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

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

11/10/2012
The Development Management process is primarily concerned with issues of land use and has been set up to protect the public and the environment from the unacceptable planning activities of private individuals and development companies.

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

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

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

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

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

THEREFORE we will:

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

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

LOCAL COUNCILS

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Minutes of the Development Management Committee held on 12 September 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>2010/2225</td>
<td>Tharston</td>
<td>Land at Chequers Road, Tharston</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2012/0863/F</td>
<td>Carleton Rode</td>
<td>Land west of School, Flaxlands Road, Carleton Rode</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2012/1019/F</td>
<td>Pulham Market</td>
<td>Grove Farm, North Green Road, Pulham Market</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2012/1082/F</td>
<td>Tivetshall St Margaret</td>
<td>Red House Farm, Station Road, Tivetshall St Margaret</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2012/1083</td>
<td>Pulham Market</td>
<td>Rookery Farm, Grays Lane, Pulham Market</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2012/1171/F</td>
<td>Pulham Market</td>
<td>The Hall, Pulham Market</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2012/1233/F</td>
<td>Pulham Market</td>
<td>Bush Green Farm, Bush Green, Pulham Market</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2012/1414</td>
<td>Tivetshall St Margaret</td>
<td>Friends Meeting House, Lodge Road, Tivetshall St Margaret</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2012/0651</td>
<td>Loddon</td>
<td>Land to Rear of the Swan Inn, 23 Church Plan, Loddon</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2012/0652</td>
<td>Loddon</td>
<td>Land to Rear of the Swan Inn, 23 Church Plan, Loddon</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2012/0940</td>
<td>Diss</td>
<td>Land at junction of Frenze Brooke and River Waveney, Victoria Road, Diss</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2012/1061</td>
<td>Hethersett</td>
<td>Land North of Twin Barn Farm, Ketteringham Lane, Hethersett</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2012/1070/F</td>
<td>Wicklewood</td>
<td>Church Farm, Church Lane, Wicklewood</td>
<td>142</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 172)

8. **Planning Appeals (for information)**  
(attached – page 175)
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>Fire alarm</th>
<th>If the fire alarm sounds please make your way to the nearest fire exit. Members of staff will be on hand to escort you to the evacuation point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phones</td>
<td>Please switch off your mobile phone or put it into silent mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets</td>
<td>The toilets can be found on your right and left of the lobby as you enter the Council Chamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>There will be a short comfort break after two hours if the meeting continues that long</td>
</tr>
<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>A</th>
<th>Advert</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Proposal by Government Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Certificate of Alternative Development</td>
<td>HZ</td>
<td>Hazardous Substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Change of Use</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Existing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Reserved Matters (Detail following outline consent)</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Proposed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Full (details included)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Outline (details reserved for later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Householder – Full application relating to residential property</td>
<td>RVC</td>
<td>Removal/Variation of Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Application to be determined by County Council</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Proposal by Statutory Undertaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

Report of Director of Development and Environment

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

S.P Structure Plan
S.N.L.P South Norfolk Local Plan
P.D Permitted Development – buildings and works which do not normally require planning permission. (The effect of the condition is to require planning permission for the buildings and works specified).
J.C.S Joint Core Strategy
N.P.P.F National Planning Policy Framework
MOVA Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation
1. Introduction

1.1 The above application was considered at your meeting on 12 September 2012 and the following recommendation recorded in the minutes (subject to approval of the minutes today):

Approve with conditions

(conditions as per agenda papers)

Subject to S106 agreement in respect of affordable housing (and associated claw back), off site highway and associated commuted sum to MOVA, education and library contributions, older children/adult open space, ecology bio-diversity offsetting and community facilities.

Members indicated their preference for the provision of on-site affordable housing, required by policy rather than a contribution towards the cost of provision of the Long Stratton by-pass, by way of material consideration. Members authorised officers to agree with the Applicant the option of appropriate on-site provision of affordable housing, in accordance with policy requirements.”

1.2 I subsequently requested that the application was amended to reflect the above resolution.

1.3 A copy of the previous report is attached as Appendix 1.

2. Background

2.1 Members will recall that the officer recommendation was to require the S106 contribution of £500,000 for off-site works for MOVA with the remainder as a contribution to the Long Stratton by-pass. As detailed above, Members indicated however, by way of an alternative material consideration and the application of policy, that the £500,000 contribution should be required towards the provision of MOVA and affordable housing provision on-site.

3. Issues to be Considered

3.1 The applicant has stated they are happy for part of the S106 contribution to be used for additional affordable housing rather than a contribution to a Long Stratton by-pass. Deducting the estimated cost of MOVA would leave a sum of £350,000 that could be assigned to affordable housing.
3.2 The applicant, via his agent has since also stated that what this sum would provide will be greatly affected by whether the dwellings were to be provided on or off-site, given the £500,000 developer contribution was based on a site valuation of 10, but later revised to 12, affordable houses on-site. If provided off-site, by way of a commuted sum the contribution for affordable housing, would equate to the provision of approximately 7 additional affordable units. If however the additional affordable housing were to be provided on-site, on the same costing basis as above, there would only be 3.5 additional units of affordable housing, (i.e. a total of 15.5 units on the site as a whole). The applicant, via his agent, has requested that we consider a commuted sum, towards provision of affordable housing off-site.

3.3 At present no supporting information has been submitted to justify this assumption and it would need to be verified by the Council’s Property Consultant, Stuart Bizley, and by Keith Mitchell, Housing Strategy Manager. However we did have considerable financial information submitted with the application and have no reason to doubt that the assertions made are correct and only 3.5 additional units could be provided on site given the developers did raise their original contribution of affordable houses from 10 to 12.

3.4 As a rule we would look to provide the units on site, but given the viability issues associated with this site, material consideration could be given to the provision of the units by way of commuted sum for provision off-site. This however would raise other issues relating to the location of a suitable site and how and when these units will be delivered. For this reason alone the units should ideally be provided on-site, as Members indicated.

3.5 Given how few additional affordable housing units (3.5) could be provided on site, it is anticipated that Members may wish to re-consider the original recommendation and material consideration, of providing a commuted sum towards the provision of the Long Stratton by-pass in lieu of additional affordable units on-site

3.6 In addition, to the above affordable housing issue, the applicant has also requested that Condition 4, as detailed in the committee report, requiring an element of single storey dwellings, is re-considered. They state the inclusion of this requirement was not discussed during the application process and there is no indication of the number of units that might be affected. They state the financial viability exercise was based on development of two and two and half storey dwellings. They consider the inclusion of single storey dwellings would have a lower plot value in viability terms. They also question the likely demand for single storey dwellings given the number of existing ones in the village.

3.7 In this instance, given the viability issues associated with this scheme, to require a condition to provide a certain amount of single storey units may prove not to be viable. In view of this I propose the requirement to provide single storey dwellings, by way of condition, is deleted. The developer can still be encouraged to provide these as part of any detailed design which will have to follow the new Place Making Guide, in any event.

4. Recommendation

4.1 In light of the low number of affordable units that could be achieved on site it is recommended that Members reconsider their indication about allocating part of the S106 contribution to additional affordable housing and revert back to the original recommendation and agree the £500,000 developer contribution be used for off-site highway works, namely the installation of MOVA, and contribution to the Long Stratton by-pass.

4.2 To agree the deletion of condition 4 as previously recommended, relating to the requirement to provide single storey dwellings.

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

**17 October 2012**

#### Major applications or applications raising issues of significant precedent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appl. No</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Applicants Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010/2225/O</td>
<td>THARSTON and HAPTON</td>
<td>Sunguard Land Ltd</td>
<td>Land at Chequers Road Thorston Norwich</td>
<td>Outline application for residential development of up to 120 dwellings and associated works including access from Chequers Road and Jeremyn Way (amended proposal)</td>
<td>Authorise director of Development and Environment to Approve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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/placement planting
8. Tree protection, retention and arboricultural report (highway trees)
9. Levels to be agreed
10. 10% renewable energy on site
11. Bio-diversity offsetting, 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 plans including footway link to school
26. Highway improvements – off site – Swan Lane/Chequers Road junction, Chequers Road from Swan Lane to new access roundabout
27. Off-site works competed to satisfaction of Highway Authority and Ipa
28. Off-site works for MOVA before 21 dwellings occupied and to satisfaction of Highway Authority and Ipa
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 offsetting 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

- 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 Thorston.
- IMPB – 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 Jennyn 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 Thorston will become ‘rat runs’.
- the development is in the Parish of Thorston and Hapton. The Parish Council would expect, if the proposed development went ahead, that all §106 agreement payments or community contributions be received by the Parish.

Original comments

Refuse

- fully endorses everything sent in by Thorston and Hapton.
- does not want to see any estate scale development until there is a Long Stratton bypass.
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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 council 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 no 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 Taw
- 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
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- 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; IPA needs to be satisfied that connection does not have adverse environmental impacts – consider this issue is considered further. Appropriate wording 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 downstream – a foul water drainage strategy will need to be prepared to determine mitigation measures and water strategy/flood risk assessment
Request noise/conditions on any decision:
- site layout should take into account and accommodate AW assets within either prospectively acceptable 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 to 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
Development Management Committee

3.6 Natural England

No objections
- site lies approximately 2km to the east of Fornelot 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 Ipsa, 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 Ipsa should consider UKBAP species and habitats when implementing their duty under section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2008 (NERC) and Ipsa 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 though 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/ac 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 (lpas) 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 by-pass
• 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 flat; 2 x 2 bed 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
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 site 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 assume 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 offsetting process (NBOF). The NBOF 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 there 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 CNDP - 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 need 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 houses 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, 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 formulating 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
- Suggesting 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 Jermyn Way when there is a pre-built path directly east, next to Schools – why not planned?
- lived in Rockeries 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 Jermyn 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 Thorston 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 increased tenfold, road deteriorated drastically and verges becoming non-existent
• happy Jermy 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 localized flooding as the run off from the fields cannot reach the stream
• Jermy 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
• Jermy 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 Jermy 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 ‘ret runs’
• how can Bidwells present their claims without any public consultation
• understand Jermy 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 Jermy 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 like
• master plan misleading – up to 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
• nite 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 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 reappear
- 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
- 'indigenous' trees would not be in interests of the environment
- 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

- place 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 £106 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
Development Management Committee 17 October 2012

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 GNDP area and Long Stratton
- agree residents enjoy quieter roads but the traffic proposed will not adversely affect Jernyn 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 Jernyn Way. As part of the off-site highway works the applicant is proposing improvements at the Chequers Road/Swan Lane junction and the installation of MOVA, which is an intelligent traffic management signal system, at the A140/Fowerpot 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 5 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 Hatton 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/Bypass
- 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 Thorston, 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 GNPD authorities and Sanguard Homes was prepared for the Examination into the JCS, which acknowledged 'that Chequers Road, Thorston 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/GNLP 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 set 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 dependent upon overall viability. The applicant is proposing to provide committed sums towards education (£11,735), 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 average clawback (£50,000) payment which together with any unsent by-pass money would do
towards affordable housing. This is still under discussion with nplaw who have advised that any overage clause should be pursued rather than a 'non-returnable' offer of £30,000.

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 bypass. 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 GNPD 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 WCSP 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 procrastination 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 Thorston 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 Jermy 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 ecology/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 4.6 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 Crampian 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.
Impact on ecology and trees

4.29 The application has raised a number 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 0.8 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 DfE pilot for Biodiversity Offsetting and has established a steering group to manage the offsetting process (NBOP). The NBOP steering group has approved the biodiversity offsetting 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 offsetting via a S106 agreement to be agreed by Defra and Natural England. A full copy of the Ecologists 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 offsetting 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 trees in 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 area allow growth for any future 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 Highways 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 (Spreadingsoak 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.
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#### Context

The Development is located on the eastern outskirts of the southern edge of Thurstaston approximately 200m from the banks of Long Wirral. The site features aredescribed asbeing suitable for a range of residential and community facilities. The development proposes an area of children's play and public open space within the site.

#### Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Code</th>
<th>Analysis Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.01</td>
<td>The development provides a site size of 1.5ha with a mix of residential and community facilities, such as schools, parks, play areas, shops, pubs and cafés.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.01</td>
<td>There is an expression to achieve a mix of housing types and tenures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.01</td>
<td>The floor area of the development, which includes the reserved matters application, is shown as approximately 1500m². The proposed dwelling types are shown as being compatible with the site's characteristics and local context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.01</td>
<td>The proposed mix of tenure is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.01</td>
<td>The development is described as being in line with the site's location and context, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.01</td>
<td>The proposed tenure mix is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.01</td>
<td>The proposed tenure mix is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.01</td>
<td>The proposed tenure mix is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.01</td>
<td>The proposed tenure mix is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.01</td>
<td>The proposed tenure mix is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.01</td>
<td>The proposed tenure mix is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.01</td>
<td>The proposed tenure mix is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.01</td>
<td>The proposed tenure mix is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.01</td>
<td>The proposed tenure mix is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.01</td>
<td>The proposed tenure mix is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.01</td>
<td>The proposed tenure mix is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.01</td>
<td>The proposed tenure mix is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.01</td>
<td>The proposed tenure mix is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.01</td>
<td>The proposed tenure mix is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.01</td>
<td>The proposed tenure mix is being discussed with the local authority, and it is expected to meet the needs of the local community and residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The analysis above is based on the information provided in the application. Further analysis is required to address the concerns raised by the local authority and to ensure the development meets the needs of the local community and residents.
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12 September 2012

- The DAS provides an analysis of the immediate site and its surroundings. These include information at this stage on the wider context of Long Stratton to inform the design review. A letter of intent will be carried out at the Reserve Matters stage.

- The design proposals at this stage are intended to provide an indication of the development of the site. The use of the site is subject to development and will be made subject to the planning process.

- The DAS is subject to a site visit and a site plan. A letter of intent will be carried out at the Reserve Matters stage.

- The site is subject to a site visit and a site plan. A letter of intent will be carried out at the Reserve Matters stage.

- The DAS provides an analysis of the immediate site and its surroundings. These include information at this stage on the wider context of Long Stratton to inform the design review. A letter of intent will be carried out at the Reserve Matters stage.

- The DAS provides an analysis of the immediate site and its surroundings. These include information at this stage on the wider context of Long Stratton to inform the design review. A letter of intent will be carried out at the Reserve Matters stage.

- The DAS provides an analysis of the immediate site and its surroundings. These include information at this stage on the wider context of Long Stratton to inform the design review. A letter of intent will be carried out at the Reserve Matters stage.

- The DAS provides an analysis of the immediate site and its surroundings. These include information at this stage on the wider context of Long Stratton to inform the design review. A letter of intent will be carried out at the Reserve Matters stage.
Internal Memorandum

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

From: Simon Marjoram (Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy)

Tel No: 01508 533610

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 GNPD 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 (GNPD, August 2010).

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 emphasized 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 Thorston, 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 Sanguard Homea was prepared for the Examination into the JCS, which acknowledged ‘that Chequers Road, Thorston 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 Hempsall (A140/B152?) Crossroads and £2 million for bus priority on the approach to...

---

the A140/A47 Harford junction. The bypass/Hempnall 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 Section 38 contribution.

The proposal could be considered as part of the ‘floating’ 1,600 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 then the applicants need 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 5 ‘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’.

---

5 South Norfolk Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule Publication (5 February 2012 to 6 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 6 '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, IMP8, IMP9, IMP15, LE17, 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 for one or more of the following’.
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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).
Chequers Road, Thorston – SNDC: 2010/2225
Ecological comments by Dr David White, District Ecologist.
26 January 2012

Summary of ecological situation:
I was asked by Helen Mofere 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 sphegodes, 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 report 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:
To: Helen Metters
Ref No: 2010/225
From: David White (Dr.), District Ecologist
Date: 21 August 2012
Subject: Chequer's Road, Thorston; further ecological comments

**memorandum**

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 and will thus require compensation is only the grassland section described in the original ecological survey as DAP 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 GNOP is part of the Defra pilot of Biodiversity Offsetting and has established a steering group to manage the offsetting 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._
Major Applications

Parish : CARLETON RODE

Applicants Name : Peter & Andrew Jackson
Site Address : Land west of School, Flaxlands Road, Carleton Rode, Norfolk NR16 1RL

Proposal : Proposed residential development for 11 dwellings, on land adjacent Carleton Rode Primary School

Recommendation : Refuse

1. Outside Village Boundary, contrary SNLP ENV8
2. Out of character with this part of Carleton Rode contrary to JCS2
3. Would formalise the street scene contrary to JCS2
4. Harm setting of listed building contrary to SNLP IMP15
5. Design and layout of servicing and boundary treatments is contrary to JCS2
6. Creates awkward spaces for maintaining and security contrary to JCS2
7. Failure to have sufficient regard to the amenity of the public footpath contrary to JCS2
8. Plot 2 would offer insufficient level of residential amenity contrary to SNLP IMP9

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework

Including
Section 6 – Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
Section 7 – Requiring good design
Section 12 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy

Including
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2: Promoting good design
Policy 3: Energy and water
Policy 4: Housing delivery
Policy 6: Access and transportation
Policy 15: Service Villages
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan

ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP15: Setting of Listed Buildings
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
TRA 17: Off-site road improvements
TRA 19: Parking standards

1.4 South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD September 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2012/0039 Screening Opinion for residential Development – ES not required
2.2 1987/3470 Erection of dwelling Refused 20/01/1988
2.3 1986/3234 Erection of dwelling Refused 07/01/1987

3. Consultations

3.1 Carleton Rode Parish Council: Original Plans:
   - Refused
   - No main sewerage available and treatment plant too close.
   - Outside development boundary on good agricultural land.
   - Scheme too large for the village. Prefer smaller sites.
   - Highway safety concerns due to proximity of road bends.
   - No great demand for affordable housing in the village.

