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Please note that item numbers 6-13 will not be heard by the Committee before 3.15 pm

Pool of Substitutes

Leslie Dale
Nigel Legg
Brian Riches
Vivienne Bell

Pre-Committee Members' Question Time

12.15pm – 12.45pm Blomefield Room

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 on items 1 – 5, and arrive at 3.15 pm if you intend to speak on items 6-13.

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

South Norfolk Council

Agenda

Date

Wednesday 12 September 2012

Time

1.00 pm

Place

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

Contact

Caroline Heasley   tel (01508) 533685
South Norfolk District Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

Email: democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Website: www.south-norfolk.gov.uk
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 15 August 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>2012/1278/F</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>14 Mere Street, Diss</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2012/1279/LB</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>14 Mere Street, Diss</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010/2225/O</td>
<td>THARSTON and HAPTON</td>
<td>Land at Chequers Road Tharston</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2012/0530/F</td>
<td>REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON</td>
<td>Land north-west of Briar Farm, Mendham Lane, Harleston</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2012/1049/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>The Caravan, Green Field Farm, Chepore Lane, Spooner Row</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2012/1269/F</td>
<td>COLNEY</td>
<td>Car parking at Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital, Colney Lane</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2012/0364/F</td>
<td>SHELTON</td>
<td>Land north of Balls Green, Primrose Lane, Shelton</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2012/0835/F</td>
<td>HEYWOOD</td>
<td>The Goat House, Burston Road, Heywood</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2012/0869/F</td>
<td>EASTON</td>
<td>Chez Denis Restaurant, 76 Dereham Road</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2012/0972/F</td>
<td>BUNWELL</td>
<td>Bluebell Cottage, Brick Kiln Lane, Bunwell</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2012/1261/H</td>
<td>PORINGLAND</td>
<td>5 Cawstons Meadow</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2012/1322/H</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>9 A Lynch Green, Hethersett</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2012/1412/F</td>
<td>TASBURGH</td>
<td>Greenacres Farm, Ipswich Road, Tasburgh</td>
<td>143</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. **Enforcement Reports**  
   (attached – page 146)

8. **Planning Appeals (for information)**  
   (attached – page 156)

9. **Planning Appeal decision at Townhouse Road, Costessey (for information)**  
   (attached – page 157)
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 five minutes. After four minutes the circle on the screen turns amber and then it turns red after five 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>Category</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire alarm</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td>A water dispenser is provided in the corner of the Council Chamber for your use</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>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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.P</td>
<td>Structure Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.N.L.P</td>
<td>South Norfolk Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.D</td>
<td>Permitted Development – buildings and works which do not normally require planning permission. (The effect of the condition is to require planning permission for the buildings and works specified).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C.S</td>
<td>Joint Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.P.P.F</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

**Report of Director of Development and Environment**

Key to letters included within application reference number to identify application type – e.g. 07/96/3000/A – application for consent to display an advert:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Advert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Certificate of Alternative Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Change of Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Reserved Matters (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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.P</td>
<td>Structure Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.N.L.P</td>
<td>South Norfolk Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.D</td>
<td>Permitted Development – buildings and works which do not normally require planning permission. (The effect of the condition is to require planning permission for the buildings and works specified).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C.S</td>
<td>Joint Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.P.P.F</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enforcement Report

Report of The Development Control Services Manager

1. Enforcement Ref : 2004/0254
Parish : WORTWELL
Site : Station Farm
       High Road
       Wortwell
       Norfolk
       IP20 0EN
Development : Standing of a caravan
Developer : Mr F Bennett

1. Background

1.1 In 2008 an Enforcement Notice was served requiring the removal of a towing caravan situated on a field to the north of the A143 in Wortwell which was being for residential occupation and the removal of the non agricultural items stored on the land. The Enforcement Notice took effect on the 17th April 2008 with a compliance period of three years for the removal of the caravan from the land and a compliance period of two months for the removal of the non-agricultural stored items.

1.2 The occupier of the caravan Mr Paul King wrote to the Council prior to the expiry of the compliance period formally requesting that either the period for compliance be extended for a further three years or the Enforcement Notice be withdrawn. The Committee resolved to extend the compliance period for a further one year. At this time a Section 215 Notice was also served requiring the proper maintenance of the land. This Notice required the clearance of all stored items not used in connection with the enjoyment of the residential use of the caravan. This notice has been complied with.

1.3 Mr King has written again requesting either a further extension to the compliance period or the withdrawal of the Enforcement Notice. He states that he has still not been able to find an alternative site, this site allows him to live in the lifestyle of his choice, is in close proximity to his elderly mother, daughter and her children.

2. Planning Policies

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites
Policy H: Paragraph 25

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council : The caravan has never been given permission and the parish Council definitely want it removed forthwith. Over the years we have received many complaints, about illegal fires, (many of which have involved calling out the local fire brigade) and the dumping of builders rubbish and we do not see why the village should tolerate the situation any longer.
3.2 District Member: The site looks much tidier now, but I don't think the local community will be keen to see this extended. He/we need to find a permanent solution.

4. Assessment

4.1 There is an unmet need for caravan pitches within the District, there is no evidence of currently available suitable alternative provision for the occupants who would need the sites.

4.2 Policy H paragraph 25 of the Planning Policy For Traveller Sites states that 'if a local planning authority cannot demonstrate and up-to-date five-year supply of deliverable sites, this should be a significant material consideration in any subsequent planning decision when considering applications for the grant of temporary planning permission'. Whilst the request for an extension to the compliance period is not an application for temporary planning permission the thrust of this paragraph 25 is still relevant and a material consideration when deciding whether to extend the compliance period.

4.3 The Council envisages making provision through the local planning process and the earliest estimate of when a Development Plan Document (DPD) might be completed to allocate sites for all kinds of accommodation was, in the summer of 2011, 18 months minimum to 2 ½ years.

4.4 In May 2011 a Planning Inspector, when deciding a Planning Appeal on another Travellers site, believed it reasonable to work on a basis of a three year completion period of the DPD and a further two years would be needed to allow for actual delivery of sites. At the Appeal the Planning Inspector believed, on the balance of probability, that the need for alternative sites was likely to be met in four years, in the summer of 2015.

4.5 Although the policy context has changed, the fundamental reasons for requiring removal of the caravans remain valid. Whilst the Parish Council and District Member comments are noted the lack of alternative sites and the experience from the previously mentioned appeal, suggests that the period for compliance with the Enforcement Notice should be extended.

5. Recommendation

5.1 That the date for compliance for the Enforcement Notice served on 17th March 2008 is extended to September 2015.
Background

1.1 It was brought to our attention earlier this year that a close-boarded wooden fence and a pergola had been erected to the front of 7a Alburgh Road without the benefit of planning permission. The fence and pergola are both nearly 2 metres tall.

1.2 The owners of the site were requested to either remove the pergola and reduce the height of the fence to not exceed 1 metre adjacent to the highway or submit a planning application to regularise situation.

1.3 The owners chose to remove the pergola and reduce the height of the fence. Whilst the fence was reduced in height it still exceeds 1 metre in certain areas by up to 150mm. There has also been some dead wood placed within the boundary which helps screen the property, however this does not require planning permission.

Planning Policies

2.1 Joint Core Strategy (JCS)

2.2 Policy 2: Promoting Good Design

Consultations

3.1 Parish Council: To be reported

3.2 District Member: To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways: To be reported

3.4 Local Residents: To be reported

Assessment

4.1 The property is located in an area of linear development where there is a mixture of frontages, although predominantly hedging. The fence as originally built was considered to be out of keeping with the local distinctiveness of the area and have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the locality.

4.2 The fence is located close to the highway and two neighbouring properties. NCC Highways haven been consulted on the works and their comments will be reported to the committee.
4.3 The fence having been reduced in height to marginally over 1 metre has much less of an impact on the locality and the local distinctiveness of the area. Whilst the fence exceeds the 1 metre allowed by permitted development given it is only marginally taller in some areas I do not consider it to be expedient to take enforcement action in this instance subject to the views of NCC Highways.

5. Recommendation

5.1 That subject to the views of NCC Highways no further action be taken on the matter
3. **Enforcement Ref**: 2012/8164  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM  
**Site**: Land on the South East Side of Norwich Common  
Wymondham  
NR18 0SL  
**Development**: Display of Unauthorised Advertisement  
**Developer**: Mr S Maddison

1. **Background**

1.1 An application for the retention of an advertisement board has been refused under the delegated system on the grounds of visual impact on the locality and on highway safety. A copy of the delegated report is attached as appendix 2 which gives an assessment of the sign and the grounds of refusal.

2. **Assessment**

2.1 I consider that the sign does detract from the area and results in highway safety issues. For these reasons I consider it expedient to request authority for Prosecution Action to secure the removal of the sign if necessary.

3. **Recommendation**

3.1 Authorise prosecution if necessary, to secure removal of the sign.
DELEGATED REPORT

Appl. No. : 2012/1231/A
Parish : WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Mr S Maddison
Site Address : Land on the South East side of Norwich Common, Wymondham, Norfolk
Proposal : Charles Church sign advertising the Oaklands Development at Becketts Grove, in the field on land south east side of Norwich Common

Recommendation : Refuse
1 - Contrary to SNLP policy
2 - Visual Impact and safety issue relating to highway safety

Planning Policies

National Planning Policy Framework
Section 7 requiring good Design

Joint Core Strategy
Policy 2 Promoting Good Design

South Norfolk Local Plan
IMP8 : Highway Safety
IMP19 : Advertisements
IMP22 : Corporate Signs

Planning History

2012/1374/EA – Screening opinion for proposed residential development

Consultations

Town Council : Refuse
Inappropriate location – distracts motorists and endangers the free flow of traffic

District Member : No comments received

NCC Highways : Object - interfere with the free flow of traffic to the detriment of safety on the adjoining highway.

Historic Environment Service : No comments received

Landscape Officer : No objections

Local Residents : No comments received
Assessment

The sign has already been erected situated on the east side of the roundabout. The land on which the advertisement is positioned is not the development site which is further north off Norwich Road.

Policies in the JCS, Local Plan and requirements of the NPPF seek to ensure that proposals are for an appropriate use, are of good design and do not adversely affect the visual appearance of the area. 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.

The development is assessed against the above policies, however I consider that the sign is inappropriately placed being close to the highway and not on land to which the advertisement refers. The scale of the advert detracts from the open nature of the site and is a distraction of highway users for these reasons I consider the advertisement is in conflict with the above policies.

Reason for Refusal

The proposal is contrary to the provisions of Policy 2 of the JSC and the adopted South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 including, in particular, policies IMP8, IMP19 and IMP22. 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.

The advertisement has already been installed on the site however it does not relate to the area of land on which it is displayed. The height and design of the sign is considered to have an adverse impact on the visual appearance of the area. In addition due to the position of the sign in such close proximity to a roundabout it causes a distraction to road users resulting in the advertisement being in conflict with highway safety and the purposes of policy IMP8.

1. In my opinion, this proposal satisfies the scheme of delegation (effective from 01.01.12) and does not need to be reported to committee.
2. All periods of publicity (Site Notice, Press Notice and Consultee response time limits) have expired.

Case Officer: _________________________ Authorised Officer:_____________________

Dated: _________________________ Dated: _____________________
Applications referred back to Committee

1. **Appl. No**: 2012/1278/F  
   **Parish**: DISS
   
   **Applicants Name**: William Hill Organisation Ltd  
   **Site Address**: 14 Mere Street, Diss, Norfolk, IP22 4AD  
   **Proposal**: Use of premises for A2 purposes as a licensed betting office, including the installation of 2no. a/c condenser units, 2 satellite dishes and an aerial.
   
   **Recommendation**: Approve with conditions
   
   1. Full - Planning Permission Time Limit
   2. In accordance with submitted drawings
   3. Conditions on hours of use 08:00-10:30
   4. No use of plant and machinery 23:00 - 07:00
   5. Details of provision of receptacle for cigarette
   6. Access to public by Mere Street entrance only

2. **Appl. No**: 2012/1279/LB
   **Parish**: DISS
   
   **Applicants Name**: William Hill Organisation Ltd  
   **Site Address**: 14 Mere Street, Diss, Norfolk, IP22 4AD  
   **Proposal**: Use of premises for A2 purposes as a licensed betting office, including the installation of 2no. a/c condenser units, 2 satellite dishes and an aerial.
   
   **Recommendation**: Approve with conditions
   
   1. Listed building Time Limit
   2. In accordance with submitted drawings

This application was deferred from Development Management Committee on 15th August 2012 as additional information had been received and there had been insufficient time to consider this prior to the committee meeting. For the purposes of simplicity all updates to the applications have been incorporated into this report.

1. **Planning Policies**

   1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
   Section 2: Ensuring the vitality of Town Centres
   Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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

   1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**
   SHO 5: Mix of uses within Central Business Areas
   IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)
   IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.
   IMP10: Noise
### Planning History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/0450</td>
<td>Proposed removal of ground floor staircase and partition wall, making good first floor and installation of external staircase and safety balustrade</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/0449</td>
<td>Proposed removal of ground floor staircase and partition wall, making good first floor and installation of external staircase and safety balustrade</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/1907</td>
<td>Proposed removal of ground floor staircase and partition wall, making good first floor</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/1203</td>
<td>Installation of disabled w.c</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/0874</td>
<td>Relocation of staff facilities from second floor to first floor</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/0839</td>
<td>Proposed demolition of modern single storey extension removal of existing staircase &amp; erection of new rear extension</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/0840</td>
<td>Proposed demolition of modern single storey extension removal of existing staircase &amp; erection of new rear extension</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consultation

3.1 **Town Council**

- NPPF now supersedes previous national guidance
- NPPF promotes competitive town centres that provide customer choice and diverse retail offer and which reflects the individuality of town centre
- Where town centres are in decline, local authorities should plan positively for their future to encourage economic activity
- In comparison with some town centres, Diss is relatively stable but there are signs of decline with vacant units
- Concern over loss of another retail unit, may have short term gain but will not contribute to viability of town centre in long term
- A1 use of this type does little to encourage economic activity, detracts from street scene and reduces diverse retail offer
- Diss wishes to retain character and individuality which is being eroded with loss of retail to A2
- Already 2 betting shops in Mere Street
- Loss of retail will not help the town recover economically and affect the viability of town in the long term
- Another betting shop is opening in Mavery House, if another is granted it will result in 4 in the town
With regard to appeal decision all application should be given consideration on their own individual merits. In appeal case betting shop was only one in the town and was seeking to extend into adjacent premise which was too small to rent as a viable unit. Special justification was made.

These circumstances very different, this application is 4th betting premises in primary area, currently occupied by a charity shop.

SHO5 is a saved policy subjective approach is leading a significant erosion of A1 retail space.

Proposal does not meet objectives of NPPF.

Alterations to listed building appear to be acceptable.

3.2 District Member
Mr Keith Kiddie: To be determined by committee
- I am concerned that by approving this application there will be a lack of commercial diversity on the High Street of Diss.

Mr G H Walden: To be determined by committee
- Will result in a fourth betting shop in less than 200m of the high street of Diss.
- Independent Town Centre Committee is working to revitalise the Town Centre, the application with have a negative impact on their work.
- The Town Council's own attempt to develop a coherent neighbourhood plan.
- It would do nothing to promote competition in market town centres as required by the NPPF nor improve retail services which the town desperately needs.
- I urge the Committee to refuse this application.

Mr Tony Palmer: To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 Environmental Services (Protection):
- Conditional support
  - Conditions on hours of use 08:00-10:30
  - No use of plant and machinery 23:00 - 07:00
  - Provision of receptacle for cigarette

3.4 Conservation Officer: No objection:
- Clarification required on signage

3.5 Planning Policy: Support
- If predominate use in primary retail area is still A1 and there are no over concentrations of A2 uses.

3.6 Richard Bacon MP
Object
- Considers South Norfolk’s interpretation of policy SHO 5 prior to the Wymondham appeal decision is closer in spirit to the National Planning Policy Framework than the subsequent interpretation.
- Little weight should be given to Wymondham decision as it sought to extend a business into a small neighbouring property which was not considered to be a viable retail unit. The appeal decision has little in common with the current applications.
- Impending closure of Stead and Simpsons will leave east side of Mere Street dominated by betting shops.
- Three betting shops within a minute's walk and a further one opening in Mavery House consider proliferation of betting shops to be deleterious to the town.
- 1997 South Norfolk Retail study showed Diss was trading well but lacked vitality. The catering offer is healthy but the closure if Stead and Simpson show that towns retail offer continues to decline.
- Difficult to see how unit will ever be reclaimed for retail
- Will add nothing to the vibrancy and vitality

12 letters of objection
- Present occupier is the only business in the area providing furniture recycling service, close will result in loss of facility and additional burden on waste disposal facilities
- Loss of a retail outlet in a town already seeing a downturn in footfall, to encourage visitor and residents to support town and boost local economy we need the right mix of shops not 4 betting shops and 3 within 50 metres
- Application site is adjacent to existing Coral bookmakers and close to Ladbrokes, question the need for three betting shops so close together
- Loss of shopping attraction, town to attain look and feel of a mini Las Vegas.
- Should retain shops so we can attract more retailers.
- Have to travel to Norwich to access items such as affordable ladies fashion and computers
- A better range of shop would help to support local restaurants and cafes
- Disabled people are reliant on local shops
- We need some other shops rather than charity, betting, coffee and professional
- Should not be encouraging more gambling
- Publication of NPPF gives the opportunity to re-assess policy
- Weight should not be given to Wymondham appeal decision (Coral were extending into adjacent small listed building so there was special justification)
- No special justification in this instance as property vacant
- No evidence that an alternative use can not be found
- Concentration of betting shops would undermine retail attractiveness of Mere Street
- In Ladbrokes case building was vacant and was adjacent to a different type of A2
- Annual Monitoring Report 2010 identified loss of retail
- Most primary shopping Area should retain 70-80% A1
- Proposal fails to add to the range of services
- Policy SHO5 still a saved policy.
- Appeal decisions on appeals relating to betting shops which have been dismissed have been submitted.
4. Assessment

4.1 The application relates to 14 Mere Street in Diss, which is a listed building within the Conservation Area. The building is part of the primary shopping area for Diss. The building is currently occupied by the YMCA as a retail unit. It is proposed to change the use of the property to a betting shop (A2). The application also proposes minor internal works, two satellites dishes and condenser units on the flat roof at the rear of the property.

4.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes competitive town centre environments and states the viability and vitality of town centres should be supported and competitive town centres which provide customer choice and a diverse retail offer should be promoted.

4.3 The main policy in the South Norfolk Local Plan relating to the change of use is policy SHO5, which is a very restrictive policy that does not permit the loss of any retail premises. The aim of this policy, is to protect the vitality and viability of town centres by preserving A1 uses within primary shopping areas.

4.4 Whilst the principle of policy SHO5 is broadly consistent with the NPPF which supports the principle of policies identifying Primary Shopping Areas and policies that make it clear which uses will be permitted in such locations; paragraph 23 in the NPPF does not however, offer any additional support to policy SHO5 in comparison to previous national guidance in terms of restricting uses in the Primary Shopping Area to the A1 use class.

4.5 In the past the very restrictive interpretation of policy SHO5, has been relaxed as a result of an appeal decision in Wymondham and also due to changes in national policy. The Wymondham appeal decision (application number 2002/0121) related to a change of use from A1 to A2. The relevance of the Wymondham appeal decision has been questioned. However, although the Wymondham decision was based on a particular set of circumstances I would maintain that the appeal decision is relevant in requiring a more liberal interpretation of policy SHO5 than refusing all applications for a change of use from A1 regardless of any other considerations. The appeal decision involved a loss of an A1 unit to be incorporated into an adjoining A2 use which was clearly contrary to SHO5, thereby setting a precedent that such change of use applications can be permitted if other considerations show that the majority of units within the primary shopping area remain in A1 use.

4.6 The key issues in determining this application is whether the loss of this A1 unit would adversely impact on the vitality and viability of Diss town centre and whether the proposal adds to customer choice and a diverse retail offer.

4.7 Information submitted by the applicant indicates that when taking into consideration the use of vacant units and the proposed change of use 62.2% of premises within the primary shopping area would still be retail. I have surveyed the primary shopping area myself and there are some anomalies with the applicant’s data with my calculations the percentage of retail units would be 62.5%. I therefore consider that there is still a predominance of retail in the primary shopping area and although it will not increase the retail offer it will add to customer choice in a particular service. The applicant has in additional submitted figures showing the high level of foot fall that betting shops produce.
4.8 In addition an assessment of the potential harm that a change of use may cause to the integrity of the Primary Shopping Area also needs to be made including ensuring the excessive concentrations of ‘dead’ frontages arising as a result of a grouping of too many A2 uses together. Although there is already a betting shop in the building next to the application site, Mere Street remains predominantly A1 retail, and I do not consider that this change of use would result in a concentration of uses which would harm the vitality and viability of the town centre to such an extent that would warrant a refusal.

4.9 Two appeal decision notices have been submitted to the Council which are available to view on the Council’s website as is the Wymondham appeal decision. With regard to the Deptford appeal decision and issues of anti social behaviour in this case there was a far larger number of betting shops and a pre-existing anti social behaviour problem in the area. I am not aware that there is currently a significant anti social behaviour problem relating to betting shops in Diss so I therefore consider that the decision has very little weight. The second decision in Harrow relates to a specific policy which includes percentages of non-retail use within the policy text, something that is not in policy SHO5.

4.10 It is not the role of the planning system to assess the demand for uses including betting shops.

4.11 The Conservation Officer raises no objection to the proposed alterations to the listed building the satellite dishes and air conditioning units are located a flat roof of to the rear of the property which are screened from Chapel Street by existing buildings.

4.12 Environmental Services have not raised any objection to the application. They have however, noted that the air conditioning could cause a nuisance if operated during the night; further acoustic information would need to be submitted to assess this. However, the applicant is prepared to accept a condition that it is not used during the night. They have also recommended any hours of use condition and the details of a receptacle for cigarettes is provided as problems have occurred in the past with cigarette litter outside betting shops

4.13 A concern has been raised about access by members of the public to the rear of the property and this does appear to be something that occurs in the adjacent betting shop. In order to prevent access by members of the public via the rear of the property in excessive numbers which may be detrimental to amenity I have proposed a condition restricting public access to the Mere Street entrance.

4.14 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. Policy IMP13 is only partially consistent but no harm is caused to the listed buildings.

5. Reasons for approval 2012/1278/F

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 1 – Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets, Policy 2 – Promoting good design of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies IMP13 – Alterations to listed buildings, IMP18 – Development in Conservation Areas, IMP10 - Noise 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 / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework. Policy IMP13 is only partially consistent but no harm is caused to the listed buildings.

5.2 The Primary Shopping Area will still be predominantly A1 taking into account the proposed change of use and the proposal would not result in an over concentration of use A2 uses which would result in harm being caused to the vitality and viability of the town centre.
5.3 The development would not result in a level noise and disturbance which would be detrimental to the amenity of nearby residents.

5.4 The development is considered to accord with Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP18 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area due to the overall design and detailing of the scheme.

5.5 The development 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 preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

6. Reasons for Approval 2012/1279/LB

6.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 1 – Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets, Policy 2 – Promoting good design of the Joint Core Strategy and policy IMP13 – Alterations to listed buildings 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 policy remain partially consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework. Policy IMP13 is only partially consistent but no harm is caused to the listed buildings.

6.2 The development 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 preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman, 01508 533833, and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Development Management Committee
12 September 2012

Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

3. Appl. No : 2010/2225/O
Parish : THARSTON and HAPTON

Applicants Name : Sunguard Land Ltd
Site Address : Land at Chequers Road Tharston Norwich
Proposal : Outline application for residential development of up to 120 dwellings and associated works including access from Chequers Road and Jermyn Way (amended proposal)

Recommendation : Authorise director of Development and Environment to Approve

1 Outline planning permission time limit
2 Reserved matters
3 Maximum of 120 dwellings
4 Element of single storey dwellings
5 Master plan to be agreed
6 Water efficiency scheme to be agreed
7 Landscape/replacement planting
8 Tree protection, retention and arboricultural report (highway trees)
9 Levels to be agreed
10 10% renewable energy on site
11 Bio-diversity off-setting, mitigation and enhancement measures
12 No development until foul water strategy prepared to determine mitigation measures and agreed with Anglian Water
13 No development until surface water strategy/flood risk assessment agreed with Anglian Water
14 No development until preliminary risk assessment submitted and agreed with Environment Agency, including verification report
15 Contamination
16 Pollution control – comprehensive working practices procedures
17 Surface drainage scheme – run-off etc
18 Scheme carried out in accordance with submitted FRA
19 Details of management of sustainable drainage scheme (foul water) at each stage
20 Retention, protection and enhancement of hedgerows
21 No development until programme of archaeological evaluation
22 Full details of roads, footways, cycleways, foul and on site water drainage
23 Full details of access arrangements
24 Full details of parking provision in accordance with adopted standard
25 Access in accordance with approved pans including footway link to school
26 Highway improvements – off site – Swan Lane/Chequers Road junction, Chequers Road form Swan Lane to new access roundabout
27 Off-site works competed to satisfaction of Highway Authority and lpa
28 Off-site works for MOVA before 21 dwellings occupied and to satisfaction of Highway Authority and lpa
29 Retention of trees and hedges as indicated, including highway trees (and submission of appropriate surveys and assessments)
30 Landscaping (inc details of management)
31 Bio-diversity off setting plan
32 Materials to be agreed
33 Boundary treatment
34 Play areas to be provided

Subject to Section 106 Agreement in respect of affordable housing (and associated claw back), off site highway works, education and library contributions, older children/adult open space, ecology off-setting and community facilities.
1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
Section 6: Delivering 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

Paragraphs 14 (sustainable development)
49 (5 year supply), 214 & 215 (status of Local Plan Policies)

1.2 Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4: Housing delivery
Policy 7: Supporting communities
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 14: Key Service Centres
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 Saved Policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP)
ENV8: Development in the open countryside (part consistent)
ENV14: Habitat protection
ENV15: Species protection
IMP2: Landscaping
IMP8: Safe and free flow of traffic
IMP9: Residential amenity
UTL15: Contributions to recreation and community facilities
TRA1: Provision of pedestrian links
TRA7: Off site highway improvements

The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above as they remain consistent or part consistent with the NPPF.

