699  Proposed new ground floor extension, first floors and alterations for change of use to offices, storage and retail showroom  Approved

3.  Consultations

3.1  Town Council  :  Approve
   - This compromised solution appears to be a sensible resolution for providing adequate signage for both parties.
   - The applicant indicated flexibility regarding the order of the individual business signs.

3.2  District Member

   Mr Keith Kiddie  :  Can be delegated
   Mr G H Walden  :  Can be delegated
   Mr Tony Palmer  :  To be determined by committee if recommended for refusal.
   - Potentially reduces street clutter by combing two signs and thereby reducing the impact on the street scene.

3.3  NCC Highways  :  Object
   - Applicant’s intention to provide a single sign are valid
   - Approval could result in three large signs erected in close proximity to each other which would be confusing and an unnecessary distraction to motorists driving on A1066 route.
   - If consent is granted we would wish for the following comments to be taken into account.
   - Sign is 6 metres, two signs have been given approval at 5 metres. A maximum height of 5 metres for this sign is recommended.
   - The floating letters “computers” should not overhang the adjacent footpath.
   - Colours of signs need to be clarified so the colours do not clash with nearby traffic signals.

3.4  Conservation Officer  :  Object
   - Site within a Conservation Area
   - Height and illumination would have an adverse impact on street scene and character of the Conservation Area.
   - Obscure the Garden Centre Sign and will add to already cluttered appearance along Victoria Road.
   - Do not object to signage but should be subservient to the surrounding built form and similar in scale to other advertisements
3.5 Local Residents: One letter of objection

- Although the Garden centre has now been considered this is an after thought and we should have been considered with previous application.
- We are bottom of both sides which will be obscured by parked cars during the day.
- Remain disappointed that original totem sign was approved despite obscuring our sign.
- A better solution would be to would be to place their sign further to the East of their property.
- 121 Computers already have a massive illuminated sign on the front of their building and this new approved illuminated totem sign would be over extravagant.

4. Assessment

4.1 The application relates to 121 Computers in Victoria Road Diss. The main building is a contemporary design which is set back from the road, permission has recently been granted for a two storey link extension and the two storey Georgian property on the frontage will also be incorporated onto the site. The site is within the conservation area.

4.2 This application is for a 6 metre tall totem sign, the whole sign will be fully internally illuminated with the word “Computers” protruding from the side of the sign. It is proposed the sign will advertise both 121 Computers and the adjacent Garden Centre.

4.3 Permission was granted by members, contrary to recommendation, for a 5 metre internally illuminated sign on the site (application number 2011/1164). This is located to the west of the entrance to 121 Computers. Concern was raised at the time by the owner of the Garden Centre that this sign would obscure views of his existing sign. Subsequently the Garden Centre applied for a 6 metres internally illuminated totem sign to the east of their entrance (application number 2012/0656) which was again approved by planning committee contrary to officer recommendation in May of this year. The proposed sign subject to this application is directly to the east of the approved garden centre sign.

4.4 121 Computers have said that they are prepared to agree for the totem sign given permission under 2011/1164 to be voluntarily revoked with no compensation. The Garden Centre does not wish to be party to a joint sign and are unlikely to agree to the revocation of their approved sign.

4.5 Policy IMP19 permits advertisements as long as they are well designed, in scale, appropriate to the building and its use and positioned so as to preserve or enhance the overall appearance of the building.

4.6 Policy IMP21 only permits illuminated advertisements within central business areas. On listed building and in conservation areas illuminated advertisements will only be granted where the general level of illumination in the area is such as to require an illuminated sign to satisfactorily identify the business and should only be illuminated with non-flashing external light source. Outside the central business area illuminated signs will only be permitted on businesses dependent on evening trade.

4.7 The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies, IMP19 and IMP21 in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because although those policies are only partially consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework as the NPPF states that only advertisements that have an appreciable impact on a building or their surroundings should be subject to the local authority’s detailed assessment, I consider that in this particular case the impact of this advertisement is significant and does warrant detailed assessment.
4.8 In view of previous approval for signs of this scale, I consider that an additional sign of this size and level of illumination would cause significant harm to the visual amenity of the conservation area and would be contrary to both policies IMP18 IMP19 and IMP21 of the SNLP. The sign is considered excessive for these types of business, which is not dependent on evening trade. The accumulative impact of the signs would cause significant harm to the Conservation Area.

4.9 Given the precedent that has been set for two approved signs it could be said that there was some benefit in having one joint sign rather than two signs. But this benefit could only be secured if both parties were prepared to voluntarily revoke their permissions without compensation, which is not the case.

4.10 This sign is directly to the east of the approved Garden centre sign so both signs would obscure one side of each other if they were erected.