3.2 District Member: Original Plans:
   - Request application be decided by Committee
   - Not a preferred site due to proximity to Sewage Treatment Works
   - Road Improvements
   - Extra parking for School
   - Close to School and church

3.3 NCC Highways: Original Plans
   - Recommend Refusal.
   - Road serving the site is inadequate to serve the development proposed.
   - Junction of the C138 with the B1113 has severely restricted visibility in the southerly direction.
   - Detrimental to highway safety. Contrary to Development Plan Policy IMP8.
   - Inadequate visibility splays at the junction of the access with the Highway.
   - Would cause danger and inconvenience to users of the adjoining public highway.

3.4 Anglian Water Services Ltd: Original Plans
   - Within 400m encroachment zone of Carleton Rode Church Road Sewage Treatment Works.
   - Development sensitive to odour should not be located in close proximity to a Sewage Treatment Works.
Development Management Committee

17 October 2012

- May lead to an unacceptable standard of amenity for occupiers, or prejudice the ability of Anglian Water to carry out operation changes to the works.
- Existing capacity for the wastewater and foul sewage flows from the development.

3.5 English Heritage: Original Plans
- The grade I Listed Church, grade II listed farmhouse at Church Farm, grade II listed former Rectory and the grade II listed Rectory Cottages form the core of an important historic grouping.
- Setting of this group historically formed by the surrounding fields.
- Development would result in loss of last remaining direct link that the church has to open countryside.
- Would seriously erode the relationship of Church Farm to the fields.
- Diagonal view through the road junction and out to open countryside would be lost.
- Highways requirements would significantly change the character and appearance of the lane.
- Would harm setting of nearby heritage assets, principally All saints Church and Church farm, though that harm would be less than substantial.
- Other sites within the village could accommodate affordable housing.
- Public benefits of providing affordable housing would not outweigh the harm to the heritage assets.
- Recommend refusal.

Amended Plan:

3.6 Housing Strategy Manager: Original Plans:
- Support revised offer of 2x 2 bedroom units and 1x 3 bedroom unit for social rent

Amended Plan:

3.7 Environmental Services (Protection): To be reported

3.8 Historic Environment Service:
- Archaeological field evaluation has been completed.
- The evaluation did not identify any significant heritage assets with archaeological interest.
- No further archaeological work will be required at this site.

3.9 Flood Defence Officer: Recommend Condition regarding surface water disposal.
3.10 Planning Policy:
- 8 year supply housing land supply in rural area
- Other sites chosen as Preferred Options due to proximity of Sewage Treatment Works and Listed building constraints
- Policies JCS: 1; 2; 3; 4; 6; 7; 15 and 20, SNLP: ENV8; IMP2; IMP8; and IMP15. (List not exhaustive).

3.11 Public Right of Way:
- Original Plans:
  - No objection
  - Subject to public right of way route remaining unaffected and available for public use at all times on foot.

3.12 CPRE:
- Original Plans
  - Object.
  - Inappropriate development.
  - On a greenfield site not listed as a proposed preferred option in the LDF.
  - Would fulfil target for village in one application
  - Concerns about highway safety and visual amenity
  - Intrusion into the historic landscape.

3.13 Local Residents:
- Original Plans:
  - Objections
    - 18 letters from 14 properties
    - Highway has blind corners and junction near site
    - Additional traffic on narrow Chapel Road with bends and no passing places
    - Traffic build-up close to school
    - Inadequate on-site parking
    - Question capacity of sewerage system
    - Disruption from construction activity
    - No benefit to village
    - Out of keeping with historic village setting
    - Largest residential development in the villages history
    - Out of proportion for village
    - Scale and intensity no place in rural landscape
    - Obstruct views of church
    - Ruin peaceful area
    - Loss of rural setting
    - Large, cramped, enclosed
    - Design nightmare
    - Detract from setting of listed buildings
    - Outside development boundary
    - Not a preferred site
    - Conflicts with local plan, NPPF
    - Loss of view / visual amenity
    - Noise disturbance
    - Light nuisance
    - Increased traffic
    - Lack of facilities and public transport in village
    - Dangerous for pedestrians
    - Area has difficulty managing traffic
• Passing bay will not increase road capacity
• Roads flood and in poor state of repair
• Congestion due to church and school
• Lack of visibility splays
• Garages will not be used for parking
• Lack of off street parking
• Set precedent for further development
• Unsustainable
• Better sites
• Urban development
• Loss of agricultural land / Greenfield site
• Contrary to protection of countryside and environment
• Proximity to sewage treatment works
• Sewage treatment works have frequent maintenance problems
• No main sewer
• Sewage treatment works have frequent maintenance problems
• No arrangement for surface water drainage
• Utilities cannot cope
• Pollution of Carleton Rode Fens from surface water
• No need
• Of 9 new affordable houses completed only 5 occupied by local families
• Need could be met by infill and building re-use
• Request development management Committee visit site

4. Assessment

4.1 The application site is approx 0.62ha and is located to the west of the school on the south side of Flaxlands Road. It is proposed to erect 11 dwellings comprising 3 No. two-bed; 4 No. three-bed and 4. No. four-bed. Three of the units would be affordable comprising 2No. two-bed and 1No. three-bed. There would be a single point of vehicle access to the site from Flaxlands Road.

4.2 The site is arable land currently in cultivation. The layout of the site has been revised following the initial comments form Norfolk County Council Highways.

4.3 The main issues in this case are the principle of development in this location; the impact on the character and appearance of the area including the setting of nearby listed buildings; highway safety; residential amenity and housing need.

Principle of development in this location

4.4 The South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 designates the site as outside the Development Limits and Village Boundaries and therefore in the open countryside.

4.5 The Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2011 designates Carleton Rode as a Service Village and allocates 10-20 houses subject to form and character considerations. 5 dwellings have been granted planning permission at Cooks Garage, The Turnpike. The New Local Plan Site Specific Preferred Site
Allocations and Development Boundaries is currently out to consultation. This document identifies 2 No. sites to accommodate 10 houses and defines a preferred Development Boundary for Carleton Rode. Allocating land for 10 dwellings is based on Norfolk County Council Transport concerns regarding road capacity in the village. In this current consultation document the site is not identified as a preferred site and remains outside the Development Boundary. The result being that the site continues to be treated as countryside in policy terms.

4.6 Under The NPPF the current adopted Policy continues to have full weight at this point in time. Therefore, the NPPF does not alter the current local policy position in terms of the SNLP and JCS.

4.7 This site was put forward at the Site Specific Policies and Allocations process stage and was discounted because of the proximity to the sewage treatment works and English Heritage concerns regarding the impact of development in this location on the setting of the grade I listed church. The two sites in Carleton Rode that have been put forward as Preferred Options, are not in such close proximity to a sewage treatment works and do not have the Listed Building setting constraint. In addition one of the sites would even development on both sides of the road.

4.8 Although the SNLP is in need of updating, there is a five year land supply for the rural area. Therefore, there is no overriding need to approve additional dwellings ahead of the New Local Plan. Even so the emerging New Local Plan is proposing to accommodate the allocated development for Carleton Rode on sites that have fewer constraints than the application site.

4.9 Therefore, at this stage there does not appear to be sufficient grounds for determining this application other than in accordance with the current policy position. Consequently, the site is located outside of areas identified as suitable or potentially suitable for development and development of the site would be contrary to the provisions of the development plan.

Character and appearance of area

4.10 The housing allocation for the village is subject to form and character considerations. The majority of Carleton Rode is located along Flaxlands Road/Rode Lane. This part of Carleton Rode is separated by an area of open countryside from the part of Carleton Road surrounding the Church. The character of these two areas of Carleton Rode differs. The area around the church is characterised by a rural setting with limited inconsistent built development that has incrementally increased over time.

4.11 The application scheme is of a layout, density and repetitive form that would be out of character with the ad-hoc generally lower density development around the church.

4.12 All Saints Church is listed grade I; the farmhouse at Church Farm is listed grade II; the former Rectory is listed grade II; and Rectory Cottages are listed grade II. English Heritage has commented that the proposal would adversely affect the setting of nearby listed buildings principally All Saints Church and Church Farm. Although they state that this harm would be less than substantial. This harm to setting is based on the loss of the connection between the heritage assets and the open fields that would result from the proposed development.

4.13 Given the character of this part of Carleton Road is heavily influenced by the heritage assets and the rural setting, a development that is out of character with the current arrangement of development would impact on the setting of the listed buildings. Such an impact would not enhance the setting of the listed buildings.
The arrangement and form of buildings in this part of Carleton Rode is characterised by a looser informal pattern of development, it is defined by both building and landscape elements. The proposed development is characterised by a coherent form of buildings arranged in a close knit pattern and would reduce the contribution the landscape element makes to the character of this part of Carleton Road. In particular, the row of dwellings at the south of the site are located close together in a linear dense form that appears overly cramped for detached dwellings in this rural location. Consequently the proposed development would not be consistent with or complement the existing grain of development in this part of Carleton Rode. Whilst the scheme has a clear design concept, this does not reinforce or enhance the local character. Aside from this approach being out of character with this part of Carleton Rode, there is no objection to the form, scale or mass of the individual house designs.

This part of the street scene is currently defined by a field hedge adjacent to the rural road. The application proposals would formalise the street scene as a result of the highway works and the more manicured hedge that is likely to result from the replacement hedge being within the domestic curtilage.

**Design**

The entrance to the site would be flanked by a row of car parking and a bin collection store. The dwellings to the front of the site would back onto the internal road/private driveway. The plans show the gardens to be enclosed by close boarded fencing. This results in a significant length of close boarded fencing on one side of the street scene. The combination of these features does not positively contribute to the setting of the development.

The parking court arrangement in the south corner would terminate views within the development with garaging/parking. This parking arrangement also results in parking being remote from the dwellings it is intended to serve and with limited natural surveillance.

The development also includes other spaces which are awkward for the purposes of good maintenance and security, including the space adjacent to the public footpath and what appear to be ‘left-over’ grass areas, such as the narrow green areas between boundaries and hard surfaced areas. In addition, the dwellings to the front of the site that back onto the internal road driveway do not benefit from a secure layout.

Apart from the frontage hedge there do not appear to be any significant landscape features affected by the proposal. The landscaping of the development could be dealt with by condition.

The open space in the centre of the site is being put forward as public open space although the development does not generate the need to provide play space under the Council’s policies. The applicant is suggesting a management agreement for the residents to maintain the green spaces. This could be secured by condition.

The applicant states the properties will reach at least Code Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. This will be partly achieved by ground source heat pumps, rainwater harvesting and solar panels. Details of these aspects could be secured by condition.
Highways

4.22 The revised plans show one point of access and highway works at the boundary of the site with the public highway. The proposals include passing places on the highway network near the site. Norfolk County Council Highways final comments are to be reported.

4.23 Carleton Rode Public Footpath No 17 is adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. The ability to use this route should not be affected by the proposed development. However, the development will result in the enclosing of the footpath which is currently open to fields. Incorporating the footpath into the layout of the development could have achieved a safer, more pleasant environment along the length of the footpath adjacent to the site.

4.24 The proposal shows a sufficient number of parking spaces. However, there are concerns about the location of some of these spaces as set out above. All properties have rear gardens with rear access. Therefore, there is adequate space to provide cycle parking on site.

Residential amenity

4.25 The development would be within 400m of an Anglian Water Sewage Treatment Works. Anglian Water have objected on the basis that this may lead to an unacceptable standard of amenity for future occupiers or prejudice the ability of Anglian Water to carry out operational changes to the works due to odour from the works. The Applicant is offering financial contribution to AW to ensure no odour/ to improve facilities via a legal agreement.

4.26 There is no specific Development Plan Policy that covers the issue of distance of dwellings from sewage treatment works. Although the risk of odour from a treatment plant may be a good reason for preferring more distant sites when choosing sites to allocate in a local plan, there is no evidence that this particular Sewage Treatment Works does currently, or will in the future cause odour that has or would have a sufficiently adverse impact on the residential amenity of potential occupiers of the site to warrant refusal of a planning application. In these circumstances a requirement for a financial contribution to AW could not be justified as it could not be shown to be necessary or reasonable.

4.27 The proposed dwellings would be sufficiently far from existing residential properties to ensure that the residential amenity of the occupiers of the existing properties could be safeguarded.

4.28 Within the site the development would provide a sufficient level of residential amenity for the potential occupiers, except for those occupying Plot 2. This Plot would suffer a loss of privacy and potential overbearing impact from the dwelling proposed for Plot 11 by reason of the proximity of the dwelling on Plot 11 to Plot 2.

4.29 The proposed dwellings are orientated such and located sufficiently far from the school to ensure that there is not an adverse impact on the operation of the school.

Servicing

4.30 There is sufficient rear garden space to accommodate bin storage and all properties have rear access. The proposal meets operational requirements by showing a bin collection point near the front of the site. However, there are concerns as set out above about the impact of this arrangement on the setting of the proposed development.
4.31 The matter of surface water drainage can be dealt with by condition. Anglian Water has commented that there is capacity for foul drainage.

Affordable Housing

4.32 JCS Policy 4 requires 30% affordable housing on this site. To meet this requirement 3 No. affordable housing units all for social rent are proposed. Plot No. 2, 3 and 4. The Housing Strategy Manager has confirmed the units proposed would meet with their requirements. This would need to be secured by way of a S106 agreement.

Other matters

4.33 The archaeological field evaluation submitted by the applicant has not identified any significant heritage assets with archaeological interest.

4.34 The Contamination Scoping Assessment submitted by the applicant states that there is no apparent contamination that would prevent the site from being developed for the proposed use. However, there is a filled pond on the site that requires further investigation. This matter could be dealt with by way of condition.

5. Conclusion

5.1 In conclusion, the principle of development is not consistent with the Development Plan; the development would be out of character with this part of Carleton Rode and would adversely impact on the setting of heritage assets; the layout within the site does not meet the design standards sought by the JCS; and Plot 2 would not benefit from a sufficient level of residential amenity.

6. Reasons for Refusal

6.1 There are no grounds for determining this application other than in accordance with the current Development Plan. The site is located outside of areas identified as suitable for development. Consequently development of the site would be contrary to the provisions of the SNLP Policy ENV8. 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 part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

6.2 The proposed development is characterised by a coherent form of buildings arranged in a close knit pattern and would reduce the contribution the landscape element makes to the character of this part of Carleton Road. In particular, the row of dwellings in the south part of the site are located close together in a linear dense form that appears overly cramped for detached dwellings in this rural location. Consequently the proposed development would not be consistent with or compliment the existing grain of development in this part of Carleton Rode. The design concept does not reinforce or enhance the local character contrary to JCS Policy 2.

6.3 The application proposals would formalise the street scene as a result of the highway works and the more manicured appearance that is likely to result from the replacement hedge being within the domestic curtilage contrary to JCS Policy 2.
6.4 The application scheme is of a layout, density and repetitive form that would be out of character with the ad-hoc generally lower density development around the church. The character of this part of Carleton Road is heavily influenced by the heritage assets and the rural setting, a development that is out of character with the current arrangement of development would impact on the setting of the listed buildings. Such an impact would not enhance the setting of the listed buildings contrary to SNLP Policy IMP15.

6.5 The entrance to the site would be flanked by a row of car parking and a bin collection store. The dwellings to the front of the site would back onto the internal road/private driveway resulting in a significant length of close boarded fencing on one side of the street scene. The combination of these features does not positively contribute to the setting of the development. The parking court arrangement in the south corner would terminate views within the development with garaging/parking. This parking arrangement also results in parking being remote from the dwellings it is intended to serve and with limited natural surveillance. Therefore, the design and layout of servicing and boundary treatments is contrary to JCS2.

6.6 The development includes other awkward spaces for maintaining and in terms of security and the dwellings to the front of the site that back onto the internal road driveway do not benefit from a secure layout contrary to JCS Policy 2.

6.7 The development will result in the enclosing of the footpath which is currently open to fields Contrary to JCS Policy 2.

6.8 Plot 2 would suffer a loss of privacy and overbearing impact from the dwelling proposed for Plot 11 by reason of the proximity of the dwelling on Plot 11 to Plot 2 contrary to SNLP Policy IMP9. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Michelle Lyon, 01508 533681, and E-mail: mlyon@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Applications raising issues of significant precedent

1. **Introduction**

1.1 The Council has received 6 individual applications for the erection of a total of 15 turbines within the parishes of Pulham Market and Tivetshall St Margaret, items 3-9 on this Agenda. Your officers and the Parish Council’s have concerns at the potential cumulative impact they may have, in terms of creating a feature in views or sequences of views as part of a journey on the landscape, concentrated within the Pulham and Tivetshall areas. I am sure Members are fully aware of the undetermined application at Tivetshall St Mary (2010/0861) for 3 x 140m turbines and the refused application, subject to appeal decision, in Pulham Market/Dickleburgh (2010/0383) for 3 x 126m turbines. Equally consent has already been given for 1 turbine at Walk Farm, 1 at Walk Farm Lodge, Tivetshall St Margaret, 1 at Wharton’s Nurseries and 1 at Hill Farm both in Pulham St Mary It is therefore felt appropriate to put all the current applications to committee to enable consideration to be given to the cumulative impact of all the proposed turbines in this locality.

2. **Policy**

2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework, Part 10 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change supports and promote the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy. Policy 3 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out that development will where possible aim to maximise the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy sources and sustainable construction technologies. Policy UTL 13 of the Local Plan promotes renewable energy projects provided that the benefits are not outweighed by demonstrable harm to the locality in terms of visual intrusion, noise or the safe and free flow of traffic.

2.2 In the face of such strong policy support, the general approach must be to approve renewable energy proposals unless the particular development would cause very significant harm, sufficient to outweigh the presumption in favour of renewable energy provision

3. **Consideration**

3.1 Each application must be assessed on its individual merits but also in relation to each other to ascertain the overall impact the turbines will have on the character and appearance of our landscape. I have recommended approval of applications 2012/1019, 2012/1082, 2012/1171 and 2012/1233. Refusal of 2012/1083 and 2012/1414 due to the negative cumulative impact, which outweighs the positive renewable energy.

3.2 Attached to this report, as Appendix 1, is a plan indicating the locations of the current applications and those already determined.
3. **Appl. No**: 2012/1019/F  
**Parish**: PULHAM MARKET  
Applicants Name: Mr Bim Mountain  
Site Address: Grove Farm North Green Road, Pulham Market, Diss, Norfolk, IP21 4XW  
Proposal: Installation of a two micro scale wind turbines (14.97m to hub, 5.6m diameter blades)

Recommendation: Authorise the DDE to Approve with conditions
1. Full - Planning Permission Time Limit  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings  
3. Accord with turbine specification  
4. Mitigation

Subject to an ecological survey being submitted and agreed with the ecologist

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 3 Energy and water

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
UTL 13: Renewable energy (Part Consistent)  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 10: Noise

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2010/1281  
Demolition of existing house and outbuildings. Erection of replacement dwelling with detached garage. Erection of mobile home whilst dwelling is being built. Approved

2.2 2009/2037  
Demolition of existing house and outbuildings. Proposed construction of replacement dwelling with detached garage. Erection of mobile home on site to be lived in until new dwelling is built. Refused

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: No objections  
3.2 District Member: Can be delegated  
3.3 Environmental Services (Protection):  
- The distance to the nearest property boundary is over 200 metres away and therefore the development is unlikely to cause any noise disturbance
3.4 Conservation Officer : No objections

3.5 Landscape Officer : No comments received

3.6 MOD (Wind Turbines) – EMAIL : No objections

3.7 Ecologist : Insufficient information
      - Site specific ecological survey required

3.8 Local Residents : 1 letter of strong objection but no further comments made

4. Assessment

4.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of two wind turbines to the west of Grove Farm. The agent has put forward two designs of turbine so that the Council can choose which one we prefer. I consider that due to the location of the turbines the Quite Revolution is the preferred turbine due to design of the blades, which is less bulky than the Evance. Therefore the turbine will be 14.97 metres to the hub and 17.77 metres to the tip of the blades. The tower is a grey colour and the blades are white. The proposal is to provide Grove Farm with a sustainable and efficient electrical energy with an expected annual carbon saving of 8.32 tonnes and annual energy of 15.48 MWh

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

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

4.4 One objection has been received, but no further comments have been made, to the proposal. The nearby residents are a reasonable distance from the turbines and as such I do not consider that the proposal would be so detrimental to their amenities via noise and disturbance to refuse the application on amenity grounds. In terms of visual amenities, officers are concerned at the number of proposed turbines within the parishes of Tivetshall and Pulham Market and the potential cumulative impact they may have. In terms of visual amenities, I do not consider the proposal would have such an adverse impact on the character of the surrounding countryside, to warrant refusal on this ground. The turbine is well away from the other turbines proposed and as such I do not consider this proposal would have a negative cumulative impact.

5. Reasons for Approval

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

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis, 01508 533788, and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No** : 2012/1082/F  
**Parish** : TIVETSHALL ST MARGARET  

Applicants Name : Mr Eric Popp  
Site Address : Red House Farm, Station Road, Tivetshall St. Margaret, Norwich NR15 2DJ  
Proposal : Installation of a three micro scale wind turbines (14.97m to hub, 5.6m diameter blades)  

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

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 3 Energy and water

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
UTL 13: Renewable energy (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/0047 Conversion of redundant farm building to create self contained holiday units, to be used in connection with existing bed and breakfast  
Approved

2.2 2008/0476 Agricultural building  
Prior approval not required

2.3 2004/1831 Conversion of barn to dwelling  
Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council : Fully support

3.2 District Member : Can be delegated

3.3 NCC Highways : No objections

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) : No objections:  
- The distance to the nearest property boundary is over 300metres away and therefore the development is unlikely to cause any noise disturbance

3.5 Conservation Officer : No objections

3.6 Landscape Officer : No comments received
4. Assessment

4.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of three wind turbines to the north of Red House Farm. The agent has put forward two designs of turbine so that the Council can choose which one we prefer. I consider that due to the location of the turbines the Quite Revolution is the preferred turbine due to design of the blades, which is less bulky than the Evance. Therefore the turbine will be 14.97 metres to the hub and 17.77 metres to the tip of the blades. The tower is a grey colour and the blades are white. The proposal is to provide Red House Farm with a sustainable and efficient electrical energy with an expected annual carbon saving of 13.14 tonnes and annual energy of 24.48 MWh.

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

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

4.4 No objections have been raised to the proposal. The nearby residents are a reasonable distance from the turbines and as such I do not consider that the proposal would be so detrimental to their amenities via noise and disturbance to refuse the application on amenity grounds.

4.5 In terms of visual amenities, officers are concerned at the number of proposed turbines within the parishes of Tivetshall and Pulham Market and the potential cumulative impact they may have. Presently I have two further turbines proposed at Friends Meeting House close to this site and three turbines at Rookery Farm on the opposite side of the A140. It is considered that if all these turbines are approved they would have a negative impact on visual amenities.

4.6 It is considered that on balance that whilst the proposed turbines subject to this application will be visible given the sites natural mature screening, I do not consider however that the proposal would have such an adverse impact on the character of the surrounding countryside, to warrant refusal on this ground. Careful consideration has been given to this site, Rookery Farm and Friends Meeting House which are proposing 8 turbines in total. Officers are concerned at the number of proposed turbines within the parishes of Tivetshall and Pulham Market and the potential cumulative impact they may have, in terms of creating a feature in views or sequences of views as part of a journey. Due to the natural mature screening around the site rather than the more open nature of the other sites, the three turbines would have a lesser impact on the surrounding landscape. Therefore I consider that this proposal is acceptable.
5. Reasons for Approval

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

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis, 01508 533788, and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **Appl. No**: 2012/1083  
**Parish**: PULHAM MARKET

- **Applicants Name**: Mr Jonathan Gray  
- **Site Address**: Rookery Farm Grays Lane Pulham Market Diss IP21 4XQ  
- **Proposal**: Installation of a three micro scale wind turbines (14.97m to hub, 5.6m diameter blades)

**Recommendation**: Refuse  
1. Will create a negative cumulative impact, detrimental to visual amenities

---

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 3: Energy and water

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
UTL 13: Renewable energy (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings

2. **Planning History**

2.1 **2011/0341** Change of use from agriculture storage to a base/storage for traffic management business (cones, traffic lights, signs, barriers)  
**Not yet determined**

2.2 **2009/1885** Internal and external alterations including repair & replacement windows.  
**Approved**

2.3 **2008/0603** Demolition of small brick outbuilding  
**Approved**

2.4 **2007/2169** Proposed barn conversion to residential use  
**Approved**

2.5 **2007/2168** Proposed barn conversion to residential use  
**Approved**

2.6 **2007/0941** Proposed barn conversion to residential use  
**Refused**

2.7 **2007/0940** Proposed barn conversion to residential use  
**Refused**

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
No objection

3.2 District Member  
Can be delegated

3.3 Ecologist - David White  
Conditional support

3.4 Landscape Officer  
No comments received

3.5 Ministry of defence  
No objections
3.6 Public Right Of Way No objections

3.7 Conservation Officer No objections to the revised siting

3.8 Environmental Services (Protection) To be reported

3.9 NCC Highways No objections

3.10 Local Residents 1 letter of support:
Non polluting contribution to the environment

1 letter of objection:
Visual disturbance
Visual intrusion
Loss of value of property
Should site further east near the applicants property

4. Assessment

4.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of three wind turbines to the northeast of Rookery Farm. The agent has put forward two designs of turbine so that the Council can choose which one we prefer. I consider that due to the location of the turbines the Quite Revolution is the preferred turbine due to design of the blades, which is less bulky than the Evance. Therefore the turbines will be 14.97 metres to the hub and 17.77 metres to the tip of the blades. The tower is a grey colour and the blades are white. The proposal is to provide Rookery Farm with a sustainable and efficient electrical energy with an expected annual carbon saving of 13.14 tonnes and annual energy of 24.48 MWh.

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

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

4.4 In the face of such strong policy support, the general approach must be to approve renewable energy proposals unless the particular development would cause very significant harm, sufficient to outweigh the presumption in favour of renewable energy provision

4.5 One letter of support and one objection has been received as set out above. The nearby residents are a reasonable distance from the turbines and as such I do not consider that the proposal would be so detrimental to their amenities via noise and disturbance to refuse the application on amenity grounds, however this assessment is subject to the views of the environmental health officer.

4.6 Officers are concerned at the number of proposed turbines within the parishes of Tivetshall and Pulham Market and the potential cumulative impact they may have, in terms of creating a feature in views or sequences of views as part of a journey. In terms of visual amenities, this site is open to the north and clearly visible in the wider landscape, particularly when
viewed from the A140 looking south. I consider that the turbines due to their location would create a visual impact on the landscape and will create a feature. Immediately to the other side of the A140 3 turbines are proposed at Red House Barn and, directly adjacent to that site, a further two at Friends Meeting House. The proposal would, if approved together with the other 5 turbines, have a severe adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside, due to the cumulative impact of 8 turbines on the landscape. Whilst the Council is supportive of renewable energy proposals, in this particular case the harm is considered to outweigh the benefit and the proposed development cannot be supported.

5. **Reasons for Refusal**

5.1 The proposed three turbines by virtue of their number, size and siting in an open landscape would if approved together with the three at Red House Farm and two at Friends Meeting House would create a negative cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape. In view of the above the proposal is contrary to policy UTL 13: Renewable energy of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

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

6. **Appl. No** : 2012/1171/F  
**Parish** : PULHAM MARKET

Applicants Name : Mr John Young  
Site Address : The Hall, Pulham Market, Norfolk, IP214XF  
Proposal : Installation of two small scale wind turbines (18.3m to hub)

Recommendation : Approve with conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 3 Energy and water

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
UTL 13: Renewable energy (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/0104 Installation of ground mounted Photo voltaic panels Approved

The site has extensive history relating to the conversion of the redundant agricultural buildings to business uses.

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council : No objections in principle  
- Are attempting to maintain an overview of the visual impact of accumulative installations across the parish.  
- Considering the other on-going applications within the vicinity both to the southeast and southwest also need to be taken into account.

3.2 District Member : Can be delegated

3.3 NCC Highways : No objection

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection) : No objections

3.5 Conservation Officer : No objection

3.6 Landscape Officer : No comments received

3.7 Ecologist - David White : No objections
3.8 MOD (Wind Turbines) – Email
   : No objections

3.9 Local Residents : No comments

4. Assessment

4.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of two wind turbines to the west/southwest of the Pulham Market Hall complex. The turbine will be 18.3 metres to the hub and 25 metres to the tip of the blades. The tower is a pale grey colour and the blades are light grey. The proposal is to provide Pulham Market Hall with a sustainable and efficient electrical energy with an expected annual carbon saving of 25 tonnes and annual energy of 49 MWh.

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

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

4.4 No objections have been raised to the proposal. The nearby residents are a reasonable distance from the turbine and as such I do not consider that the proposal would be so detrimental to their amenities via noise and disturbance to refuse the application on amenity grounds. In terms of visual amenities, the Parish Council have pointed out the number of proposed turbines within their parish and ask that consideration is given to the possible cumulative impact they may have. The two turbines are located to the south of the village and a distance away from the other turbines proposed and as such I do not consider this proposal would have a negative cumulative impact. Whilst the turbines will be visible in the wider landscape I do not consider the proposal would have such an adverse impact on the character of the surrounding countryside, to warrant refusal on this ground.

5. Reasons for Approval

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

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis, 01508 533788, and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2012/1233/F  
**Parish**: PULHAM MARKET 

Applicants Name: Mr Robert Alexander  
Site Address: Bush Green Farm, Bush Green, Pulham Market, Diss, IP21 4YB  
Proposal: Installation of a three micro scale wind turbines (14.97m to hub, 5.5m diameter blades) 

**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions 

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

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 3 Energy and water

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
UTL 13: Renewable energy (Part Consistent)  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow of traffic  
IMP 10: Noise

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2008/0699 Building store for agricultural machinery Approved  
2.2 2006/2268 Proposed grain store Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: No objection  
- Also maintain an overview of the visual impact of accumulative ad-hoc installations across the Parish and therefore future applications may not be supported.

3.2 District Member: To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways: No objections  
3.4 Environmental Health Protection Officer: No objections  
3.5 Conservation Officer: No objections  
3.6 Ecologist - David White: No objections  
3.7 Public Right of Way: No objections  
3.8 MOD (Wind Turbines) – EMAIL: No objections
3.9 Local Residents:
   - 1 letter of support with caution
     - Would strongly object to the monstrosities of the huge and unnecessary larger turbines

4. **Assessment**

4.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of three wind turbines to the south of Bush Green Farm. The agent has put forward two designs of turbine so that the Council can choose which one we prefer. I consider that due to the location of the turbines the Quite Revolution is the preferred turbine due to design of the blades, which is less bulky than the Evance. Therefore the turbines will be 14.97 metres to the hub and 17.77 metres to the tip of the blades. The tower is a grey colour and the blades are white. The proposal is to provide Bush Green Farm with a sustainable and efficient electrical energy with an expected annual carbon saving of 13.14 tonnes and annual energy of 24.48 MWh.

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

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

4.4 No objections have been raised to the proposal. The nearby residents are a reasonable distance from the turbines and as such I do not consider that the proposal would be so detrimental to their amenities via noise and disturbance to refuse the application on amenity grounds. In terms of visual amenities, officers are concerned at the number of proposed turbines within the parishes of Tivetshall and Pulham Market and the potential cumulative impact they may have, this concern is also voiced by the parish council. It is considered that on balance that whilst the proposed turbines subject to this application will be visible in the wider landscape I do not consider the proposal would have such an adverse impact on the character of the surrounding countryside, to warrant refusal on this ground and they are a reasonable distance from the other proposed sites. Careful consideration however will need to be given to any further turbines within the vicinity of this site.

5. **Reasons for Approval**

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

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis, 01508 533788, and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
8. **Appl. No**: 2012/1414  
**Parish**: TIVETSHALL ST MARGARET

**Applicants Name**: Mr & Mrs Clarke  
**Site Address**: Friends Meeting House Lodge Road Tivetshall St. Margaret  
Norwich NR15 2AZ

**Proposal**: Installation of two micro scale wind turbines (14.97m to hub, 5.6m diameter blades)

**Recommendation**: Refuse  
1. Will create a negative cumulative impact, detrimental to visual amenities

1. **Planning Policies**

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

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 3: Energy and water

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
UTL 13: Renewable energy (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/0565 Proposed erection of agricultural storage building  
Prior approval not required

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Refuse:  
Concerned re visual impact and cumulative effect  
Proposed development within an area of 13 listed buildings  
Concerned that the proposal will harm the wildlife habitat of bats  
Impact on neighbours via constant shadow and flicker  
Noise disturbance

3.2 District Member  
Can be delegated

3.3 MOD (Wind Turbines) – EMAIL  
No objections

3.4 Ecologist – David White  
Object conditionally;  
The turbines should be moved further away from the hedge-line towards the middle of the field  
The suitability of ponds for great crested newts should be assessed and impacts addressed

3.5 Landscape Officer  
No comments received

3.6 District Member  
Can be delegated
3.7 Conservation Officer  No objections

3.8 Environmental Services (Protection)  No objections: The nearest property boundary is 115m away, whilst the property is 125m. Whilst it would be preferable that the turbines were moved further away, it is unlikely that the development would create a noise nuisance.

3.9 NCC Highways  No objections

3.10 Local Residents  6 letters of objection:
- Site unsuitable for the location of wind turbines due to their impact on the local bat population
- Detrimental to visual amenities
- Noise disturbance
- Shadow and Flickering
- Impact on wildlife - barn owls, honey bees and butterflies
- Concerned that one turbine is 124m from my home, 118m from boundary but is 200m from the applicants property and 213 from their boundary
- Devaluation of property
- Impact on listed buildings

7 letters of support:
- Best way for saving energy and producing electricity
- Do not experience any sound or interference from an existing turbine
- Not visually intrusive
- The one thing Norfolk has is a lot of wind
- Don't like the giant ones but the small ones do not look out of place

4. Assessment

4.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of two turbines to the east of Friends Meeting House. The agent has put forward two designs of turbine so that the Council can choose which one we prefer. I consider that due to the location of the turbines the Quite Revolution is the preferred turbine due to design of the blades, which is less bulky than the Evance. Therefore the turbine will be 14.97 metres to the hub and 17.77 metres to the tip of the blades. The tower is a grey colour and the blades are white. The proposal is to provide Friends Meeting House with a sustainable and efficient electrical energy with an expected annual carbon saving of 8.76 tonnes and annual energy of 16.32 MWh.

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

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

4.4 In the face of such strong policy support, the general approach must be to approve renewable energy proposals unless the particular development would cause very significant harm, sufficient to outweigh the presumption in favour of renewable energy provision.
4.5 6 letters of objection and the Parish Council have raised objections as set out above. The conservation officer has raised no objections to the turbines and therefore I do not consider that the application could be refused on adverse impact on the setting of the nearby listed buildings. The nearby residents are a reasonable distance from the turbines and as such I and the environmental health officer do not consider that the proposal would be so detrimental to their amenities via noise and disturbance to refuse the application on amenity grounds. The ecologist although raising concerns considered that these can be overcome and is negotiating with the agents. In view of this I do not consider that application could be refused due to the impact on wildlife.

4.6 Officers are concerned at the number of proposed turbines within the parishes of Tivetshall and Pulham Market and the potential cumulative impact they may have, in terms of creating a feature in views or sequences of views as part of a journey. Presently I have three further turbines proposed at Red House Farm located to the southeast of this site and three turbines at Rookery Farm on the opposite side of the A140. It is considered that if all these turbines are approved they would have a negative impact on visual amenities.

4.7 In terms of visual amenities, this site has natural mature vegetation to the northern boundary, substantial hedge and trees to the west, and hedging to the east. There is existing hedging and vegetation to the southern boundary but this is not particularly substantial. The turbines will be visible when viewed from Station Road to the south and Lodge Road. I consider that the turbines due to their location would create a visual impact on the landscape and will create a feature. It is considered that the proposal would, if approved together with the other 6 turbines, have a severe adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside due to the cumulative impact of 8 turbines on the landscape. Whilst the Council is supportive of renewable energy proposals, in this particular case the harm is considered to outweigh the benefit and the proposal development cannot be supported.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 It is considered that the proposed two turbines by virtue of their number, size and siting in a relatively open landscape would, if approved together with the three at Red House Farm, and three at Rookery Farm, create a negative cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape. In view of the above, the proposal is contrary to policy UTL 13: Renewable energy of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788 and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No**: 2012/0651  
**Parish**: LODDON  
**Applicants Name**: Mr Justin Fenwick  
**Site Address**: Land To Rear Of The Swan Inn 23 Church Plain Loddon  
**Proposal**: Demolition of derelict outbuilding and erection of three two storey dwellings, reconfiguration of public house car park and alterations to the landscaping of the public house garden.  
**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions  
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amendments  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Window details to be agreed  
5. Verge and eaves details  
6. Slab level to be agreed  
7. Provision of parking, service  
8. Car parking layout to be marked out  
9. Provision of bollards  
10. Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
11. Implement landscaping scheme  
12. New Water Efficiency  
13. Reporting of unexpected contamination

10. **Appl. No**: 2012/0652  
**Parish**: LODDON  
**Applicants Name**: Mr Justin Fenwick  
**Site Address**: Land To Rear Of The Swan Inn 23 Church Plain Loddon  
**Proposal**: Demolition of derelict outbuilding.  
**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions  
1. Listed Building Time Limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 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 14: Key Service Centres

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 5: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of specified towns (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity
Development Management Committee

IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings
IMP 13: Alterations and extensions to listed buildings
IMP 16: Demolition in Conservation Areas
LEI 8: Loss of recreational or amenity land

2. Planning History

2.1 2011/1575 Creation of two houses/domestic building plots Withdrawn and reorganisation of existing car park

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Comments on original proposal
Refuse
- Over development as a result of inclusion of plot 4
- Loss of amenity to neighbouring properties (over looking of gardens) from plot 4
- Concern over safety of footpath to Sale court due to width and height of fences
- No objections to plots 1, 2 and 3
- If approved lighting to footpath would be essential

Comments on first amendments
Approve
- Footpath to have suitable lighting, tarmaced surface and footpath should retained within the boundary of The Swan

Comments on latest amended proposal
To be reported

3.2 District Member Comments on original proposal
Determination by committee unless for refusal
- Have attended Parish Council meeting and item is obviously very contentious
- Reservations about the number of properties proposed
- Plots 1 and 2 are acceptable but their parking arrangements are poor and can not be protected in a public house car park
- Plot 3 adjacent to bowls club is acceptable but feel there are amenity issues with noise from car park and bowls club and same problem will apply with parking
- Plot 4 is not acceptable, too large for plot, potential for over looking and parking problems
- Proposed walkway is very unsatisfactory and unsafe and narrow, with 90 degree bend plenty of opportunities for attacks on pedestrians

Comments on amended proposal
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Public Right Of Way Comments on original proposal
No objection does not affect public right of way

Comments on amended proposal
To be reported
3.4 Police Architectural Liaison Officer

Comments on original proposal
- Concerned about footpath
- Width of footpath would mean that they would mean people would have to come into close proximity to people to pass
- People would be unable to see the exit on entering the path in either direction
- Guidance on paths being straight wide, well lit and devoid of hiding places and over looked has been disregarded.
- Footpath could help to facilitate crime

Comments on amended proposal
To be reported

3.5 NCC Highways

Comments on original proposal
Conditional support
- Car parking area needs marked out in accordance with layout plan
- Car parking for dwellings to be laid out

Comments on amended proposal
To be reported

3.6 Conservation Officer

Comments on original proposal
Object
- Loddon does have yards and alleyways with accesses of the main street so a development would not necessarily be out of character
- Scheme is fragmented and design does not make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area although the scheme does not cause significant harm to the setting of the listed building.
- No objection to the demolition of the building to the north which appears beyond reasonable repair
- New building should respond better to their historic setting

Comments on amended proposal
To be reported

3.7 Environmental Services (Protection)

Comments on original proposal
No objection
- Have been complaints in the past regarding noise disturbance from public house but none recently.
- Would appear that new dwellings are not any closer than existing dwellings, although there is always some possibility of disturbance for dwellings in the curtilage of the public house
- Any lighting to footpath would need to be conditioned

Comments on amended proposal
To be reported
3.8 Local Residents

Comments on original proposal
9 letters of objection (from 8 households):
- Loss of view
- Over looking
- Over development
- Out of character with area
- Adversely affects the setting of a grade II listed building
- Concerned about the safety of the foot path enclosed, blind and unlit
- Difficult to pass on foot paths with push chairs and wheelchairs
- Path is important link needs to be maintained
- Path to bowls club is potential hiding space and is not wide enough for equipment needed to maintain the bowling green
- Concerned that this narrow path is at rear of garden would create a confined space which would result in more noise and disturbance.
- Building to be demolished curtilage listed building and within the Conservation Area should not be allowed to leave a building to deteriorate and then allowed to demolish it.
- Dwellings would suffer from noise and disturbance from the public house
- No development shall be allowed on playing field or bowling greens
- Access is obstructed by bus stop
- Access will be required to indoors club for maintenance
- Design unexceptional
- Height and size of unit 4 is intrusive
- Gas pipe beneath where unit 4 is proposed

One letter of support
- Current foot path does not contribute to the number of crimes
- Management of the public house mean there is little disturbance
- Access path should be maintained
- Would have preferred fewer parking paces and play area and seating area over looking the bowling green

Comments on amended proposals
To be reported

4. Assessment

4.1 The application relates to part of the curtilage of The Swan Public House (The Swan) in Loddon. The site is within the Conservation Area and is at the rear of two significant listed buildings: The Swan Hotel and the former Town Hall. The Swan is a prominent three storey building in brick and tile with a lower range at the rear; the former Town Hall is now in mixed use but the original section has very ornate gables and chimneys. The land at the rear is used as a car park with a brick wall on its west side behind which is a bowls green and clubhouse. Modern dwellings at Sale Court extend to the south.

4.2 The application as originally submitted was for 4 dwellings but following negotiations has been reduced in scale and numbers and is now for the erection of three dwellings, one with three bedrooms and two with two bedrooms; they are located east of the site with associated car parking and landscaping. It is also proposed to repave a seating area directly to the rear of the public house.
4.3 The site is within the development limit for Loddon and as such there is a presumption in favour of development subject to this being achievable within the constraints of the site.

4.4 Part of the site currently forms an area to the side of the bowling green. The bowling green is to be retained as part of this application. I therefore do not consider that the proposal is contrary to policy LEI8 in the South Norfolk Local Plan as it only affects a small part of the site and does not prejudice the sporting or other recreational facilities on the site.

4.5 There is a partially collapsed building on the site. This building predates 1948 and is considered to be a curtilage listed building. The Conservation Officer however, considers that this building is beyond reasonable repair now and raises no objection to its demolition.

4.6 As mentioned above, the application has been extensively amended since it was submitted, a dwelling was originally proposed on the piece of land to the east of Sale Court (plot 4), which raised a number of layout, design and amenity concerns. This has now been deleted from the application. This has resolved concerns about the unofficial right of way that runs through the site and some of the overlooking issues.

4.7 The design of the new dwellings has been considerably improved with the applicant taking into account the principles of the ‘Place Making Guide’, which has just been adopted. The dwellings now reflect the local distinctiveness of Loddon as required by policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and will help to enhance this part of the Conservation Area and the setting of the listed buildings. The proposed brick wall and landscaping will help to provide some separation between the dwelling and the car park.

4.8 Some concerns have been raised about the access onto Church Plain, but the Highway Officer has not raised an objection to this. Two car parking spaces have been provided for each dwelling. The Highway Officer is happy that there is sufficient car parking retained for the public house and bowling greens.

4.9 Concerns have also been raised regarding potential overlooking and this was mainly in relation to plot 4 which has now been deleted. However, concern has also been raised regarding the other units. Back to back distances between unit 3 and properties in Sale Court are in excess of 22 metres which is considered an acceptable distance. Plot 1 would back onto the garden of 3 St Georges Lane but the actual bungalow is located further to the east, so I do not consider that the impact is significant enough to warrant refusal.

4.10 The site is within the centre of Loddon, some concern has been raised about the level of noise in the area. It is acknowledged that there will be some noise and disturbance as a result of its central location however, I do not consider that this would be significant enough to warrant a refusal.

4.11 Access is maintained to the bowling Green via a 2 metre wide path, a gate is proposed to secure this area. The width of this path has been increased from 1.2 metres. An access for large items will also be provided through the shared turning area between the dwellings.

4.12 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 HOU5 is only partially consistent because the NPPF does not specification refereed to the need to balance housing and employment provision.

4.13 In conclusion the development will provide additional housing in a sustainable location which will preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the listed building without adversely affecting residential amenity or highway safety to a significant degree.
5. Reasons for Approval 2012/0651/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, Policy 3: Energy and water and Policy 14: Key Service Centres of the Joint Core Strategy and HOU 5: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of specified towns, IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic, IMP 9: Residential amenity, IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas, IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings, IMP 16: Demolition in Conservation Areas and LEI 8: Loss of recreational or amenity land 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 HOU5 is only partially consistent because the NPPF does not specification referred to the need to balance housing and employment provision.

5.2 The proposal will provide additional housing in a sustainable location which will preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the listed building without adversely affecting residential amenity or highway safety to a significant degree. The bowling green is retained as part of the development and as a result the sporting or other recreational facilities on the site are not prejudiced by the proposal.

5.3 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 and the contribution it makes to the spaces between buildings within the area.

6. Reasons for Approval 2012/0652/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 of the Joint Core Strategy and policy IMP13 – Alterations and extensions 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 policies partial consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework and in this instance it is considered that the curtilage listed building is beyond reasonable repair and its demolition is acceptable in this instance.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Helen Bowman 01508 533833 and E-mail: hbowman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
11. **Appl. No**: 2012/0940  
**Parish**: DISS  

**Applicants Name**: Mr Edwards  
**Site Address**: Land At Junction Of Frenze Brooke And River Waveney Victoria Road Diss  
**Proposal**: Proposed repair and retail warehouse  

**Recommendation**: Refuse

1. Contrary to JCS policies 5 and 17, and SNLP policies ENV8 and ENV 3 - the building does not demand a rural location, and does not involve the re-use of an existing building. The proposal represents inappropriate development within the sensitive river valley area.

2. Contrary to Section 10 of the NPPF, as there are alternative locations that appear to be reasonably available within Flood Zone 1. The size, arrangement and location of the proposed building use within flood zones 2 and 3, fails the sequential test.

3. Given the prominent location of the of the building at the entrance to the town, its overall design quality is not of a sufficient standard to positively contribute towards its setting, contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF Section 1: Building a strong competitive economy  
NPPF Section 7: Requiring good design  
NPPF Section 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF Section 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design  
Policy 5 : The Economy  
Policy 17 : Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise  
ENV 3: River valleys  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
IMP 10: Noise

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/1574 Proposed repairs and retail warehouse Withdrawn
3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council

Refuse
- the application does not satisfy the criteria for sustainable development such that it warrants consent outside the development boundary.

3.2 District Members:

Mr G H Walden
Approve, provided that safe egress can be provided for traffic both east and west.

Mr Keith Kiddie
Can be delegated

Mr Tony Palmer
To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 Ecologist - David White

Refuse
- The site is in a very sensitive location and provides a significant link between the ecologically-rich Frenze valley and the River Waveney valley and semi-natural habitats to the south. Wildlife utilise the stream and banks beneath the road bridge to safely cross the A1066. I do not think that the impacts from the development can be mitigated for.

3.4 Planning Policy

None received.

3.5 Economic Development Manager

The entry to Diss is very important, and sets the tone for the Town.
- Visitors can draw the wrong conclusions from seeing development such as large utilitarian industrial buildings on the town’s approaches.
- Any building located here should be of a more interesting and stimulation design.

3.6 Landscape Officer

None received.

3.7 Environmental Services (Protection)

No objection
- Subject to appropriate conditions that deal with potential contaminated land and noise. Opening hours should also not include Sundays or Public Holidays.

3.8 Mid Suffolk District Council

None received.

3.9 Anglian Water Services Ltd

None received.

3.10 Environment Agency

No objection
- Subject to appropriate conditions. South Norfolk Council should consider the application of the Sequential Test.

3.11 NCC Highways

No objection
- Subject to appropriate conditions.

3.12 Local Residents

6 letters of support received
- Family run business providing local jobs for local people
- If application is unsuccessful could lead to closure of business
- Support local businesses
- Enhance Diss as a prosperous market town
4. **Assessment**

4.1 The site is located at the eastern extremity of the town, adjacent the junction of River Waveney and Frenze Brooke. Located outside the defined development limits, the site is bounded by the River Waveney to the south (with Stuston Common Golf Course beyond that) and Frenze Brooke to the east. The site is bounded to the west by a bunded parking / storage area serving the operations at the former Cartco site. This area of land has the benefit of outline planning permission for residential development granted in 2010.

4.2 The site is located within Flood Zones 2 (medium probability) and 3 (high probability), and is within the river valley policy area where inappropriate development will not be permitted.

4.3 The application proposes a large two-storey building for the retail, repair and storage of mowers and agricultural equipment, along with associated parking and turning areas. The breakdown of uses is as follows:

- Retail - 341 sq metres
- General Industrial - 171 sq metres
- Storage & distribution - 343 sq metres

4.4 The overall internal ground floor area of the building is 897 sq metres, with an additional 628 sq metres of loft space. (Total floor space being 1525 sq metres.) The plans show the building having a maximum height of 7.9 metres and a general eaves height of 4.4 metres. Proposed materials would be box profile sheeting for the roof, and a mixture of Kingspan Sheet Cladding and brickwork to the elevations. Fifteen parking spaces and a turning area are proposed to the west and south of the building. The applicants state that the current business employs 3 part-time staff, and that this proposal would result in there being 4 full-time staff and 2 part time staff. A site layout plan is attached as appendix 2.

4.5 As this is a full application, the main issues for consideration are:

- The principle of development outside the defined development limits of Diss.
- Ecology
- Design & Layout
- Highway impact
- Flood Risk
- Impact on residential amenity

**Principle of Development Outside the Development Boundary**

4.6 Local Plan policy ENV8 restricts development in the open countryside to that required for agriculture or forestry; justified to sustain an economic and social activity and demanding of a rural location, or; involving the adaptation of an existing building. Although the proposed use of the building is for the repair of mowers and agricultural equipment, I do not consider this activity to be requisite for agriculture in this location, as the repair of agricultural equipment often takes place within existing farm buildings or in the field. The building does not, in my opinion demand a rural location, and does not involve the re-use of an existing building.

4.7 Although it has to be acknowledged that the site is not in a remote rural location, it is clearly outside the defined limit of a town, and within the sensitive river valley area. I do not feel that this type of development should be encouraged in this location and have concluded that the proposal does not accord with local plan policies ENV8 and ENV3.
JCS Policy 17 allows for commercial development outside development limits where it can be demonstrated that a rural location is justified. The applicants have submitted a basic sequential test dealing with retail and industrial locations showing that although there are some available premises, none were suitable in terms of size. It was further argued that the proposed uses could not be split up to suit the available premises, and that the type of use involved noisy activities, not really suited to existing employment locations. The conclusion was that a proposal of the size and nature proposed can not be accommodated anywhere in Diss.

Whilst it is accepted that the desire for such a large building would preclude the available existing premises, there is still allocated employment land undeveloped to the east and west of Sandy Lane, adjacent Allied Grain.

Local Plan policy ENV3 protects the river valley policy area from 'inappropriate development', which is defined as development not required for agriculture or forestry, recreation, alterations to dwellings, limited infilling, or development of allocated sites. As well as being within an ecological sensitive area, the site occupies a prominent position forming part of the existing setting of the River Frenze and Waveney.

I am aware of the desire to promote employment and business opportunities in the district, in accordance with the thrust of Section 1 of the NPPF and JCS Policy 5, however I am not convinced that this consideration is of sufficient weight to override the general presumption against inappropriate development within the river valley area. The application therefore fails to accord with local plan policy ENV3. For these reasons, the development is not considered to be sustainable development as defined by the NPPF.

Ecology

The County Ecologist has advised that that the site is in a very sensitive location providing a link between the ecologically-rich Frenze valley and the River Waveney valley and semi-natural habitats to the south. Wildlife utilise the stream and banks beneath the road bridge to safely cross the A1066. Whilst mitigation has been put forward by the applicants, including the creation of a woodland corridor at the eastern edge of the site, the ecologist is not convinced that the mitigation will be sufficient, as it will not prevent long-term disturbance to the crucial crossing point and confluence of two rivers.

Section 11 par. 117 of the NPPF indicates that planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, and local plan policy ENV14 seeks to prevent development that would harm habitats that have a demonstrable importance to wildlife. Taking on board the advice of the County Ecologist, I feel that the development would harm an ecological sensitive area and therefore fails to accord with section 11 of the NPPF and local plan policy ENV14.

Design & Layout

Elevations of the building are attached as appendix 3. Originally, the applicants provided little information in respect of the design and layout of the building, which appears to be mainly based on the requirements for access to the site and internal space. This is disappointing given the prominence of the site at the entrance to the town, although perhaps understandable given its proposed use. However, JCS Policy 2 requires all development to be of a high quality design and provide a positive contribution to its setting. This being even more important given the buildings’ entrance location within the river valley setting.
I appreciate the fact that the applicants have attempted to improve the overall appearance of the building, and in isolation and in the right location, may not be objectionable. The design proposed is an improvement on that originally submitted, however it still falls a long way short of meeting the design quality expected at such a prominent and gateway site. There is no evidence to suggest that the development is exceptional and innovative in relation to the overall design of the building or its relationship with its setting and the defining characteristics of Diss. This further enhances my view that the proposed use and subsequent required building is in the wrong location. However, in this entrance location I feel that both local plan and JCS policy requires a higher quality building than that proposed. The proposal therefore fails to accord with JCS Policy 2.

**Highway Impact**

Whilst acknowledging the concerns of the Town Council in respect of the potential adverse impact on Victoria Road, the siting of the building more centrally within the site allows for an access onto Victoria Road that achieves the required visibility splays, and further amended plans and the submission of a safety audit has overcome the initial concerns of NCC: Highways, who now raise no objection to the proposal. On this basis the application is considered to accord with local plan policy IMP8.

**Flood Risk**

Although the site itself is within Flood Zone 3 (High Probability), the proposed building is located within Flood Zone 2 (Medium Probability). Section 10 of the NPPF requires all development to be guided to areas of low probability of flooding, this being Flood Zone 1 (i.e. all areas outside Zones 2 & 3), unless it can be demonstrated that no other more suitable and available sites exist. The Council is therefore required to undertake a sequential test to establish if other sites at less risk from flooding are available.

Allocated employment land (policy EMP1) exists to the east of Sawmills Road and Sandy Lane. There is also small area of EMP1 allocated land adjacent to White Gables, Sandy Lane - both within the development boundary and outside flood zones 2 & 3. There are also smaller vacant business units within an established industrial estate (Units 1 & 2-6 Courts Industrial Estate) - again these sites are within the Development boundary and outside flood zones 2 & 3.

As there are alternative locations, that appear to be reasonably available, the size, arrangement and location of the proposed building use within flood zones 2 and 3, fails the sequential test in my opinion. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of Section 10 of the NPPF.

**Impact on Residential Amenity**

In considering this proposal I have to also take into account the neighbouring site to the west that has outline planning permission for residential development. Whilst no layout details for the development have been determined, the potential noise impact of the proposed retail/industrial use has to be taken into account. The applicant has indicated that the testing of the mowers can be a noisy operation, not suited to a residential or light industrial area. The applicant has submitted the results of a noise assessment, which concludes that any resulting noise from the proposed activity would be unlikely to cause a potential noise nuisance at the nearest residential property. Colleagues in the Environmental Protection Team accept this conclusion, subject to any approval being conditional on there being no windows or doors opened which face residential properties, and there being no outside working.
4.21 Taking into account the above, I am satisfied that the proposal accords with the requirements of policy IMP10.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 Principle of development - Although the proposed use of the building is for the repair of mowers and agricultural equipment, I do not consider this activity to be requisite for agriculture, as the repair of agricultural equipment often takes place within existing farm buildings or in the field. The building does not, in my opinion demand a rural location, and does not involve, therefore, use of an existing building. Although it has to be acknowledged that the site is not in a remote rural location, it is clearly outside the defined limit of a town, and within the sensitive river valley area. I do not feel that this type of development should be encouraged in this location and have concluded that the proposal does not accord with local plan policies ENV8 and ENV3.

5.2 JCS Policy 17 allows for commercial development outside development limits where it can be demonstrated that a rural location is justified. However, in this case there is undeveloped employment land outside the built up area, and, the proposed site is located adjacent to land recently granted permission for residential development. I am aware of the desire to promote employment and business opportunities in the district, in accordance with the thrust of Section 1 of the NPPF and JCS Policy 5, however I am not convinced that this consideration is of sufficient weight to override the general presumption against inappropriate development within the river valley area. The application therefore fails to accord with local plan policy JCS Policy 17 and local plan policy ENV3.

5.3 Flood Risk - The proposal is contrary to Section 10 of the NPPF, as there are alternative locations that appear to be reasonably available within Flood Zone 1. The size, arrangement and location of the proposed building use within flood zones 2 and 3, fails the sequential test.

5.4 Design & Layout - Given the prominent location of the of the building at the entrance to the town, its overall design quality is not of a sufficient standard to positively contribute towards its setting, contrary to Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Gary Hancox 01508 533841 ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
12. **Appl. No**: 2012/1061  
**Parish**: HETHERSETT  
Applicants Name: Mr Ben Kemp  
Site Address: Land North Of Twin Barn Farm Ketteringham Lane Hethersett NR9 3DF  
Proposal: Proposed Carbon Neutral Dwelling  
Recommendation: Approve with Conditions  

1. **Planning Policies**  

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 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 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 14: Key Service Centres  

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  

2. **Planning History**  

2.1 2012/1061 Proposed Carbon Neutral Dwelling Current application  
2.2 2009/1064 Contemporary dwelling Refused  
2.3 2009/0216 Contemporary dwelling Withdrawn  
2.4 1983/1357 7 dwellings Refused  
2.5 1979/0444 Agricultural dwelling Refused  
2.6 1977/0638 Dwelling and stable Refused
3. Consultations

3.1 Hethersett Parish Council
   Refuse
   - Outside development boundary
   - Not in keeping with the landscape
   - More prominent than previous proposal
   - Too large for site
   - Construction traffic should be off the road

3.2 Local Members
   To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Conservation Officer
   The scheme has responded to the defining characteristics of the local area with a simple form and layout re-interpreted in a distinctly contemporary manner with the cantilevered form of the main wing. The simple treatment of the landscaping proposals will ensure integration into the existing landscape and enhance the site. Careful consideration has been given to a range of issues as an integral part of the design process including sustainability, energy conservation, renewable energy technologies and Lifetimes Homes criteria. The architectural design and treatment of the exterior of the building, although based on a traditional barn, has been carefully thought out and detailed in a distinctly contemporary manner.

3.4 NCC Highways
   No objection
   - Subject to conditions

3.5 Local Residents
   No comments received.

4. Assessment

4.1 The application is submitted in full for the erection of a Code 6 sustainable country home, which seeks to be justified outside the defined development limits by being of an exceptional, innovative and outstanding contemporary design. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Ecological Survey and Landscape Appraisal.

4.2 The site is located to the south of Hethersett and is to the west of Ketteringham Lane. The site is bordered by hedgerows with fields to the east and west, with land rising towards the west. To the north of the site are playing fields associated with the school and to the south is a range of farm buildings.

4.3 The Design and Access Statement (appendix 2) sets out that the driving inspiration throughout the design stage has been to capture the relationship between the architecture and its surrounding landscape. It sets out that the design has sought to incorporate traditional roof pitches together with large open doors through the façade design to reflect traditional barn buildings. The design has a hierarchy of structure between the two wings again inspired by traditional barn buildings.

4.4 The design incorporates the use of louvers to add a contemporary value to the external façade whilst controlling solar gain and external views, and to provide visual balance through cantilevered elements and by the use of a mix of vertical and horizontal wood cladding balanced with glazed areas.

4.5 The site is located outside Hethersett Development Limit, and as such is in a location where policies in the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan seek to restrict new development to that which requires a rural location and is needed in connection with the operation of an appropriate rural use.
A number of previous applications have been submitted for development on this site under the provisions of an exceptions clause within Planning Policy Statement 7. PPS7 set out that very occasionally the exceptional quality and innovative nature of the design of a proposed, isolated new house may provide special justification for granting planning permission. Such a design should be truly outstanding and ground breaking for example, in its use of materials, methods of construction or its contribution to protecting and enhancing the environment, so helping to raise the standards of design more generally in rural areas. The value of such a building will be found in its reflection of the highest standards in contemporary architecture, the significant enhancement of its immediate setting and its sensitivity to the defining characteristics of the local area.

Planning Policy Statement 7 was replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework. The NPPF introduces a presumption in favour of sustainable forms of development and sets out that in rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. It sets out that Local Planning Authorities should avoid isolated new dwellings unless there are special circumstances such as the essential needs of a rural worker, it would represent the optimal use of a heritage asset or would re use a redundant or disused building or the exceptional quality or innovative nature of the dwelling. With regard to the latter, the 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

While I recognise that the site is beyond the main built up area of Hethersett and as such is defined as open countryside in the Local Plan, I do not consider that the site could be considered to be "isolated". The urban edge of Hethersett runs along the B1172, however there are a number of substantial developments along the southern side of the B1172 which include Hethersett Old Hall School and its grounds immediately to the north of the site, Hethersett Hall Care Home to the east of the site and Park Farm Hotel to the west of the site. I consider that the site will be seen in the context of these developments and substantially relates to Hethersett as a settlement in terms of its visual character as well as its accessibility to services and can not be considered to be isolated.

The proposal is supported with a Design and Access Statement and a Landscape Appraisal. Reference is made to the character of the surrounding area and in particular the relationship between groups of buildings, especially farmhouses and their associated outbuildings and their wider relationship with the landscape setting.

The proposed building is based on the simple, pitched roof form of traditional buildings found locally and the visual relationship between the two wings creates a similar hierarchy to that found in groups of farm building in particular. However, the cantilevered design of the first floor to the main wing creates a distinctly contemporary interpretation of the traditional form. The treatment of the building facades is also based on the traditional design of a barn with large, simple, door openings, but re-interpreted through the use of panels of vertical and horizontal cladding, louvres and glazing to create a strong and visually balanced architectural composition.

The design is intended to satisfy the requirements of Level 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, although this cannot be fully assessed until a more detailed specification has been drawn up. However the statement sets out the key principles incorporated into the design with the objective of reaching Level 6. These include site orientation to maximise passive solar gain and natural lighting; use of external solar control louvres which have been
designed as an integral part of the architectural composition of the building facades; ground source and air source heat pumps; passive ventilation through the design and layout of the building; rainwater harvesting; grey water recycling; energy conservation through thermal massing and use of locally sourced materials. There is a strong relationship between internal spaces and the external landscape which takes advantage of key views along with solar gain and natural lighting. The design also meets the criteria for 'Lifetime Homes' with disabled access throughout.

4.12 The Landscape Appraisal and layout drawing set out the proposals for the integration of the building into the landscape through a simple but high quality design which will enhance its setting.

4.13 In order to fully assess the proposals, further information and clarification of a number of points was requested relating to location and appearance of photovoltaic cells referred to in the Design & access Statement, relationship between the building and the topography of the site and cross sections through the building to illustrate the floor levels. Additional details have now been submitted confirming that the site is relatively level and that no changes are proposed to the existing site levels and the photovoltaic cells are to take the form of slates as an integral part of the roof design to the south facing roof slopes.

4.14 The Council's Conservation and Design Architect considers that the scheme has responded to the defining characteristics of the local area with a simple form and layout re-interpreted in a distinctly contemporary manner with the cantilevered form of the main wing. The simple treatment of the landscaping proposals will ensure integration into the existing landscape and enhance the site. Careful consideration has been given to a range of issues as an integral part of the design process including sustainability, energy conservation, renewable energy technologies and Lifetimes Homes criteria. The architectural design and treatment of the exterior of the building, although based on a traditional barn, has been carefully thought out and detailed in a distinctly contemporary manner. He is therefore of the opinion that the design is of sufficiently high quality to support the proposal and would therefore recommend approval.

4.15 The site is located away from other properties and will be seen in the context of the adjacent farm buildings and in view of the Conservation and Design Architect's views, I consider that the building as proposed could be supported in this location and would not harm the character of the area or the amenity of neighbouring uses.

4.16 The proposal incorporates an arboricultural assessment which sets out that it is proposed to remove the frontage hedge to improve visibility and a number of dead elms. However it is proposed to replace the frontage hedge and the remaining existing boundary hedges are to be retained and enhanced on the other boundaries.

4.17 The ecology assessment which has been undertaken concludes that there are no significant habitats or presence of protected species, although there is potential for bat foraging and roosting within dead trees. The report makes a number of recommendations which should be undertaken as part of any development.

4.18 The site will be served by the existing narrow road, however the Highway Authority has raised no objection subject to conditions.
5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The scheme has responded to the defining characteristics of the local area with a simple form and layout re-interpreted in a distinctly contemporary manner with the cantilevered form of the main wing. The simple treatment of the landscaping proposals will ensure integration into the existing landscape and enhance the site. Careful consideration has been given to a range of issues as an integral part of the design process including sustainability, energy conservation, renewable energy technologies and Lifetimes Homes criteria. The architectural design and treatment of the exterior of the building, although based on a traditional barn, has been carefully thought out and detailed in a distinctly contemporary manner. The proposal is therefore considered to meet the requirements of paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework and will not adversely affect the character of the area, the amenity of neighbouring uses or highway safety.

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

Ketteringham Lane, Hethersett
Proposal:

To create a new family home within this beautiful countryside location

- One outstanding original 5 bedroom house to Code 6 level of sustainability.
- Promote contemporary design harnessing elements of the natural environment.
- Develop and retain a sustainable landscaping scheme for garden use.

Location and Situation:

The site is situated to the south western side of the large village of Hethersett.

The site is located to the south of what was the main A11 and is now the main Norwich Road through the southern side of Hethersett. Further to the south is the new A11 dual carriageway (approx 200m).

The site is located within an area which has mixed uses. To the north and north west is the complex of buildings (formerly a large country house) which comprise Hethersett School. The playing fields for the School adjoin the northern boundary of the site. There are also several other larger detached houses to the north of the site on either side of Ketteringham Lane to the junction with Norwich Road. Immediately to the south of the site is a substantial farm complex of new and older style farms. To the east of the site is Ketteringham Lane and on the other side of this is an open arable field with hedged boundaries which looks out to a wooded area some 200m east. To the western side of the site is another larger arable field and further fields beyond.

The site itself is a small field or paddock which appears to have been associated with the farm buildings / use but had become disused over time and has become gradually covered in mainly Blackthorn scrub. This appears to have been cleared and is now re-establishing again.

Approach:

The driving inspiration throughout every design stage is to capture the relationship between the architecture and its surrounding landscape, with the intention of harnessing the beauty and character of the surrounding countryside within the architecture. Views from within the building have been strategically positioned to allow the occupier to enjoy living within this beautiful rural location.

Equally as important as creating a beautiful and practical space for the occupier, is the creation of a visual piece of contemporary architecture for neighbours and local people enjoying the natural countryside.

- A sensitive response to the surrounding built environment and natural landscape.
- An example of contemporary design, presenting a moment in time for future generations.
Accommodation:
- One five bedroom home to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6.
- A holistic and flexible design which is suitable for occupiers of any age.
- Full disabled access throughout integrated into design in a subtle manner.

Aims and Objectives:
- Create a code level 6 living space.
- Bringing to life a large overgrown site, which respects the existing living trees.
- To use traditional local materials.
- To utilise local skills.
- To create a balanced design, which combines traditional with contemporary.
- To create a quality architectural legacy on this site for future generations to enjoy.

Site Specific Development Strategy:
The development strategy will focus on various elements in order to assess the overall proposition in a holistic way. Aspects to be considered and layered within the design are as follows:
- Design Philosophy.
- Design Form.
- Inspirational Projects.
- Internal Layout.
- Materials.
- Environmental issues.
- Access and future proofing.
- Landscape strategy.

Design Philosophy:
It is the intention that this is not just a building, but an experience in which the viewer can engage with. A holding power must hold the viewer for a moment and invite them to inquire further.

This building is a balanced composition, harmonising lightness with weight, wood with glass, cantilever with grounded base, open views with private space, and the traditional with contemporary.

Each transition made throughout the building is designed as a series of unique spaces, each element an architectural composition rather than just a building placed on a piece of land. This building is intended to be a piece of sculpture within the landscape.
Design Form:

In this rural environment, Urbanbtiu presents a careful yet playful combination of contemporary architecture/sculpture which is fused with the traditional, as inspired by its immediate surrounding context. The built form has been carefully designed to both enhance and appear comfortable within its setting.

- The traditional pitch roof is suited to the area, as seen locally within existing buildings.
- Visually designed to evoke the large open doors of a traditional barn building, through the façade design.
- A hierarchy of structure between the two wings is inspired by the traditional barn building.
- Sunlight and daylight are key elements. Orientated to maximize solar gain, the building exploits to the maximum in their design this commodity and takes full advantage of the views.
- A sense of space and scale is highlighted, with each individual room/space varying in character.
- Louvres add a contemporary value to the external façade whilst also controlling solar gain and external views.
- Visual balance is manipulated through cantilevered elements, which are balanced with grounded elements.
- Solid elements of vertical and horizontal wood cladding are balanced with glazed areas.

Inspirational Projects:

This project has been informed and strengthened by existing inspirational buildings, which have aided forming the building’s unique design. It has been intended throughout that the house at Ketteningham should be traditional, yet contemporary, and the following images played an important role within the design process:

- Cantilever
• Large windows with country aspect
Double storey traditional barn style windows
• Louvres

• Internal windows
- Internal sliding bookcase
Internal Layout:
Flexible use of space suitable for any user:

- Sliding shelving allow open plan space to become segmented, in a practical manner.
- Every bedroom has its own personality, each with a strong relationship to the outdoors.
- Each room is located to make the most of both views out and solar gain.
- Private space is subtly integrated into the open plan design.
- Split onto 3 levels to maximise views outwards.
- Disabled access throughout.
- A holistic approach has considered in its design the practical use of space in terms of family use, with designated areas suited to both short term and long term storage.
- Very much a ‘show home’, this building is flexible for both personal family use or sociable occasions.
- Gallery space allows the user to appreciate artwork within this contemporary setting.
- Each room has a prominent and strategically positioned view.

Materials:
We use materials and construction methods as ‘a handrail between the past and the future.’ Careful selection of wood, steel, glass, and red brick will present a piece of architecture that borrows the skills of the past but reinvents them for now. It is intended that the grafting together of certain elements produce a direct relationship between the old and the new – the choice of materials assists in the dialogue between legacy and the future.

Environmental issues:
Mass structure alongside lightweight systems will enable us to take advantage of controlled solar gain. The intention is to incorporate the following;

- Ground source and air source heat pump technology to be installed.
- Rainwater harvesting tanks to collect rainwater for garden irrigation.
- Incorporation for solar hot water systems.
- Non toxic materials are to be used.
- All tools and materials are to be sourced in the region as far as possible.
- Lightweight structures used alongside landscape areas.
- Careful management during construction process will ensure tree protection zones are maintained.
13. **Appl. No**: 2012/1070/F  
**Parish**: WICKLEWOOD

**Applicants Name**: Mr Peter Meacock  
**Site Address**: Church Farm, Church Lane, Wicklewood, Norfolk, NR18 9QH  
**Proposal**: The installation consists of a single small scale domestic 11kw Gaia turbine, mounted on a 18m steel mast on a 5m² concrete base. The turbine is a twin-bladed design manufactured as a single composite unit 13m in diameter. All non-galvanised elements of the turbine will be coloured pale grey/ off white.

**Recommendation**: Authorise DDE to Approve

1. Full permission time limit  
2. Compliance with amended plans  
3. Remove if redundant or not operational for 6 months.

(Subject to final comments of MoD)

1. **Planning Policy**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**

Part 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change.  
Part 11: Preserving and enhancing the natural environment.  
Part 12: Preserving and enhancing the historic environment.

1.2 **Joint Core Strategy**

Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets.  

1.3 **South Norfolk Local Plan**

UTL13: Renewable Energy (part consistent)  
IMP9: Residential Amenity  
IMP10: Noise  
IMP15: Setting of listed buildings  
ENV14: Habitat protection  
ENV15: Species protection

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2012/0840 Screening Opinion for 18m Turbine  
**ES not required**

2.2 2011/1798 Photovoltaic panels to barn and freestanding  
**Approved 16-12-11**

2.3 2011/1509 Change of use from storage to 1 bed holiday let  
**Approved 09-09-11**

2.4 2010/0281 Extensions to house, barn and new store  
**Approved 01-04-10**

2.5 2005/0980 New garage block  
**Approved 22-06-05**
3. Consultations

3.1 Wicklewood Parish Council: Original Submission:
- Eyesore, out of keeping with surrounding environment
- Export of surplus energy to National Grid constitutes a commercial use and a change of use of the land
- Likely noise disturbance
- Impact on wildlife

Amended Plan:
- 3m reduction will make little noticeable difference to visual impact
- No difference to noise concerns
- Still excessively large for domestic use
- Impact on landscape and residential areas is unacceptable
- Note MoD concerns should not be disregarded
- Planning Committee should visit site to witness detrimental impact likely.

3.2 District Member: To be reported if appropriate

3.3 English Heritage: Recommend consider impact carefully due to motion of blades being disproportionately noticeable compared to scale of the proposal. With regard to English Heritage’s remit of impact on Wicklewood Parish Church:
- Turbine will be prominent in the landscape, but its position on land lower than the churchyard and the trees around the church mean it will not be prominent from the church
- In views of the church, the turbine will not dominate it and will be screened in most views
- Conclude some impact on setting of church but no major degree of harm
- Would not object to the proposal

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection): Note nearest residential cartilage is 130m from turbine
- Noise levels will comply with World Health Organisation recommendations
- Do not object to the application

3.5 Landscape Officer: No comments received

3.6 Ecologist: Unlikely there will be any significant impact on ecology.
- Turbine is acceptable distance from features such as hedges, trees or watercourses where impact on bats and birds is more likely
- Wintering birds using open field habitat unlikely to be disturbed in this case
- Norfolk Biodiversity Information Service data shows no record of species of conservation concern that might be affected
3.7 Ministry of Defence

Original Submission:
- Unacceptable interference to radar at Trimingham – reduced sensitivity and ‘false’ returns.

Amended Plan:
- Response to re-consultation not received at time of writing – to be reported.

(Note applicant has supplied copy of letter he received from MoD advising no concerns with turbine blades having maximum height of 21.5m, which is the amended proposal height.)

3.8 Local Residents

Original submission:
- Objections
  - Scale and visual impact in attractive landscape
  - Alternative technologies available and preferable
  - Likely noise disturbance and vibration
  - Adverse impact on wildlife
  - Unattractive design
  - Commercial scale and use
  - Too close to housing
  - Negative impact on local tourism business
  - Suggest Members visit site and area

Support
- Quiet and environmentally friendly
- No significant harm to wildlife likely
- Need more renewable energy, good for environment
- Encourage children to appreciate renewable energy issue

Amended Plan
- Letters from objectors to confirm amendment does not overcome original objections

No further letters from supporters or withdrawal of objections.

4. Assessment

4.1 Renewable energy such as that from wind turbines is encouraged in both national and local planning policy (see NPPF Part 10; JCS Policy3; and SNLP Policy UTL13). The NPPF goes further at paragraph 98 by making it clear that applicants should not be required to demonstrate a need for the renewable energy generation proposed and to recognise that even small scale projects provide a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions. This clearly indicates that little weight should be given some objector’s suggestion that the scale of the proposal is greater than is necessary for domestic need.

4.2 In the face of such strong policy support, the general approach must be to approve renewable energy proposals unless the particular development would cause very significant harm, sufficient to outweigh the presumption in favour of renewable energy provision.
In this case, there are a number of issues that require consideration in order to assess whether the development would cause sufficient harm to justify refusing the application. These can be considered under the headings of visual impact; noise impact; ecological impact; impact on heritage assets; and the impact on MoD radar coverage.

Visual impact

The original submission proposed an 18m pole tower with 2 turbine blades of 13m in diameter. This is different to the 3 blade turbines we have more commonly seen proposed in the District which tend to have shorter blades. Following objection from the MoD, the application has been amended to propose a lower pole tower of 15m, while the blades remain unchanged. This gives a maximum height with a blade in the vertical position of 21.5m.

The turbine is proposed in a prominent location just to the north of the built up area of Wicklewood. It would sit on a shoulder of land on the side of a gently sloping valley of generally open arable fields which create an attractive landscape and setting to the settlement. The turbine would be a prominent feature in the landscape when viewed from closer distances to the south, east and west, including from a number of residential properties along Church Lane and Hackford Road (closest residential property 130m). Members should note the considerable degree of objection raised by local residents and the Parish Council on visual impact grounds, amongst others. The turbine would also be visible from longer views to the west, even as far as the B1108 Norwich to Watton Road, although it would be less conspicuous from such a distance. The turbine blades would be visible above the skyline from much of these areas. Views of the turbine from the north would be blocked by the rising landform of the opposite valley side and a substantial area of woodland. Some residents and the Parish Council have suggested that Members should visit the site to assess the proposal before reaching a decision.

From the above description it will be noted that the turbine would be a locally conspicuous feature. Members will be aware however, that this is often the case with turbines because of their requirement for an open position to work efficiently. It is a matter of judgement whether the visual impact in this case is so harmful as to justify refusal of the application. When making this judgement it should be noted that, although I would describe the area as an attractive landscape, it has no specific designation for protection either nationally or locally. This is significant because planning policies referring to landscape protection such as the latest NPPF are expressed with specific reference to areas with special designation for protection such as National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Even the older SNLP does not specifically single out this area for special landscape protection.

Taking account of this lack of specific policy protection and the very strong policy support for renewable energy proposals, I conclude that, on balance, the application should not be refused on visual/landscape impact grounds.

Noise Impact

NPPF paragraph 123 and SNLP Policy IMP10 make it clear that planning decisions should avoid noise levels having significant adverse impacts. Concerns have been expressed by a number of people regarding potential noise disturbance in this rural area. However, the Environmental Services Team has examined the technical information provided and has raised no objection. They find that the level of noise generated, combined with the distance of the turbine from residential properties result in it being unlikely that noise levels experienced by local people would exceed the World Health Organisation’s recommended limits, even at night. In these circumstances I do not consider that noise impact would constitute a reason for refusing permission.
Ecological Impact

4.9 Reference to potential harm to wildlife has been made by local people. SNLP policies IMP14 and 15 give protection to protected species and their habitats and the NPPF (para 118) indicates that development causing significant harm to biodiversity (which cannot be mitigated) should be refused. There is no evidence provided that suggests such significant harm is likely. The Council's Ecologist has considered the proposal in the light of biodiversity records and his own judgement and raises no objection. I do not consider there is likely to be any harm to ecological interests that would justify refusing permission.

Impact on Heritage Assets

4.10 The greatest potential impact on any Heritage Asset in this case would be impact on the setting of Wicklewood Parish Church which stands approximately 300m from the proposed turbine location, on higher ground and surrounded by mature trees. The NPPF section 12 and SNLP policy IMP15 provide the policy context for the protection of listed buildings and their setting.

4.11 As reported above, English Heritage have been consulted and raised no objection as they found the proposal unlikely to cause a major degree of harm to the setting of the Church.

Impact on MoD radar coverage

4.12 The MoD have advised the applicant that they have no concerns about the revised turbine height (21.5m), but at the time of writing I have not received a direct response to our re-consultation on the amended scheme. Effective radar coverage is clearly a very serious consideration and any decision should be subject to the MoD's final comments which I hope to be able to report to the meeting.

Conclusion

4.13 Having considered the potential forms of harm likely to result from the proposed development, I find (subject to MoD comments) that they do not individually or cumulatively amount to sufficiently significant harm to outweigh the strong policy support given to renewable energy in national and local planning policy. In these circumstances the application should be approved, subject to conditions as summarised at the head of this report.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposed turbine, as amended, would accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (part 10) as well as the Joint Core Strategy Policy 1 and South Norfolk Local Plan Policy UTL13 which support such renewable energy schemes. This support is not outweighed by any harm likely to result from the development, including considerations of visual impact, noise impact, ecological impact, impact on heritage assets and interference with radar coverage.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  and E-mail:  Chris Trett, 01508 533794, ctrett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
14. **Appl. No**: 2012/1095  
**Parish**: HINGHAM

Applicants Name: Keys Hill Park Ltd  
Site Address: Redevelopment On The Site Of 37-39 Hardingham Road Hingham  
Norfolk NR9 4LX  
Proposal: Specialised supported living scheme (part demolition and redevelopment of site for twenty person single and shared occupancy 12 residential units, a reception, office and communal activities building together with associated car parking/turning, gardens and summer house)

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit (C)  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Specific Use  
4. Implement boundary treatment  
5. Full details of external lighting (C)  
6. Details of surface water disposal (C/e)  
7. Surface Water (C/e)  
8. Reporting of unexpected contamination(C)  
9. Details of shift changes  
10. Provision of fire hydrant  
11. Provision of parking, not on plan  
12. Highway Improvements - Offsite

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 6: Access and Transportation  
Policy 14: Key Service Centres

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

2. **Planning History**

2.1 1990/0897 Single storey dwelling Refused 13-07-1990  
3 Consultations

3.1 Hingham Town Council
   No objection in principle
   - reservations about size of scheme
   - vehicle numbers
   - requested public meeting with developers
   - request deferral for public meeting

3.2 Mrs Yvonne Bendle
   To be determined by Committee
   - Contrary to NPPF and Policy IMP8 of SNLP due to position of access
     and nature of local highway. Existing congestion at peak times and road
     used by farm traffic with access shared with commercial units
   - Although footpath proposed, this is only on one side so pedestrians will
     still need to cross the road
   - Contrary to Policy IMP9 and IMP10 of SNLP due to proximity to
     neighbours
   - Applicant compares proposal to existing facility in Wroxham, but Wroxham
     has a large supermarket and other services
   - There is sufficient sheltered / care facilities in Hingham to cater for
     the settlements needs
   - should be located in a larger settlement

3.3 NCC- Planning Obligations
   Identify the need for the contribution towards the provision of fire hydrant

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)
   There are existing flooding issues within the lower catchment of Hingham
   associated with foul and surface water drainage that should not be
   exacerbated by new development.

   Suggest condition relating to potential for contaminated land

3.5 Keith Mitchell – Housing Strategy Manager
   Support
   - Size and number of units well suited to provide supported accommodation

3.6 NCC Highways
   Acceptable subject to key improvements to provide a footway to link to
   the existing footway. Requested clarification regarding parking levels and
   provision of cycle parking, together with improvements to the width of
   Hardingham Road.

   Following further details confirm that the level of parking proposed together
   with the cycle parking and highway improvements are acceptable.

3.7 Local Residents
   9 letters of objection
   - Inappropriate use due to access and proximity to neighbouring properties
   - Concerns regarding traffic generation with 20 residents and associated
     staff and shift change-overs
   - Hardingham Road is a rural lane with residential properties both sides. It
     is narrow in a number of places and regularly used by farm traffic
   - Often congestion, particularly at school times
   - No footpath or refuge on the bend in front of the development. Road is
     used daily by school children.
   - proposed footpath will reduce width of road
   - Loss of privacy for immediate neighbours
Development Management Committee

17 October 2012

- concerns about light pollution
- disturbance to neighbours due to vehicular activity
- concerns about capacity of drainage
- proximity to adjacent workshops which make furniture and generates noise.
- conflict with HGVs serving adjacent commercial units

Hingham Surgery has also commented that:
- The number of patients served by the surgery has grown and they are now at the upper limit of what they can cope with.
- Additional patients are likely to have significant medical needs and proposal could result in deterioration in medical care for existing patients
- Not enough people with learning disabilities in Hingham to justify proposal
- Impacts on local highway from staff and delivery movements together with visits from families
- While the surgery has an "open" list, this does not mean that it is actively encouraging new patients
- Proposal should be located in one of the larger settlements

NCC Community Health and Social Care
- NCC supports the national direction to increase supported living opportunities
- Support supported living and residential care for people with mental health and / or learning disabilities
- Currently reviewing clients in longer term residential mental health placements. This has identified that there are a number of vacancies and that capacity is being filled by placements from outside Norfolk
- As with other developments, there is the possibility that the proposal will increase the demand for local health services and other services

4. Assessment

4.1 The proposal is for the conversion of the existing dwellings (37/39) to provide 2 No three person shared units and the conversion of a games room to a single persons unit. A range of buildings will be demolished including the former joinery workshop and an entrance / reception building will be erected, together with 10 single person units and 1, three person unit to provide a residential care facility. The units will be erected in two wings which have their principle entrance facing the centre of the site with garden areas to the east and west of the units. To the south of the proposal it is summer house and communal garden while to the east beyond a line of conifers is a vegetable garden. The application is supported by a Design and Access Statement together with "Demographic trends and commissioning intensions" (appendix 2) and supporting statement and summary (appendix 3)

4.2 The development will provide a residential care facility modelled on supported living theme where residents have domestic style accommodation with staff support aimed at maximising independence through practicing life skills and promoting community integration. The service is not designed to be a home for life but is a transitional service. The age range will be predominantly 20 to 40.
4.3 The new units will be linear in form and will be single storey with an eaves height of 2.8m, and a ridge line of 5.95m. The vehicular access will be between No 43 and 45/47/49 which also serves the commercial units to the east. At the site frontage is a car parking area which will accommodate 17 vehicles together with cycle storage. A pedestrian / emergency access will be provided from the west passing the frontage of no 33 and 35 to link to the new section of footway along Hardingham Road. The scheme has also been amended to show widening of a section of Hardingham Road to compensate for the width of the new footway.

4.4 The site is located within the Development Limit for Hingham and is bordered to the north and west by residential properties with commercial units to the east and south and as such the principle of development is acceptable. Hingham is identified as a Key Service Centre in the Joint Core Strategy which are settlements that have a range of facilities enabling them to meet local needs as well as the needs of residents of surrounding areas, although it is recognised that there is a limited range of shops and services which results in a predicted growth of approximately 100 dwellings. Policies in the Joint Core Strategy, South Nnfolk Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework encourage sustainable forms of development which are in keeping with the locality, do not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring uses or highway safety.

4.5 The site is currently occupied by two dwellings and associated outbuildings and commercial building. The new buildings will be single storey in form with the reception building being located in a similar position to the existing frontage building. This will be visible in the outlook of nos 41 and 43, but due to its orientation and height, I consider that it will not dominate the outlook of these properties. The two wings of units are orientated north / south, with the main entrances facing into the centre of the site. The units are set away from most of the neighbouring dwellings but will be 8m from the boundary with No 35 and 20m from the rear elevation. No 35 is orientated to face south east and as such the units will not be within the main outlook of this property although they will be visible from the garden area. At present there is a low fence along this boundary and I consider that details of the boundary along this part of the site should be required.

4.6 I consider that, due to the layout of the units and their position relative to the neighbours, they will not have a significant adverse effect on their outlook or result in a significant loss of amenity. A number of communal areas are proposed, but these will be located adjacent to the boundaries with the commercial units and centrally in the site.

4.7 A neighbouring commercial unit has commented regarding the potential for disturbance to future occupiers and while I recognise the position of the commercial units I do not consider that it will be significantly greater than that experienced by existing neighbouring properties. Concerns have also been raised regarding potential disturbance to neighbours from vehicle movements associated with the parking area and from shift change-overs. The car park area is close to an existing neighbour, however the applicants have confirmed that this will be solid bound which will help to reduce noise disturbance. Details of the times of shift changes have been indicated, but the latest and earliest could be limited by conditions to minimise disturbance.

4.8 Concerns have been raised regarding the appropriateness of the use and the need for the facility to serve the residents of Hingham, which already accommodates a number of residential care facilities. As set out above, Hingham is a Key Service Centre which is identified as meeting the needs of the residents and surrounding areas and as such I consider that it is an appropriate location to provide such a facility. The primary character of the units will be residential and the residents will be supported in accessing local facilities and services and as set out above, I consider that the nature of the use and associated activities is unlikely to have a significant adverse effect on the character of the area or amenities of neighbouring properties.
The local doctors surgery has raised concerns regarding the capacity of the surgery and the appropriateness of the use in Hingham. As set out above I consider that the use is appropriate to the area and that Hingham is identified as a key service centre which is proposed to accommodate up to 100 additional dwellings. The applicant has also responded to the doctor’s comments regarding the implications for service demand based on their experience of operating similar facilities in Wroxham. While I note the doctors concerns I consider that from a planning perspective, the proposal is acceptable.

With regard to the suitability of the access and local highway network, the site will be served by an existing access point which serves a number of dwellings and commercial units. The highway Authority have raised no objections to the suitability of this access point and while the concerns of the neighbours and commercial units are noted, the parking area will not obstruct their access and I therefore consider that this is acceptable. With regard to Hardingham Road, it is proposed to construct a section of footway to link to an existing path and to widen the road to compensate for the width lost by the path. I consider that the level of traffic associated with the proposal will not significantly contribute to congestion in the locality or adversely affect highway safety. The Highway Authority has raised no objection subject to conditions.

Environmental Services have commented regarding drainage issues in the locality and concern has been raised regarding the capacity of local infrastructure. The applicants have confirmed that they are liaising with Anglian Water and I consider that drainage matters can be determined by conditions.

Members may wish to note that the Town Council did request a further deferment of the application until a public meeting could be held. The applicant was not willing to accept further delay and, in the absence of any adequate reason to defer, the application is presented for determination.

The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policies 2, 3, 4, 6, 14 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies IMP8, IMP9 and HOU6 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the proposed scale and nature of use is considered to appropriate to the locality and will not have a significant adverse effect on the character of the area, the amenity of neighbouring uses or highway safety.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Demographic Trends & Commissioning Intentions (LD)

a) Norfolk has the highest prevalence of adults with Learning Disabilities (LD) in the Eastern Region, recording an average annual increase of 3.6% p.a. since 2006. The highest concentration of people with this condition is centred around Norwich and South Norfolk, where there is an undersupply of recovery model services.

b) People with a LD are living significantly longer, many with elderly parents as carers, who are moving towards a situation where they are unable to cope with the demands of caring for a son or daughter with complex needs.

c) An increasing number of young people with LD are now moving from children's services into adult services - these adolescents often find that their only placement option is within a service for older people and so the Keys Hill Park (KHP) model of care (Recovery Model) where the majority of people accommodated are in their 20's and 30's is seen as being more suitable by health & social care commissioners. This is a 'stated intention' (key strand) of the commissioners' strategy to develop appropriate services throughout the county.

Demographic Trends & Commissioning Intentions (MH)

d) Norfolk has the 3rd highest number of Adults with mental health needs (MH) in the Eastern Region and the highest number in residential based provision, excluding secure hospital beds. Norwich and South Norfolk have the highest proportion of people with MH support needs. The vast majority of these people are in long-stay accommodation and need to move to transitional ‘recovery model’ services.

h) Between 1998 and 2007 admissions of people (in Norfolk) with serious mental health needs to hospital doubled from just under 6000 to 12000. The writer has first hand experience (and contributes directly) to dialogue between the CEO's of NHS Norfolk, Norfolk County Council Community Services (Social Services) and NWWHTFT (statutory MH provider) around the lack of community support services for those living at home and in the wider community, especially for those who find themselves in difficulty. It is believed that the paucity of relevant services has played a major part in this significant increase in demand on the acute sector.

j) KHP’s model of care is ‘recovery/advanced recovery’ based with several former MH patients now living successfully in the community following a period of intensive support and rehabilitation/reablement at KHP.

k) A fundamental strand of commissioning strategy (‘stated intention’) makes clear that people with MH needs must be given more intensive support around rehabilitation/learning life skills in order to reduce longer stays in residential care (average in Norfolk is 8 years). As with point c) above, integrated commissioning teams are keen to see the development of services that deliver this outcome.
37 & 39 Hardingham Road, Hingham

Supporting Statement & Summary

1. The business model will mirror that of Keys Hill Park (KHP) – a residential care facility (C2) but modeled on an assisted living theme where each resident enjoys domestic-style accommodation with staff support aimed at maximizing independence through practicing life skills and promoting community integration.

2. KHP is a preferred provider of care to integrated social care practitioners because its model and delivery of care reflects the published commissioning intentions of Norfolk County Council. Indeed, KHP’s Head of Service, represents the county’s 436 provider organisations on Norfolk’s System Leadership Board, sitting alongside Harold Bodmer (Head of Community Services/Social Services), Andrew Morgan (CEO of Norfolk and Gt. Yarmouth & Waveney PCT) and all acute hospital/NHS Foundation Trust CEO’s.

3. The Hingham project will seek to promote independence and enhance life skills so that the people in residence will be able to move on to independent living or semi-independent living and working within the community. This service is not a home for life, it is a transitional service, without which Norfolk County Council’s transformation agenda (which requires the transformation of long-term care home services) will not be able to achieve its goals.

4. The age profile of people using the service will be adults of working age, 18 years and upwards, although the likely range will be 20-40, similar to that of KHP.

5. A fully qualified manager will be supported by a staff team of approximately 30 in number (3 x shifts with approx 10-12 people on the day and afternoon shifts and 4 people on the night shift). No cooks/cleaners or ancillary staff are employed as residents work closely with care support staff to develop/ embed life skills.

6. The proposed development will have approximately 17 car parking spaces. For a 20 bed facility this is considered very generous when compared to other care provider organisations.

7. Hingham, like KHP, will offer financial incentives for staff to travel to work by bicycle or use public transport. This has proved popular with only 70% of KHP staff travelling to work by car.

8. We estimate that of the 10-12 staff on shift at any one time no more than 10 are likely to require car parking, plus the Manager = 11. There will also be a pool car (no minibuses are used by the group so as to avoid any sense of institutionalisation) = 12. Visiting professionals may number one or two at
the same time, but if we assume 4, the total number of spaces utilised will not exceed 14.

9. Having formerly owned and operated the largest care provider service in Norfolk the author is confident that the above figures are accurate.

10. Around 40 jobs will be created within the local community and money will find its way into local businesses. From extensive experience we know that people using this type of service (those resident at Hingham) will use local shops and businesses.

11. People able to understand road traffic matters and assessed as able to use the available access routes into town will be allowed to walk into Hingham unescorted. For those who find this a little disconcerting or unable to fully appreciate road safety issues, a member of staff will accompany them to ensure safe passage to (and from) the chosen destination.

12. Demographic information and associated commissioning intentions – part of Norfolk’s MPS (Market Position Statement) – published November 2011, are attached.

Dennis Bacon
May 2012

The author holds the following positions:

a) Head of Service, Keys Hill Park, Wroxham, Norwich
b) Chair of NIC (Norfolk Independent Care), Progress House, Blofield, Norwich
c) Board Member, NHS Norfolk & Norfolk County Council System Leadership Group
d) Chair of Norfolk Annual Care Conference Organising Committee
15. **Appl. No**: 2012/1243  
**Parish**: HETHERSETT

**Applicants Name**: Mr Payne & Ms Evans  
**Site Address**: The Willows Cedar Road Hethersett Norfolk NR9 3JY  
**Proposal**: Sub division of the site curtilage of The Willows to provide 2 no detached 2 storey dwellings

**Recommendation**: Approve with Conditions

1. Outline Permission Time Limit (C)  
2. Standard outline requiring RM  
3. In accord with submitted drawings  
4. External materials to be agreed  
5. Slab level to be agreed  
6. New Water Efficiency (C/e)  
7. Implement boundary treatment  
8. Ecology Mitigation  
9. Tree protection  
10. Retention trees and hedges (C)  
11. New Access Construction over verge  
12. Access Gates - Configuration  
13. Visibility splay dimension in cond (C/i)  
14. Provision of parking, service  
15. Highway Improvements - Offsite  
16. Clearance of vegetation to Cedar Road

### 1. Planning Policies

#### 1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
- NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home  
- NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
- NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
- NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

#### 1.2 Joint Core Strategy
- Policy 2: Promoting good design  
- Policy 3: Energy and water  
- Policy 4: Housing delivery  
- Policy 14: Key Service Centres  
- Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets

#### 1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
- ENV 14: Habitat protection  
- ENV 19: Tree Preservation Orders  
- HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes  
- IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
- IMP 9: Residential amenity

### 2. Planning History

#### 2.1 2012/1243  
Current application

Sub division of the site curtilage of The Willows to provide 2 no detached 2 storey dwellings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2012/0392</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>2 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2011/1470</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>3 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2010/1476</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Material amendments to planning consent 2009/0414 (Proposed side extension)- Addition of roof light, change in window configuration, velux moved on rear elevation, walls totally clad in siberian larch and front porch added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2010/0675</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Non Material Amendment to 2009/0414 (Proposed side extension) - Addition of roof light, change in window configuration, velux to be moved to rear elevation and walls to existing and extension clad in siberian larch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2009/0414</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Proposed side extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2005/0267</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>Reduce trees to hedge height close to large Lime tree; Remove 3-4 lower branches of Goat Willow overhanging pond.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Consultations**

3.1 **Hethersett Parish Council**

No comments subject to:
- SNC Tree Officer providing assurance that proposal is acceptable in relation to TPO trees
- That there are measures in place to protect the trees during and after construction and
- Assurance that the development will not adversely affect the safety of users of Cedar Road adjacent to the site which was designated as a safe route for pedestrians and cyclists from the Poppy fields development.

3.2 **Local Members**

- Mr D Bills: No comments received
- Mr L G P Dale: No comments received

3.3 **Landscape Officer**

No objection subject to conditions

3.4 **Historic Environment Service**

No comments received

3.5 **NCC Highways**

Approve subject to conditions
- Proposal now includes provision of a passing bay but is slightly restricted due to trees and vegetation. Frontage vegetation will be cut back to the line of boundary to allow pedestrians to stand clear of vehicles.

3.6 **Head Of Environmental Services**

Comment regarding drainage proposals and recommend a number of advisory notes
Local Residents

- 3rd application with previous applications having generated substantial opposition from people in the locality
- Existing covenant restricting development on the land
- Existing green space should be preserved especially in the light of proposed major developments
- Highway concerns previously raised by NCC have not changed. Increase in traffic on narrow road. Potential increase in conflict with pedestrians, dog walkers and school children
- Cedar Road was designated as a safe route for pedestrians / cyclists for Poppyfields development
- Provision of passing places is insufficient to address concerns and does not really allow for two vehicles to pass. It also raises concerns about future maintenance, adequacy of their surfacing and size to accommodate people with prams or mobility needs
- Construction traffic should not be accommodated on Cedar Road. Any deliveries should be restricted to certain times
- Drainage concerns re capacity of pond and use of soakaways
- Arboricultural assessment does not cover impacts on neighbouring trees
- Removal of well established hedgerows and widening Cedar Road will ruin the character of the beautiful lane
- Use of site by bats for foraging. Should retain linear landscape features
- Impact on outlook of neighbours and disturbance from light and noise
- Should consider the objections raised in connection with previous applications

Assessment

4.1 The application is a revised scheme and follows the withdrawal of 2011/1470 which was for the erection of 3 detached properties and refusal of 2012/0392/O which was for 2 detached dwellings. 2012/0392 was refused for the following reasons:

4.2 "The unclassified road serving the site is considered to be inadequate to serve the development proposed, by reason of its restricted width and lack of passing provision. 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 Plan."

4.3 The application is not supported by sufficient highways information to demonstrate that the proposed development will not be prejudicial to the satisfactory functioning of the highway / highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan."

4.4 This revised scheme is also submitted in outline with details of access, layout and scale submitted for consideration. The revised details seek to address previously raised issues and includes additional details relating to the highway concerns by including the provision of a passing place on Cedar Road and trimming back vegetation along the site frontage to provide space for pedestrians.
4.5 The site is within the currently defined Development Limit for Hethersett and as such the principle of development is acceptable. Policies in the JCS and SNLP and the requirements of the NPPF seek to promoted development which is of scale, form and character which takes account of the character of the site and its environs and which does not have a significant adverse effect on the outlook or amenity of neighbouring uses or highway safety.

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

4.7 The site is located at the western edge of Cedar Road, which is a single width track which is characterised by heavily landscaped detached properties (mainly covered by TPO). To the south of the site around the turning head, are linked 2 storey properties on Melton Court. Other properties on Melton Court are single storey in form.

4.8 The dwellings are proposed to be 2 storey in form with a footprint of 11m x 7m and a ridge height of 8m. They are orientated so that their main outlook is north west, south east, in order to minimise impacts from overlooking of the neighbouring properties. This orientation will also present the gable elevation towards the neighbouring dwellings both on Cedar Road and Melton Court. Plot 2 is now closer to boundary with 9 Melton Court

4.9 Plot 2 will be approximately 3m from the boundary with 9 Melton Court and will be 9m from the nearest part of the dwelling. The proposal will be prominent from that property, particularly following the removal of the existing group of trees which are currently on the boundary, however due to the orientation of the properties I consider that it will not dominate the outlook of this dwelling, although it will impact on the amenity area. The proposal will be to the north of these neighbours and as such overlooking will be limited.

4.10 To the north are detached properties on the opposite side of Cedar Road. These will be approximately 20m from plot 1 and while they will be prominent in the outlook of these properties, it will be onto the gable elevation which will be partially screened by landscaping. There will be some overshadowing of these dwellings, but due to the orientation and separation I consider that this is not sufficient to justify refusal of the application.

4.11 Within the site are a number of trees which are covered by a Tree Preservation Order. The schemes have been amended to retain a number of trees which were previously shown to be removed and reduced works within root protection areas. Concerns have been raised regarding the impact on the character of the area, the impact on neighbouring trees and the impacts for ecology of the site by the removal of trees. While a group of trees are proposed to be removed along the southern boundary, it is proposed to plant a mixed hedgerow along the southern boundary in its place to seek to retain linear landscape features for ecology interests. The scheme now proposes to remove vegetation along the site frontage to provide space for pedestrians along Cedar Road and while this will increase the openness of the site, I do not consider that it results in such harm to the character of the area to justify refusal of the application. The Landscape Officer has considered the submitted arboricultural information and following the revised layout has raised no objection subject to conditions.

4.12 Ecology information has been submitted which indicates that there is a low probability of trees on the site being used for bat roosting, although due to the presence of the pond, form of boundary treatments, limited lighting and sheltered environment, is likely to support bat foraging. The report makes a number of recommendations to limit impacts should planning permission be granted.
4.13 With regard to amphibians and reptiles, the report indicates that the pond and the boundary habitat do provide an important habitat for these species, and mitigation measures are put forward to limit impacts should planning permission be granted.

4.14 With regard to drainage concerns the scheme indicates that the properties will incorporate rainwater harvesting systems and that surface water and treated effluent from the treatment plant will drain to cellular soakaways. Environmental Services have previously indicated that they would support the use of rain saver systems with over flow to soakaways and package treatment plant subject to percolation tests being carried out to demonstrate the effectiveness of the soakaway, particularly during wet periods. They have raised no objection to the current application and recommend a number of advisory notes.

4.15 The site will be accessed off Cedar Road and provides for visibility splays of 2.4m x 25m as previously recommended and the Highway Authority. The scheme now proposes a passing place and the removal of vegetation to provide space for pedestrians and on this basis the Highway Authority has raised no objection subject to conditions.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policies 1, 2, 4 and 14 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies ENV14, ENV19, HOU4, IMP8 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the proposal has been designed to safeguard the amenities of neighbours while taking account of ecological and arboricultural interests of the site and addressing the concerns of the Highway Authority.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Stuart Pontin 01508 533796
and E-mail: spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
16. **Appl. No**: 2012/1341  
**Parish**: COSTESSEY

Applicants Name: Mr Richard Lovett  
Site Address: Land & Outbuilding At 56 Grove Avenue Costessey  
Proposal: 2 Storey dwelling with 4no. bedrooms following planning application 2011/1869/F

Recommendation: Approve with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Windows to be obscure glazed  
4. No PD for Classes ABCDE & G  
5. No additional windows at first floor  
6. Contaminated land - submit scheme  
7. Provision of parking, service

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2 : Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/1869 Change of use of annexe into 4 bedroom bungalow  
Approved

2.2 2008/0348 Redevelopment of existing site to change former office/store into 1 dwelling  
Approved

2.3 1992/1152 Conversion of workshop into 2 dwellings  
Approved

2.4 1986/3038 Renewal of permission for upholstery business  
Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Refuse

- Intrusive to neighbours  
- Raised roof line visible from all around due to its location central of several gardens  
- Loss of light and overlooking to neighbours

3.2 District member  
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways  
Approve  
- On site car parking and turning area laid out
3.4 Local Residents

- 3 letters of objection
  - Precedent for back land development
  - Intrusion on privacy
  - Long standing trees to be felled
  - Adversely affect residential amenity through overlooking and overshadowing
  - Concern with future dormers
  - Roof line not in keeping with immediate vicinity
  - Not a commercial building

1 letter no comment as long as this is adhered to as they have not been overlooked
boundary lines kept in place

4. Assessment

4.1 This application is a re-submission of an application approved in 2011. The proposal previously approved was for the conversion of an existing single storey building with a lawful business use as upholsterers into a single storey dwelling. The proposal incorporated a change in roof height to 6.3 metre but did not include rooms above ground floor. The current application incorporates a change in roof height to 7.1 metres and provides for bedrooms in the roof space with velux windows in both the front and rear elevation. The building is in the curtilage of a detached two storey property set behind other properties and is in the development boundary for Costessey. The new dwelling will share a driveway with the existing dwelling.

4.2 Policies in the Joint Core Strategy, Local Plan and requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework seek to ensure that the proposals are for an appropriate use, are of a good design and will not adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring residents. Such a development within the defined development limit must also not prejudice the supply of land for other purposes along a strategic route. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 The building is located within a corner of the plot situated approximately 2 metres away from both the rear and side boundaries. The front of the building faces onto the garden of the neighbouring property which will become the garden for the proposed dwelling and has mature planting on the side boundaries. All three of these boundaries border onto the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties with a 1.8 metre boarded fence marking the boundaries. The west of the proposed dwelling will be open driveway and fencing splitting the existing curtilage.

4.4 Although the roof height of the existing building is to be raised to 7.1 metres, I do not consider that this will adversely impact on the neighbouring properties through overshadowing due to the position and distance of the property from the neighbouring dwellings. Due to the location of the property and the neighbouring properties, I have recommended a condition for the proposed roof-lights in the rear elevation to be obscure glazed and fixed shut (the bathroom and en suite can be mechanically vented). The boundaries of the properties to the front of the site are approximately 25 metres from the dwelling and I consider that the proposed roof-lights on the front of the property will not significantly impact on the residential amenity of these occupiers. I have also recommended the removal of permitted development rights for any openings above ground floor level to protect the privacy and residential amenity of adjoining residents.
4.5 Although the existing building is within the development boundary for Costessey it is in a situation where a new dwelling would not normally be looked on favourably due to its backland characteristics. However, it was considered at the time of the previous applications for conversion of the building to two dwellings and the more recent applications to change it to a single dwelling, that its use as a dwelling was more favourable within a residential area than a business use and this is still considered to be an appropriate view. Due to the location of the building and the allowance under permitted development rules I have removed permitted development for alterations, extensions and outbuildings to allow the Council to control any future development within the front garden of the site.

4.6 The access to the proposed dwelling will be along the existing driveway to the adjacent dwelling which is a wide driveway with gates adjacent to the highway and enough room for a vehicle to pull off the road. I consider that any increase in traffic to the new dwelling will not adversely affect highway safety. The highway authority has raised no objection to the proposal.

4.7 There have been objections from the Parish Council and neighbouring properties with regard to the impact of the proposal on the adjoining dwellings. However, I consider that the design of the proposal will not have a significant impact on the residential amenities of these occupiers and the conditions on the decision will protect their amenities in the future.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 - Promoting good design of the Joint Core Strategy and HOU4 - Residential development within the defined development limits, IMP8 - Safe and free flow of traffic, IMP9 - Residential Amenity of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The building is within the Development limits for Costessey and has been designed to ensure that the existing residential amenities of the neighbouring residents are not adversely affected by overlooking, overshadowing or the setting of the scheme.

5.3 Displacement of the authorised commercial use of the single dwelling is considered to represent an improvement and be more compatible with the residential character of the area.

5.4 The development is considered to accord with Policy IMP8 as there will be no adverse impact on the highway safety and it will not prejudice the free flow of traffic on the highway network.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Lynn Armes 01508 533821 larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk
17. **Appl. No**: 2012/1515  
**Parish**: FORNCETT  
Applicants Name: Mr Quinton Spratt  
Site Address: Homestead Farm Chequers Hill Forncett St. Mary Norwich NR16 1JP  
Proposal: Demolition of existing outbuilding and construction of detached annex  
Recommendation: Approve with conditions  
1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. Approved details  
3. Materials  
4. Annexe

**Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
*NPPF 07: Requiring good design*

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 9: Residential amenity  
HOU 21: Annexes  
IMP 2: Landscaping*

2. **Planning History**

2.1 1999/0829 Conversion of barn to dwelling Approved  
2.2 1993/0273 Erection of extension to dwelling Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Forncett Parish Council  
No comments received  
3.2 Local Member  
Mr Bob McClenning To Committee  
3.3 Local Residents  
One letter of representation has been received from Dr. M.D. Willis. The letter advises that the development is for an 81 year old lady who has failing health and is increasingly frail. Furthermore that she will need close supervision and increasing support.

The approval of the application would allow for her to be cared for by her supportive family and would therefore obviate the need for her to find warden controlled accommodation that is otherwise in short supply in this area.
4. **Assessment**

**Site context**

4.1 The application site forms part of a larger domestic curtilage associated with Homestead Farm which is situated to the north of Chequers Hill/Long Lane. Homestead Farm is accessed on its eastern side via a driveway directly from the road.

4.2 Homestead Farm is a two storey dwelling house with large garden areas on all sides, within the garden area are some existing outbuildings, these include to the south an agricultural storage building with a small hairdressing salon. The garden areas benefit from mature trees and vegetation which enclose the sides and rear of the curtilage.

4.3 The single storey hairdressing salon and storage barn are not extensions to the dwelling house but are located just over 2m away. The storage barn is constructed of metal sheeting and timber with an open lean-to section on its eastern elevation. The hairdressing salon has a pitched roof and has timber windows and pebble dash walls.

4.4 To the west of the application site is a converted barn and to the east and south are fields.

**Proposal**

4.5 The application proposes the demolition and removal of the storage barn to the south of the main dwelling house and which is attached to the hairdressing salon. The hairdressing salon would remain.

4.6 The barn is proposed to be replaced with single storey two bedroom annex which would also provide for a living room, bathroom and kitchen area. The annex would have a pitched roof with pantiles to match the main dwelling house and pebble dash wall finish to match the existing hairdressing salon building.

4.7 There is no separately designated parking or garden ground for the annex proposed. Between the annex and hairdressing salon a utility and storage area is proposed to be created and roofed with profile sheeting.

4.8 The annex building can be comfortably accommodated within the footprint of the demolished barn/storage building.

4.9 The application details that the western elevation roof slope would have solar panels attached.

**Assessment**

4.10 The application site is located in an area of open countryside and as such is subject to the requirements of Saved Policy ENV8 which would require any new development in the open countryside to be for an economic and social activity which demands a rural location.

4.11 The development is not for an economic activity however it would allow for the intent of the social element of Saved Policy ENV8 to be met, as the development would provide for an elderly/infirm relative to be cared for by family members. Due to the economic activity of the family associated with the application a rural location is required.
4.12 Saved Policy HOU21: Annexes directs that the conversion of outbuildings to form self contained annexes may be permitted where the annexe is designed to be ancillary to the main house. In this instance the nearest outbuilding is the storage unit. However, it is not considered that the storage unit would be appropriate for conversion and the removal of this building with a smaller building replacing it will allow for the development of an annexe which is ancillary to the main house in use and appearance to be established.

4.13 The proximity of the annexe proposal to the main house and the hairdressing salon ensure that it could not be used as anything other than ancillary to the existing buildings. Should approval be forthcoming a condition of this nature should be imposed.

4.14 The development is proposed to have two bedrooms, the second being required for a live-in carer. Although this makes the annexe larger than may be expected, it still fits within the footprint of the existing storage barn.

4.15 The development proposal is of a scale and design which is considered to be acceptable in relation to the main dwelling and the salon building. The annexe is proposed to be single storey and have a pitched roof with materials to be used which match the existing buildings. This acknowledgement of the established design principles of the existing buildings meets with the aims and objectives of NPPF 7 and JCS Policy 2.

4.16 The development by virtue of the site location and its minor scale would not impact upon the residential amenity of any property other than Homestead Farm. Therefore the application is considered to meet with the aims and objectives of Saved Policy IMP9.

4.17 Saved Policy IMP2 - Landscaping directs that new development should incorporate a high level of landscaping to ensure that it integrates into its surroundings. Due to the annex being proposed to the rear of the existing house and the level of vegetation that exists around the curtilage, the proposed annex would not be visible within the wider landscape context or directly obvious from the roadside. It is therefore not considered necessary to seek any further planting to mitigate against the visual impact of the development.

Conclusion

4.18 The development will provide for close care for an elderly/infirm relative in a development which, due to its location could only be used as an annexe to the existing dwelling.

4.19 The development will not have any negative impact on the landscape, residential amenity or highway safety.

4.20 It is acknowledged that the development does not fully accord with the aims and objectives of Saved Policy ENV 8 but on balance, given the use proposed, the location of the development and the imposition of conditions the development is considered to be acceptable.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The development would allow for the care of an elderly relative in close proximity to their family in a building which by virtue of its location and proximity to the main dwellinghouse could only be considered to be an annexe in accordance with the guidance of Saved Policy HOU21.

5.2 The development is of a scale and orientation that it would not be detrimental to the residential amenity of any neighbouring properties in accordance with Saved Policy IMP9.
5.3 The development is considered to comply with the aims and objectives of NPPF 7 and JCS Policy 2 as it has been designed to incorporate materials and a roof form which respect the established design principles of the existing dwelling and furthermore the scale of development is subservient to the main dwelling house.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number   Ian Reilly 01508 533674
and E-mail:   ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Development Management Committee
17 October 2012
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South Norfolk Council, Long Stratton, Norwich, Norfolk, NR15 2XE Tel (01508) 533633 Fax (01508) 533625
Enforcement Report

Report of the Development Control Services Manager

Enforcement Ref : 2012/8189
Parish : WYMONDHAM
Site : 70 Damgate Street, Wymondham, NR18 0BH
Development : Erection of Gates Adjacent to a Highway in Curtilage of Grade II Listed Building Without Consent
Developer : Mrs S Luiska

1. **Background**

1.1 It was brought to our attention in June 2012 that the owner of 70 Damgate Street had erected entrance gates to the property which are immediately adjacent to the highway.

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

1.3 The Conservation Officer assessed the gates and stated that in relation to the adjacent bridge the gate and posts are too high and have an adverse impact on views.

1.4 The Highways Officer of Norfolk County Council also assessed the gates and quoted from their Safe and Sustainable Development document which states at guidance note 3.7:

> ‘Any new or replacement gates, security barriers or any other obstacles to free access into development sites must be set back a sufficient distance to allow the longest vehicles that would regularly be expected to visit the site, to stand clear of the carriageway whilst the gates, security barrier or other obstacle is operated.’

The Highways Officer states they would normally suggest this distance be 5 metres. At this location a driver would have to wait in Damgate Street, either blocking the highway or parked partially on the footway and double yellow lines whilst the gates are opened. The gates as erected would not therefore meet with our standard guidance.

1.5 A number of residents have also complained to the Council regarding of the erection of the gates.

2. **Planning Policies**

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework - which replaces :-
National Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5): Planning for the Historic Environment
Section 12: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

2.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2: Promoting Good Design

2.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
IMP 8: Safe and Free Flow of Traffic
IMP 9: Residential Amenity
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Building
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Building
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas
3. **Assessment**

3.1 The dwelling is a Grade II Listed Building located within the Wymondham Conservation Area. The property is semi-detached and forms the southern end of a range of dwellings dating back to the early sixteenth century, the development has a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area setting.

3.2 It is concluded that the significance of the heritage asset has been eroded by the erection of the gates.

4. **Recommendation**

4.1 That, subject to legal advice, enforcement action is taken requiring the removal of the gates and all supporting posts within a period of 2 months from the date the enforcement notice takes effect.
### PLANNING APPEALS

**Appeals received from 04 September 2012 to 03 October 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish/Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/0983</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM Land at Oaklands East Morley Lane</td>
<td>Mr Scott Rudling</td>
<td>Outline planning application for the erection of a detached single storey dwelling house with rooms in roof including means of access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/0061</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM 70 Damgate Street</td>
<td>Ms S Luiska</td>
<td>Retention of UPVC windows to side and front elevations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/0062</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM 70 Damgate Street</td>
<td>Ms S Luiska</td>
<td>Retention of UPVC windows and door to the rear of the property, flue and CCTV cameras.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appeal decisions from 04 September 2012 to 03 October 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>2011/1805</td>
<td>HINGHAM Ex Wheelers Site, Watton Road</td>
<td>Mr D Thomas</td>
<td>Proposed demolition of ex industrial units and new residential development and additional garden to Cedar Cottages</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Appeal Dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>