2. Planning History

2.1 2010/0499 Screening opinion for residential development EIA not required

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Councils:
Tharston and Hapton

Original comments
Refuse
- outside development boundary
- contrary to emerging JCS as it is not linked to funding of the Long Stratton By-pass
- it would encroach into a parish not designated for development
- the associated loss of rural character and biodiversity is illustrated in the submitted Ecology report, which identifies the site as BAP habitat of lowland meadow
• it would add to volume of traffic on the single lane portion of Chequers Road, with consequential further verge erosion and loss of residential amenity
• Chequers Road is already over-burdened with both the amount and speed of through traffic.
• The suggested MOVA scheme to improve access onto A140 at the Flowerpot Lane lights would make it worse
• lack of capacity for more foul and surface water drainage
• there is insufficient infrastructure in Long Stratton for further development on this scale

Re Service report – nothing to add to objections

Comments on amendments:
Refuse
• re-iterate previous objections, plus following concerns:
  • greatly concerned that new Ecology report is in contradiction with the previous one
  • we consider ecology impact unacceptable and will be taking steps to assess the rural character and biodiversity of the plot due to conflicting reports
  • have serious concerns regarding the safety of Chequers Road – no safe pedestrian along this road to access to Long Stratton, current roundabout misused, concern another roundabout will cause road to be dangerous

Comments on latest amendments
Refuse
• all comments previously made are relevant, would like to reiterate its concerns re: environmental impact, lack of safe pedestrian access to Long Stratton and urbanisation of the rural village of Tharston
• IMP8 – serious concerns regarding the access to the site, it has been established that widening Chequers Road is NOT possible, relieved to hear this as it felt that the narrowness of the road works as natural speed reduction on a road that is already over used and has incidence of speeding. It strongly felt the access should NOT be from Jermyn Way. There is no scope to widen this road and it was not designed to take the increased amount of traffic that this proposal would create.
• the Parish Council does NOT consider a MOVA traffic light scheme in Long Stratton will be the answer – small country lanes in Tharston will become ‘rat runs’
• the development is in the Parish of Tharston and Hapton. The Parish Council would expect, if the proposed development went ahead, that all S106 agreement payments or community contributions be received by the Parish.

Original comments
Refuse
• fully endorses everything sent in by Tharston and Hapton
• does not want to see any estate scale development until there is a Long Stratton bypass
Re Service report – nothing to add to objections

Comments on amendments
Refuse
• the comments already made still stand

Additional comments
Refuse
• the drainage issue is of concern – foul water drainage, no conclusion reached in respect of flood risk assessment
• the development would mean generation of more traffic onto Flowerpot Lane at Long Stratton
• there is not sufficient infrastructure in Long Stratton
• it is contrary to the JCS policy – it is not linked to the A140
• there would be link with Long Stratton but no funding coming to it
• there is concern for safety if there were to be access through Jermyn Way due to the amount of traffic and parking on what is a narrow and twisting estate road, which is felt to be inadequate to serve the additional development proposed
• the development would effectively form an extension to Long Stratton, but any S106 or CIL funding would be unlikely to benefit Long Stratton since the site is within the parish of Tharston

3.2 District Members

Mrs S Rice (Member at time of original consultation) : To be determined by committee
• there has been a lot of concern from residents in relation to this development and the parish councils are against it. Potential highways and traffic problems regarding Chequers Road. This is a large development and I believe that the committee needs to closely examine that the infrastructure is put in place and is sufficient to sustain the number of houses

Mr T Blowfield
Mr A Pond : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : Comments on original scheme
Holding objection – inadequate road network
• the Highway Authority has had a long and continuous informal dialogue with regard to this proposed development and at no time has there not been full vehicular access to Jermyn Way
• the Highway Authority considers that this link is essential to the proper development of this area of housing
• this application only proposes an emergency access to Jermyn Way and Highway Authority does not consider this acceptable
Comments on amended scheme
Conditional support, has considered all the supporting information and has no highway objection
- note now proposed to provide second point of access from Jermyn Way. The Norfolk Design guide allows up to 200 dwellings to be served off a type 3 road (Jermyn Way is type 3 standard). The proposed development with that of Jermyn Way will satisfy that criteria so there can be not legitimate objection to the proposal on grounds of the standard of the new access road of Jermyn Way.
- the revised access proposals with the previously agreed off-site improvements to Swan Lane/Chequers Road and the Street/Flowerpot Lane junctions are acceptable to the Highway Authority
- note agent, Bidwells, would also accept a planning permission based on an emergency access route through to Jermyn Way, if your planning committee decided this was an appropriate highways solution. Given that the application was formally revised I would not have thought that the Planning Committee could grant permission for development with an emergency access only through to Jermyn Way. An ‘emergency access only’ scenario is not acceptable to the Highway Authority and would attend committee to rigorously defend the position of the Highway Authority.
- it is considered that walking routes to the village centre and local schools are most important to this development especially given the lack of footway provision on Chequers Road north of Jermyn Way.
- part of the mitigation package is the installation of MOVA at The Street/Flowerpot Lane junction. I am recommending this is covered by a Grampian condition in the normal way for off-site junction improvements with the works being procured under the terms of a S278 agreement between the Highway Authority and the developer. Note developer wants to cover this by a lump sum contribution but as no detailed design, cannot be confident this will cover the scheme costs, therefore not appropriate to accept a fixed sum.

3.4 Environment Agency : Original comments
Flood Risk
- Object, Flood Risk Assessment does not comply with the requirements of PPS25
- Drainage network
- a drainage network crosses through the site in a northerly direction towards the River Tas
- need to ensure adequate foul drainage infrastructure is in place
- unsure whether this housing development is included within the housing figures proposed within the JCS
- Contaminated Land
note Phase 1 Geo-environmental Assessment submitted, recommend condition for a preliminary risk assessment and verification
- contamination condition
- Energy and resource efficiency conditions
- Pollution control conditions
Note must use a registered waste carrier to authorised facility

Additional comments
Note issues of flood risk and foul water now excluded from report – our comments on flood risk remain the same
- note Anglian Waters report and there is capacity
- note Anglian Water noted capacity issue and a drainage strategy will be needed – we are not aware of any pollution issues, but have concerns that there may be higher risk of pollution; LPA needs to be satisfied that connection does not have adverse environmental impacts – consider this issue is considered further. Appropriate worded condition should be appended or a S106

Comments on Flood Risk Assessment
No objection to the application on flood risk, subject to condition that development not begin until surface water drainage scheme submitted based on sustainable drainage principles, carried out in accordance with FRA, maintenance scheme for drainage scheme

Amended scheme
No further comments to make

3.5 Anglian Water Services Ltd: Original comments
Foul drainage – at present there is capacity
Foul sewage network – development will lead to unacceptable risk of flooding down stream – a foul water drainage strategy will need to be prepared to determine mitigation measures and water strategy/flood risk assessment
Request notes/conditions on any decision:
- site layout should take into account and accommodate AW assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space

Comments on potential capacity issue
- the constraints at the sewage treatment works remain the same as reported in the Water Cycle Study(WCS)
- the WCS confirmed capacity for up top 1400 dwellings within the existing flow consents; it will be challenging to accommodate the full 1800 allocated and any additional will be an even further stretch
- it is not possible to forecast it and when technologies will be available to enable further capacity at the treatment works within the tight environmental constraints
- we have confirmed in response to this application that LS sewage treatment plant has the capacity to serve the 120 dwellings, but this will of course take up part of the 1400 available capacity
3.6 Natural England

- No objections
  - site lies approximately 2km to the east of Fornsett Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest
  - welcome the inclusion of the phase 1 habitat survey and ecology report, the report makes recommendations for enhancement and mitigation measure which should be implemented
  - NE’s aspiration is for 40% of new development to be multifunctional green space, of which at least 50% must be publicly accessible, this means of the 4.4 hectares, approximately 1.76 hectares should be designated green space within the development

Sent response direct to ‘Buglife’ who contacted them direct and advised:

- raised no objection to Lpa, but advised in our response that if development is permitted then part of the site should be restored and managed as lowland meadow and that wider biodiversity should be incorporated into the development. The Lpa should consider UKBAP species and habitats when implementing their duty under section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC) and Lpa should be able to demonstrate that they have fulfilled this duty, including a consideration of whether invertebrate surveys are required in order for them to determine the application.

Additional comments
- no further comments to make on latest amendment – Flood Risk Assessment

Comments on amendments
- refer to standing advice

Comments on further amendments
- raised no objection to original proposal and these amendments unlikely to have significantly different impacts on the natural environment than the original proposal

3.7 Police Architectural Liaison Officer

Original comments
Norfolk Constabulary is seeking S106 funding in relation to this development. Also to encourage the developer to construct to ‘Secured by Design’ principles seeking accreditation

Additional comments
- developer should be guided by principles of ‘Safer Places in the Planning System and Crime Prevention’, although not stated in the Design and Access Statement, it is clear that most of the principles have been considered
• the thorough route in the development should not be a
generator for inappropriate traffic movements or
excessive permeability, features such as surface
treatment and on street parking will discourage
motorists from using the ‘route’ as a ‘circuit’
• from the scale of development proposed and
considering future development in the GNDP area, it is
anticipated that it may require financial contributions
towards delivering Police services to address
community safety, tackle the fear of crime and seek to
achieve a reduction in crime

3.8 Environmental Services
(Protection) : Conditional support
• contaminated land during construction
• details of surface water and run-off
• details of how on-site pond will be managed
• note Anglian Water state there is capacity for foul
water drainage

Comments on Flood Risk Assessment
• note discharge to balancing pond should be controlled
at Greenfield run-off rate of 3.91/sec into the
watercourse at northern end of site
• need adequate management plan for future
maintenance of surface water drainage
• request study of foul water capacity, note Anglian
Water state capacity for 1400 dwellings

3.9 Design Officer : Comments on original
• completed Building for Life evaluation, note this is
only an informal evaluation as the application is
outline, a formal assessment will be carried out
following the submission of a Reserved Matter
application to establish a revised score
• initial score 4.5

Additional comments
Carried out revised Building for Life evaluation based on
the additional evidence submitted. The application has
scored 11.5 out of 20 and has the potential to score more
points as the reserved matters stage to comply with the
good design aspirations of policy 2 of the JCS

Attached at appendix 2 is the Building for Life evaluation

Further comments
• with respect to revised indicative density plan – the
proposed distribution of dwellings across the site, with
the lower density on the edges near the existing built
form and higher density towards the centre, is in my
view a logical and sensible way of distributing the
proposed ‘up to 120 dwellings’
• therefore have no objection to the indicative density
plan
3.10 Landscape Officer: Conditional support

- A comprehensive tree assessment has been provided and this is acceptable.
- I have previously indicated that I would not be adverse to the consideration of the removal of the poplars, and the subsequent master plan now proposes the replacement of these new trees of other species.
- Poplars are relatively short-lived trees and their quick growth rate means that they are often more brittle than other species, it is for these reasons that I take the view that it is generally inappropriate to use TPOs to protect poplars (with exception to rarer native black poplar).
- The situation around these trees is much different to when the TPO was served in 1991 when they were isolated from public access. Now dwellings and public open space are in close proximity, and these bring with them hazards that must be a consideration in risk assessment.
- Not considered in the report is the oak tree situated at the junction to Chequers Road and Swan Lane, nor the trees potentially affected by the necessary highway improvements, these all indicated as being retained by useful to have survey and arboricultural impact assessment.

3.11 Planning Policy: Original comments

Additional comments

- NPPF and status of local plan policies – NPPF is now a key consideration. Under paragraph 214 the JCS can still be given weight for 12 months, even though there is little conflict with the NPPF. Under paragraph 215 saved SNLP policies can still be given ‘due weight’ where they are consistent.
- The NPPF retains the requirement for local planning authorities (LPA’s) to be able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of specific, deliverable housing sites. This has been increased to 5 years plus 5% to offer greater choice and competition in the housing market or 5 years plus 20% in areas where there has been persistent under delivery.
- There is currently a shortfall in supply of housing land in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA), which is a significant material consideration.
- The applicant has indicated the site is available immediately, is readily serviced in a sustainable location, with good non-car access to local services, facilities and employment and that the NPPF includes a presumption in favour of such ‘sustainable development’.
• however the impact of approving the site still needs to be considered in the context of not prejudicing the overall growth in Long Stratton and delivery of required infrastructure, including a by-pass
• applicant has stated the proposal ‘is not dependent on the bypass proceeding’ and therefore the application can be logically considered as part of the floating 1800 dwellings’. As such the application would be considered as additional to the 1800 dwellings needed to deliver a bypass
• reference made to capacity at sewerage treatment and education but will need to be verified by Anglian Water and NCC:Education
• in principle if there is sufficient infrastructure capacity for development to proceed over and above the 1800 bypass related dwellings (and associated local employment) allocated to Long Stratton, there would be no policy objection to the site being considered as part of the ‘floating’ 1800 dwellings in the South Norfolk part of the NPA

Full comments are attached at Appendix 3

3.12 Housing Strategy Manager (Keith Mitchell)

Original comments
• unable to comment until receive more information on affordable housing proposals

Amended comments
The applicants propose an option that includes 10 affordable homes on site, would prefer a better mix: 2 x 1 bed flats; 2 x 2 house for rent; 2 x 3 bed house for rent; 2 x 2 bed houses for shared equity

3.13 Historic Environment Services

Original comments
Further archaeological evaluation by trial trenching is required prior to determination

Comments on amendments
Conditional support
• have received a report for the field evaluation of the site which contained no features of archaeological interest
• the field evaluation by trial trenching has given a guide to the reliability of the geophysical survey and now consider the information submitted to be sufficient to allow an informed planning decision to be made
• suggest condition to cover a programme of archaeological evaluation

3.14 Ecologist

Original comments
Refuse, although support enhancements of Ecology report, apart from reservations about management of lowland meadow habitat – given scale of habitat loss a management regime is unlikely to improve the biodiversity significantly enough and will result in loss of valuable UK BAP habitat
Additional comments
Need to identify area to be enhanced and managed. This will need to be subject to long term management plan and S106 to ensure it’s continued valued. Further invertebrate surveys would be useful to identify the most sensitive areas and to guide the management plan

Comments on additional information
- note the correspondence and changing opinions of various parties, it is my opinion that there is a reasonable likelihood that the central meadow has some existing biodiversity significance and, with some scrub clearance and basic management, the biodiversity potential may be significantly higher
- consider the applicant should retain the central area within the design plan, this should be accompanied by a condition to provide a management plan
- note the potential value for invertebrates of conservation concern has been raised but the comments made by Buglife, were, in my opinion, when it was indicated the sire was Lowland BAP habitat. As this is not the case, I do think this is a significant issue. Given the current flora and likely history of the site, it is reasonable to assumes some value for invertebrates and I do not feel further survey for invertebrates is necessary

Additional comments
- it is accepted that there is a requirement for compensation for biodiversity loss under planning policy and that biodiversity offsetting is an appropriate method to address this. The part of the site in question to be lost will require compensation is only the grassland section (described in original ecological survey as BAP lowland)
- the Consultant engaged by the applicant in this case has identified a grassland site that will be brought into condition and managed for 10 years as compensation
- the GNDP is part of the Defra pilot of Biodiversity Offsetting and has established a steering group to manage the off-setting process (NBOP). The NBOP steering group has approved the biodiversity offsetting approach in this application
- it will be necessary to secure via a S106 agreement and will be an assessment of the grassland of both the application site and the compensation site using Defra matrix, all parties have agreed to this with maximum commuted sum of £10,000

Attached as appendix 4 are the detailed comments of the District Ecologist, including full justification of the ecological issues
3.15 Norfolk Wildlife Trust

Original comments
Object
- the grassland habitat should be considered as UK BAP priority habitat
- do not agree that improved management of a portion of the meadow would be able to compensate for the loss of the majority of the former meadow and do not agree that this can be considered as enhancement

Comments on amendments
Maintain objection
- we accept argument put forward in the letter from the Ecology Consultancy regarding the BAP habitat status of the former arable land but it is clear that this land does have some ecological value as grassland even if it does not fit the criteria for BAP habitat
- as such if development were to proceed then mitigation for any loss will still be required
- concerned about loss of part of central grassland and incorporation of one of the boundary hedges in the development
- in our view for their to be sufficient mitigation the development should be at least 40% natural open space following advice from NE and TCPA – the whole of central field should be retained as natural green space and sufficient wildlife corridor (at least 20 metres) and subject to ecological enhancement, including protection and enhancement of existing hedgerows around central field and the perimeter of the site

Comment on further amendments
Not able to sustain overall objection
- accept that the central field is unlikely to be of BAP habitat status
- our advice regarding percentage of open green spaces were advisory and not the core of our objection and also did not refer to whether this would be gardens or not. In our view, the 405 figure is widely accepted and we are happy for SNC to decide how much of this area they would wish to see in gardens and how much public open space and accept appropriate to leave the exact location of this green space at a later stage.
- still remains view that there is likely to be less impact on biodiversity if the central field and accompanying hedgerows are retained as part of the overall green space
3.16 GNDP - Sandra Easthaugh: In relation to the JCS, the site is considered to be on the edge of the settlement for Long Stratton. A number of JCS polices will apply. The scale of growth proposed for Long Stratton in the JCS is dependent on, and intended to fund the provision of a bypass. Consequently development that undermines the provision of the by-pass would be contrary to the JCS.

3.17 NCC – Countryside Access Officer: There are 3 public rights of way that are located on the land. Need to identify the locations on path 31 as not fully coincident with the cycle route and in part is located on the field edge

Comments on amendments
- the track to the pumping station from the proposed estate road is shown as an existing Public Footpath – this is not the case
- we assume the route shown as ‘additional public footpath’ (including ‘new link to school path’ is actually to be adopted highway (footway) and not public footpath, as latter would not be an appropriate status, may be appropriate to consider cycle path
- we would need assurance that minimum widths of the those existing public footpaths are to be retained – no less than current width
- may be appropriate to set a restricted height for any fences proposed adjacent to public footpaths to prevent creating a ‘channelled-in/alley type’ effect
- may be appropriate to consider improving the surfaces of the existing public footpaths with a hardened surface or even bringing them to adoptable footway standard – future maintenance liability will need to be determined

3.18 NCC – Obligations: Original comments
Contributions for Education, fire hydrants, library
Need to retain footpaths and opportunities to link to routes

Comments on potential capacity issue
- implicit in the County Council’s original response, was the assumption that the proposal for 120 dwelling would form part of the 18 house identified for Long Stratton in JCS and as such would be broadly consistent with the spatial strategy set out in the JCS
- Under the current planning obligations planning regime (i.e. Reg 122 of the CIL Regulations) the County Council has to ‘gift’ any spare capacity at the existing schools to the applicant of this proposal in order to be compliant with the CIL Regulations
- confirmed that the 120 dwellings alongside the 1800 outlined for Long Stratton can be accommodated, subject to receiving all the necessary developer funding (planning obligations) in line with Reg 122 (statutory tests) of the CIL Regulations

3.20 Local Residents : 90 letters/emails (from 41 households) of objection expressing the following concerns:

**Location/policy issues**
- development proposed as part of Long Stratton but not even in Long Stratton – it is in Tharston
- outside the development boundary
- even if area faces a shortfall is it wise to add more houses to Long Stratton
- site within parish of Tharston and Hapton outside development boundary for Long Stratton
- already sufficient land available to accommodate 1800 houses for Long Stratton
- will blur the gap between urban and rural
- priority should be given to proposals in pipeline in LDF
- queries over SNLP and previous NALP and how can site be designated as part of Long Stratton, do not agree how this can be agreed without any public consultation
- there is a surplus of land to develop in Long Stratton without this one
- Tharston already over developed
- boundaries should be clarified (Long Stratton/Tharston) to ensure that dilemmas are not continually glossed over, ignored or misinterpreted by those unwilling to follow recognised guidelines or boundary data
- note comments made on ‘Statement of Common Ground’ for examination by the JCS, but surely residents should have participated in formatting its content and not as it appears representing the views of the developer?
- please to see SNC acknowledges that the ‘application site is still outside the Long Stratton Development Limit and in the Open Countryside’ – surely any planning officer would look to identify suitable housing land for potential growth close to the proposed by-pass location to avoid any future traffic having to travel through or across Long Stratton to reach the by-pass
By-pass
- understand no further development until by-pass been built
- any development should be located closer to the proposed route of the bypass
- understand if land developed in Long Stratton the developer would have to make a contribution towards the by-pass

Road Safety/Access/traffic lights
- Sunguards offer of lights to ‘improve the flow’ will in fact make it more difficult for those of use who live along the road by increasing speed of traffic and impossible to turn out to A140 safely
- the development at Lime Tree Avenue has already meant doubling of the time needed to access the road
- to reject the access possibility directly onto Swan Lane on cost grounds will lead to more traffic using Chequers Road to access the A140 via the improved traffic lights on Flowerpot Lane
- no mention of improving Chequers Road, to cope with extra volume find it hard to believe that pedestrians and cyclists will have to use Jermy Way when there is a pre-built path directly east, next to Schools – why not planned?
- lived on Rookeries development for over 8 years with one access and no problems of access for emergency vehicles
- need safe access directly onto Swan Lane, a safe distance from the bend and serious work to improve the junction of Swan Lane with the A140
- Chequers Road simply not large enough to cope with this additional traffic, no passing places
- the proposed junction with Swan lane, despite changes will become a congested junction and the risk of collisions between vehicles approaching from Forncett
- levels of speed on Swan Lane and Chequers Road are already excessive and the situation is not being helped with the out of speed limits being near the Doctors Surgery
- is it not possible to consider a different exit on to Swan Lane on the eastern side of the Council house where the traffic would not have to exit right on the corner
- the road from the junction of Swan Lane to Jermy Way is simply not adequate and evidenced by the breakdown of the sides of the roads and verges. There is a 20mph speed restriction, and my experience shows that few people take regard of that
- application makes reference to Bus Routes but how would potential passengers make their way safely to a bus stop without so much as a pavement from the proposed access onto Chequers Road? Forncett badly needs a pavement to get potential bus passengers to the stop
- have lived in Tharston for over 35 years and irrespective of our views, the various local developments have been approved by SNC leading as we anticipated to creating a ‘rat run’ along Chequers Road
- Chequers road is being destroyed
- the traffic survey by ASD Engineering confirming Chequers Road is safe and can handle more volume appears to flawed, therefore if on the ‘experts’ reports are proved to be incorrect, how may other ‘experts’ analysis of MOVA, Travel, Flood Risk, Arboriculture, Energy, Ecology, Environmental, Geo-physical are flawed?
- why is no 2010 pedestrian traffic recorded in Chequers Road? – because they want to continue living
- volume of traffic been addressed, albeit flawed within the Bidwells application but the speed of traffic has not
- £15,000 was donated by the developers of last scheme for ‘traffic calming’ measures and what did we get - £14,000 consultancy fees and 3 x 20 mph signs! – need to be backed up with passing places
- as result of ‘residents questionnaire’ majority of residents in Chequers Road do not want to see yet another residential development with access directly onto Chequers Road; prefer to see Chequers Road closed to through traffic; most logical solution – direct access to Swan lane behind 1-8 Chequers Road
- need to protect Chequers Road from Long Stratton infiltration otherwise end up with a Village separated from its origin
- since Rookeries development has been established walking along country lane has stopped and traffic increase tenfold, road deteriorated drastically and verges becoming non-existent
- happy Jermyn Way will not be used as an access but still concerned about use as emergency access
- traffic volume and speed along Chequers Road is already excessive for the nature of the road
- impact of construction traffic
- no detailed proposals in plan to improve Chequers Road and would have thought these are needed
- our drive and lawns destroyed, car crashed through our ditch
- on three separate occasions knocked down whilst walking my dog on Chequers road, sides of road caving in
- access onto Chequers Road contrary to NCC thinking as the time of 1972 Wimpey application - Parish Council meeting 1972 with Mr Tomlinson and NCC it was recorded that ‘Chequers Road can not take any further traffic, any traffic to north would have to exit onto Swan Lane.’
- footpaths – no accompanying information showing how these footpaths are used
- large sections of banks are being eroded and pushed into ditches causing localised flooding as the run off from the fields cannot reach the stream
- Jermyn Way quiet cul-de-sac never intended for use other than for the vehicles owned by residents living on Rookeries Estate, mainly constructed of block paving, not intended to be through road
- Jermyn Way not suitable for heavy vehicles, it is child friendly and would be detrimental to safety, extra traffic adjacent play area
- seems to be contradictory advice from NCC to applicant
- copy of letter to NCC to request they re-consider their stance as there is alternative solution via Swan Lane
- copy of letter to agent, Bidwells, with results of questionnaire from residents of Chequers Road – alternative solution via Swan Lane, do not want Chequers Road to be lit at night or pavemented, establish to pre 1990 condition and closed off at the ‘mini roundabout
- the much talked about Traffic Systems (MOVA) will not solve the problem because of the level of through traffic
- improvements to widen Chequers Road and new mini roundabout are likely to increase risk as they will improve ‘flow’ of traffic
- disagree that hedges are overgrown and extend beyond highway boundaries, they are well maintained and trimmed
- removing our verges will damage visibility when emerging from driveways
- why not put official passing places in Chequers Road and preserve its country setting and village environment
- has consideration been given for 20 mph for Chequers Road and surrounding roads in Jermyn Way?
- there are differences between characteristics of 20 mph speed limit and 20 mph zones - understand 20mph limits is where speed reduced but no physical measures, 20 mph zones use traffic calming measures
- more roads will become ‘rat runs’
- how can Bidwells present their claims without any public consultation
- understand Jermyn Way constructed with only 4.8 m width, are residents to assume since the Highways Authority do not accept the widening of Chequers Road as an option, that this access route is deleted from the application?
- children play, walk to school along Jermyn Way, unsafe access as most of properties have no front garden so open their doors more or less straight on to the road
nature of road already makes is difficult for even small cars to pass safely in opposite directions.

during bad weather road can remain frozen for whole days a time because of lack of sun warmth reaching the road surface; extra traffic would make it even more treacherous.

presume, Jermyn Way would be the main access for all the works traffic? –peace destroyed, mud and dust.

will Jermyn Way be upgraded for additional vehicles?

what will the route be for heavy vehicles and other traffic to the development site during construction?

use Jermyn Way for cycles, already been forced to dis-mount, traffic is in excess of 20 mph.

Jermyn Way as an access for emergency vehicles seemed a reasonable compromise.

even though the route through Jermyn Way has ‘tortuous alignment’ (Safety Audit – NCC Highways), this in no way guarantees it’s safety.

having seen the Safety Audit Report, take issue with following conclusions – alignment; junctions; non-motorised users; solution.

residents will not travel down the unimproved part of Chequers Road (via two roundabouts), because this part cannot be improved, the application should be refused.

20mph is never enforced, only once since the police with speed cameras.

Amenity issues

will affect quality of life in terms of increased noise.

extra danger for children – safety.

Core services and facilities

Long Stratton does not have the facilities, work or social infrastructure for another 300+ people most of whom I suspect would work in Norwich, causing more pollution and adding to the difficulties of a ‘dormitory town’.

how will health centre, dentists, schools etc. cope?

Layout/Design/Character of area

whilst the ‘Artistic Impression’ of the final development looks great to untrained eye, what will final design look.

master plan misleading – up top 120 dwellings but can only count 90.

development does not fit in with character of the Road, lane has low banks and ditches that form part of the character.

only to build to CSH3 – should be built to Passivehaus standards.

area will become an urban sprawl with the industrial site traffic.

note Building for Life Evaluation and consider the 4.5 score to be conservative in its marking. If one looks at the local residents comments, then more than 60% identify the access via Chequers Road and/or Jermyn Way is the major fault with the proposal. If Mr Watts took these opinion into account then the score for section 14 should be zero, giving a final score of 3.5 out of 10, whilst Bidwells attempted to recover from this disastrous marking, none of their ‘red’ comments really affect the final conclusion – The outline application as detailed is seriously flawed and needs to go back to the drawing board to address local residents issues.
Ecology/trees

- already seen a few years removal of strategic trees and hedges to allow yet more dwellings
- abundant to wildlife-development will effect ancient grassland that is a biodiversity action plan priority habitat
- area is home to a wide range of invertebrates and is regularly over flown by bats and owls
- letter from Buglife (a charity - The Invertebrate Conservation Trust), site may be ancient grassland or at least an important remnant of lowland meadow. The latter is a highly threatened habitat. Flower rich meadows are a huge importance for sustaining biodiversity and support pollinators that then pollinate crops we eat. It is our expert opinion that given the geographical context and the flora of the site the grassland may be of significance to threatened and endangered invertebrate species. Consider without invertebrate data the EIA process is incomplete and it is impossible to assess the scale of the impact of this development on biodiversity.
- line of TPO’d Poplar trees along southern boundary – who is responsible – if near their end are they going to replace
- members should be made aware of photos of meadow
- question why original ecology survey has been so widely disparaged by second report and ignored with respect to habitat management and encouraging ancient meadow species to repopulate
- object to removal existing line of TPO’d trees – specifically imposed to provide a screen, any new planting will take 50 plus years to reach the level of screening now in place
- to replace with ‘indigenous’ trees would not be in interests of the environment
- it seems Sunguard suggesting trees are destructed to facilitate the use of solar panels but suspect the real reason is that they want to ensure the sale of their houses by offering sunny gardens
- as can be seen from Car Home under construction, a new road onto Swan Lane will help solve most of the problems

Drainage

- piece of land does not drain well
- flood risk assessment says local sewage plant cannot cope with any new development within the Long Stratton area until 2016

Other issues

- looks like a done deal is you look as consultations and discussions – hope we still live in a democracy
- Lime Tree Avenue went ahead anyway and then sold properties to housing association – what guarantees could give that this would not happen to this development
- includes affordable housing, causes concern as not in keeping with the character of the current development in Jermyn Way, our properties may be devalued
- moved to location for peace and quiet and countryside, will overlook a building site and living in all the mud and dust this will create
- land is only redundant as owner decided not to crop
- misleading information submitted
- no doubt SNC is aware that Tharston and Hapton is presently without a viable or useable Village Hall although we received S106 money in 1989/9, the majority of which is unspent, you may also be aware that the PC against the view of all the members of the Renovation Committee decided to purchase the Church room without having a structural survey, can I suggest the owners of the development land donate the land to Village of Tharston.
- the only employment opportunity would be short term for the housing developer, not for the local community
the NPPF gives communities hope that their views will be considered when the application is decided, particularly relevant to Chequers road site: the decision should be a collective enterprise; to check unrestricted urban sprawl of large build up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns (villages) merging into one another

to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

3 letters of support (from 1 household) with the following comments:

- looks to be well laid out with good well thought out vehicular access
  - good to see that the proposals are relatively low density housing that overall appears to be in keeping with the local area
- earmarked for housing for many years and always concern would be high density
- the landscaping proposal would seem to cover most issues and the TPO’s will protect some of the existing landscape features
- land earmarked for development for over 20 years, it is not agricultural land but unused ‘scrub’ land
- comments received not considering the wider needs of the GNPD area and Long Stratton
- agree residents enjoy quieter roads but the traffic proposed will not adversely affect Jermyn Way in the long term
- most important consideration is layout in terms of roof angles and reduced carbon output in terms of fuels

NOTE: THE ABOVE MERELY ATTEMPTS TO SUMMARISE THE MAIN POINTS RAISED IN THE LETTERS OF OBJECTION/SUPPORT AND RESPONSES FROM STATUTORY CONSULTEES. A COPY OF ALL THE RESPONSES, IN FULL, CAN BE VIEWED ON THE COUNCIL’S WEB SITE.

4. Assessment

4.1 The site and proposal

This outline application seeks consent for the erection of up to 120 dwellings on a site of 4.4 hectares which represents an overall site coverage of approximately 27 dwellings to the hectare. The net developable area has however been reduced for the requirement for additional ecology/amenity area (0.6 hectares) which brings the overall density up to 32 dwellings per hectare. All matters are to be reserved except for access. Access, as amended (originally just via Chequers Road), is proposed to be via Chequers Road and Jermyn Way. As part of the off-site highway works the applicant is proposing to improvements at the Chequers Road/Swan Lane junction and the installation of MOVA, which is an intelligent traffic management signal system, at the A140/Flowerpot Lane signal controlled junction.

4.2 The application has been submitted with the following documentation:

- Transport Assessment, and subsequent Supplementary Highways Report and Safety Audit Report
- Phase 1 habitat Survey and Protected Species Assessment
- Ecology Survey and related updates/amendments
- Interim Residential Travel Plan
- Planning Statement
- Flood Risk Assessment
- Servicing Report
- Arboricultural Assessment
- Energy Statement
- Geo-Environmental Assessment
- Geo-Physical Survey
- Design and Access Statement
4.3 The site is a green field site, redundant agricultural land that has recently been subject to site clearance. The site is located on the eastern side of Chequers Road on the southern edge of Tharston Parish and outside but immediately adjacent to the Long Stratton Development Limit in the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP). There are residential properties to part of the north, west and south boundary (Jermy Way) and to the east, north-east and part north open fields. The new Care Home, under construction, and behind the Doctors surgery on Swan Lane is located on part of the east boundary. The site can be connected by way of existing metalled and lighted footpaths running along the east boundary, to the schools, doctors, shops and other facilities. There is a group of TPO’d poplar trees on the south west boundary. A site location plan and layout plan are attached as Appendix 1 and 5 respectively.

4.4 As the site is located outside the current development boundary in an area open countryside (as defined by the SNLP), the application is contrary to saved policy ENV8. The proposal should therefore be refused unless there are material considerations that dictate otherwise. In my opinion the following material considerations need to be considered:

- The publication of the NPPF and its significance in respect of the acknowledged deficit in South Norfolk’s housing land supply within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA). There are currently 3.28 years supply in the NPA. The recently published National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that relevant policies for the supply of housing in the local plan cannot be considered up-to date where a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites does not exist. The 5 year supply should also have an additional buffer of 5%, or 20% where there has been a record of persistent under-delivery of housing. The 5% buffer would reduce the supply (as at 01/04/2011) to 3.13 years.

- The site is a sustainable location.

- The site appears to be deliverable (as defined in section 6 of the NPPF) in that it is available now and offers a reasonable prospect of being delivered within the next 5 years.

4.5 It will be noted from section 3 above that there has been a significant amount of objection to the proposal from both Tharston and Hapton and Long Stratton Parish Councils and from local residents raising a number of issues. In my opinion, the critical issues members need to address are the principle of the development having regard to:

- Key policy issues, the provision of the NPPF, the adopted JCS, and the requirement to achieve a 5-year land supply for housing and affordable housing

- The suitability of the site having regard to its sustainability, character, design approach and landscape

- Highway Impacts/By-pass

- Impact on ecology and trees

- Amenity and other issues
4.6 The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not remove the need to assess the proposed development having first had regard to the development plan, however, the relevant policies referred to need to be up-to-date. The Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) has accepted there is a 5-year land supply deficit within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA, and as Section 6 of the NPPF points out, where this is the case, the relevant development plan policies cannot be up-to-date. Whilst material considerations then need to be taken into account, the NPPF advises that development should be approved unless the ‘adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.’

4.7 Long Stratton is identified as a location for major growth under JCS policies 9 and 10. Although the application is in the civil parish of Tharston, immediately adjacent to the boundary with the parish of Long Stratton, it is not unusual for development that functions as part of one settlement to actually be in a different civil parish (and the JCS settlement hierarchy is based on settlements and not parishes). As such a Statement of Common Ground between the GNDP authorities and Sunguard Homes was prepared for the Examination into the JCS, which acknowledged ‘that Chequers Road, Tharston is in town planning terms, part of Long Stratton’.

4.8 This issue has been disputed by a number of residents and the parish council, but from a planning policy point of view I can confirm the site can be considered under the above JCS policies 9 and 10. Policy 9 sets out the housing numbers for the main growth locations in the NPA. This includes at least 1800 homes at Long Stratton and at least another 1800 ‘floating’ units to be distributed on small sites, including the potential for additional homes at the named growth locations. The site can therefore, in principle, be pursued under either option.

4.9 The Area Action Plan for Long Stratton has been subject to initial consultations to develop a vision, but no consultations taken on preferred sites to accommodate the JCS requirements.

4.10 If the site is pursued as part of the 1800 units for Long Stratton the applicant would need to be explicit about how the proposal meets all the requirements for this growth location and in particular whether a suitable contribution can be made towards a by-pass for Long Stratton (a prerequisite of the 1800 homes), and the other transport provision on the A140 corridor, whilst also providing for other JCS/SNLP requirements, including affordable housing, open space provisions etc. Currently planning permission does not exist for a bypass scheme or other proposed works. Policy 20 of the JCS does sets out an indicative cost of £20 million for a bypass and the necessary improvement to Hempnall Crossroads and £2 million for bus priority on the approach to the A47. This equates to approximately £11,000 per dwelling for 1800 homes.

4.11 The applicant has carried out a financial appraisal for the site, and this has been verified by the Council’s Property Consultant. Members will be aware that financial testing, especially for affordable housing, can be assessed under policy 4 of the JCS and supporting text (para 5.29) where it is recognised that affordable housing provision is dependant upon overall viability. The applicant is proposing to provide commuted sums towards education (£11,736) off site highway works (£175,000), community facilities (£27,000), public open space (£53,840 plus maintenance), Ecology off-setting (£10,000), Library (£7,500) and fire hydrants (£2,500). This leaves £1 million to be spent on affordable housing/bypass/MOVA. The applicant has put forward a scheme to provide 12 affordable houses, with £500,000 to be spent on MOVA with the surplus going towards the by-pass. In addition they have also offered an overage clawback (£50,000) payment which together with any unspent by-pass money would go
towards affordable housing. This is still under discussions with nplaw who have advised that any overage clause should be pursued rather than a ‘non-returnable’ offer of £50,000.

4.12 As noted above the applicant has potential to pursue the application either as part of the 1800 units for Long Stratton, or as part of the ‘floating’ 1800, under policy 9 of the JCS. It is your officers’ view that the site can be considered as part of the ‘floating’ 1800 houses needed in the NPA. The applicant, in their case for developing the site, has stated that the proposal ‘is not dependent on the bypass processing’ and therefore ‘the application can be logically considered as part of the floating 1800 dwellings’. This view is shared by your officers. There are benefits of assessing this application as part of the ‘floating’ 1800 is that it will not prejudice the allocating of 1800 to provide the by-pass. The Education Authority has confirmed there would be capacity for what would be 1920 additional houses in Long Stratton. Anglian Water have confirmed there is currently capacity in the Water Capacity Study carried out for the GNDP that there is capacity for 1400 houses and long term solutions will need to be looked at after this. As such this would not directly prejudice the future growth area as this would have to be looked at in any event. The JCS anticipates new technologies will improve water efficiency measures in the future, therefore, less impact on current systems. The WCS carried out for the 1400 houses in Long Stratton was based on current technologies. This development will also be making a contribution to the by-pass albeit at the expense of affordable housing provision, but the by-pass and the aspirations of the JCS are considered to carry greater material consideration.

4.13 It is noted that many residents and the parish council feel that the site should not be considered ahead of the bypass and sites allocated for development through the LDF process. However, the Highway Authority has said that a by-pass is not necessary for this development. Consequently, taking the above into account I feel the proposed development cannot be dismissed purely on the grounds of prematurity, and that the demonstrable lack of a 5-year supply carries significant weight in the consideration of the application.

Suitability of the site, including character and design approach

4.14 Long Stratton and Tharston already has a good range of facilities and this site is very well located and in walking distance to a good range of facilities, including all three schools, doctors surgery, shops, employment and other facilities. The site is sustainable in these terms.

4.15 The Master Plan submitted with this proposal shows new links to the existing school footpath, adjacent to the south-east of the site and existing public footpaths within the site, diverted to access road and all other routes retained. The latter raises no objections from the Countryside Officer.

4.16 The visual impact of the site would be limited to the within the immediate vicinity of the site and I do not consider will harm the wider rural character. As part of the highway works, improvements to Chequers Road are proposed which includes a new mini-roundabout on Chequers Road and junction improvements to Chequers Lane/Swan Lane. This are being carried out within the extent of the public highway and existing trees, on the highway, are proposed to be retained.

4.17 The introduction of a further mini-roundabout will change the character of this semi rural area but in my opinion given there is already a mini-roundabout to the entrance of Jermyn Way, also known as ‘The Rookeries’ development, I do not consider the visual harm to the rural character of the area to be significant.
4.18 As stated above the site is approximately 4.4 hectares. A density plan has been submitted which divides the site into two distinct areas, the perimeter (2.3 hectares with a net housing of 25-30 houses per hectare and the middle part of the site, except for ecologly/amenity area (0.6 hectares) will be 40-45 dwellings to the hectare. The overall density being approximately 32 dwellings to the hectare. I agree with the developer that a higher density can be justified and this view is also shared by the Council’s Design Officer who scores this outline application 11.5 under the Building for Life evaluation. The higher density houses would be located in the centre of the site, incorporating two and half storey development. This massing of houses in the centre of the site would be offset by the proposed open spaces area across the centre of the site. The extensive mature hedges that exist on boundaries are to be retained.

4.19 It is considered the site will be able to satisfactorily accommodate this scale of development and any reserved matter application will need to follow the Council’s new Place Making Guide, to be considered for adoption as SPD at Full Council on the 24 September 2012. Although this outline scheme, due to lack of information at this outline stage, only scores 11.5 out of 20 against the Building for Life evaluation (policy 2 of the JCS requires a score of at least 14), it is accepted that an outline application will find it difficult to demonstrate this. At the reserved matter stage the final design and layout of the scheme will need to achieve a score of at least 14 and the Council’s Design officer is satisfied that with the information submitted with this scheme the development has the potential to score more points at the reserved matters stage to comply with the good design aspiration of policy 2 of the JCS.

4.20 The application is considered to accord with Section 7 of the NPPF and policy 2 of the JCS.

**Highway Impacts/By-pass**

4.21 The scheme as originally submitted proposed access from Chequers Road with an emergency access via Jermyn Way. The Highway Authority objected to this arrangement on grounds of inadequate road network and suggested that a full vehicular access to Jermyn Way was also included.

4.22 In response to this the applicant sought to amend the application, in direct consultation with the Highway Authority, as the applicant was reluctant to include a full access via Jermyn Way, given the objection to this by local residents. It should also be noted that local residents and both Parish Councils have reservations about access from Chequers Road. It has been suggested, by local residents, that an alternative access via the new Care Home Site and to the rear of properties on Chequers Road should be considered, to create an access point from the site direct to Swan Lane and thus avoiding the need to connect to Chequers Road and Jermyn Way. However, this does not form part of the proposal and as Members are aware an application, as submitted, needs to be assessed on its own merits.

4.23 Initially the applicants sought to improve the access along Chequers Road but this also showed that there was not sufficient highway land to widen the road. It would also have resulted in residents driveways being closer to edge of the carriageway. The Highway Authority also agreed to carry out an audit survey, which raised a number of safety concerns. The applicant then formally submitted an alternative scheme, with full access from Jermyn Way and an updated ‘Supplementary Highways Report’ was also submitted. The revised scheme also shows the following works:
- Provide mini-roundabout access into development site from Chequers Road.
- The internal access road to the proposed residential development will connect directly into Jermyn Way.
- The section of Chequers Road between Swan Lane and the new site access mini roundabout will be widened (where necessary) to ensure a 4.8 wide road carriageway. There is an existing pedestrian route along this section that will be maintained, and a 1.5 metre footway will be provided along the site frontage on Chequers Road.

No improvement works will be undertaken on the section of Chequers Road between the new site access mini roundabout and the existing Jermyn Way mini-roundabout.

4.24 This revised access arrangement removes the previous objections raised by the Highway Authority. They are now satisfied the proposal is acceptable in highway safety terms and provides adequate and safe access for the development. They have confirmed the access to the site via the second access point on Jermyn Way meets the required standards of ‘The Norfolk Residential Design Guide’. This allows up to 200 dwellings to be served from a type 3 road and Jermyn Way is type 3 standard. The proposed off-site works are also acceptable in highway terms.

4.25 It is fully acknowledged that the proposed access arrangements raise the most concerns from the Parish Councils and local residents, however, I do not consider the overall harm and impact to residents, will be so detrimental to warrant refusal of planning permission given the positive recommendation of the Highway Officer.

4.26 Much debate has also been given to the installation of MOVA, to the traffic lights on the junction at The Street/Flowerpot Lane which will improve traffic flow as whole for Long Stratton/Tharston. The Highway Authority is clear that this highway improvement is needed to serve the development and have suggested a Grampian condition to cover this. This will need to be secured by way a S106 agreement and will involve a commuted sum being paid. Until the works are costed by the Highway Authority the exact figure will not be known.

4.27 Discussions have also taken place on whether this commuted sum should in fact be spent on MOVA or the whole amount put towards the contributions needed for the by-pass. As already mentioned above the development of the site is not dependent on the need for a by-pass and is to be considered as part of the 1800 ‘floating’ dwellings in the NPA. It could also be argued that if the by-pass was in place, would the traffic lights be needed. However, we do not know when the by-pass will be in place. This site is deliverable and material weight needs to be given to the 5-year supply issue. There would be benefits to the junction if MOVA was installed as part of this development and to the residents of Long Stratton and Tharston.

4.28 Notwithstanding this, a contribution is proposed to be made to the by-pass, as explained above. Members still have the choice to decide how this commuted sum could be managed and spent, and could decide that the £500,000 is spent on MOVA and affordable housing with no by-pass contribution.
4.29 The application has raised a number of concerns and initial objections from Norfolk Wildlife Trust, with respect to the potential loss of biodiversity. In light of these concerns the Master Plan has been amended, and additional Ecology information forwarded. The Master Plan now shows part of the central area of the site to be retained, as this has some existing bio-diversity significance. This amounts to approximately 0.6 hectares and will be used for managed grassland and open space area.

4.30 It has been agreed with the applicant and the District Ecologist that there is an additional requirement for compensation for biodiversity loss. The applicant’s Consultant has identified a grassland site that will be brought into use condition and managed for 10 years as compensation. The GNDP authorities are part of the Defra pilot for Biodiversity Offsetting and has established a steering group to manage the off-setting process (NBOP). The NBOP steering group has approved the biodiversity off-setting approach in this application.

4.31 It should be noted that the part of the site in question that will be lost and will thus require compensation is only the grassland section described in the original ecological survey as BAP lowland grassland, although its status as this habitat is uncertain. It will be necessary to agree this off-setting via a S106 agreement to be agreed by Defra and Natural England. A full copy of the Ecologist’s comments can be found at appendix 4. The applicant has agreed to this approach.

4.32 The objection from Norfolk Wildlife Trust has been withdrawn and Natural England does not raise any objections to the development. I am therefore satisfied, with the biodiversity off-setting approach above, the proposal is in accordance with Section 11 of the NPPF, Policy 1 of the JCA and policies ENV14 and 14 of the SNLP.

4.33 The comments of ‘Buglife’ are noted with respect to the value of the site and whether any additional surveys are required. The District Ecologist has advised that, in his opinion, the comments of ‘Buglife’ were made when the site was indicated to be Lowland BAP but as this is not the case he does not consider this to be a significant issue. Given the current flora and likely history of the site, it is reasonable to assume some value for invertebrates but does not consider further survey necessary.

4.34 The revised Master Plan shows the existing TPO’d poplar trees, situated on part of the south west boundary, to be removed and replaced with other species. The Council’s Landscape Officer would not be adverse to the removal of the poplar trees. He notes that an acceptable and comprehensive tree assessment has been submitted with the application. He notes that poplars are relatively short-lived trees and their quick growth rate means that they are quite often more brittle than other species, and it is for these reasons he would take the view that it is generally inappropriate to use TPOs to protect poplar trees (with the exception of the much rare native black poplar).

4.35 He goes on to advise that the situation around the tress is much different now to when the TPO was served in 1991 when they were isolated from public access. Now dwellings and public open space are in close proximity, and these bring with them hazards that must be a consideration in risk assessment. In view of these comments I think it would appropriate to remove these trees at this stage as a clear safety margin would need to be given to the new development in any event and given the view of the Landscape Officer’s view that they are inappropriate trees to generally serve a TPO on. It should be
noted all other category A and B trees will be retained on the site and I suggest a condition is attached to any permission to agree a full landscaping scheme and replacement trees on this boundary. It will be important that any houses located in this are allow growth for any further trees and sited to protect residential amenity. With this condition I am satisfied the proposal is acceptable in landscape terms and satisfies policy 11 of the NPPF, policies 1 and 10 of the JCS and policy IMP2 of the SNLP.

Amenity and other issues

4.36 Although this is only an outline application with access as the only reserved matter, I am satisfied the proposal can be accommodated with the immediate area and not have an undue impact on residential amenity. The layout of the site is not fixed at this stage and the indicative layout gives enough information to show that any dwellings will be able to be sited without any undue impact on existing residential amenity in relation to those properties adjacent the site. This can be fully evaluated at the reserved matters stage, and if necessary a lesser number of houses achieved, as the application is for “up to 120 dwellings”.

4.37 The increased use of Chequers Road and Jermyn Way will have an impact on residential amenity due to increased usage. The concerns raised by residents especially in relation to Jermyn Way are noted as there are dwellings in close proximity to the road, including a play area adjacent to the proposed entrance point. However as previously advise above the Highway Authority does not raise an objection on safety grounds, and I do not consider the impact on increased usage will be so detrimental to warrant refusal on residential amenity grounds. This also applies to the new mini-roundabout on Chequers Road where clearly the properties opposite will have some additional impact but these properties (Spreadingoak Farm and The Chestnuts) are well set back from the road and there is a wooded area on the frontage between these two properties. I am satisfied the development accords with policy IMP9 of the SNLP relating to residential amenity.

4.38 The Environment Agency initially raised objections to the proposal due to insufficient flood risk assessment (FRA), however this objection was withdrawn with the submission of further information and they now conditionally support the scheme. Conditions include submission of full surface water drainage scheme in accordance with FRA and maintenance. Conditions will also be attached with respect to water efficiency. With these conditions the proposal is considered to accord with section 10 of the NPPF and policies 1 and 3 of the JCS.

4.39 With respect to foul water, Anglian water has not raised any objections and confirms there is not a capacity issue. Works carried out as part of the GNDP Water Cycle Study shows that the network for Long Stratton has capacity for 1400 dwellings. They have also suggested conditions be attached with respect to a foul water strategy, to ensure no flooding down stream and associated mitigating conditions. With these conditions I am satisfied the proposal accords with section 10 of the NPPF and policy 1 of the JCS policy.

4.40 It should be noted at Section 3 that there have been a number of concerns raised that have not been specifically raised in this assessment. However, all concerns raised have been taken into account when reaching this recommendation and any significant harm taken into account.
Conclusion

4.41 It is accepted that there is not a five year supply of housing sites within the Norwich Policy Area. The NPPF is clear and explicit that in such circumstances local planning authorities should consider favourably sustainable development that would address deficit. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that where the development plan is silent or relevant policies are out of date, permission should be granted unless ‘any adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits’. The lack of five year supply and the requirements of the NPPF are a very strong material consideration in favour of this application.

4.42 I consider the site to be sustainable, having regard to its location, connectivity with adjoining development, proximity to local services and facilities, impact on the local transport network, ecology, drainage and its impact on the landscape character and appearance of the area. As such I consider there are no adverse impacts arising from the development that are sufficient either individually or collectively to outweigh the weight that must be given to seriousness of the five year supply deficit and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

4.43 As detailed above, the site does not meet all of the aspirations of the JCS with respect to the provision of affordable housing but the application has been submitted with a financial appraisal to justify this lack of provision, in accordance with policy 4 of the JCS. It is the view of your officers that a contribution towards the by-pass should be made in addition to the provision of MOVA, instead of more affordable housing provision. This is based on the aspirations of the JCS and the Long Stratton growth area and associated requirement for a by-pass. It is acknowledged that the 120 dwellings will be in addition to the 1800 allocated for Long Stratton but will form part of the NPA ‘floating’ 1800, which like all the allocations is a minimum figure. The dwellings would also add to the robustness of the Council’s plans to accommodate the ‘floating’ 1800. There is sufficient capacity within Long Stratton to accommodate this growth.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The development is outside the development limits and contrary to policy ENV8 of the SNLP and policy 4 of the JCS relating to affordable housing. Policies 9 and 10 of the JCS seek to accommodate development in Long Stratton which can include this part of Tharston. It is accepted that there is not a five year supply of housing sites within the Norwich Policy Area. The NPPF is clear and explicit that in such circumstances local planning authorities should consider favourably sustainable development that would address that deficit, in accordance with paragraph 14. The lack of five year supply and the requirements of the NPPF are a very strong material consideration in favour of this application.

5.2 The requirements of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development outweigh other material considerations and that the proposed development, limited to up to 120 dwellings, can be accepted as a departure from policy ENV8. In all other aspects, and subject to appropriate conditions, the proposed development is in accordance with Sections 6, 7, 10 and 11 of the NPPF and relevant policies in the JCS.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Mellors, 01508 533789, and E-mail: hmellors@s-norfolk.gov.uk
### Building for Life Evaluation

**Scheme name:** Land at Chequers Road, Tharston, 2010/2225/O OUTLINE

**Application Number:** 2010/2225/O OUTLINE

**Date:** 03/09/2012

**Accredited Assessor:** Chris Watts

### Development Management Committee 12 September 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the development provide [or is it close to] community facilities, such as a school, park, play areas, shops, pubs or cafes?</td>
<td>The development is located on the eastern side of Chequers Road on the southern edge of Tharston approximately 2km from the centre of Long Stratton. The nearest facilities are located in Long Stratton, providing a good range of services including retail and commercial, as well as leisure and community facilities. The Development proposes an area of children’s play and public open space within the site. Refer to DAS Section 4, Planning Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there a tenure mix that reflects the needs and aspirations of the local community?</td>
<td>The final choice of dwelling types will be embodied in the reserved matters application and it is clearly not possible to specify these before the outline permission is granted with any conditions and legal agreement attached. The indicative masterplan however shows how a variety of house types could be sited on the development. The density proposed of up to 130 dwellings on 4.5 hectares means that it would be relatively straightforward to achieve a range of house types over the site. The developer when submitting the reserved matters application will need to provide full details of existing and proposed measures to mitigate against noise, etc. in Long Stratton and Tharston to establish the appropriate mix of dwellings at that time. Given that the financial contribution calculation associated with the application has been based on a residual mix of housing, we believe that this factor should be afforded a positive mark as the development clearly satisfy this criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is there a tenure mix that reflects the needs of the local community?</td>
<td>The appropriate mix of tenure is being discussed with the SCC Housing Officer and is likely to meet the needs of the local community and JCS at Reserved Matters Stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the development have easy access to public transport?</td>
<td>The site is located within walking distance of a bus stop on Swan Lane. It is considered that the site is in a sustainable location with good pedestrian links to facilities in Long Stratton. An interim transport plan has been provided as part of the outline application. Refer to DAS Sections 6, Planning Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the development have any features that reduce its environmental impact?</td>
<td>It is proposed that the site will achieve at least level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes for all market housing and affordable homes. The JCS requires that affordable homes achieve a minimum of level 4 for water efficiency. There is an aspiration to achieve a 10% reduction in carbon emissions by on-site renewable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- Development proposals for the area are subject to the satisfaction of reserved matters and the agreement of conditions. The development is subject to the agreement of a legal agreement, including the agreement of a financial contribution calculation.
- The site is located within walking distance of a bus stop on Swan Lane. It is considered that the site is in a sustainable location with good pedestrian links to facilities in Long Stratton.
- An interim transport plan has been provided as part of the outline application.
### Development Management Committee

#### 12 September 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the design specific to the scheme?</strong></td>
<td>The DAS provides an analysis of the immediate site and its surroundings. There is limited information at this stage on the wider context of Long Station to inform the design response. A further assessment will be carried out at the Reserved Matters stage.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the scheme exploit existing buildings, landscape or topography?</strong></td>
<td>The DAS and supporting information provides evidence of how the landscape and topography of the site has informed the initial design concept of the development. The evolution of the site appears to be developed out of a clear analysis and understanding of the site. A further assessment will be carried out at the Reserved Matters stage.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the scheme feel like a place with a distinctive character?</strong></td>
<td>The layout has been developed out of a understanding of the site. A series of boxs that provide formage onto open spaces and footpaths have the potential to result in a distinctive layout. House types and public realm need to demonstrate how they will go beyond standard designs to create a place with a distinctive character.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do the buildings and layout make it easy to find your way around?</strong></td>
<td>The DAS states that there will be a clear hierarchy of streets to ensure a legible street network. A further assessment of how the layout makes it easy to navigate around will be carried out at the Reserved Matters stage.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are streets defined by a coherent and well structured building layout?</strong></td>
<td>No evidence is provided of how block typologies and street hierarchies will support a well structured building layout. The access points into the site and the established mature hedgerows to a large extent dictate how building can be laid out and the indicative masterplan has been specifically designed to incorporate this in a coherent and well structured manner as indicated on the indicative masterplan.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the building layout take priority over the streets and car parking, so that the highways do not dominate?</strong></td>
<td>The scheme proposes to face buildings onto roads, footpaths and open spaces. A further assessment will be carried out at Reserved Matters stage to assess how the building layout will take priority over streets and standard highway designs.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the car parking well integrated and situated so as to support the street scene?</strong></td>
<td>Thought has been given to different forms of car parking, including in-curtilage parking, off-street parking, garage parking and parking courts. No evidence is provided at this stage to assess how successfully car parking will be integrated into the site layout.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are the streets pedestrian, cycle and vehicle friendly?</strong></td>
<td>The development proposes a hierarchy of streets, pedestrian and cycling paths. The development also proposes a footpath/footway through Jennys Way to the south. A further assessment will be carried out at Reserved Matters stage.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the scheme integrate with existing streets, paths and surrounding development?</strong></td>
<td>The development proposes a secondary access and footpath cycle link to Jennys Way, as well as upgrades to the existing highway network. The indicative masterplan attempts to relate to the surrounding development.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are public spaces and pedestrian routes overlooked and do they feel safe?</strong></td>
<td>The DAS provides some basic information on security and how the occupation of buildings, design of public and private spaces has influenced the design response to ensure that it can incorporate Secured by Design principles. A further assessment will be carried out at the reserved matters stage.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is the public space well designed and does it have suitable management arrangements in place?</strong></td>
<td>Public open space is proposed throughout the scheme that forms part of the proposal. The detailed design of public spaces and long-term management will be considered at the reserved matters stage. Consultation is currently underway with SMCs ecologist consultant on the management of the central areas but it has been agreed in principle that there will be financial contributions included in the section 106 agreement towards the management of both on-site and offsite ecology and amenity areas in this development. The development will therefore have suitable management arrangements in place for public space.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do buildings exhibit architectural quality?</strong></td>
<td>An assessment of the building forms and materials in the area has not been undertaken. The architectural quality of house types cannot be fully assessed until the reserved matters stage.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do internet spaces and layout allow for adaptation, conversion or extension?</strong></td>
<td>The proposed density of the site and the range of house types that will be built upon it clearly allows for adaptation, conversion and extension of houses on the development. Further evidence will need to be provided at reserved matters stage to demonstrate how houses meet Life Time Homes standards.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Has the scheme made use of advances in construction or technology that enhance its performance, quality, and attractiveness?</strong></td>
<td>The scheme aspires to meet the policy requirements of the design and sustainability policies in the JCS. It also aspires to meet the policy requirements of the design and sustainability policies in the JCS. A further assessment will be carried out at the reserved matters stage.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do buildings or spaces support statutory minima, such as Building Regulations?</strong></td>
<td>The scheme aspires to meet the policy requirements of the design and sustainability policies in the JCS. A further assessment will be carried out at the reserved matters stage.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Note: The table contains questions related to the design and layout of a development project, along with the responses and scores assigned to each question.
Internal Memorandum

To: Helen Mellors (Area Planning Officer, South & East Team)

From: Simon Marjoram (Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy)
Tel No: 01508 533810
Your Ref: 2010/2225/O
Date: 9 March 2012

Tharston: Chequers Road
Up to 120 dwellings and associated works

The above proposal falls outside the defined Development Limit for Long Stratton in the saved South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) and is therefore contrary to saved Policy ENV 8.

Housing Land Supply

The applicant is proposing the site because of a lack of deliverable housing land in the Norwich Policy Area¹ (NPA), under the requirements of Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3): Housing. PPS3 was updated in June 2010; however, the requirement for local planning authorities to be able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land remains unchanged. This requirement has also been reiterated in the draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk sets out the strategic planning framework for the three authorities to 2026. The JCS housing requirement is based on an assessment of local need, as set out in a supporting Topic Paper². The Topic Paper looked at a range of evidence sources based on the suggestions in Paragraph 33 of PPS3; the level of growth set out in the JCS strikes a balance between what is achievable within environmental and infrastructure constraints and a reduced level which may artificially constrain the housing market. Consequently the JCS figures form the basis for the assessment of 5 year housing land supply across the GNDP³ authorities.

¹ Norwich Policy Area is the area covering the city and those parts of Broadland and South Norfolk which relate to the city, including Long Stratton/Tharston.
² Topic Paper: Homes and Housing Evidence on appropriate levels of house building in Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (GNDP, August 2010)
³ www.south-norfolk.gov.uk
The GNDP authorities have expressed significant concerns about the interpretation of the five year land supply during weak market conditions and also about the release of sites outside the Development Plan process undermining public confidence in the planning system. Specifically, the measure of supply is heavily influenced by developers’ intentions rather than the availability and suitability of land in planning terms. Clearly, in a weak market, demand falls and sites are developed more slowly; under current interpretations of five year supply this has the effect of reducing the proportion of homes coming forward during the five year period making it appear as though the supply of suitable and available land has diminished, even though the same sites are still available. A more reasonable interpretation of supply would be to take the available and suitable land and assess what would be achievable by the site owner/developer when the market demand increases to more typical rates. This approach forms the basis of the GNDP’s assessment.

Notwithstanding this, the assessment shows the Norwich Policy Area as having a 3.28 year supply at 1st April 2011 (for the five year period 2012/13 – 2016/17); full details can be found in Appendix A of the GNDP’s 2010/11 JCS Annual Monitoring Report. In addition to the need to address the shortfall in the amount of available and deliverable housing land the Government has also emphasised the role of local planning authorities taking a positive approach to development as a key to delivering economic growth, as set out in the Ministerial Statement by the Rt Hon Greg Clark on 23 March 2011.

Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and the Context of Growth at Long Stratton

Long Stratton is identified as a location for major growth under JCS Policies 9 and 10. Although the application site is in the civil parish of Tharston, immediately adjacent to the boundary with the parish of Long Stratton, it is not unusual for development that functions as part of one settlement to actually be in a different civil parish. As such a Statement of Common Ground between the GNDP authorities and Sunguard Homes was prepared for the Examination into the JCS, which acknowledged “that Chequers Road, Tharston is in town planning terms, part of Long Stratton”.

Policy 9 sets out the housing numbers for the main growth locations in the Norwich Policy Area. This includes 1,800 homes at Long Stratton and another 1,800 ‘floating’ units to be distributed on smaller sites (i.e. as yet unallocated to a particular settlement), including the potential for additional homes at the named growth locations. Consequently the applicant has the potential to pursue the application either as part of the 1,800 units for Long Stratton, or as part of the ‘floating’ 1,800, taking the Long Stratton total to at least 1,920 units. Policy 10 sets out a number of general criteria which development in the main growth locations should seek to achieve, plus specific principles for each location.

If the homes are proposed as part of the 1,800 units for Long Stratton the applicant needs to be explicit about how the proposal meets all of the JCS requirements for this growth location. In particular, it is unclear whether a suitable contribution can be made towards a bypass for Long Stratton (a prerequisite of the 1,800 homes), and the other transport provision on the A140 corridor, whilst also providing for the other JCS/South Norfolk Local Plan requirements, including affordable housing, open space provisions etc. Currently planning permission does not exist for a bypass scheme or the other proposed works, however the Infrastructure Framework accompanying JCS Policy 20 ‘Implementation’ does set out an indicative cost of £20 million for a bypass and the necessary improvements to the Hempnall (A140/B1527) Crossroads and £2 million for bus priority on the approach to

---

3 Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk: Annual Monitoring Report 2010-2011
4 http://www.communities.gov.uk/statements/newsroom/planningforgrowth
the A140/A47 Harford junction. The bypass/Hemnall crossroads cost equates to approximately £11,000 per dwelling for 1,800 homes. The recent Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) consultation proposed that 50% of this cost, which represents the site specific access element for 1,800 homes, would be sought from the developers via a Section 38 Agreement and the remaining 50% from CIL. The bypass and associated schemes are identified in the JCS as Priority 1 projects for the period 2016-21.

The applicants also do not make it clear whether taking the 120 units from the Long Stratton 1,800 will affect the viability of delivering the bypass and other necessary infrastructure from the remaining 1,680 dwellings e.g. with a potentially reduced S38 contribution.

The proposal could be considered as part of the ‘floating’ 1,800 units to be accommodated on smaller sites in the South Norfolk part of the NPA, thus avoiding the need to contribute to the bypass, which could still be funded via the remaining 1,800 homes. If this approach is taken the applicant needs to demonstrate that this level of development (i.e. approx. 1,920 dwellings overall) can be accommodated within the local infrastructure capacities, particularly the sewerage constraints and secondary school provision.

Not addressing the JCS/SNLP requirements for Long Stratton would mean the proposal fails to meet the PPS 3 criteria of being ‘in line with planning and housing objectives ... and spatial vision for the area’ and would be undermining the ‘wider policy objectives’ for Long Stratton (PPS3, para 69, point 5).

Other JCS requirements

Policy 2 ‘Design’ – meeting the criteria of the Policy, including achieving 14 points using the Building for Life assessment. The Policy also requires proposals to respect local distinctiveness, including the landscape setting of settlements – the 2001 South Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment notes the vulnerability of the landscape in this area to the loss of vegetation structure, including woodland and hedgerows;

Policy 3 ‘Energy and Water’ – requirement for 10% of energy to be from ‘decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources’ and for the design and access statement to demonstrate that it is not viable to exceed 10% and that opportunities for sustainable construction have been maximised. Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 to be reached for water efficiency.

Policy 4 ‘Housing Delivery’ – subject to viability, the policy sets out the requirements for 33% affordable housing on a scheme of this size, with an indicative tenure split of 85% social rent and 15% intermediate tenures.

Policy 6 ‘Access and Transportation’ – the site is well located in terms of providing good pedestrian (and cycle) access to a range of facilities including schools, health centre, leisure facilities, employment opportunities and the village centre, however measures should be included to encourage walking and cycling as the primary means of travel.

Policy 9 ‘Strategy for Growth in the Norwich Policy Area’ – refers to the opportunities to enhance green infrastructure throughout the area; this is echoed in Policy 10, which for Long Stratton requires ‘investment in strategic green infrastructure corridor reflecting and conserving the ancient landscape to the east of the village’.

6 South Norfolk Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule Publication (6 February 2012 to 5 March 2012)
Policy 20 ‘Implementation’ – in advance of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) the policy sets out the types of infrastructure ‘essential to secure sustainable development’, many of which will be relevant to Long Stratton; developers in strategic growth areas will also be required to ‘enter into an ongoing commitment to support community development’.

Saved South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) Policies

A number of saved Development Management Policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan will also be relevant, including:
- IMP15 ‘Setting of Listed Buildings’, taking into account a number of Listed properties in Chequers Road, including The Meadows immediately adjoining the site;
- IMP 2 ‘Landscaping’, including the protection and enhancement of existing features;
- IMP 8 ‘Safe and free flow of traffic’, both direct access to the site and the impacts further afield;
- IMP 9 ‘Residential amenity’;
- LEI 7 ‘Open space provision in new development’;
- TRA 1 ‘Provision of pedestrian links’ and TRA 3 ‘Provision of cycling facilities’ re maximising the potential of the site and its close proximity to a range of services, facilities and employment opportunities.

Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD

The Council is currently progressing the above document, initial consultation on which took place in autumn 2010 and autumn 2011. Amongst the responses to the consultation Anglian Water flagged up Foul Sewerage Network capacity problems in relation to the potential allocation of this site whilst Norfolk County Council wished to see good pedestrian and cycle links to Swan Lane.

Conclusion

Although there continues to be a shortfall in the five year supply of deliverable housing land in the Norwich Policy Area, this does not override all other considerations. At present it is not explicit that the application helps fulfil the spatial vision for the area as set out in the Joint Core Strategy.

Signed

4
Tharston - Chequers Road (up to 120 dwellings and associated works)

Additional Comments

Set out below are Planning Policy comments in response to the additional information submitted by the applicant (dated 29 March):

National Planning Policy Framework and the status of local planning policies

Since the previous Policy comments (dated 9 March 2012), the Government has published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which came into effect on 27 March and is now a key material consideration in determining planning applications (NPPF, paragraph 196). Under paragraph 214 of the NPPF the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Policies can still be given weight for 12 months, from 27 March, even where there is a ‘limited degree of conflict’ with the NPPF. Under paragraph 215 of the NPPF the saved South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) Policies can still be given ‘due weight’ where they are consistent with the NPPF. An assessment of where saved SNLP Policies are consistent with the NPPF has been undertaken and all of those referred to in the previous Planning Policy comments – IMP2, IMP6, IMP9, IMP15, LEI7, TRA1, TRA3 & ENV8 (in respect of residential development) – are considered to be consistent.

5-Year Supply

The NPPF retains the requirement for local planning authorities to be able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of specific, deliverable housing sites. This has been increased to 5 years plus 5% to offer greater choice and competition in the housing market or to 5 years plus 20% in areas where there has been persistent under delivery. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that ‘relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing
sites'. As acknowledged in the previous Planning Policy comments, there is currently a shortfall in the supply of housing land in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA), which is a significant material consideration. The applicant has indicated that the site is available immediately, is readily serviced and in a sustainable location, with good non-car access to local services, facilities and employment and that the NPPF includes a presumption in favour of such ‘sustainable development’. However, the impact of approving this site still needs to be considered in the context of not prejudicing the overall growth in Long Stratton and delivery of the required infrastructure, including a bypass.

Context of the growth at Long Stratton

The applicant has stated that the proposal ‘is not dependent on the bypass proceeding’ and therefore ‘the application can be logically considered as part of the floating 1,800 dwellings’. As such, the application would be considered as additional to the 1,800 dwellings needed to deliver a bypass. As noted in the previous Planning Policy comments (9 March 2012), under JCS Policy 9, the applicant has the potential to pursue the application either as part of the 1,800 units for Long Stratton, or as part of the ‘floating’ 1,800.

The applicant has indicated that they feel the sewage treatment works has capacity for approximately 15 years development, by which point circumstances and technologies will be different; however there is no indication as to whether Anglian Water endorse this view. The applicant also refers to there being capacity at local schools and, at the 15 March meeting between the applicant and Planning Officers, referred to Norfolk County Council’s response to the application which stated that there is sufficient capacity at Long Stratton High School not to require a contribution from this development (NCC, 10 August 2011). However, it would be useful if the County Council could clarify (a) on what assumptions their comments were made i.e. that the houses were part of the 1,800 for Long Stratton, or additional to it, and (b) what the long term capacity of the High School is on its current site.

In principle, if there is sufficient infrastructure capacity for development to proceed over and above the 1,800 bypass related dwellings (and associated local employment) allocated to Long Stratton, there would be no Policy objection to the site being considered as part of the ‘floating’ 1,800 dwellings in the South Norfolk part of the NPA.

Financial Considerations

As noted by the applicant, Section 143 (2) (b) of the Localism Act, concerning material considerations, states that ‘any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application’ should be taken into account; ‘local financial considerations’ are defined in Localism Act Section 143 (4).

Signed
Chequers Road, Tharston – SNDC; 2010/2225
Ecological comments by Dr David White, District Ecologist.
26 January 2012

Summary of ecological situation:
I was asked by Helen Mellors on 10 January 2012 to comment on the ecological situation in regards to the above application.

Having reviewed the correspondence and changing opinions of various parties, it is my opinion that there is a reasonable likelihood that the central meadow has some existing biodiversity significance and, with some scrub clearance and basic management, the biodiversity potential may be significantly higher. I believe this to be a reasonable assumption based on:

- the species lists provided;
- the likelihood of nutrient poor soils as indicated by the presence of key species;
- the fact that scrub clearance undertaken for the archaeological surveys seemed to bring some rapid benefits for meadow species;
- the presumption of some value for invertebrates.

Recommendation:
To this end, I believe the applicant should retain the central area within the design plan. This should be accompanied by a condition to provide a management plan for the site.

My reasons are given below.

The ecological issues: justification
Much of the correspondence on ecological issues is really an argument as to whether the site is 'lowland meadow' habitat. But, in my opinion, the question should really be if the known and likely biodiversity of the site of enough significance to be a material consideration in the determination of the planning application under the policies of SNDC and the JCS. Following this, the suitability of the proposed mitigation can then be assessed.

The overall impression of the various botanical and habitat surveys, including the 'repeated botanical survey' by Bob Ellis in June 2011 (referred to in the letter from the Ecology Consultancy on 27th October 2011 but that I have not seen), give the impression of a site that in its current state is moderately diverse in its flora but which may have been more species-rich in the relatively recent past. The central meadow area appears to have the richest flora and the highest likelihood of continuity of meadow habitat. The Ecology report (Para 4.1) indicated that the site may be of county importance following management. Whilst I think this can be re-assessed as being overly optimistic following the consultants own (re-)analysis, the site does have some biodiversity value even if it does not meet the standards of a CWS.

The question of potential value for invertebrates of conservation concern has been raised but the comments made by Buglife were, in my opinion, made
when it was indicated that the site was Lowland BAP habitat. As this is not the case, I do not think this is a significant issue. Given the current flora and the likely history of the site, it is reasonable to assume some value for invertebrates and I do not believe further survey for invertebrates is necessary.

A further issue is the potential biodiversity value of the site. It is broadly accepted in conservation circles that scrub clearance can result in a return to good conservation status if the soils are nutrient-poor [Dolman et al, 2010]. At this site, there is some evidence that soils are poor (e.g. the presence of Ophrys apifera, a relatively short-lived orchid species with a requirement for low nutrients, that is a species typically associated with sites where there is low nutrient status and a viable seedbank [Hutchings 2010]). The ecologists reports also implies this too, by suggesting that it would be possible to ‘create and preserve an area of high quality meadow’ (correspondence from Ecology Consultancy to Helena Carey, 21st June 2011), the consultants are implying the presence of environmental conditions needed for establishment – i.e. low nutrient status.

Clearly in pure ecological terms it would be preferable to retain the central meadow as it is the best area of grassland and, in my opinion, this must be the preferred option. Pragmatically if the necessities of design does not permit this, then retaining two areas of linked grassland may be an alternative. In either situation, this will depend on ensuring a management plan through conditions that the areas will be managed appropriately specifically for biodiversity (as opposed to open space) in the medium to long-term. If the decision is to link two areas of habitat, the linking habitat must be ecologically meaningful (not just the mown edges of a footpath, for example). I would be thinking of undertaking grassland management to improve species richness rather than creation of meadow by sowing seed.

Reference:
As agreed with the applicant and the ecological consultant acting for the applicant, it is accepted that there is a requirement for compensation for biodiversity loss under planning policy and that biodiversity offsetting is an appropriate method to address this. The part of the site in question that will be lost will and will thus require compensation is only the grassland section described in the original ecological survey as BAP lowland grassland, although its status as this habitat is uncertain.

The Consultant engaged by the applicant in this case has identified a grassland site that will be brought into condition and managed for 10 years as compensation. The GNDP is part of the Defra pilot of Biodiversity Offsetting and has established a steering group to manage the off-setting process (NBOP). The NBOP steering group has approved the biodiversity offsetting approach in this application.

It will be necessary to secure biodiversity offsetting through a clause in the s106 agreement. The clause should be framed so as to require that the development authorised by the permission should not commence, or proceed beyond an agreed stage, until the specified offsetting requirement has been secured.

In practice, this requirement will be an assessment of the grassland of both the application site and the compensation site using the Defra matrix, rubber-stamped by the local Natural England biodiversity offsetting officer. The applicant will then pay the agreed sum derived from the matrix to manage the compensatory site. All parties have agreed the maximum sum will not exceed £10,000.

Tentative recommended clause:

The development authorised by the permission should not commence, or proceed beyond [...], until a biodiversity offsetting requirement has been secured to the satisfaction of the Norwich Biodiversity Off-setting Pilot steering group and agreed by Natural England. The offsetting will be in the form of a payment to bring a grassland site into favourable condition and managed for 10 years in compensation for the grassland habitat lost as a result of the development.
Indicative masterplan densities
(See site coverage section of letter dated 4/7/2012)

Overall site area 4.4 hectares
Up to 120 dwellings = gross housing density of c. 27/hectare

Approx. 2.3 hectares with a net housing density of c.25-30/hectare

Approx 1.5 hectares with a net housing density c.40-45/hectare
4. **Appl. No**: 2012/0530/F  
**Parish**: REDENHALL WITH HARLESTON  
**Applicants Name**: Persimmon Homes (Anglia) Ltd  
**Site Address**: Land north-west of Briar Farm, Mendham Lane, Harleston, Norfolk  
**Proposal**: Residential development of 120 dwellings with associated open space, attenuation lagoon, roundabout access and off site highways works

**Recommendation**: Approve

1. Full permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amended plans  
3. Detailed surface water scheme to be submitted  
4. Detailed foul water scheme to be submitted. Implementation of mitigation measures to be implemented before occupation.  
5. Detailed highway drawings prior to commencement of development  
6. Roads to binder course prior to occupation  
7. Plan detailed on site parking for construction workers to be agreed prior to commencement  
8. Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) to be agreed  
9. All traffic to use agreed CTMP during construction of the development  
10. Wheel washing facilities to be agreed  
11. Agreed wheel washing facilities to be used throughout the period of construction of the development  
12. Detailed scheme of off-site highway works to be agreed  
13. Agreed off-site highway works to be completed prior to occupation  
14. Tree and hedge protection  
15. Landscaping  
16. Landscape management  
17. In accordance with ecological mitigation  
18. Scheme of archaeological work to be agreed and completed prior to commencement of development  
19. PD removal for windows in east elevation to plots 20 & 25  
20. Fire hydrants

Subject to a S106 legal agreement providing for developer contributions towards education, libraries, travel plan, off-site highway works, open space, bus service contributions, on-site child play space, funding towards improvements to the leisure centre (the developers have offered the provision of a MUGA at the recreation ground adjacent the leisure centre), contributions towards education and the provision of off-site recycling (subject to an appropriate assessment of current need), and an affordable housing agreement confirming the type, tenure and mix of affordable housing, including its affordability in perpetuity.

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
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 7 – Supporting local communities
Policy 14 – Key Service Centres
Policy 20 – Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan

HAR 2: Housing allocation, Mendham Lane, Harleston
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. Planning History

2.1 2002/0596 136 dwellings and associated works Refused

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council : Support the application in principle, subject to the outstanding queries (as of July 2012) of NCC Highways and Anglian Water having been addressed.

3.2 District Members

Mr B Riches : Can be a delegated decision.
Mr J Savage : To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 NCC Highways : No objection, subject to appropriate conditions.

3.4 Environment Agency : Comments on amended plans/information to be reported.

3.5 Anglian Water Services Ltd : Foul Sewerage Network – Harleston STW has capacity for the foul flows from the development. A drainage solution has been agreed for an alternative connection point to mitigate the risk of any potential flooding downstream.

Surface Water Disposal – A sustainable drainage system has been agreed in principle with the developer.

3.6 Historic Environment Service : No objection, subject to a condition requiring a programme of archaeological works prior to the commencement of any development.

3.7 SNC - Housing Strategy Manager : Supports the proposals, which proposes 32.5% affordable housing, with one property being a wheelchair adapted 2 bedroom bungalow. The tenure mix is in accordance with JCS policy.

3.8 Police Architectural Liaison Officer : No objection to the amended scheme.

3.9 Environmental Services (Protection) : To be reported.
3.10 SNC: Design Officer : No objection to the scheme, which scores 17 out of 20 when assessed against the Building for Life criteria.

3.11 SNC: Landscape Officer : No objections received.

3.12 NCC: Planning Obligations : Require education contributions towards nursery provision and library provision totalling £59,598.

3.13 Local Residents : 20 letters of objection received from 16 properties

- Inadequate infrastructure
- Can waste water treatment plant work?
- Will destroy valuable agricultural land and wildlife habitat
- Will overlook properties in Badger Close
- Brownfield land should be developed ahead of Greenfield sites
- Loss of privacy to properties in Howard Close
- Detrimental impact of extra traffic on roads
- Doctors surgery not able to cope with demand
- Too dense a development
- Development unnecessary at this present time
- Existing services in Harleston will not be able to cope
- Not enough employment in the area to sustain development.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 This full application proposes a development of 120 dwellings on a 4 hectare site, allocated for such use under local plan policy HAR2. An area to the west of the site also allocated by this policy has already been developed by Badger Homes (now known as Badger Close). This comprises a mixture of single and two-storey properties. To the north of the site is the older mainly single storey development of Howard Close. The site comprises an arable field that has a gentle fall to the north and has a small frontage with Mendham Lane. Mature hedgerows and trees bound the site to the west and north and also bisect the middle of the site running north south. A site location plan is attached as appendix 1.

4.2 A planning application for 136 dwellings on this site was refused in 2002, as it was felt that at the time other brownfield sites should be developed ahead of this site. This new application for 120 dwellings is submitted now, as all of the brownfield sites under consideration in 2002 have now been developed. The key planning policy relating to the site is policy HAR2 that allocates the site for residential development requiring the developer to provide open space, affordable housing, bus service contributions, on-site child play space, footpath/cycleway links though to Howard Close, funding towards the leisure centre, contributions towards education and libraries, and off-site recycling.

4.3 It is noted that several neighbours have raised concern that the infrastructure of the town cannot cope with more development. Specifically, concern was raised about the difficulties of obtaining appointments with the doctors. Following consultation with Harleston Medical Practice it was apparent that this issue was caused by being understaffed, and not the actual capacity of the surgery itself. However, the medical Practice have confirmed that they are supportive of the development and that by September, four additional clinical staff will have started work. These staff increases will ensure that any increase in patients can be accommodated.

4.4 In respect of education, the County Council have confirmed that there is spare capacity at both the primary and high schools, and, subject to developer funding towards enhanced nursery provision, no objection to the development is raised.
4.5 As the principle of development on this site is established through the HAR2 allocation, and taking into account the above, I consider the site to be appropriate for development and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, which gives a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Subject to the securing of the required planning obligations to be secured by way of a legal agreement, the proposal also accords with policy HAR2. The remaining issues for consideration are:

- Siting, design and layout
- Impact on neighbouring amenities
- Highway Impact
- Drainage

**Siting, design and layout**

4.6 Both JCS Policy 2 and Section 7 of the NPPF require high quality design, and great importance is attached to the design of the built environment, with it being seen as a key aspect of sustainable development, indivisible from good planning and contributing positively to making places better for people. The design and access statement submitted with the application explains how the scheme has been influenced by a contextual and character appraisal of the site and the surrounding area. The site layout and street scenes are attached as appendix 2 to this report.

4.7 The scheme has recognised the presence of single storey development to the north and north west of the site, and proposes low density bungalows adjacent these areas. The creation of a new roundabout and entrance at the south of the site has allowed for the creation of a thoughtfully designed ‘draw’ into the site using a group of well proportioned two-storey dwellings. This higher density area follows the pattern and density of the neighbouring Badger Homes development and continues the street scene into the site. The existing landscape features of the site are retained and incorporated within the design of the scheme and link through to a large central green area. A combination of traditional forms and arrangement of adjoining terraced blocks helps to give the scheme its own specific character.

4.8 The scheme includes the required connectivity to Howard Close that allows Briar Road and Briar Close to provide cycle / pedestrian links to the town centre. The scheme will also provide a footpath/cycle link to the Fuller Road industrial estate (as required by policy HAR2).

4.9 The scheme has been assessed by the Council’s Design Officer against the Building for Life criteria, and it achieves a score of 17 out of 20, the gold standard, and is therefore considered to accord with the design requirements of the NPPF and JCS Policy 2. The Building for Life assessment is attached as appendix 3 to this report.

**Impact on neighbouring amenities**

4.10 The scheme (as amended) takes into account the existing development to the north and west, and maintains satisfactory first floor window to window separation distances and avoids any direct overlooking of properties. Overlooking and overbearing issues have been avoided in respect of the single storey dwellings in Green Park, Newlands Close and Howard Close, as the proposed dwellings on these boundaries are also single storey. Whilst the pedestrian / cycle link to Howard Close will lead to an increase general activity in this area, there is no vehicular link, and therefore the impact on general amenity will be minimal.

4.11 Taking the above into account, I feel that the proposed development accords with local plan policy IMP9.
Highway Impact

4.12 All traffic will enter the development via a new roundabout that will replace the current blind bend on Mendham Lane. This roundabout will also serve the existing farm access to the east, and will act as a traffic calming measure to traffic on Mendham Lane. NCC: Highways have raised no objection to this element of the scheme, subject to the submission of detailed engineering drawings that can be required by condition. Similarly, they raise no objection to the internal estate roads within the development. The scheme is therefore considered to accord with local plan policy IMP8.

Drainage

4.13 The scheme incorporates a sustainable drainage system (SUDS) that will mean that the surface water discharge rates from the site do not exceed the pre-development Greenfield run-off rates, ensuring that the risk of flooding is not increased. The system includes swales and a small bio-retention area (pond), along with a larger off-site lagoon that will attenuate the flow of water before it enters the public sewer via existing drainage ditches to the north of the site. All of these features will enhance the biodiversity of the site through the creation of additional habitat. In terms of future management of SUDS, it is intended that the lead local flood authority (NCC) will adopt them as part of their duties under the Flood & Water Management Act 2012. As this adoption arrangement may not be in place for some time, Anglian Water has offered to adopt the scheme in the interim.

4.14 In terms of foul drainage, Anglian Water has confirmed that spare capacity to accommodate flows from the development exists at Harleston STW. A proposed drainage connection will be made via new pipework to the Beech Hill Road terminal pumping station. This removes the risk of flooding from the existing network.

4.15 Subject to appropriate conditions, both Anglian Water and the Environment Agency have accepted the principle of the surface water and foul water drainage being proposed for the site. In light of this I consider that the application accords with the NPPF and the relevant JCS and local plan policies.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The principle of development proposed on this site is acceptable, and accords with saved policy HAR2 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003. The design and layout is considered to be appropriate for the character and appearance of the area, and will not significantly harm the amenities of neighbouring properties. I therefore consider that the proposal accords with the relevant saved local plan policies, in particular policies IMP8 (Safe & Free Flow of Traffic) and IMP9 (Residential Amenity) of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003. These policies are given due weight as they remain wholly / partly consistent with the published NPPF. The proposed development is in accordance with the Sections 6, 7, 10 & 11 of the NPPF, and relevant policies the Joint Core Strategy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Gary Hancox, 01508 533841, and E-mail: ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No**: 2012/1049/F  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Mr Richard Oakley  
Site Address : The Caravan, Green Field Farm, Chepore Lane, Spooner Row, Norfolk, NR18 9SR

Proposal : Change of use from agriculture to residential for the siting of 6 additional pitches together with the division of the existing 'double plot' for 2 mobile homes into 2 pitches with provision for 1 mobile home, 1 touring caravan and the erection of 1 no utility room/day room, and parking for 2 vehicles on the 8 pitches each with a 'paddock for the keeping of horses together with the extention of the existing access road, for an 'extended Romany Gypsy Family'

Recommendation : Refuse

1. Site is away from settlement in unsustainable countryside location contrary to national ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ and SNLP policies ENV8 and HOU9.
2. The development would harm the character and appearance of the countryside contrary to Joint Core Strategy Policy 2.

(Authorise Enforcement Action in respect of unauthorised caravans on the site)

1. **Planning Policy**
1.1 National:  
NPPF  
- Section 7 – Requiring good design  
- Section 11 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Planning Policy for Traveller Sites - (see extracts attached as Appendix 2, paragraphs 11 and 20-26)

Local:
1.3 Joint Core Strategy  
- Policy 2: Promoting good design  
- Policy 4: Housing delivery

1.4 South Norfolk Local Plan  
- ENV 8 – Development in the open countryside  
- IMP 8 – Safe and free flow of traffic  
- IMP 9 – Residential amenity  
- LEI 14 – Keeping of horses for recreational purposes  
- HOU 9 – Dwellings for other rural enterprises  
- HOU 22 – Mobile Homes

2. **Planning History**
2.1 2003/1696 Mobile home and access Refused
2.2 2011/0519 Static and mobile caravans Temp. Approval
3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Wymondham Town Council**

- Recommends refusal
  - Outside Development Boundary.
  - Greenfield site inappropriate and contrary to Policy ENV8.
  - Insufficient capacity in local school.
  - Traffic concerns contrary to IMP8;
    - Entrance on a corner
    - No footpath link to Spooner Row, dangerous for pedestrians
    - Road used by considerable number of lorries.
  - No health provision in Spooner Row.
  - Concerns about dominating impact on local settlements contrary IMP9, especially if the site grows
  - Current Development Plan does not identify this as Traveller site
  - Foul and surface water concerns
  - Pre-empt Local Development Framework

3.2 **Besthorpe Parish Council**

- No objection to such sites but they should be within reasonable walking distance of local facilities and this particular application fails to meet this criterion.

3.3 **District Member**

- To be reported if appropriate

3.4 **NCC Highways**

- Acceptable subject to conditions:
  - Gates set back from carriageway
  - Visibility splays 2.4 x 120m
  - On-site parking and turning
  - Note 600m from bus stop on B1172 – acceptable in rural area – footway link available but no pedestrian refuge across London Road
  - Benefit to strategic movement from proximity to A11
  - Primary school 1.2km from site, footpath link only available for part of route

3.5 **Environmental Services (Protection)**

- To be reported

3.6 **Planning Policy**

- To be reported

3.7 **Gypsy Liaison Officer**

- No comments received

3.8 **Housing Standards Officer**

- No objection.
  - Confirm shortage of Traveller sites in the District.
  - Existing social rented sites are at capacity with waiting lists.
  - Unauthorised occupation of sites occurring.
  - Note duty under Housing Act to consider accommodation needs of Travellers.
3.9 Local Residents: Support (5)
- Allows extended family to live together in accordance with their tradition
- Impact likely to be minimal
- Support because this is private, not Council run site (max. 8 pitches)

Objections (59)
- Should wait until Local Plan is prepared
- No change since refusal in 2008
- Proposal too large – impact on small settlement of Suton
- Site in open countryside – prominent and unsightly
- Does not fit into its surroundings
- Too far from shops and other facilities
- Not enough local facilities – education, health, welfare and employment
- Local public transport almost non-existent
- Chepore Lane inadequate for extra traffic
- Access on blind bend
- Potential parking on highway
- Foul and surface water problems – potential pollution
- School is full
- No footpath link to village – unsafe for pedestrians
- Precedent for further development
- Smoke from fires affecting A11
- Increase noise, light and rubbish
- Should have Environmental Impact Assessment
- Site would experience noise and pollution from the A11
- Insufficient consultation
- Gypsy and Traveller Document referred to was withdrawn so is not relevant
- No local need for this development
- Should be treated same as bricks and mortar development
- Potential pollution from horse manure storage
- Impact on local wildlife – owls and bats
- Contrary to Local Plan policies:
  - extra car travel;
  - harm rural character;
  - not make positive contribution to local design;
  - loss of agricultural land;
  - accumulation of waste;
  - will not promote social cohesion – no youth facilities;
  - no local employment;
  - increased fear of crime;
  - no public open space;
  - will not support local employment;
  - not located to minimise journeys to work;
  - does not broaden access to economic activities.
4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application site of approximately 1.45Ha is proposed to accommodate 8 pitches for an extended Romany Gypsy family, together with a paddock for keeping horses. Each pitch is proposed to contain 1 mobile home (6m x 13m); 1 touring caravan; 1 utility block (6m x 9m) and parking for 2 vehicles (max. 7.5 ton). Mobile homes and utility blocks are proposed to be timber clad with roofs in plain tile or shingles. The application indicates that no business use is proposed on the site. Foul drainage is proposed to package treatment plant(s).

4.2 The site benefits from temporary planning permission for 2 caravans. The application suggests that the site has otherwise been fallow for approximately 7/8 years since it was last put to arable use. The site lies approximately 1.5km from Spooner row and 5/6km from Wymondham and Attleborough.

4.3 Taking account of the relevant policies and circumstances of the case, I consider that the main issues for assessment can be addressed under the following headings:

- Need
- Principle of the development (particularly its location and scale)
- Visual/landscape impact
- Highways

Other issues including drainage and ecology also require consideration.

4.4 **Need**

The Joint Core Strategy requires provision of 28 Traveller pitches within South Norfolk in the period 2006 to 2011 and a further 38 in the period 2012 to 2026. These targets have not been met to date and the Housing Standards Officer confirms that there is still unmet need for sites within the District.

4.5 **Principle of the development (particularly location and scale)**

The Council have not yet adopted local criteria for the selection or assessment of Traveller sites. A number of key considerations can be identified however, from the national document, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) (see Appendix):

- Promoting peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and local community.
- Ensure scale does not dominate the nearest settled community.
- Access to health, education and employment.
- Avoid undue pressure on local infrastructure and services.
- Consider impact on local environmental quality (noise and air quality) and effect on health and well-being of site occupants and others.
4.6 The site is clearly detached from the settlement of Spooner Row and paragraph 23 of the PPTS indicates sites “away from existing settlements” should be strictly limited. Although this phrase is open to interpretation, the application site is clearly detached from Spooner Row by about 1.2km to 1.5km, where the closest facilities of a school, church, public house and rail station are located. The settlement does not contain health service facilities, but this is not unusual for a settlement of this size. There are local businesses, although the location of greater potential employment is likely to be Wymondham, Attleborough or Norwich. However, it should be born in mind that work involving travelling is part of the tradition of Traveller lifestyle and this needs to be weighed against the broader principle of minimising journeys to achieve more sustainable development.

4.7 It could be argued that some degree of separation between a Traveller’s site and more conventional housing areas could assist peaceful co-existence between the two, especially as this actually reflects the current settlement pattern in the area, involving a scatter of small dwelling groups and hamlets around the larger settlement of Spooner Row. I do not consider that a group of 8 pitches could be said to ‘dominate’ the settlement in this context.

4.8 Concerns have been expressed regarding capacity of local infrastructure and services, specifically highways, drainage and school capacity. The capacity of the local school is currently being investigated and highways and drainage are considered below.

4.9 The impact of the proposed development in terms of noise and air quality is not likely to be significant in my view, partly due to its location. Although there is one dwelling located to the north of the site, there are no other residential properties within approximately 300 metres. The site is closer to the A11, although this runs in a cutting at this point. Although traffic noise would clearly be apparent from the site, I do not consider this to be unreasonable. It is noted that the applicants clearly consider the site to be acceptable in this respect.

4.10 I find that, although the scale of the development is not unacceptable in relation to the nearest settlements, the issues regarding the location of the site are less clear-cut. The latest Government policy as contained in the PPTS indicates that a lack of a 5 year supply of deliverable Traveller sites should be a significant material consideration when considering applications for temporary permission, but the current application is clearly for permanent consent. Although Traveller Sites may have particular requirements, there is nothing in the PPTS which specifically suggests that Traveller sites should be exempt from the locational considerations which are applied to conventional housing in order to deliver sustainable development distribution.

4.11 Due weight should also be given to SNLP Policies ENV 8 and HOU9 which clearly prohibit new residential development in the countryside unless it is justified by some overriding need for on-site accommodation related to agriculture, forestry or some other rural enterprise. I find no such special justification exists and the proposal consequently conflicts with these policies.

4.12 **Highways**

Local people have expressed concerns regarding highway safety issues regarding the site access and poor quality of highway and footway network. NCC Highways have not objected to the application. The highway officer notes the lack of complete footway link to the school and doubts the accuracy of the applicant’s traffic speed information. However, these issues are not considered to justify a refusal on highway grounds and conditions could be imposed to ensure satisfactory access, visibility splays and on-site parking/turning.
4.13 **Visual /Landscape impact**

The location has no special designation for landscape protection and I accept that the visual impact of the proposal could be mitigated to some degree by the hedgerows around the site, the single storey scale of the structures and the use of timber cladding which would reduce their prominence. However, other vehicles and caravans tend to be more noticeable within such a rural environment, especially when vegetation is not in leaf. I am also concerned that the scale and extent of the proposal in such a countryside location, isolated from any built up area, would erode the generally undeveloped character of the area, which would be apparent in the vicinity of Chepore Lane. The resultant harm would conflict with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.

4.14 **Other considerations**

Concerns have been raised regarding foul and surface water drainage, but I consider that these matters could be dealt with by means of planning conditions requiring details to be agreed. The site is large enough to be able to manage and attenuate any run-off from impermeable areas such that flood risk should not be increased. Package Treatment plants are suggested for foul drainage. These would require licence from the Environment Agency to ensure no pollution occurs. The volume of discharge from such plants would not be significant compared to the total volume of surface water run-off, so that any increase in flood risk would not be significant.

4.15 Similarly, concerns about impact on ecology have been raised. Conditions could be imposed to control external lighting or to enhance the quality of the habitat. I have no evidence to suggest that the development would cause unacceptable harm to any particular species or habitat and in these circumstances I do not consider that this should be included in any reason for refusal.

5 **Conclusions**

5.1 I conclude that, notwithstanding a need for additional Traveller sites in the District, the particular site in question does not meet the requirements of the national Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, particularly in respect of its separation from settlement and services. In addition, the scale and extent of the proposal in such a rural location, isolated from any built-up area would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the countryside in conflict with Joint Core Strategy Policy 2.

6. **Reasons for Refusal**

6.1 1. The application site is located away from established settlements, services and facilities so that residents would not have easy access to them. Such an unsustainable, countryside location does not comply with national policy document ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ and also policies ENV8 and HOU9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

6.2 2. The scale, extent and design of the development in its isolated, rural location would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the countryside in conflict with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Chris Trett, 01508 533794, and E-mail: ctrett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Planning policy for traveller sites
should be included to provide a basis for decisions in case applications nevertheless come forward. Criteria based policies should be fair and should facilitate the traditional and nomadic life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community.

11. Local planning authorities should ensure that traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally. Local planning authorities should, therefore, ensure that their policies:

a) promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community
b) promote, in collaboration with commissioners of health services, access to appropriate health services
c) ensure that children can attend school on a regular basis
d) provide a settled base that reduces the need for long-distance travelling and possible environmental damage caused by unauthorised encampment
e) provide for proper consideration of the effect of local environmental quality (such as noise and air quality) on the health and well-being of any travellers that may locate there or on others as a result of new development
f) avoid placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services
g) do not locate sites in areas at high risk of flooding, including functional floodplains, given the particular vulnerability of caravans
h) reflect the extent to which traditional lifestyles (whereby some travellers live and work from the same location thereby omitting many travel to work journeys) can contribute to sustainability.

Policy C: Sites in rural areas and the countryside

12. When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community.

Policy D: Rural exception sites

13. If there is a lack of affordable land to meet local traveller needs, local planning authorities in rural areas, where viable and practical, should consider allocating and releasing sites solely for affordable traveller sites, including using a rural exception site policy for traveller sites that should also be used to manage applications. A rural exception site policy enables small sites to be used, specifically for affordable traveller sites, in small rural communities, that would not normally be used for traveller sites.

---

5 Small rural settlements have been designated for enfranchisement and right to acquire purposes (under Section 17 of the Housing Act 1996) by SI 1997/1620-25 inclusive and 1999/1307.
Decision-taking

Policy H: Determining planning applications for traveller sites

20. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

21. Applications should be assessed and determined in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the application of specific policies in the National Planning Policy Framework and this planning policy for traveller sites.

22. Local planning authorities should consider the following issues amongst other relevant matters when considering planning applications for traveller sites:

   a) the existing level of local provision and need for sites
   b) the availability (or lack) of alternative accommodation for the applicants
   c) other personal circumstances of the applicant
   d) that the locally specific criteria used to guide the allocation of sites in plans or which form the policy where there is no identified need for pitches/plots should be used to assess applications that may come forward on unallocated sites
   e) that they should determine applications for sites from any travellers and not just those with local connections

23. Local planning authorities should strictly limit new traveller site development in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan. Local planning authorities should ensure that sites in rural areas respect the scale of, and do not dominate the nearest settled community, and avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure.

24. When considering applications, local planning authorities should attach weight to the following matters:

   a) effective use of previously developed (brownfield), untidy or derelict land

---

10. Section 38(1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004: this includes adopted or approved development plan documents i.e. the local plan and neighbourhood plans which have been made in relation to the area (and the London Plan)

11. Section 38(3) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
b) sites being well planned or soft landscaped in such a way as to positively enhance the environment and increase its openness
c) promoting opportunities for healthy lifestyles, such as ensuring adequate landscaping and play areas for children
d) not enclosing a site with so much hard landscaping, high walls or fencas, that the impression may be given that the site and its occupants are deliberately isolated from the rest of the community

25. Subject to the implementation arrangements at paragraph 28, if a local planning authority cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five-year supply of deliverable sites, this should be a significant material consideration in any subsequent planning decision when considering applications for the grant of temporary planning permission.12

26. Local planning authorities should consider how they could overcome planning objections to particular proposals using planning conditions or planning obligations including:

a) limiting which parts of a site may be used for any business operations, in order to minimise the visual impact and limit the effect of noise
b) specifying the number of days the site can be occupied by more than the allowed number of caravans (which permits visitors and allows attendance at family or community events)
c) limiting the maximum number of days for which caravans might be permitted to stay on a transit site.

Policy I: Implementation

27. This planning policy comes into effect on the same day as the National Planning Policy Framework.

28. The policy set out in paragraph 25 only applies to applications for temporary planning permission for traveller sites made 12 months after this policy comes into force.

29. The implementation policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework will apply also to plan-making and decision-taking for traveller sites. In applying those implementation provisions to traveller sites, references in those provisions to policies in the National Planning Policy Framework should, where relevant, be read to include policies in this planning policy for traveller sites.

12 Policy on the use of temporary permissions is set out in Circular 11/1995: The Use of Conditions in Planning Permission. This states that there is no presumption that a temporary planning permission should become permanent.
6. **Appl. No**: 2012/1269/F  
**Parish**: COLNEY  
**Applicants Name**: Bullen Developments Ltd  
**Site Address**: Car parking at Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital, Colney Lane, Colney Norfolk, NR4 7UY  
**Proposal**: Provision of a temporary 350 space car park for the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital  

**Recommendation**: Authorise the Director of Development and Environment to approve with conditions:

1. Temporary Permission  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
3. Materials as proposed unless otherwise agreed  
4. Tree protection  
5. Landscaping Scheme to be submitted  
6. Implementation of landscaping scheme  
7. Archaeological work to be agreed  
8. Travel Plan  
9. Provision of parking and servicing areas  
10. Wheel cleaning facilities for construction vehicles  
11. Land to be restored upon expiry of permission  

Subject to comments and conditions being received from the Environment Agency.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**  
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 7 – Supporting communities  

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**  
ENV14 - Habitat protection  
ENV 15 – Species Protection  
IMP2 – Landscaping  
IMP6 – Visual impact of parked cars  
IMP 8 - Safe and free flow of traffic  
COL 4 - Expansion of the new Norfolk and Norwich Hospital  
TRA19 – Parking standards
2. Planning History

2.1 2012/1200 Build new linear accelerator suite adjacent to helicopter & within the grounds. New link corridor to run from main hospital to new suite and where breaking into existing building new aos treatment room to be created and accessed from ward area. New plant area positioned above linear accelerator suite to house mechanical and electrical equipment to service the medical areas below

Approved

2.2 2012/1145 Erection of new building for research and development purposes with associated surface car park, cycle parking, landscaping and enclosed walkway at the John Innes Centre

Approved

2.3 2012/1143 Screening opinion - Provision of a temporary 350 space car park for the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital.

EIA not required.

2.4 2012/0842 Scoping Opinion - NRP South: Provision of new research and development facilities, offices, and ancillary uses with associated car parking, access roads, and landscaping

Advice issued

2.5 2012/0500 Scoping Opinion - NRP North: Scoping opinion for new offices and ancillary uses with associated parking, access roads, landscaping and cycle parking.

Advice issued

2.6 2011/1323 Extension of time limit application to planning permission 2005/2597/F - Erection of 4 storey extension to existing school of nursing and midwifery comprising teaching and academic accommodation

Approved.

3. Consultations

3.1 Cringleford Parish Council : No objection

3.2 Little Melton Parish Council : No objection

3.3 Colney Parish Meeting : To be reported

3.4 District Members
   Mr G Wheatley : To be reported if appropriate
   Mr C Kemp : To be reported if appropriate
3.5 NCC Highways : No objection. Conditions recommended.
3.6 Environment Agency : To be reported
3.7 Historic Environment Service : No objection. Conditions recommended.
3.8 Highways Agency : No objection
3.9 Landscape Officer : No objection. Conditions recommended
3.10 Ecologist - David White : No objection. Condition recommended
3.11 Local Residents : No comments received

4. Assessment

Site Location

4.1 The application site is located to the west of the existing Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital (NNUH) grounds and forms part of a larger agricultural field. The site is located within the land area known as NRP South.

4.2 The eastern side of the site is bordered by mature vegetation and the internal hospital road and car parking. The remainder of the site is immediately bordered by agricultural fields; however further to the north is the NRP North development, to the east Hethersett Lane and to the south the A47.

4.3 The site is detailed as being 1.4ha and relatively flat. There are no current road or pedestrian accesses available from the site to the hospital complex.

Proposal

4.4 The application proposes the creation of a car park to provide for 350 spaces for a temporary period. The car parking spaces would be available for both staff and members of the public to use.

4.5 The vehicular access to the car park is proposed to be taken from the north east of the site, with pedestrian links being created on the eastern boundary to link with existing footpaths and car park areas.

4.6 The development would result in the loss of vegetation to create the access points however the majority of the existing hedging and trees would be retained and there is also further planting proposed.

4.7 The car park is proposed to contain 52 lighting columns which are five metres in height, 111 one metre high bollards, 12 lighting bollards measuring approximately one metre high and four CCTV cameras. The car park is proposed to be finished with black tarmac for the road and walkway surfaces and Brindle coloured paving for the spaces.

Principle of Development

4.8 The application site is allocated within the South Norfolk Local Plan as being within the development limits of Colney. Specifically the site is allocated under Saved Policy COL 4 - Expansion of the new Norfolk and Norwich Hospital.
4.9 Saved Policy COL 4 allocates a 5ha portion of land between the hospital and Heathersett Lane for hospital and hospital related activities. JCS Policy 7 states that provision will be made for the expansion of the NNUH.

4.10 The provision of the car parking area is considered to be in accordance with the direction of Saved Policy COL 4 and JCS Policy 7 as it would meet the parking requirements of the hospital which has undergone a period of growth in terms of services, patients and staff members whilst also not prejudicing the strategic long term growth plans for the larger NRP site.

**NRP Development Framework – Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**

4.11 The SPD was adopted in March 2009 and sets out parameters and principles for development within the allocated land areas which form the NRP. The SPD encourages a holistic approach to be taken to the development of the NRP with the creation of a masterplan document. However, the SPD does not preclude the approval of stand alone planning applications within the NRP site.

4.12 It is not considered that the development of a car park for a temporary period would have any negative impacts in relation to the rest of the NRP site being brought forward. Therefore the application is not considered to conflict with the aims of the SPD.

**Design**

4.13 JCS Policy 2: Promoting Good Design, directs that new development should take account of its siting, scale, form and character these principles are also promoted through NPPF - 7. Requiring good design. The proposal does not contain any structures apart from lighting and bollards and the scale of the car park is considered acceptable in relation to the hospital context. The retention of the majority of the existing landscaping will ensure that the character of the locality is maintained.

4.14 The location of the temporary car park has been determined by several factors. The application site is allocated for future development, it is easily accessible on foot from the main hospital complex and it is considered preferable to develop the proposed site rather than to build upon the existing open landscaped/recreational spaces which add value to the hospital grounds.

4.15 The development is considered acceptable in terms of its layout, location and impact on the existing character of the locality and is therefore considered to comply with JCS Policy 2 and NPPF 7.

**Lighting**

4.16 Saved Policy IMP25 directs that any new outdoor lighting should be designed to minimise light spillage to ensure that areas of open countryside, residential amenity and highway users are protected.

4.17 JCS Policy 7 also advises that new development will be well designed to include safe and accessible spaces where crime and the fear of crime are minimised.

4.18 The principle of the lighting strategy is to ensure that all areas of the car park are lit but that there is no unacceptable over spill from the lighting. The lighting has been commissioned to meet with the lighting standards provided through the SPD.
4.19 There has been no objection raised from the Council’s Environmental Protection Team and the use of lighting is considered to reduce the perception that the car park could be an area susceptible to criminal activity. The proposed lighting is therefore considered to be compliant with the aims of Saved Policy IMP25 and JCS Policy 7.

**Landscaping and trees**

4.20 Saved Policy IMP2 directs that development should use landscaping to incorporate into the locality and Saved Policy IMP 6 aims to reduce the visual impact of parked cars through the use of mitigation measures.

4.21 The development proposal would retain a large amount of the existing vegetation along the eastern boundary. Furthermore, it is proposed to introduce a 2m high bund at the southern end of the car park which would be landscaped and have a tree belt planted adjacent to it. There are other areas of soft landscaping proposed within the car park and surrounding its access points.

4.22 It is considered that by virtue of the retained and proposed landscaping that the visual impact of the parked cars will be mitigated against and the development successfully integrated into the area.

**Drainage & Flood Risk**

4.23 The application site is located within an area classified as being Category 1 Flood Zone; this is the lowest risk category. The application details the use of soakaways and oil filter systems to ensure that the soil and groundwater are not polluted.

4.24 Comments from the Environment Agency are outstanding and will be reported verbally to Committee.

**Highway Impact**

4.25 Currently, the hospital has over 100 employees who are entitled to parking passes but for which there are no provision of spaces. The increase in the level of services which are now being catered for at the hospital has not been matched with an increase in the number of parking spaces. This has led to instances of parking taking place in nearby residential areas and areas which are not designated for parking. The car park proposal would allow for the current shortfall in parking to be met.

4.26 To facilitate the car park, there is a need for a vehicular access to be created. The access point is 15m wide and the plan has been annotated to show how it would link into the wider NRP South development.

4.27 The application is accompanied by a Transport Assessment which has been evaluated by the Highway Authority. They have not raised any objection to the development and have recommended conditions. The application is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of Saved Policy TRA19.

**Ecology**

4.28 The NPPF advises that development should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity which is reiterated through JCS Policy 1. The application site is located within 2km of two Local Nature Reserves and twelve County Wildlife Sites.
4.29 The application is supported with an ecological survey and report which concludes that the lighting proposed will not disturb bats and that the replacement planting proposed would result in a net increase in green infrastructure/habits. These conclusions have been agreed with by the Councils Ecologist and as such the application is therefore considered to be in compliance with South Norfolk Local Plan Policies ENV14 and ENV15, JCS Policy 1 and the guidance contained within the NPPF.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The development would allow for a current shortfall in parking to meet whilst not creating any issues associated with highway safety or functionality.

5.2 The temporary nature of the application allows for flexibility to be maintained in the development of the NRP South and ensures that it would not act as any form of barrier to the land being developed for other purposes.

5.3 Through the landscaping scheme the development would result in increased green infrastructure and habitat provision.

5.4 The application is considered to comply with the aims and objectives of the relevant development plan policies in the JCS and South Norfolk Local Plan, as well as the intent of the NPPF and SPD.

5.5 There are no issues associated with ecology, landscape, drainage or highways which cannot be addressed through the imposition of conditions and there are no material considerations which would warrant the consideration of a refusal.

6. Reasons for approval

6.1 The principle of the development is considered acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy Policy 7 and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 Policy COL 4.

6.2 Through the use of replacement planting measures the overall scheme is also considered to accord with the objectives of South Norfolk Local Plan Policies ENV14, ENV15, IMP2 and IMP6.

6.3 Through the use of appropriate conditions the development proposal is also considered to comply with the aims and objectives of NPPF Section 10, Joint Core Strategy Policy 1 and 3 and South Norfolk Local Plan Policy TRA19.

6.4 The development proposal is also considered to accord with the intent of the principles established through the NRP Development Framework – Supplementary Planning Document.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Ian Reilly, 01508 533674, and E-mail: ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other Applications

7.  
   **Appl. No**: 2012/0364/F  
   **Parish**: SHELTON  
   **Applicants Name**: Mr & Mrs Groen  
   **Site Address**: Land north of Balls Green, Primrose Lane, Shelton, Norfolk, NR15 2SJ  
   **Proposal**: Code 6 level sustainable dwelling, and landscaping.  
   **Recommendation**: Refuse

   1. Does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph 55 of the NPPF, particularly in relation of the design, setting and the defining characteristics of the local area
   2. Unacceptable impact on the significance of the heritage asset through the destruction of extant earthworks and buried archaeology deposits, and through damage to the setting of those earthworks not directly affected by the proposed development, contrary to paragraphs 132, 133 and 139 of NPPF
   3. Unclassified road serving the site is inadequate, contrary to SNLP policy IMP8
   4. Unsustainable location, remote from local service centre provision, contrary to NPPF and Policy 5 of Norfolk’s 3rd Local Transport Plan – ‘Connecting Norfolk’

1. **Planning Policies**

   1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
      Section 6: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes, paragraph 55  
      Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment, paragraphs 132, 133 and 139

   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  
      ENV8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
      ENV9: National and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)  
      ENV14: Habitat protection  
      ENV15: Species protection  
      IMP2: Landscaping  
      IMP8: Safe and free flow of traffic

2. **Planning History**

   2.1 None directly relating to this site

3. **Consultations**

   3.1 **Parish Council**: Original comments  
      Approve (3-2)  
      - the commitment by applicant made to Parish Council to allow public access to development and adjacent archaeology site during and after construction and particularly access to schools
• commitment to carry out full archaeology survey
• aims to build to code level 6
• will not be intrusive from nearby roads
• do have concerns will not set precedent and following conditions should be included:
  • open to public on regular basis
  • full archaeological dig prior to commencement
  • restriction placed on amount of light from both within and external – large amount of glass form which could be significant light pollution

Comments on additional highway evidence
Approve (3-2)
• proposed new layout increases visibility at the bend where the access to the proposed development joins Primrose Lane. This will make it easier for traffic leaving or entering the proposed access to be aware of other traffic using the road
• noted with concern, that work already been undertaken at the proposed access; including the piping and filling in of a ditch and the removal of some hedgerow

3.2 District Member : To be determined by committee
• received representations from residents in Hardwick and Shelton objecting to application
• although I am all for SNC encouraging innovative design and sustainable development, share the view that ‘this is the wrong building in the wrong place’
• I fear the poetic fusion of this scheme’s design is too ‘avant-garde’ in order to maintain and reinforce the historic integrity of Shelton Hall

3.3 NCC Highways : Original comments
Refuse
• unclassified road serving development considered to be inadequate to serve development by reason of its poor alignment/restricted width/lack of passing provision/substandard construction, contrary to policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP)
• unsustainable location, remote from service centre provision conflicting with aims of sustainable development, contrary to NPPF and Policy 5 of Norfolk’s 3rd Local Transport Plan – ‘Connecting Norfolk’

Comments on additional highway evidence
Objection still maintained, as above, accepted that application is for one dwelling but location chosen is very poor in highway terms. The conclusions of the report are noted (low traffic flows and low speed), however, the additional traffic will by virtue of low level of movements, add around an additional 25% of vehicle trips to the daily total of traffic speed, and would increase conditions of hazard and inconvenience to the detriment of highway safety users on Primrose Lane. The NPPF states that decisions should take account of whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all. It is clear that because of the deficiencies of the highway network this development does not meet this aim.

3.4 Historic Environment Service

Original comments

Refuse

- Development is located within a medieval moat and its associated earthworks complex. The adjacent mated site of Shelton Hall dates to the late 15th century and it is likely this moat is a predecessor or the remains of Netherhall, which was amalgamated with Overhall to form Shelton Hall before 1490.
- The geographical survey accompanying the planning application, together with a published earthworks survey (Cushion, b and Davison, A (2003) ‘Earthworks of Norfolk’ East Anglian Archaeology 104 pp123-124) clearly shows substantial upstanding and buried remains surviving within the moat platform.
- Although not currently designated, it is of demonstrably equivalent significance to a number of scheduled moated sites. On that basis should be treated as if it were scheduled for planning purposes, in accordance with PPS5
- The development would have an unacceptable impact on the significance of the heritage asset through the destruction of extant earthworks and buried archaeological deposits, and through damage to the setting of those works not directly affected by the proposed development.

Additional comments
Contacted by applicant – my discussions with applicant have not changed our initial response, and our original comments stand

Updated comments in light of NPPF
Recommend refusal, substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage asset, contrary to paragraphs 132, 133 and 139 of the NPPF
Comments in relation to additional information (Community Archaeology)

- this additional information comprises a short statement on the benefits of community archaeology projects, that could be secured via a planning condition
- Should the applicants withdraw their application and resubmit in area clear of earthworks then possible that a new application would require programme of archaeological works and could include a community component but not solely as community archaeology project as this would be contrary to the Standards of Field Archaeology in the East of England
- still maintain objection to application, unacceptable impacts on significance of heritage asset

3.5 Environmental Services (Protection) : Conditional support

- reporting of unexpected contamination
- surface water drainage
- details of foul water to package sewage treatment plant

3.6 Conservation Officer : Refuse

- proposal does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly in relation to design, setting and the defining characteristics of the local area.

3.7 Ecologist

Original comments
Having looked at application I am sure a preliminary appraisal is necessary

Comments on Ecology Survey
Conditional support

- action points in Ecology Survey, section 2.6.7
- informative re protected species
- condition: clearing of scrub around pond 3 to enable permanently retains water and additional planting

3.8 Landscape Officer : Object

- contrary to NPPF, paragraph 55 and JCS policy 2
- direct and indirect affects on the ground and associated earthworks

3.9 Local Residents : 10 letters of objection (5 households) expressing the following concerns:

- contrary to policy – in the open countryside
- no analysis of landscape design statement
- no justification as to why this should be made an exception to policy
- contrary to JCS and PPS’s
no detailed indications in the statement as to the ‘provision for the remains and their setting to be protected, enhanced or preserved’
set a precedent for similar development in other countryside locations
difficult to determine what is innovative about the design, difficult to attribute to ‘outstanding and ground-breaking’
in terms of sustainability – these are common technologies and do not represent ‘ground-breaking’
no landscaping analysis
issues re access/boundary
not directed either at idea new building nor at design, but Shelton Hall is a famous site of which only the moat now remains
unfortunate that plan of this building is low and involve substantial excavations – note NPPF guidelines – danger of heritage loss especially as no detailed archaeology investigation is proposed
access – drive impossibly narrow for any kind of large vehicle, Primrose Lane a narrow country lance, large construction traffic
lack of local services, problems with water pressure, telephone quality and reliability of broadband
in keeping – it is reminiscent of an industrial power station
affects grade II listed building and grounds, harm setting
moat at Shelton Hall is all that remains of a former castle – it’s archaeological and historic potential should not be further compromised
critical to manage light pollution
single track road, unable to deal with agricultural traffic and already damaged
the proposed access does not accurately reflect the actual boundaries on the ground which include drainage ditches
can the entrance be wide enough to allow HGV’s to enter?
if permitted there will be three very large homes close together – Shelton Hall, New Barn and this
‘Dark Park’ is archaeologically significant to the hamlet of Shelton – there have been a number of Neolithic and Pre-historic finds in the Parish and the existence of a probable forerunner to the current Shelton Hall
note the archaeology survey conducted on behalf of the owners, state that the extent of area surveyed is 1 hectare, however total area of land is 2.4 hectares
land is agricultural land
concerns re loss of bio-diversity
Shelton Hall is a famous and historic area id development allowed it will destroy a local and English Heritage site
access – wholly inadequate
in last 30 years, late 2011 is the only time the entrance to Deer park has been cleared for access
issues re culvert and ditch
how will construction traffic negotiate left hand bend?
passing places would be required
revision to drawing 09 addresses concerns re access arrangements encroaching onto our land
highway report does not present a convincing case
understand that the proposed method of construction would involve transporting pre-fabricated sections to the site – no evidence vehicles will be able to negotiate proposed access
emergency vehicles not addressed
  - report by Create Consulting Engineering (CEE) is flawed, comments on highway safety based on data collected by NCC, and understand only relates to recorded accidents with police involvement – no. of accidents not recorded
• logical route to Long Stratton not via Harris Green, but Primrose Lane
• other concerns in report include – road not 4 metres wide; site is isolated; if 8-10 vehicular movements a day then increase from 50-100% per day (based on their own flawed survey); been in accidents less than 10mph; report only admits that development does not meet the requirement with regard to sustainable development, but that this should be ignored
• highlights increased traffic flows from the development, increasing accidents and maintenance and admits that travel to and from this location is unsustainable
• document appears to be designed to justify the cost incurred by the applicants rather than produce factual supporting evidence
• traffic survey only in place 7 days and positioned not to pick traffic from farm managers dwelling and heavy traffic associated with poultry units
• lanes only single file and unsuitable to cater for increase in traffic movements, agree with Mr A Jacklin comments
• since 1972, I have not known this entrance cleared or used by vehicles for access until recently
• entrance now increased to more than double its size, hedging and an oak tree were removed during the nesting season and approximately 14 metres of ditch has been filled, engineering operation requiring planning permission
• note Mr Jacklin’s comments re sustainable development and NPPF, no reference to this is made to this in the CEE report
• nearest bus stop 4.5 miles away and 3.6 miles to Long Stratton (not 2.5 miles)
• fails on core principles in relation to its location and accessibility – it cannot be a sustainable dwelling in isolation – it has to be sustainable in all aspects

4. Assessment

4.1 This is a full application for a substantial 5 bedroom new dwelling. In addition to the forms and drawings the application is supported by a Design Statement, Arboricultural Implications Assessment, Tree Protection and Method Statement, Archaeological Report, Ecology Survey and Transport Evidence (the latter two documents being submitted in response to consultee comments), Community Archaeology Statement and letter from the applicant. The latest letter from the applicant is attached as Appendix 2. Members will be aware that all these documents and all comments received in respect of this application can be viewed on the Council’s web site.

4.2 The site is within the overall grounds of Shelton Hall, a grade 2 listed building. The applicants have an extant permission to convert the listed ‘great barn’ at Shelton Hall into a single dwelling with detached annexe. Shelton does not have a development boundary and the erection of a dwelling in this remote, greenfield, countryside location is contrary to policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) and runs counter to policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy 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.

4.3 Furthermore the site itself is located within a medieval moat and its associated earthwork complex. The adjacent moated site of Shelton Hall dates to the late 15th century, and it is likely that this moat is its predecessor or the remains of the separate manor of Netherhall, which was amalgamated with Overhall to form Shelton Hall before 1490.
4.4 No special agricultural need or similar need has been advanced for the dwelling, other than the applicants desire to create a self sufficient home, with accessibility to all family members (including disabled members of the family) to integrate and share all aspects of the home and establish a new contemporary family home fit for the 21st century, on the site of Netherhall, but in a position to recognise the sensitivity of the former remains. A copy of the applicants Design and Access can be viewed, in full, on the Council’s web site. Members can also see the further justification put forward by the applicant in their most recent letter, attached as appendix 2 to this report.

4.5 Any development needs to be considered in relation to paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular:

‘.......Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstance such as:

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 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 Therefore any development will need to satisfy all four of the points noted above. I agree with the comments made by the Council’s Conservation, Design and Landscape Manager, which are attached as appendix 3. The principle of developing this site is a major concern given its sensitivity and historical significance. It is noted the applicant, in their opinion, have sited the dwelling to respect the sensitivity of the site and recognise the sensitivity of the former remains. However, this view is not shared by officers including the Historic Environment Services (HES), Senior Historic Environment Officer.

4.7 It is considered that the proposal will harm rather than significantly enhance its immediate setting. This view is also shared by the Council’s Landscape Officer who objects to the proposal. It should also be noted that little in the way of analysis of the site and its context or evidence to demonstrate how the design has been evolved in response has been submitted with the application. Although the design is intended to satisfy Level 6 of the Code of Sustainable Homes, and is to be commended for this, that alone is not sufficient for the design to be truly outstanding or innovative. There is no reference to the defining characteristics of the local area and the design approach proposed along with the changes in ground features will introduce features which are alien to the character and landscape of this highly sensitive site. The proposal does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph 55 of the NPPF.

4.8 Furthermore the proposal is also in conflict with paragraphs 132, 133 and 139 of NPPF as the site should be treated as if it were a scheduled monument (paragraph 139). The HES Senior Historic Environment Officer does not support the proposal as the development would have an unacceptable impact on the significance of the heritage asset through the destruction of extant earthworks and buried archaeological deposits, and through damage to the setting of those earthworks not directly affected by the proposed development. Paragraph 132 states that substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monument should be wholly exceptional. The comments received from HES are attached as appendix 4, including a copy of the additional archaeology statement submitted by the applicant.
4.9 The comments made in the applicant’s latest letter are noted (appendix 2) including the quote from paragraph 60 of the NPPF. The Council does support innovation and would not attempt to impose architectural styles, however due consideration under this paragraph still need to be given to local distinctiveness.

4.10 The Highway Authority has raised concerns about the proposed development. The access to the site is from the U76134 Primrose Lane. This road is severely restricted in width along its complete length, both northwards and southbound. Primrose Lane has a number of blind bends which results in a complete lack of inter-visibility between vehicles and or pedestrians. The access is to be from a blind bend, which although it does permit satisfactory visibility for an exiting vehicle, visibility when entering the site will be difficult. They have recommended refusal on two grounds, one being the unclassified road serving the development being inadequate and the second ground, the site being unsustainable and remote from local service centre provision.

4.11 In response to Highway Officer’s initial comments the applicant forwarded additional transport evidence and a revised access plan (the latter to address a concern raised by a nearby resident over land ownership issues). This information was re-consulted on and whilst the Highway Officer accepts in terms of highway safety and traffic flow, the impact of the development will be negligible, he still maintains his objection and still recommends refusal on two grounds.

4.12 The support of the Parish Council, as details in section 3 is noted including the site being made available to the public from an archaeology point of view as put forwarded by the applicant and their specialist consultant. The HES Officer has commented on this latest information, but still maintains this objection to the proposal, as submitted. However, this is not a material consideration of significant weight to overturn the clear policy objections to the proposal.

4.13 The Council’s Ecologist does not raise any objections to the proposal and supports the recommendations of the submitted Ecology Survey.

5. Reason for Refusal

5.1 The proposal does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly in relation to design, setting and the defining characteristics of the local area. Given the site character and sensitivity the proposal would harm rather than significantly enhance its immediate setting. Although the design is intended to satisfy Level 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, that alone is not sufficient for the design to be considered as truly outstanding or innovative. There is little in the way of analysis of the site and its context or evidence to demonstrate how the design has evolved in response. There is not reference to the defining characteristics of the local area and the design approach along with the changes in ground levels will introduce features which are alien to the character and landscape of this highly sensitive site. Furthermore the proposed dwelling would occupy an unsustainable location remote from facilities and services, and would intrude into an area of generally undeveloped countryside to detriment of its character and appearance, contrary to Joint Core Strategy Policy 1 and South Norfolk Local Plan Policy ENV8.

5.2 The proposed development is located within a medieval moat and its associated earthwork complex (NHER 10182). Although this heritage asset is not currently designated, it is of demonstrably equivalent significance to a number of scheduled moated sites. On this basis it should be treated as if it were scheduled for planning purposes, in accordance with paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework. As such this development would have an unacceptable impact on the
significance of the heritage asset through the destruction of extant earthworks and buried archaeological deposits, and through damage to the setting of those earthworks not directly affected by the proposed development and contrary to advice within the NPPF, paragraphs 132 and 133 of the NPPF and policy ENV9 of the SNLP which can be given due weight and consideration as this remains consistent/part consistent with the aims of the NPPF.

5.3 The unclassified road serving the site is considered to be inadequate to serve the development proposed, by reason of its poor alignment/restricted width/lack of passing provision/substandard construction. The proposal, if permitted, would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety, contrary to policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plans which can be given due weight as it remains consistent with the aims of the NPPF.

5.4 The proposed development is not in a sustainable location, remote from local service centre provision conflicting with the aims of sustainable development, the need to minimise travel, and the ability to reduce the reliance on the private car as represented in national and local policy, contrary to the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 5 of Norfolk’s 3rd Local Transport Plan, entitled Connecting Norfolk.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Mellors, 01508 533789, and E-mail: hmellors@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Development Management Committee

12 September 2012
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Appendix 1

Application No: 2012/0364

© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 to date Ordnance Survey Licence no 100019483

South Norfolk Council, Long Stratton, Norwich, Norfolk, NR15 2XE Tel (01508) 533633 Fax (01508) 533625
We specifically chose an architect with an award-winning track record of designing innovative, eco-friendly, low impact, sustainable buildings that are sympathetic to the local environment. The building sits in the landscape in a way that makes it virtually invisible from the road causing minimal impact. It will be totally self-sufficient in energy use and enhance rather than detract from its environment. Looking at the nature of some of the surrounding buildings in the area (admittedly, many industrially utilitarian due to their agricultural purpose), we think it would be hard to argue that the building would detract from the landscape.

On the issue of the design itself, paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPR) argues that 'Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles' while 'great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design more generally in the area' (63) This reinforces para 14, which states: 'At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking' The building is specifically designed to meet that criterion, and should be considered with 'a presumption in favour'

Paragraph 55 regarding the planning of 'isolated' homes in the countryside (referred to by the Landscape Officer) states that consideration be given to 'outstanding or innovative' design which helps 'raise standards of design more generally in rural areas'

The policy framework continues (65): 'Local planning authorities should not refuse planning permission for buildings or infrastructure which promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with an existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design' Again, this project has been specifically designed to achieve that purpose.

We have also endeavoured to 'work closely with those directly affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community' and would like to think that we have adjusted the design to overcome any reasonable objection, although we recognise that there will always be an instinctive reaction against any new development. Para 66 suggests that 'proposals that can demonstrate this in developing the design of the new development should be looked on more favourably'

In the last seven years since we moved into Shelton and renovated the Hall, we have become very attached to the area. We already had strong connections because April's family lived in Hempnall for many years. If anyone has seen any restoration programmes, they will realise that we took on the Hall to preserve it after decades of neglect, not for profit. In fact we spent far more than we would ever get back, which is often the case on old listed properties. We value its historical links with the courts of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I and wished to secure its future for generations. We have spent a lot of time and energy maintaining the grounds and woodlands, and the suggestion in one letter that we have uprooted oak trees is quite ludicrous and upsetting.

We hope to remain as part of the local community, securing the future of this new project, harnessing twenty-first century eco-technology which we feel conforms to all the latest planning guidelines (most notably on sustainable development and innovative, energy-efficient design, sympathetic to the environment) to preserve both the past and the future of this beautiful setting.
Just to clarify the possible relationship between Shelton Hall and the apparent earthworks adjacent to the site of the planning application: Blomefield holds that Netherhall and Overhall were regarded as separate manors at the time of Bishop Stigand and were only joined when the estates were taken over by the Sheltons after the Conquest. There is no evidence of any link between the proposed site and Shelton Hall, the design of which was based on Herstmonceux. The eighteenth century copy of the plans of shelton, reproduced in Anthony Emery's 'Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales' clearly show that the moated area surrounding the original hall is conjoined with a further moat to the west (following the model of Herstmonceux), but with no connection to the south.

Shelton Hall is over 250 metres away from the proposed site, 2 fields away and hidden by trees. There has never been any interest in examining the site, until instigated by us. It is not a designated site of any sort, although the HES officer has stated it should be treated as such for the purpose of this application.

Whatever its origin, we have always been keen to preserve the area surrounding the earthworks and the design of the building, resting on stilts away from any likely former settlement is specifically intended to avoid any chance of interfering with the site. The design of the house would preserve rather than inhibit the site for any possible future investigation – indeed, there is already a ploughed field to the south-west, immediately adjacent to the moated area, within 15 metres of the remaining earthworks, obliterating any possible remnants of settlement in that area. Securing the site from further agricultural development is more likely to ensure its future than undermine it.

We have always been happy to accommodate any archaeological investigations into the site and are happy to allow both research-based and educational activities in the future. In conservation there is always a delicate balance between preserving the past and living with it, and we have tried to find that balance with this project. We would argue that sympathetic development will be more beneficial to the long-term security of the site than continued neglect.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPR) states at para 139 that non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest need to be of 'demonstrably' equivalent significance to scheduled monuments. As the HES officer accepts, there is no real evidence of significance other than supposition, a view shared by Cushion, B and Davison, A, in “Earthworks of Norfolk” East Anglian Archaeology Vol 104, pp123 – 124. (quoted by the HES officer) In fact he states clearly that there is 'no supporting evidence' of a former settlement. NPPR states that consent should be refused only if 'a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset (133) This project is specifically designed to avoid any harm to the site.

The Policy Framework continues (134) ‘Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use’ This is what we are aiming to achieve, giving the site a new lease of life, rather than causing any harm or loss.

Furthermore, it suggests that ‘proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably (137). Again, this is what the project can achieve. Instead of being in a forgotten corner of a forgotten field, the site will be both more open and better maintained by being a part of a residential setting and being accessible to school projects as agreed with our local Parish Council.

April & Jack Groen
Conservation & Design Observations

Ref No: 2012/0364  Site: Land north of Balls Green, Primrose Lane, Shelton, Norfolk, NR15 2SJ

CO Name: DE

Proposal: Code 6 level sustainable dwelling, and landscaping.

Listed Building □
Affects Setting of LB  ☑
In Conservation Area □

Conservation & Design Architect Initial Comments:

Site Visit: 1 May 2012

General Comments:

This is an important and highly sensitive moated site of historic significance. Any development needs to be considered in relation to paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular:

'..........Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as:

- 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.'

Any development proposal will therefore need to satisfy all four of the points noted above. Although the application is supported by a Design & Access Statement, there is little in the way of analysis of the site and its context or evidence to demonstrate how the design has evolved in response.

I have particular concerns about the principle of development within this site given its character and sensitivity which in my view, would harm rather than significantly enhance its immediate setting. Although the design is intended to satisfy Level 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, that alone is not sufficient for the design to be considered as truly outstanding or innovative. There is no reference to the defining characteristics of the local area and the design approach proposed along with the changes in ground levels will introduce features which are alien to the character and landscape of this highly sensitive site.

The scheme fails to satisfy the stringent requirements of para 55 of the NPPF and I am therefore unable to support this proposal and would recommend refusal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further negotiations required: No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation: Refuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested reasons for refusal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not satisfy the requirements of para 55 of the NPPF, particularly in relation to design, setting and the defining characteristics of the local area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Initials: David Edleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation, Design &amp; Landscape Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: 27 July 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Helen Burgess

From: Powell, Kelly [kelly.powell@norfolk.gov.uk]
Sent: 19 March 2012 10:23
To: Planning
Subject: 1212/0364/F Land north of Balls Green, Primrose Lane, Shelton
Our Ref: CNF 44151_1

Dear Ms Mellors,

RE: 1212/0364/F Land north of Balls Green, Primrose Lane, Shelton

Thank you for consulting with us on the above application.

The proposed development is located within a medieval moat and its associated earthwork complex (NHER 10192). The adjacent moated site of Shelton Hall dates to the late 15th century, and it is likely that this moat is its predecessor or the remains of the separate manor of Netherhall, which was amalgamated with Overhall to form Shelton Hall before 1490. The geophysical survey accompanying the planning application, together with a published earthworks survey (Cushion, B and Davison, A (2003) Earthworks of Norfolk East Anglian Archaeology 104 pp123 – 124) clearly show substantial upstanding and buried remains surviving within the moat platform.

Although this heritage asset is not currently designated, it is of demonstrably equivalent significance to a number of scheduled moated sites. On that basis, it should be treated as if it were scheduled for planning purposes, in accordance with policy HE9.6 of PPS 5.

This development would have an unacceptable impact on the significance of the heritage asset through the destruction of extant earthworks and buried archaeological deposits, and through damage to the setting of those earthworks not directly affected by the proposed development.

We would therefore recommend that planning permission for this development should be refused, in accordance with policy HE9.1 of PPS 5.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss our recommendations please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely

Kelly Powell

Assistant Historic Environment Officer (Countryside)

Historic Environment Service
Environment, Transport and Development
Union House
Gressenhall
Dereham
Norfolk NR20 4DR

Direct: 01362 869285
kelly.powell@norfolk.gov.uk

The information contained in this email is intended only for the person or organisation to which it is addressed. Emails sent from and received by Members and employees of Norfolk County Council are routinely monitored for compliance and security reasons.
please attach to file

Helen Mellors (Mrs)
Area Planning Officer
Development & Environment
South Norfolk Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton
Norfolk
NR15 2XE

Tel:01508 533789
E-mail - hmellors@s-norfolk.gov.uk
E-mail - planning@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Website: www.south-norfolk.gov.uk
Facebook: www.facebook.com/southnorfolkCouncil

----Original Message-----
From: Hamilton, Ken [mailto:ken.hamilton@norfolk.gov.uk]
Sent: 22 August 2012 12:51
To: Helen Mellors
Cc: Powell, Kelly; Dack, Zara
Subject: 2012/0364 - Land North of Balls Green, Primrose Lane, Shelton

Dear Helen,

2012/0364 - Land North of Balls Green, Primrose Lane, Shelton Our ref.: CNF44151_4

I understand the above application is due to go to committee on the 12th September. In view of the history of this case and the recent change in planning policy, the following is an update on our original comments.

As stated before, the proposed development is located within a medieval moat and its associated earthwork context, published in Cushion, B and Davison, A (2003), "Earthworks of Norfolk" East Anglian Archaeology Vol. 194 pp 123-124.

I met with the applicant on site on the 2nd May, 2012. At that meeting, the applicant showed me the site, and I advised that any development would have to be clear of any earthworks, so that there was an obvious disconnect between the old and the new. I referred the applicant to the plan of the earthworks published in Earthworks of Norfolk (referenced above, and referred to in our initial planning response of 19/3/12, ref. CNF44151_1).

At our meeting on 21st June, the applicant suggested that the interpretation of this site was in doubt. However, while there is little written evidence to definitely link this feature to a named house (although there is circumstantial evidence suggesting it may be an earlier Shelton Hall, or the remains of a neighbouring manor), its interpretation as a moat and platform containing structural remains was confirmed by the geophysical survey submitted with the application.

The moats at Shelton are unusually complex, comprising a double moat (the current
Shelton Hall), 15th and 16th century barns, a third moat (separate from the double moat) and a number of fishponds and other earthworks. Out of over 800 moated sites currently known in Norfolk, only 8 (including Shelton) have three moats, indicating the rarity of such a site. The site is not currently scheduled, but it is clear from the scheduling of moats across the county that this omission is purely because the site has never been assessed. The site is of demonstrably equal or greater significance than a number of the scheduled moated sites across the county, and hence is worthy of designation.

On that basis, the site should be treated as if it were a scheduled monument, in accordance with paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, should be wholly exceptional. "Wholly exceptional" is further defined in paragraph 133.

We recommend, therefore, that the application be refused, in accordance with paragraphs 132, 133 and 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Yours aye

Ken

Ken Hamilton PhD MIfA
Senior Historic Environment Officer (Planning) Historic Environment Service
Environment, Transport and Development Union House Gressenhall Dereham Norfolk NR20 4DR
Direct: 01362 869275
Mobile: 07748 761354
Fax: 01362 860951
ken.hamilton@norfolk.gov.uk

To see our email disclaimer click here <a href="http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer">http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer</a>
Helen Mellors

From: Hamilton, Ken [ken.hamilton@norfolk.gov.uk]
Sent: 30 August 2012 14:25
To: Helen Mellors
Cc: Planning Idox; Dack, Zara; Gurney, David
Subject: RE: Community Archaeology at Shelton Hall - 2012/0364

Dear Helen,

Thank you for consulting us on the further information submitted for the site at Shelton Hall.

The additional information comprises a short statement on the benefits of community archaeology projects, together with a statement by the agent suggesting such a programme of works could be secured via a planning condition.

As you are aware, the Historic Environment Service have objected to the current application on the grounds of its unacceptable impact on the significance of heritage assets on site through both direct impact on deposits and damage to the setting of assets on site. We have advised the applicant that any development on this site should be sited away from any earthworks, with a clear and obvious separation between heritage assets and new build. As advised in our earlier response and meetings, the extent of earthworks is defined by Cushion, B and Davison, A (2003) "Earthworks of Norfolk" East Anglian Archaeology Vol. 104: 123-124.

Should the applicants withdraw their application and resubmit in an area clear of earthworks, it is possible that the new application would require a programme of archaeological works. We would be happy for this to include a community archaeology component, but it could not be carried out solely as a community archaeology project, as this would be contrary to the Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England (Gurney, D (2003) East Anglian Archaeology Occasional Paper 14). The Standards state that community works should in no way replace any aspect of any formal costed works. The Historic Environment Service are happy to advise on this if required.

In terms of the current application, as stated above, the Historic Environment Service have objected on the grounds of its unacceptable impact on the significance of heritage assets on site through both direct impact on deposits and damage to the setting of assets on site, and we maintain this objection.

Yours aye

Ken

Ken Hamilton PhD MIFA

31/08/2012
From: Helen Mellors [mailto:hmelors@s-norfolk.gov.uk]
Sent: 28 August 2012 13:52
To: Hamilton, Ken
Cc: Planning Idox
Subject: PW: Community Archaeology at Shelton Hall - 2012/0364

Dear Ken

Please find attached additional information, forwarded by the applicant, with respect to the above planning application.

Your views and comments would be appreciated.

Regards,

Helen

Helen Mellors (Mrs)
Area Planning Officer
Development & Environment
South Norfolk Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton
Norfolk
NR15 2XE

Tel:01508 533789
E-mail - hmelors@s-norfolk.gov.uk
E-mail - planning@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Website: www.south-norfolk.gov.uk
Facebook: www.facebook.com/southnorfolk council

31/08/2012
Hi Helen,

Apologies for the delayed response, Nigel has been working away on a community project. Please see attached the statement outlining the benefits for community involvement in archaeology. Subject to gaining planning permission it is our intention to execute such a proposal to increase overall value in the exciting project. The statement clearly shows the benefit of looking and recording for the benefits to the local and wider community.

We would be happy to accept a condition to this effect if permission were forthcoming.

Please do not hesitate to be in contact should you require any further information. Please could you confirm whether you intend to support this application and that the date for the committee remains 12th September 2012.

We look forward to hearing from you in the very near future.

Andi Gibbs Architect FRSA
URBANBLU LIMITED
Visit: www.urbanblu.co.uk
Email: andi@urbanblu.co.uk
Direct Line: 01943 765 044

Save a tree. Don't print this e-mail unless it is necessary.

IMPORTANT: Any views or opinions are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Urban Blu. The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain confidential and/or privileged material.

If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please do not read, copy, use or disclose this communication and notify the sender immediately. It should be noted that any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited.

Any liability for any viruses contained within this message or any of its attachments is excluded to the fullest extent permitted by law. Importing and exporting email may be monitored in line with current laws.

Dear Andi

Further to your recent conversation with Nigel Page, please find attached a statement about Community Archaeology at the site as discussed.

31/08/2012
Kind regards
Jayne

Jayne Bown
Archaeology Manager (Post Excavation & Service Delivery)
tel: 01603 756160
d: 01603 756190
m: 07788 557508
e-mail: Jayne.Bown@NPS.CO.UK

NPS Property Consultants Ltd
NPS Archaeology
Scandic House
85 Mountgate
Norwich
NR1 1PY
http://www.nps.co.uk

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 6.5.455 / Virus Database: 271.1.1/5215 - Release Date: 08/27/12 22:14:00

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

The information contained in this e-mail is intended only for the person or organisation to which it is addressed. If you have received it by mistake, please disregard and notify the sender immediately.

Any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of NPS Property Consultants Limited.

Please be aware that emails may have to be disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

To see our email disclaimer click here http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer

31/08/2012
Shelton Hall, Norfolk; Community Archaeology - background

Community archaeology projects are becoming an increasingly popular way for people to engage with local heritage and archaeology around them. Such community-based projects can successfully engage persons who have diverse ages, abilities and backgrounds, and as the archaeological process of investigation is so varied, individuals and groups can be involved at different stages and may find that they develop interests in areas of archaeology and history they had previously not considered.

NPS Archaeology has undertaken a number of different Community Archaeology projects producing positive outcomes for those involved and resulting in the discovery of exciting archaeological remains. Our most recent project at Cardigan Castle in Wales received very positive feedback from both community participants and our client. The project that we undertake at Acde involves the High School and local community and has been ongoing for five years - one of the pupils has just been awarded a place at university to study archaeology this September.

A Community Archaeology project focused on Shelton Hall would provide locally-based people (and potentially those further afield) with the opportunity to learn about the Hall whilst at the same time learning skills and discovering archaeological data about the site thus providing new information for its long-term management. Public involvement could make the local community more aware of their specific archaeological heritage whilst also helping to bring members of the community together in a shared activity.

It is advised that archaeological work, and especially that which would be intrusive (e.g. excavation) should not be carried out without the tuition, supervision and guidance provided by professional archaeologists. Such archaeologists would operate following regional and national standards to ensure that the archaeological environment is dealt with in an appropriate manner (specifically those issued by the Institute for Archaeology and guidelines set out in Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England (edited by D. Gurney, 2003)). Work should be framed within local, regional and national research objectives (especially Research and Archaeology revisited: a revised framework for the East of England (edited by M. Medlycott, 2011) and National Planning Policy Framework (2012)).

A Community Archaeology project will need funds to support it – in the case of Shelton Hall these could be by provided the developer. Generally the funding body would be expected to be responsible for aspects such as meeting the cost of professional archaeological support to monitor and manage the fieldwork, provide tuition and guidance to volunteer team members, provision of plant, welfare facilities and limited equipment if required and appropriate input to the post excavation stages (stratigraphic and specialist analysis, finds processing and production of a site report and archive).

Lilly Hodges, August 2012
8. **Appl. No** : 2012/0835/F  
**Parish** : HEYWOOD

Applicants Name : Mrs Dominique Marples  
Site Address : The Goat House, Burston Road, Heywood, Norfolk, IP22 5SX  
Proposal : Proposed erection of field shelter to store tractor and field topper.

Recommendation : Approve

1. **Policy**

1.1 Joint Core Strategy  
**Policy 2 : Promoting Good Design**

1.2 South Norfolk Local Plan  
**ENV 8 : Development in open countryside**  
**EMP 5 : Agricultural development**  
**IMP 9 : Residential amenity**

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/1130 Cart-lodge and workshop to replace existing; retain and re-locate garden shed and greenhouse; Retain ‘Yurt’ for birdlife recording and storage of agricultural and maintenance equipment. Part Approved 10-11-11

2.2 2012/8141 Action to remove unauthorised building to east of The Goat House Compliance by 17th October 2012

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Heywod Parish Council : Should remove all illegal structures before granting planning permission.

3.2 District Member : To Committee unless refused – outstanding enforcement issues.

3.3 Local Residents : 2 letters of support  
1 letter of objection  
- Additional clutter in field harms character and appearance of the area.  
- Building not necessary as there is already a ‘Yurt’ building on the land.  
- The land is not used for traditional agricultural production.  
- Fear use in association with social/music events on the land which will increase disturbance to tourist guests and residents on adjoining property.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The proposed building is a simple 3 sided shelter (4.5m x 3m x 2.5m high) with metal sheet roof and featheredge board sides. The building is required to house a tractor and field topper for use on the applicant’s 10 acres of land which is managed as meadow and from which hay crops are taken.
4.2 The building is proposed in an isolated location against a substantial field hedge approximately 100m from the nearest dwelling, where it is not readily visible from any public vantage point.

4.3 Such buildings are normally encouraged to be grouped with other buildings on the property to limit their visual impact. However, the applicant’s dwelling and other outbuildings are grouped with 3 other dwellings in separate occupation (the original farm house and two other dwellings converted from farm buildings). There is potential for increased disturbance to neighbours if the tractor shelter were erected in this area. Because the building is of modest size and will not be conspicuous, I consider its proposed detached siting would be acceptable in this particular case.

4.4 The need for the building has been challenged on the grounds that a ‘Yurt’ type structure already stands in the field and also because the land is not used for typical agricultural production. The ‘Yurt’ structure is clearly not suitable to accommodate a tractor, so I do not consider its presence justifies refusal of the new proposal. Although the agricultural use of the land is limited to hay crops, there is 10 acres of land involved which clearly requires maintenance as well as hay cropping. In view of the size of the land holding and the modest size of the proposed building, I do not consider that the building is unreasonable for the needs of the land.

4.5 The sensitivity of the application to issues of residential amenity is increased because the applicant’s land is used for occasional social/ music events, which have been the subject of complaint to the Council in the past. These events are not so frequent as to require planning permission. While I understand the concerns as expressed by some local resident’s, I do not consider that the erection of the proposed modest structure could be said to materially increase the likely intensity, frequency or harm caused by any such event on the land.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The building is of a modest scale and design which is proportionate and appropriate to the needs of the land holding on which it would stand. The building would not materially harm the character and appearance of the area and its siting is acceptable to limit any impact on nearby dwellings in separate ownership. In these circumstances the proposal is consistent with Joint Core Strategy 2 and South Norfolk Local Plan policies ENV8, EMP5 and IMP9.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Chris Trett, 01508 533794, and E-mail: ctrett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No** : 2012/0869/F  
**Parish** : EASTON  

Applicants Name : Mr Denis Rosembert  
Site Address : Chez Denis Restaurant, 76 Dereham Road, Easton, NR9 5EJ  
Proposal : Conversion of restaurant area 'A3' to form additional guest rooms 'C1' and a two storey rear extension to provide guest flats 'C1'

Recommendation : Refuse

1. Contrary to SNLP policies EMP6, IMP8, IMP9  
2. Scale of extension and the resulting impact on the character of the existing building and the loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Section 3 Supporting Rural Economy  
Section Promoting Good Design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 Promoting Good Design  
Policy 5 The Economy

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
EMP 6: Alterations and extensions to existing business premises  
IMP 5: Streetscape  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2010/0894/A Retention of advertising boards Split  
2.2 2002/1950/F Ground floor extension to restaurant with two storey extension to residential dwelling Approved  
2.3 2000/0542/F erection of two storey extension comprising of 6 en-suite bedrooms for visitors Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council : Approve –  
• Concern over parking for the additional number of rooms, owner has two cars excluding visitors, neighbour also raised issue with smoking outside of premises.

3.2 District Member : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : No objection – however there appears to be insufficient space on the site for a restaurant once the proposed extension is constructed, suggest a condition that the public use of the restaurant should cease once building work on the proposed guest room extension starts.
3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) : No comments received

3.5 Local Residents : 1 Letter of objection received
- Ruin the view from Ringland lane
- Extra cars will park in the Lane which is too narrow.
- Increase number of people smoking on the village bench outside the premises
- Loss of privacy
- Increase level of noise from guest flats
1 letter raising no objections.

4. Assessment

4.1 The premises are a two storey building which has been extended in the past to increase the private space available and the ground floor restaurant space. Parking is to the rear of the building which is separated from the residential properties on the north of the site by a 1.8 metre brick wall and the garages to the dwellings. The boundary to the west bordering Ringland Lane is screened by an existing well established hedge, a shed is also set against this boundary.

4.2 Policies in the JCS, Local Plan and requirements of the NPPF seek to ensure that proposals are for an appropriate use, are of good design and do not adversely affect the character of the premises, the privacy and amenities of the neighbouring properties, or the overall character of the area. 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.

4.3 The proposal is for the change of use from the restaurant to additional guest accommodation, and for the construction of a 2.5 storey wing to the rear to provide an additional 4 self-contained guest flats.

4.4 The premises would stay as a commercial premises therefore there would be no loss of employment from the proposed change. However, the main issue is the scale and impact the proposed extension would have on the existing premises and the neighbouring properties.

4.5 The ground floor of the extension includes a drive through section to provide access to the existing car park, to the north side of the drive through would be one of the four self contained units. The first and second floors provide an additional 3 units for guest flats, the orientation of the windows is on the east and west elevation. The 6 windows on the second floor which face east and west are kitchen (furthest from the existing building), lounge (positioned centrally) and bedroom (closest to the existing building). There are also 3 windows in the gable of the extension however these are obscure glazed and would not result in any loss of privacy. On the second floor all the windows on the west elevation are bedroom windows with the kitchen and lounge windows positioned in the east elevation. I consider that the majority of loss of privacy from the windows will be from the first floor particularly from the kitchen and lounge, although there is some distance to the nearest neighbours, this does introduce overlooking in closer proximity to the neighbouring properties than exists at present and therefore is in conflict with policy IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.
4.6 The overall scale and projection of the extension all but meets the north boundary to the rear of the site albeit set at an angle significantly reducing the feeling of space between the existing building and the neighbouring residential properties. Although the design does reflect some of the features of the existing building such as the crow step gable, the overall scale of the extension as submitted is considered to result in an overbearing feature within the space available and not respect the principle of good design as promoted by the NPPF or the policies in the JCS. For this reason I consider the proposal as submitted is in conflict with these policies.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The proposal is assessed against Sections 3 and 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policies 2 and 5 of the Joint Core Strategy and policies EMP6, IMP5, IMP8 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The existing premises have recently been used as a restaurant, and therefore have an established commercial use within the locality. The proposal is for the change of use of the former restaurant area to provide additional guest accommodation, the proposal also includes a two storey rear wing with a further four guest flats, a drive through section is included to access the parking area to the rear of the site.

5.3 The premises are sited on a corner plot surrounded by residential properties. The scale of the scheme as submitted is considered to have an adverse visual impact on the existing building and will result in overlooking and loss of privacy to the adjacent neighbouring properties from the first and second floor windows. The bulk of the rear extension will also result in an overbearing physical dominance within this locality which at present provides a gap between the commercial building and the residential properties. The proposal therefore is in conflict with the above policies.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Jacqui Jackson, 01508 533837, and E-mail: jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Development Management Committee
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10. **Appl. No** : 2012/0972/F  
**Parish** : BUNWELL  
Applicants Name : Mr H White  
Site Address : Bluebell Cottage, Brick Kiln Lane, Bunwell, Norwich, NR16 1SA  
Proposal : Retention of existing field/shelter, existing pole barn, existing aviary and storage shed  
Recommendation : Approve with conditions  
1. Full Planning Permission Time Limit  
2. In accordance with submitted details & drawings  
3. Removal of manure from site  
4. Siting of muck heap  
5. Details of external lighting to be agreed  
6. Fly and rodent control regime to be agreed  
7. Construction of aviary to be modified to include solid timber rear elevation and roof form – specification to be agreed  
8. Use of buildings to be restricted  
9. Boundary treatments to be agreed

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Section 7: Requiring good design  
Section 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

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  
IMP 10: Noise

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No recent planning history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council : Recommend refusal:  
- Size and position of the stable  
- Disappointing that this is a retrospective application  
- Views of the local residents to be considered

3.2 District Member : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : No objection

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) : No objection subject to conditions relating to disposal of manure, muck heap siting, details of external lighting, fly and rodent control regime and noise mitigation measures for the aviary
3.5 Local Residents: 8 letters of objection & 3 letters of support

Objections:

- Against retrospective applications
- No mention made of property to be used as a smallholding & no consultation of the neighbours about the same
- Rest of smallholding is separate from this site
- Planning permission recently refused for the housing of racing greyhounds close to the application site
- The site may be used for breeding of animals due to animal types (e.g., parrots, tortoises, Shetland ponies)
- Parrots are very noisy & if poultry is allowed to roam free (as previously) these birds are also very noisy
- Responsibility of the applicant to ensure that the boundary treatment is ‘poultry proof’ and unobtrusive - chickens currently roam free and enter neighbouring gardens
- Concern about the noise of the sheep and possible lambing in the future; will the sheep need an additional shelter?
- Concern about vehicle movements to and from the site, particularly associated with transportation of animals and supplies
- A rat problem eradicated 5 years ago has returned
- Smell of manure on warm and windy days is a problem meaning windows can not be opened
- Manure attracts flies which is a problem; potential for a wasp problem too
- Manure is being allowed to build up in the drainage ditches
- Concern about disease and whether DEFRA are aware of these animals in a residential area
- Possible light pollution; no mention made about outside lighting but artificial lighting will be required and will be obtrusive in the local area
- Concerned that the current use is the basis for a commercial / educational venture in the future and the lane would not be able to accommodate the traffic
- Field shelter seems to be large for its purpose and is in an inadequate position for the prevailing winds & rain thus defeating its purpose
- Building is an eyesore and not sensitively sited in terms of scale and position
- Loss of view across the countryside
- Concreting in of posts suggest permanent structures, not temporary as mentioned
- Shelter is the whole view from rear garden of The Cottage and results in shade on vegetable garden
- On sunny days there is a glare from the field shelter roof
- Loud noises from the field shelter when the ponies are kept in overnight
Support:
- Clear view of the field from property and structures are complimentary to the area
- Understand applicant wishes to extend level of stewardship on smallholding to allow for educational visits and would support this
- No objection to buildings if sited with regard to the impact on neighbours in the small community
- Area of land purchased by previous occupier for grazing of horses
- Animals are all well kept
- Dense vegetation screening along rear boundaries of properties adjoining the site has recently been removed making the smallholding more visible
- Amicable discussions took place with the applicant about boundary treatments with Walnut Tree House

1x additional comment:
- Request site visit by planning committee to assess the extent of the impact on the neighbouring properties

4. Assessment

4.1 The application site is located outside the Development Limits of Bunwell. The application seeks retrospective consent for the erection of a field shelter, pole barn, aviary and sheds within an area of agricultural land that is associated with Bluebell Cottage to the east of the site. The land forms part of a smallholding which is also located further to the south along Brick Kiln Lane.

4.2 There are a number of residential properties located to the east, north and west of the application site, and open agricultural land to the south. The land levels increase in a northerly direction towards Bunwell Hill. A drainage ditch runs along the north boundary of the site. The boundary treatments along both sides of this ditch vary however they are minimal to the rear of the field shelter.

4.3 The structures have been erected along the northern boundary of the site, closest to the rear gardens of the nearby dwellings. The aviary, attached pole barn and timber shed are positioned to the north east of the site whilst the field shelter is located to the north of the site adjacent to the rear of the garden associated with The Cottage. At the time of my site visit the area to the west of the application site was in use as grazing land for two Shetland ponies whilst the remainder of the site to the south of the structures was an area used for the keeping of poultry.

4.4 Aviaries erected within the garden areas would not normally require planning consent however this aviary has been erected outside of a garden setting and therefore the usual permitted development rights do not apply in this instance.

4.5 Policies in the JCS, Local Plan and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework seek to promote good design whilst protecting the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers from material harm. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Plan referred to above because those policies remain consistent/ part consistent where noted with the published National Planning Policy Framework.
4.6 The field shelter is approximately 14.75 metres in length and been constructed of timber weatherboarding with a metal sheet roof, colour coated green. A small shed is located to the west of this shelter. Due to the changes in ground level in the area the field shelter is approximately 1 metre lower than the ground level to the rear of the gardens to the north. The pole barn and aviary structure is constructed of similar materials although the aviary has a timber frame and wire mesh to the front and rear elevations as well as a wire mesh roof.

4.7 A number of objections have been received to the proposal from the neighbouring properties. In addition concerns were raised at the initial stages of the application process about the validity of the application. The issues raised were corrected as appropriate by the agent however in any case it was not considered that these matters affected the planning merits of the application.

4.8 The principal objections can be broken down into two separate categories; the visual impact of the field shelter and nuisance matters relating to increased pests and vermin, as well as noise from the aviary which houses tropical birds. A complaint about these latter concerns has recently been lodged with Environmental Services however I have been advised that this does not alter the original consultation response.

4.9 The field shelter is typical of many structures found within a rural setting. Due to the changes in ground levels in the area its visual impact is reduced although it remains a relatively large structure when viewed from the rear of The Cottage, the closest property to the north. The removal of the vegetation along the rear boundary of The Cottage has increased the views into the site from this property. I understand that the owner of this property has recently planted a laurel hedge along this boundary although this has yet to mature. Due to the proximity of the field shelter to the drainage ditch I do not feel that it would be possible for the applicant to introduce further screening to the rear. The visual impact of the pole barn and aviary is reduced by the natural vegetation along this part of the boundary although the ownership of this vegetation has not been established.

4.10 Environmental Services have not raised an objection to the application subject to a number of conditions detailed above which will address many of the concerns raised by neighbouring occupiers, particularly in regard to lighting, manure disposal, the siting of muck heaps and pest control regimes. Due to the sensitivity of the site and its relationship to the neighbouring dwellings I consider that these are all reasonable conditions. The noise arising from the aviary has been subject to a number of objections and Environmental Services have suggested that a mitigation scheme to reduce the level of noise emanating from the aviary, in particular modification of the structure to include timber weatherboarding to the rear and a solid roof, would have the effect of reducing the noise levels.

4.11 Concerns have also been raised about the possible need for further structures on the site, as well as a requirement for external lighting and use of the site as an educational centre in the future. However these are not details that form part of the current application and a condition is suggested regarding lighting on site. Further structures on the site would require an additional planning consent, as would the use of the site for educational visits if this was to occur at a material scale.

4.12 Although it is unfortunate that a retrospective application was sought I consider that the scale of development on the site is commensurate with the size of the plot and the keeping of animals as part of a smallholding is neither unusual nor inappropriate in this context either. The policies set out above promote good design and it is my opinion that the form and size of the structures are acceptable in this location too. As part of the assessment of this application I have also visited the property immediately to the rear of the application site, The Cottage, in order to assess the visual impact of the field shelter in particular from the rear garden of this dwelling and whilst I have some sympathy with the concerns of the neighbour I do not consider that the visual impact is so adverse as to justify recommending refusal of planning permission.
4.13 Whilst I accept that the erection of the structures has had an impact on the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers many of the concerns that have been raised may be addressed by appropriate conditions and I do not consider that the application may reasonably be refused.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is considered to be an appropriate land use for the area, subject to the conditions outlined above and is not considered to have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers. The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies ENV8, IMP8, IMP9, IMP10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Plan referred to above because those policies remain consistent/part consistent where noted with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Kate Fisher, 01508 533985, kfisher@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
Section 7; Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
HOU 19: Extensions to existing dwellings
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. Planning History

2.1 None recent

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council : Approve

3.2 District Members
  Mrs L Neal : To be reported if appropriate
  Mr J Overton : To be determined by committee

Extension by virtue of its scale in relationship to the
neighbours property (at higher level, small back garden,
bedroom windows) and close proximity of neighbours
boundary, massing and location, is of concern

3.3 Local Residents : 1 letter of objection
  • Could result in overlooking
  • Concern regarding main bedroom window being blocked
  • Trying to sell dwelling
  • Small garden area
  • Big impact on feel to garden

4. Assessment

4.1 The application relates to a single storey rear extension to the applicants dwelling. The
dwelling is within a residential area with surrounding single storey dwellings.

Appl. No : 2012/1261/H
Parish : PORINGLAND
Applicants Name : Mr R Burrows
Site Address : 5 Cawstons Meadow,
Proposal : Single storey extension to back elevation
Recommendation : Approve with conditions

1 Full - Planning Permission Time Limit
2 In accordance with submitted drawings
3 Matching Materials
4.2 The rear boundary to the applicants dwelling is defined by a fence and established natural boundary. The dwelling due to its orientation has neighbouring dwellings rear gardens facing onto the applicants west (side) boundary.

4.3 Objections have been raised from one resident regarding overlooking, that their main rear bedroom windows will be blocked, the effect on the neighbours small garden and the possible impact on the future sale of the dwelling. However the potential affect on the future value of the dwelling is not a planning reason and therefore will not be commented on further.

4.4 While I acknowledge the objections raised I consider that the design of the proposal and the enlargement of the dwelling by 3.3 metres in length will not result in an adverse impact on the neighbours privacy or amenities. I acknowledge that the applicants dwelling is on a slightly higher land level than that of the neighbour and the proposal will be visible however I do not consider this will be over dominant and result in an adverse affect on the neighbours residential amenity. The boundary treatment also will assist with screening the proposal. A minor reduction in the size of this proposal would result in this extension being permitted development where no planning consent would be required.

4.5 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 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies HOU 19 and IMP 9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

5.2 Policies in the JCS, Local Plan and requirements of the NPPF seek to ensure that proposals are for an appropriate use, are of a good design and do not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.3 The application is acceptable as the proposal has been designed sympathetically to the original dwelling and while visible from the neighbouring occupiers will not result in an adverse impact on the adjoining occupier’s privacy or amenities.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chrissy Briggs, 01508 533832, cbriggs@s-norfolk.gov.uk
12. **Appl. No:** 2012/1322/H  
   **Parish:** HETHERSETT

   **Applicants Name:** Mr A Stevens  
   **Site Address:** 9 A Lynch Green, Hethersett, Norwich, NR9 3JU  
   **Proposal:** Proposed single storey infill extension to existing bungalow

   **Recommendation:** Approve with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

   1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**  
      **Section 7:** Requiring Good Design  
      **Joint Core Strategy**

   1.2 **Policy 2 Promoting Good Design**

   **South Norfolk Local Plan**

   1.3 **HOU 19:** Extensions to existing dwellings  
      **IMP 8:** Safe and free flow of traffic  
      **IMP 9:** Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No recent history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council:** Refuse  
   - Overdevelopment of the site  
   - Loss of light to neighbouring property  
   - Parking to be on site

3.2 **District Member:** To be reported if appropriate

3.3 **NCC Highways:** Need amended plan to demonstrate parking for 3 cars

3.4 **Local Residents:** 3 Letters of objection  
   - Overdevelopment of the site  
   - Loss of light to neighbouring properties  
   - Trees within falling distance of property  
   - 4 en-suite bedroom property appears to have inadequate parking  
   - If approved parking to be on site.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The existing property is a detached single storey dwelling. The plot is narrow on the road frontage however it opens up to extensive mature gardens to the rear of the site. The site is set within the Development Limits of Hethersett. The property consists of a block work wall along the side of the boundary of No11 which is a single storey dwelling. A close boarded fence of approximately 1.8m forms the boundary between the application site and No 9 Lynch Green which is a two storey property previously extended to the side with a two storey extension, and to the rear with a two storey and a single storey extension. At present there is sufficient parking on the driveway for two cars, and a third available space under the existing carport.
4.2 Policies in the JCS, Local Plan and requirements of the NPPF seek to ensure that proposals are for an appropriate use, are of good design and do not adversely affect the privacy or residential amenities of the neighbouring properties. 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.

4.3 The proposal is to re-configure the existing roof of one half of the bungalow which at present is orientated gable end onto Lynch Green. The style of the roof is a wedge with the highest part of the existing roof remaining unchanged. The section of the roof on the north east side of the bungalow is at a lower level, the intention is to rebuild the existing wall on the boundary of no11, with a slight increase to match the eaves level of the side adjacent to No 11, allowing a complete new roof to the north east side of the bungalow increasing the pitch to the existing ridge level. The new section of roof will include 4 velux roof lights, 2 will provide light to bedroom 4 and the other 2 proving light to the lounge, there will be no side facing windows to No 11. In addition there is a flat roof section to the rear of the existing bungalow currently providing a conservatory and a storage area, this section which will be partially rebuilt but the footprint will not increase, the existing flat roof will be replaced with a pitched roof.

4.4 Concern has been raised by the Parish Council and the neighbours to overdevelopment of the site. However, there is no change in the footprint of the existing bungalow, but there is extensive refurbishment to the internal layout which includes the existing courtyard and carport area to incorporate into living accommodation. Much of the works will include the rebuilding of the wall which faces No 11, however, as there is an area of dispute between the properties, the rebuilt wall will be on the existing footings (subject to building control approval) of the existing wall. I have been assured by the agent and the applicant that the replaced rain water goods will be within the boundary of the application site. The additional wall required to provide the cavity will be an internal wall therefore having no impact on the boundary of the two properties.

4.5 The proposal will result in a large expanse of roof along the boundary of No 11. To achieve the proposed alteration to the roof, the existing wall height will be slightly increased to match the existing eaves height of the opposite elevation. However, the proposed roof will replace a section of gable wall which is hard on the boundary of no 11. I consider that although it is close to the boundary the roof does slope away from the boundary which is adjacent to the driveway of No 11. There are some windows along the side elevation of No 11 one of which serves the kitchen. However, I do not consider that this will result in building which will be so overbearing or result in a significant additional loss of light to justify refusal. There are no windows other than velux windows in this proposed elevation therefore no issues relating to loss of privacy arise.

4.6 Concern has also been raised by No 9 which is a two storey property to the south west of the application site. No 9 has been significantly extended both to the side and the rear which is where their kitchen is positioned. The concern raised is the loss of light to the kitchen window resulting from the replacement of the flat roof with a pitched roof over the existing conservatory/store area. Having visited the site early in the morning I do not consider that any loss of sunlight to the kitchen is so significant as to justify refusal. There are no windows other than velux windows in this proposed elevation therefore no issues relating to loss of privacy arise.

4.7 Issue has also been raised to the lack of parking on the site. Highways have requested an amended plan to demonstrate parking for 3 cars.

4.8 The front garden of the property is to be revised removing the walled section of garden to allow adequate parking and turning areas, an amended plan has been submitted to meet the requirements of County Highways however, no updated comments have not been received at the time of this report and an update will be given to Committee.
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 Section 7, Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies HOU19, IMP8 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The development is considered to accord with Policy HOU19 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the extension has been designed to ensure that the parking and access to the dwelling will be improved and adequate for the dwelling. The alteration to the existing roof will change the character of the existing property however this is considered to be an improvement within the street scene, and any additional impact on the neighbouring property will be minimal as the increase in the roof height will be immediately adjacent to the driveway of the adjacent property. There are no side facing windows to result in loss of privacy, the scheme therefore accords with the above policies.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Jacqui Jackson, 01508 533837, and E-mail: jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
13. **Appl. No**: 2012/1412/F  
**Parish**: TASBURGH  
Applicants Name: Mr Melvyn Thouless  
Site Address: Greenacres Farm, Ipswich Road, Tasburgh, Norfolk, NR15 1NS  
Proposal: Static caravan in garden area for residential use  
Recommendation: Refuse  

1  Insufficient justification for a dwelling in countryside location. Contrary to SNLP Policy ENV8 and JCS Policy 17.  

Authorise enforcement action one year compliance period

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
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. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/0715 Variation of condition 3 of planning permission to increase the number of adult dogs from 12 to 20  
Refused

2.2 2011/0903 Certificate of lawfulness storage of caravans  
Approved

2.3 2010/1538 Retrospective application for change of use to dog breeding kennels.  
Approved

3. **Consultation**

3.1 Parish Council: Approve

3.2 District Member: Can be delegated unless officer recommends for refusal.  
- The applicant needs to live on site until he regains possession of his home.  
- On going legal issues with tenant so should be considered by committee

3.3 NCC Highways: No objection

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection): To be reported

3.5 Local Residents: One letter of support
4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application relates to Greenacres Farm which is located adjacent to the A140 at Tasburgh. The application is for the temporary retention of a mobile home for residential use at the rear of the existing dwelling.

4.2 The mobile home is located outside the development boundary for the village of Tasburgh and as such any new dwellings would be considered contrary to policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP), which restricts new dwellings outside the development limits and village boundaries, unless they are requisite for agriculture or forestry, is justified to sustain economic and social activity in rural communities and commands a rural location or is the suitable adaption and re-use of an existing rural building. A similar approach is taken in policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). No evidence has been put forward to support the proposal under these policies.

4.3 Policy 15 of the JCS identifies Tasburgh as a “Service Village” which will have a defined development boundary which could 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 / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework, policy ENV8 is consistent in terms of housing provision.

4.4 The applicant is currently living in the caravan as they have been unable to re-occupy the main dwelling as the tenant is still in occupation. The applicant is currently undertaking court proceedings to regain access to the main dwelling and intends to move into the house when this is resolved.

4.5 As the proposal is contrary to policy it can not be supported. However, given the specific circumstances regarding regaining possession of the house I suggest that enforcement action is agreed with a compliance period of one year, which will give sufficient time for the legal issues to be resolved.

4.6 The proposal raises no amenity or highway safety concerns and is located to the rear of the existing dwelling so has limited impact on the local landscape.

5. **Reasons for Approval**

5.1 The proposal does not accord with these policies as it constitutes a new dwelling located outside a development limit or village boundary and it is not connected with agriculture, forestry, organised recreation/tourist facilities or the expansion of existing institutions. 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. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies of the SNLP referred to above because those policies remain consistent / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework, policy ENV8 is consistent in terms of housing provision.

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

Appeals received from 07 August 2012 to 03 September 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish/Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010/8302</td>
<td>SAXLINGHAM THORPE</td>
<td>Mr Steven James</td>
<td>Caravan parked in agricultural field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land on the north side of</td>
<td>Charles Fryett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Windy Lane, Foxhole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/1957</td>
<td>DITCHINGHAM</td>
<td>Mr Stuart Johnson</td>
<td>Install access and field gate onto pasture land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenity Land west of Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road, Yarmouth Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/0481</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Mrs C De Falco</td>
<td>Proposed erection of single storey dwelling, garage and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-division of garden at</td>
<td></td>
<td>access off Henstead Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 Lynch Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/0741</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Standard Life Investments</td>
<td>Use of former Focus Store for retail use without</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former Focus DIY Store</td>
<td>Property Holdings Ltd</td>
<td>compliance with restriction as to goods to be sold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units 1A &amp; 1B Farrier Close</td>
<td></td>
<td>imposed by planning permission issued on 9 May 2007, ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007/0497/F, as modified by Modification Order made by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Norfolk District Council on 31 July 2007, - upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>implementation of planning permission issued on 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>December 2011, ref 2011/1784/F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appeal decisions from 07 August 2012 to 03 September 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish/Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Decision Maker</th>
<th>Final Decision</th>
<th>Appeal Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009/1996</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Mr M Green &amp; Norwich Consolidated</td>
<td>Residential development of 70 dwellings and</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Townhouse Road</td>
<td>Charities</td>
<td>associated works</td>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>