4.11 The Highway Officer has raised concern about the potential proliferation of signs on the site; the approval of this application could result in three large signs being erected which would be a distraction to road users which could be detrimental to the safe and free flow of traffic.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The proposal is contrary to the provision of the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 including, in particular, policies IMP19 – Advertisements, IMP21 – Illuminated advertisements, IMP18 Development in Conservation Areas and IMP8 – Safe and free flow of traffic. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies IMP19 and IMP21 in the South Norfolk Local Plan, because those policies remain partially consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework, however the significant impact of this advertisement does warrant detailed assessment. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policy IMP18 and IMP8 in the South Norfolk Local Plan, because those policies remains consistend with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The proposed internally illuminated totem sign due its size and level of illumination would adversely affect the character and appearance of the adjacent conservation area.

5.3 There is a proliferation of advertisement signs on the site and proposed additional of a further (illuminated) advertisement would add to the distraction of highway users and could interfere with the free flow of traffic and to the detriment of safety of the adjoining highway, contrary to policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman, 01508 533833, and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
12. **Appl. No**: 2012/0959/F  
**Parish**: GREAT MOULTON

**Applicants Name**: Mr & Mrs Brown  
**Site Address**: Meadow View, The Haulage Yard, Broadgate Lane, Great Moulton, Norfolk, NR15 2HX  
**Proposal**: Retrospective application for retention of mobile home  
**Recommendation**: Refuse

- Insufficient justification for a dwelling in countryside location. Contrary to Policies ENV8.

1. **Planning Policies**
   1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   Section 6 – Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes, paragraph 55
   1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 1: Addressing Climate Change and protecting environmental assets  
   Policy 17: Smaller rural communities and the countryside
   1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
   IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Consultations**
   2.1 Parish Council: No views or comments
   2.2 District Member: To be determined by committee unless for approval
   2.3 NCC Highways: No objections
   2.4 Local Residents: 1 letter of objection  
   - Moved into New House farm in 2008 and not aware of any overnight stays in the original caravan at the Haulage Yard until November 2011
   - Mr & Mrs Brown were living in a bungalow in Aslacton
   - The original caravan was used as a shelter as and when they came to the yard
   - Latest caravan arrived in January 2012 and old caravan moved away
   - Will set a precedent if not subject to proper planning procedure

3. **Assessment**
   3.1 This application seeks consent for the retention of a mobile home which is lived in by Mr and Mrs Brown an elderly couple, located at The Haulage Yard, Broadgate Lane.
3.2 The mobile home is located outside the development boundary for the village of Great Moulton and as such any new dwellings would be considered contrary to policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP). No evidence has been put to support the proposal under this policy. Policy 15 of the JCS identifies Great Moulton as a “Service Village” which will have defined development boundaries and can accommodate infill or small groups of dwellings. In addition, the NPPF promotes the presumption in favour of sustainable development, however the site is beyond the currently defined development limits and is a substantial distance from the defined settlements and as such I consider that countryside policies prevail. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies of the SNLP referred to above because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

3.3 The agent has advised that Mr and Mrs Brown acquired the site and associated house in 1984 and started running a livestock haulage business. For personal and financial reasons the house was sold in 2004 and they occupied the mobile for 6 months prior to moving to Aslacton. The mobile remained on site and was used in connection with the running of the small holding, welfare of the animals and security. In November last year they moved into the mobile home as a permanent residence.

3.4 The material planning considerations that have been put forward by the agent are that the site is well established business base and a small holding that includes cattle, horses, sheep and geese, therefore this justifies the need for someone to live on site. Plus security of vehicles and diesel stored on the site. Whilst I full appreciate the above, the nature and size of the holding would not justify the provision of an agricultural workers accommodation and while the protection of property can be a material consideration it is not by itself to be sufficient to justify a new dwelling. Equally based on the information provided by the agent and the neighbour the mobile has not been occupied long enough as an independent residential unit to enable a certificate of lawfulness to be applied for.

3.5 As this application is for the retention of the mobile, it is requested that subject to legal advice enforcement action be authorised to cease the use of the land for residential purposes and remove the static caravan/mobile from the land in its entirety.

5. **Reasons for Refusal**

5.1 The site is located in a countryside location where policies seek to restrict new dwellings including mobile homes to those required to enable agricultural, forestry and certain other full time workers to live at or in the immediate vicinity of their place of work. While the protection of property can be a material consideration it is not by itself to be sufficient to justify a new dwelling. The submitted details do not demonstrate that it is essential for the proper functioning of the enterprise for one or more workers to be readily available at most times. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy, Policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis, 01508 533788, ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
13. **Appl. No**: 2012/1003/A  
**Parish**: LODDON  
Applicants Name: Mr David Charles  
Site Address: Loddon Water Mill, 45 Bridge Street, Loddon, Norfolk, NR14 6NA  
Proposal: Retention of sign  
Recommendation: Approve with conditions  
1 In accordance with submitted drawings

14. **Appl. No**: 2012/1004/LB  
**Parish**: LODDON  
Applicants Name: Mr David Charles  
Site Address: Loddon Water Mill, 45 Bridge Street, Loddon, Norfolk, NR14 6NA  
Proposal: Retention of sign  
Recommendation: Approve with conditions  
1 In accordance with submitted drawings

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Section 7 – Requiring good design  
Section 12 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 19: Advertisements (Part Consistent)  
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/0507 Change of use of ground floor from private dwelling to vintage tea rooms and sale of bygones and collectables with no external or internal alterations. Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Loddon Parish Council: Approve  
Chedgrave Parish Council: Approve

3.2 District Members Mr C L Gould: To be determined by committee  
- The sign, although nicely made, is out of place on this listed building in its dominating position at the head of the river  
- Business is welcome as it offers employment and uses locally produced produce  
- There is a sign at the entrance to 45 Bridge Street and the need for two is questionable  
- Application at variance to Loddon Conservation Area Character Appraisal  
- A better solution would be a larger sign in the Staithe car park
Brings into question IMP4, IMP13 and IMP19 of SNLP and paras 67 and 68 of NPPF.

Mr D Blake : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : No comments received

3.4 Broads Authority : No objections as the sign does not have a significant detrimental impact on the character and setting of the Broads.

3.5 Lower Yare Third I D B : No comments received

3.6 Conservation Officer : Approve

3.7 Local Residents/businesses : 6 letters of objection
   - Any sign inappropriate but this is nothing short of vandalism
   - Too big/large
   - Set a precedent
   - Dominating on such a beautiful and historically important building
   - One of Norfolk’s oldest mills
   - Does not fit in with surroundings
   - Not in keeping with other signs in the location
   - Signs on Mill in past but in sole ownership
   - Erected without consultation with neighbours
   - Erected without consent
   - Sign made of plastic and wood is inappropriate
   - Community asset and its external appearance and character should be preserved for future generations
   - Unnecessary as two signs already exist at entrance gate
   - Alternative business advertising available nearby at Church Plain and Loddon Staith notice boards
   - Suggest all 3 businesses in Loddon Mill apply for permission to erect and maintain a sign at Loddon Staith

4. Assessment

4.1 These applications seek advertisement consent and listed building consent for the retention of a sign erected on Loddon Water Mill.

4.2 The Mill is listed grade 2, 18th and 19th centuries, weather boarded with pantiled roofs. The main mill is three storeys and attic, with the two storey Mill house, rendered, on the left, and a lower range to the right. The building is in a prominent position in the street and Conservation Area, at the “entrance” to Loddon from the north, and at the head of the river on the east side. The sign has been erected in connection with the recently approved vintage tea rooms and sale of bygones and collectables.

4.3 The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policy IMP19 in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because although the policy is only partially consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework as the NPPF states that only advertisements that have an appreciable impact on a building or their surroundings should be subject to the local authority’s detailed assessment, it is considered in this case that the impact of this advertisement is significant and does warrant detailed assessment.
4.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes under Section 7 that the control of advertisements should be efficient, effective and simple in concept and operation. Policy IMP19 in the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) requires advertisements to be well designed, in scale, appropriate to the building and its use and positioned so as to preserve or enhance the overall appearance of the building.

4.5 The sign is an Aluminium composite Di bond panel with printed vinyl laminated graphics, it is framed with a hardwood oak frame. The applicant has advised that he considers that the effect is exactly the same as if the main panel was made of wood and has been built to resist the additional exposure to the elements due to its positioning on the main road and the dirt spray from passing lorries and double decker buses.

4.6 When the Mill was a restaurant in the late 1970s, there was a board sign fixed between the upper two windows on the east side of the Mill. There are equally other mills in the county which have signs, some with individual letters or painted directly onto the boarding. The Conservation Officer and I have assessed the proposal and consider that a sign on this side of the Mill is justified in this case, given that the primary elevation faces the river, the absence of an entrance or shop window, the proximity of the Mill so close to the road, and the previous history of the building. The position of the sign set between the two windows, is considered appropriate. The colour and style of the sign is not unlike the Well Being Centre signage which was a deliberate decision by the applicants; it is an attractive sign. Whilst it is appreciated that the sign is large, over 2metres by 1 metre, the Mill is a large scaled building with an industrial background.

4.7 The concerns raised by local residents and Local member as set out above are fully appreciated, however, the conservation officer and I do not consider the sign to be inappropriate and it does not adversely affect the character and appearance of the Mill. It is reasonable for the applicant to wish to advertise the business carried out in the premises, on the building itself as do the other business in Loddon, rather than off site in the Church Plain and the Staithe car parks.

5. Reasons for Approval 2012/1003

5.1 The sign is acceptable respect of the aims of the 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 IMP19 – Advertisements of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

5.2 The sign accords with the above policy IMP19 as the advertisement is in scale; appropriate to the building and its use; and positioned so not to adversely affect the overall appearance of the listed building.

6. Reasons for approval 2012/1004

6.1 The sign is considered to accord with Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as it has been designed to ensure that it would not adversely affect the special architectural and historic interest of the building.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Claire Curtis, 01508 533788, ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk