Development Management Committee
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Please note that item numbers 5-12 will not be heard by the Committee before 3.15 pm

Pool of Substitutes
Leslie Dale
Nigel Legg
Brian Riches

Pre-Committee Members' Question Time
12.00pm – 12.30pm  Blomefield Room

Date
Wednesday 5 December 2012

Time
1.00 pm

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

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

Email: democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Website: www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

Please note that the order of the agenda may change at the discretion of the Chairman, so it is advisable to arrive at the commencement of the meeting if you are intending to speak on items 1 – 4, and arrive at 3.15 pm if you intend to speak on items 5-12.

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
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 6A)

4. Minutes of the Development Management Committee held on 7 November 2012;
   (attached – page 7)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 18)

   To consider the applications as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Planning Ref No.</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2012/1037</td>
<td>COSTESSEY</td>
<td>Phase 4, Queen’s Hill, Costessey</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2011/2093</td>
<td>MULBARTON</td>
<td>Land East Of Long Lane, Mulbarton</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2012/0405</td>
<td>BIXLEY</td>
<td>Land to the west of Octagon Farm Bungay Road Bixley</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2012/1702</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Land Between Burdock Close And Blackthorn Road</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2011/1082</td>
<td>WACTON</td>
<td>Land adj. 31 Hall Lane, Wacton</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2012/1308</td>
<td>TOPCROFT</td>
<td>Puffa Meadow Rectory Road Topcroft</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2012/1359</td>
<td>FORNCETT</td>
<td>8 Orchard Close Forncett St. Peter</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2012/1545</td>
<td>ASLACTON</td>
<td>Pearl Farm The Street Aslacton</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2012/1638</td>
<td>BAWBURGH</td>
<td>Hillside Stocks Hill Bawburgh</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2012/1658</td>
<td>ROYDON</td>
<td>Land Next To Manor Lodge Manor Road Roydon</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2012/1740</td>
<td>TASBURGH</td>
<td>Watermill House Low Road Tasburgh</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2012/1951</td>
<td>DISS</td>
<td>23 Willbye Avenue Diss</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Sites Sub-Committee;**

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

7. **Enforcement Report**  
(attached – page 100)

8. **Planning Appeals (for information)**  
(attached – page 103)

9. **Date of next scheduled meeting** – Wednesday 9 January 2013
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;
  - Local member
- 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><strong>Fire alarm</strong></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><strong>Mobile phones</strong></td>
<td>Please switch off your mobile phone or put it into silent mode.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toilets</strong></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><strong>Break</strong></td>
<td>There will be a short comfort break after two hours if the meeting continues that long.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drinking water</strong></td>
<td>A water dispenser is provided in the corner of the Council Chamber for your use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS

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

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

#### Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

Report of Director of Development and Environment

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

A Advert
AD Certificate of Alternative Development
CA Conservation Area
CU Change of Use
D Reserved Matters (Detail following outline consent)
F Full (details included)
H Householder – Full application relating to residential property
C Application to be determined by County Council

G Proposal by Government Department
HZ Hazardous Substance
LB Listed Building
LE Certificate of Lawful Existing development
LP Certificate of Lawful Proposed development
O Outline (details reserved for later)
RVC Removal/Variation of Condition
SU Proposal by Statutory Undertaker

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

S.P Structure Plan
S.N.L.P South Norfolk Local Plan
P.D Permitted Development – buildings and works which do not normally require planning permission. (The effect of the condition is to require planning permission for the buildings and works specified).
J.C.S Joint Core Strategy
N.P.P.F National Planning Policy Framework
Development Management Committee  5 December 2012

Major Applications or Applications Raising Issues of Significant Precedent

1. Appl. No : 2012/1037
Parish : COSTESSEY
Applicants Name : Bovis Homes Ltd
Site Address : Phase 4, Queen's Hill, Costessey, Norwich, NR8 5ET
Proposal : Proposed residential development of 115 dwellings including associated infrastructure

Recommendation : Approve with conditions

1 In accordance with submitted drawings
2 Materials
3 Water efficiency scheme to be submitted
4 No occupation until it has been shown that adequate capacity of the existing foul sewerage network and pumping stations exists to cater for the foul flows from the development and that both the northern and southern pumping stations have been adopted by Anglian Water
5 Landscaping
6 No occupation of any dwelling until the bus link from Ringland Lane to the development has been provided

Subject to S106 legal agreement to provide financial contributions towards the production and implementation of a Travel Plan for the whole of Queen’s Hills, highway improvements to Ringland Lane, and a highway contribution in accordance with that required by the Bovis appeal decision 2007/1443.

Introduction

This application was deferred by members of the Development Management Committee on the 15th August 2012 for the following reason:

• The design and amount of 3-storey dwellings is unacceptable. Members had no objection in principle, but required amended plans to be submitted to address their concerns.

Amended plans have now been received from the applicants that show a re-designed 3-storey dwelling and a reduction in its use throughout the site.

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
COS 1: Housing allocation, north of the River Tud, Costessey
Development Management Committee
5 December 2012

2. Planning History

2.1 2001/1435/O Outline application for residential development (approx. 1400 dwellings) Allowed at appeal

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council No objection, although raise concerns with parking areas and possible anti social behaviour. Previous issues at QH indicate that the road widths are too narrow with a lack of off-street parking.

3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate.

3.3 NCC Highways No objection, subject to a S106 legal agreement requiring financial contributions towards a Travel Plan, and a deed of variation of an existing legal agreement to allow a financial contribution to provide for improvements to Ringland Lane to facilitate bus links to the site.

3.4 Environment Agency No objection, subject to appropriate conditions.

3.5 Ecologist Supports the proposed ecological mitigation within the Ecological Appraisal. Development of this site needs to contribute towards overall Green Infrastructure in the area.

3.6 Landscape Officer A query has been raised about the need to fell an Oak tree at the edge of the site adjacent Spinks Lane. This issue will be updated verbally at committee. No objection to the remainder of the scheme.

3.7 Anglian Water Services Ltd None received.

3.8 Environmental Services (Protection) None received.

3.9 NCC: Planning Obligations Co-Ordinator No objection, subject to financial contributions towards the provision of a 420-place school (extended from 350).

3.10 Local Residents 3 letters of objection received

- Transport / access issues
- Object to the use of 2.5 storey buildings
- Green areas provide convenient access for fly-tipping.
- Trees should be protected

4. Assessment

4.1 Members have already considered the overall layout and design of the application and raised no objection. My previous committee report is attached as appendix 2.

4.2 Taking on board the members concerns in respect of the 3-storey elements of the scheme, the applicants have amended their design by reducing the height of the dwellings and removing some of the vertical emphasis to their frontage. The majority of 3-storey dwellings fronting onto the road are now 2 ½ storeys in height, and are considered to be better proportioned. Units fronting the access road to the site have also been amended so that the adjoining dwellings have a better relationship in terms of scale and height.
4.3 Both the Design Officer and I now feel that the amendments to the scheme have satisfactorily addressed the concerns expressed by members, and that the application can be approved.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposals broadly fulfil the requirements of the approved Masterplan, and as amended, are now of a sufficient standard to accord with the requirements of JCS Policy 2. Subject to the funding and provision of a Travel Plan, and improvements to Ringland Lane to facilitate bus links to the site, the development shall not have a detrimental impact on the highway network. Subject to financial contributions towards improvements to the primary school on site, it has been demonstrated that adequate education provision can be afforded to accommodate the development.

5.2 Subject to the above, the applications broadly accord with policies 1 & 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, adopted March 2011, and policies COS1 & IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003. It is recommended that application be approved.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Gary Hancox 01508 533841 ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
2. **Appl. No**: 2011/2093  
**Parish**: MULBARTON

Applicants Name: Welbeck Strategic Land - Mr Erik Pagano  
Site Address: Land East Of Long Lane Mulbarton Norfolk NR14 8AW  
Proposal: Development of 180 dwellings (Use Class C3), access, allotments,  
public open space and associated infrastructure.

Recommendation: Approve

1. Outline Permission Time Limit  
2. Standard outline requiring RM  
3. In accordance with approved details  
4. Standard Outline Condition highways  
5. Construction Traffic (Parking)  
6. Construction Traffic Management  
7. Wheel Cleaning Facilities  
8. Highway improvements  
9. Highway improvements (timing)  
10. Traffic Regulation Orders  
11. Interim Travel Plan  
12. Traffic monitoring  
13. Additional traffic assessment  
14. Surface Water Drainage  
15. Foul Sewerage Network  
16. Archaeological Works  
17. External materials to be agreed  
18. Retention trees and hedges  
19. Tree protection  
20. Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
21. Fire Hydrants

Subject to a S106 legal agreement providing for developer contributions towards education, as  
required by County Council, and as required through local negotiations with the schools, libraries,  
travel plan, off-site highway works, provision of land for a doctors surgery and an affordable  
housing agreement confirming the type, tenure, and mix of affordable housing, including its  
affordability in perpetuity.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework

NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
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

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 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 15: Service Villages
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan

ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
ENV 14: Habitat protection
ENV 15: Species protection
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links

2. Planning History

2.1 2011/0821 Screening Opinion for new residential development and accessible public spaces EIANR

3. Consultations

3.1 Mulbarton Parish Council
The parish council have advised of their objection to the development and that they will be seeking to initiate a judicial review on any grant of approval as they wish to develop their own neighbourhood plan. Their main objection is that the site is located in the wrong place and would lead to increased pressure on the road network.

Flordon Parish Council
Concerns regarding the possible increase in traffic down Long Lane.

Swardeston Parish Council
No comments received

3.2 District Members:
Cllr N G M Legg
The application should be determined by committee, as it is a major development outside of the development boundary.

Cllr J Herbert
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Conservation Officer
No objections

3.4 Anglian Water Services Ltd
No objection subject to conditions

3.5 Environment Agency
No objections. Conditions recommended.

3.6 English Heritage
No objections

3.7 Environmental Services
No objections subject to EA conditions being imposed

3.8 Historic Environment Service
No objections. Conditions recommended

3.9 Housing Strategy Manager
No objections subject to securing the affordable housing provision through a section 106.

3.10 Landscape Officer
No objections

3.11 Natural England -
No objections
3.12 NCC Highways  No objection subject to conditions and agreements secured through a Section 106.

3.13 NCC- Planning Obligations  No objections

3.14 Public Right Of Way  No objections

3.15 Police Architectural Liaison Officer  No objections

3.16 Play And Amenities Area Officer  No comments received

3.17 Planning Policy  The application (for 180 dwellings) is on the site of our preferred site in Mulbarton. Preferred sites have emerged after assessment against sustainability criteria during the site selection process. However, we are currently in the middle of a public consultation on our preferred sites, and additional evidence received at this time could affect the ‘preferred’ status of a site.

Our preferred site is smaller than the application site, and we have suggested 150 dwellings as a limit, subject to suitable access/highways work. However, there is currently a shortage of housing supply in the Norwich Policy Area.

Other constraints on the site include surface water drainage, water supply and sewerage capacity, with water mains crossing the site. A draft policy consideration is that the development of this site should contribute towards B1113/A140 junction improvements.

3.18 The Ramblers (Norfolk Area)  No comments received

3.19 Local Residents  The application has been subject to 151 letters of representation. There have been 149 received objecting to the development. The objections raise the following issues:

- Increased flooding
- Increased urbanisation of the locality
- The density of the development is too high
- The development is contrary to Saved Policies ENV8 and IMP8
- The village is only supposed to have a further 15 – 20 dwellings
- The development is contrary to the aims of NPPF as it is not sustainable
- Loss of privacy for neighbouring dwellings
- Increase in noise pollution for neighbouring dwellings
- Light and CO2 pollution from cars
- The rural character of the route in and out of the village will be lost
- The lack of a five year land supply is not be a good reason to approve the development
- Currently inadequate road and footpath/cycleway system which will be come worse with increased traffic and the proposals to increase provision are not sufficient
• The new junction proposed at Long Lane, The Rosary and Cuckoofield Lane is inadequate
• Community consultation event was misleading
• The relocation of the surgery will lead to increased traffic on The Rosary
• The development is in the wrong place, if a new development is required it should be to the north of the village where there are better roads.
• Traffic concerns regarding construction traffic and workers cars
• There is no need for a mini roundabout adjacent Mulbarton Hall it would restrict rather than improve flow of traffic and damage the rural amenity and environment of Mulbarton Common
• Highway work impacts on the conservation area and the listed Mulbarton Hall
• The development will not result in any modal shift occurring
• The relocation of the surgery will fragment the existing services encouraging people to drive rather than walk
• The Hopkins development is unfinished and has houses still for sale
• The current services would not be able to cope with extra demand
• No parking for allotment holders to the north
• Concerns regarding when traffic count took place

A letter of support has been received from the Humbleyard Doctors Surgery it advises that:
• The current surgery building is at the end of its useful life and has been identified as requiring to be replaced
• The building cannot be given any further significant extensions which would allow for the provision of further medical staff to meet the demands of the growing population of Mulbarton and surrounding localities
• The current proposals represent the best chance the doctors surgery has of being able to meet the current and future demands of the area

A letter of support has been received from the Chair of Governors of Mulbarton Primary School on behalf of the two Mulbarton Schools. It advises the following:
• The developers have initiated conversations with the schools at an early stage and have taken on board concerns which have been raised
• They have agreed to fund improvements for the car park and footpaths which will come some way to increasing road safety for school users
• The number of children which would be resultant from the development could be accommodated currently however, due to no monies being received from the Hopkins Homes development this would seriously stretch resources. Therefore providing that education payments are made then extra demand at the schools could be accommodated in standards at least as good as present.
4. **Assessment**

**Site Context**

4.1 The application site is approximately 13.4 ha of agricultural land and is located on the south eastern corner of Mulbarton. Its northern boundary runs along 'The Rosary' and its western boundary along Long Lane. Further to the west is an ongoing residential development and The Rosary on the north contains existing residential properties in a linear fashion on both sides of the road. The eastern and southern sides of the application site are adjacent open farmland.

4.2 The northern boundary has two separate land conditions with the eastern side adjoining the rear garden areas of residential properties and the western a series of allotments. The boundary areas are generally well vegetated with dense hedging and trees, there is also an existing pond within the site and public footpath on the eastern side.

4.3 The site is gently slopping and has been divided into four fields. The fields have hedgerow boundaries these have a network of associated wet ditches along their base.

**Proposal**

4.4 The outline planning application proposes the development of the site for residential purposes with provision for 180 dwellings, access, public open space and associated infrastructure. All matters are reserved apart from access.

4.5 There are two vehicular access points (north and south) proposed on the eastern boundary giving access onto Long Lane.

4.6 Although the proposal is in outline form only, the application has been accompanied by supporting plans detailing height, density, land use and green infrastructure parameters which demonstrate that the site can accommodate 180 dwellings.

**Principle of development**

4.7 The application site is located in an area of open countryside as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan and as such the proposal is considered to be contrary to Saved Policy ENV8, therefore the application should be refused unless there are other development plan policies and/or material considerations which would dictate otherwise.

4.8 JCS Policy 9 advises that 1800 dwellings will be required in the Norwich Policy Area within sustainable sites. Furthermore the NPPF directs that there will be a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that relevant policies for the supply of housing land cannot be considered up to date where a 5 year land supply of deliverable sites does not exist. Currently there is not a 5 year land supply for housing in the NPA.

4.9 Mulbarton is identified within the JCS Policy 15 as a service village; these are considered appropriate for small scale developments ie 10-20 dwellings. Mulbarton is considered to be a highly ranked service village in terms of its community provisions, which include a primary school, food shop, village hall and public transport services to Norwich and other main towns. JCS Policy 15 goes on to state that 20 dwellings may be exceeded where a specific site is identified which can be demonstrated to improve service provision and sustainability, and where it is compatible with the overall strategy.

4.10 The application proposes to develop the site for up to 180 dwellings, which is larger than the suggested amount given by JCS Policy 15. However, given the amount of dwellings required within the NPA, as stated in JCS Policy 9, and the direction provided by the NPPF regarding the 5 year land supply issue the principle of development is considered to be acceptable. Therefore the development should be considered on its sustainability merits, impacts on the existing locality and its potential to be delivered within 5 years.
4.11 It should also be noted that the application site encompasses Site No 1146/S0141 which has been identified through the South Norfolk Council Local Plan Site Specific Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document for residential development with a suggested land use of 150 dwellings.

**Sustainability**

4.12 The NPPF requires for there to be a presumption in favour of sustainable development and identifies that there are three dimensions to sustainable development. These are listed as economic, social and environmental.

4.13 The site is considered to be located within close distance to a food store, primary school, village hall and doctors surgery. The site is also serviced well by bus routes and road network to allow for commuting. These factors allow for social and economic benefits to be established through the development of the site in accordance with the direction of the NPPF and JCS Policy 7.

4.14 It should also be noted that through the delivery of the Section 106 legal agreement the doctors’ surgery could be relocated to within the application site.

4.15 The application is accompanied by landscape and ecological documentation which demonstrate that the development could be carried out without any significant negative impact to biodiversity or landscape features. Should approval be forthcoming, the development would be subject to detailed landscaping plans with a focus on the retention of hedgerows and quality open space provision. The enhancement of environmental features and the establishment of managed green infrastructure will allow for the environmental element of the NPPF and the intent of JCS Policy 1 to be successfully adhered to.

4.16 It is proposed to enhance and maintain the existing drainage system of field drains and attenuation ponds to provide for all storm events of up to 1 in 100 year events plus an allowance of 30% for climate change factors. SUDS techniques are also proposed to address water quality issues.

4.17 The application has not been subject to any objections from the Environment Agency or the Council’s Flood Risk Officer and as such is considered to comply with the requirements of NPPF Section 10 and JCS Policies 1 and 3.

4.18 The planning application is supported with details regarding the archaeological qualities of the site and it has been agreed with Historic Environment Services that conditions should be attached to any grant of approval to ensure that the development complies with the aims and objectives of NPPF Section 12.

**Highway Impacts**

4.19 The application is in outline form with all matters reserved except for access. There are two vehicular access points proposed to serve the development, these are located on the western side of the site and provide direct access onto Long Lane.

4.20 As part of the proposal the following highway improvements are to be implemented:

- Mini round about at the junction of Long Lane and The Common
- Extended paving at the mini roundabout on all sides of the junction
- A crossing table on The Common
- Relocation and extension of 20mph zone along The Rosary
- Road alignment, road marking and over run works to the junction of Long Lane and The Rosary
- Footpath and crossing provision to the proposed northern access entrance of the site
- Creation of 2.4 metre x 40 metre visibility splays
- Signage for cycle and pedestrian shared surface.
- Traffic Calming measures

4.21 The Highway Authority has negotiated these works and has not objected to the development of the site on the provision that these works are delivered through the imposition of appropriate conditions.

4.22 It is acknowledged that a significant number of objections cover issues to do with highway safety and functionality, however given that the Highway Authority have not objected to the development on highway impact grounds the application will not be considered for refusal on this issue and the proposal is therefore considered to accord with the requirements of Saved Local Plan Policy IMP8.

4.23 The agent has confirmed with the Highway Authority that all of the highway improvement works are within land which is either publically maintained highway or within land under the ownership of the applicant.

Design

4.24 JCS Policy 2 and Section 7 of the NPPF require high quality design and great importance is attached to the design of the built environment, with it being seen as a key aspect of sustainable development. The planning application has demonstrated that the site can be developed having appropriate regard to its context, and provides for open space and play areas, permeable links to the wider countryside and local facilities, sustainable drainage, as well as a good mix of housing, to include single storey dwellings, apartments and the required 33% affordable housing.

4.25 The proposed development of 180 dwellings will result in an overall site density of 25 dwellings per hectare, this does not include the large areas of public open space. It is considered that this level of development is acceptable and would not result in a development which would be out of character with the locality. Furthermore it is not considered that this development density is objectionable for a site located so close to the village, local services and with good local connections to existing development. In terms of scale, the applicants context appraisal has adequately demonstrated that the site is capable of accommodating buildings up to 3 storeys in height.

4.26 Taking into account the above, it is my opinion that the development of this site would accord with Section 7 of the NPPF and Policy 2 of the JCS in this regard. It is also considered that the development proposal by virtue of the proposed density, mix of buildings heights and open grassland accords with the principles of the South Norfolk Council Place making Guide which seeks for development to take account of the established design principles of the locality. Should approval be forthcoming further detail will also be provided through the reserved matters application.

Deliverability

4.27 NPPF section 6 directs that residential developments to be considered for meeting any short fall in the five year land supply should be deliverable within the five year period.

4.28 The application site is available and the land owner is the applicant. The site does not have any known constraints which would restrict it from being built out within the five year period. The development proposal has shown a mixture of house types and is therefore attractive to mixture of demand.
4.29 The application is therefore considered to be deliverable within a five year period and is therefore in accordance with this element of the NPPF.

**Residential amenity**

4.30 In accordance with saved policy IMP9 of the SNLP, planning permission will only be granted for new development where there is no significant adverse impact on the amenity of residents through overlooking, overshadowing, setting of adjacent buildings or other impact on the privacy and amenity of nearby dwellings.

4.31 It is considered that the future site layout can be designed in such a manner to avoid any direct overlooking or impact in terms of overshadowing of habitable rooms of the nearby residential properties.

**Conclusion**

4.32 The village of Mulbarton has been identified through the JCS and the South Norfolk Council Local Plan - Site Specific Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document as a service village which is capable of providing for further expansion above the normal levels associated with service villages. The application site is considered to be in a sustainable location and capable of delivering the proposed development within the next five years.

4.33 The development application is in outline form only and should approval be forthcoming details regarding design and layout will need to be addressed. However, from the parameter plans and indicative masterplan provided it is clear than that the provision of 180 dwellings can be achieved at a density which would respect the character of the area with large areas of open parkland also created.

4.34 The proposal would provide for a sustainable residential development which could be delivered within five years. It is accepted that there is not a five year supply of 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. The lack of a five year land supply and the requirements of the NPPF are a very strong material consideration in favour of the application.

4.35 The requirements of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development outweigh other material considerations and the application can be accepted as a departure from Saved Policy ENV8.

5. **Reasons for Approval**

5.1 The proposal would provide for a sustainable residential development which could be delivered within five years. It is accepted that there is not a five year supply of 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. The lack of a five year land supply and the requirements of the NPPF are a very strong material consideration in favour of the application.

5.2 The requirements of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development outweigh other material considerations and the application can be accepted as a departure from Saved Policy ENV8.

5.3 The masterplan and supporting documents have demonstrated that the site can be developed with regard to the existing design principles of the locality and therefore subject to appropriate conditions the application is considered to comply with the aims and objectives of NPPF Section 7 and JCS Policy 2.
5.4 The development would provide for a wide choice of housing types, with 33% of the units being for affordable housing. The mix of house type and tenure is considered to comply with aims and objectives of NPPF Section 6 and JCS Policy 4.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:
Ian Reilly 01508 533674
ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
3. **Appl. No**: 2012/0405  
**Parish**: BIXLEY  

Applicants Name: Trustees Of Arminghall Settlement  
Site Address: Land To The of West Octagon Farm Bungay Road Bixley Norfolk NR14 8SA  

Proposal: Application for outline planning permission for mixed use development for community, residential and commercial uses and associated external works. A new electricity substation, new pumping station, SUDS (including pond) and open spaces are included in the proposal.

Recommendation: Approve

1. Outline permission time limit  
2. Required RM  
3. In accordance with submitted amendments  
4. External materials to be agreed  
5. Surface water drainage (inc. details of SUDS) in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment  
6. Details of foul water disposal  
7. Ecological mitigation plan to be submitted and agreed  
8. Archaeology  
9. Details of roads, footways etc.  
10. Estate roads in accordance with approved drawings  
11. Estate roads to binder course before occupation  
12. Construction traffic parking  
13. Wheel cleaning facilities  
14. Highway improvements – offsite  
15. No development until Traffic Regulation Order has been promoted  
16. Full details of external lighting  
17. Retention of trees and hedges  
18. Tree planting  
19. Tree protection  
20. Landscape management plan  
21. Fire hydrants

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

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
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 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 14: Key Service Centres  
Policy 20: Implementation
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
   IMP 9: Residential amenity
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)

2. Planning History

2.1 No planning history (planning applications).

3. Consultations

3.1 Bixley Parish Council  Refuse
   - inappropriate design.

3.2 Poringland Parish Council  No comments received

3.3 District Members:  Cllr Trevor Lewis  To committee.
   Cllr Lisa Neal  Accepts that the plan is sustainable, however consider the design of
   the houses to be quite ugly.

3.4 SNC: Environmental Services  No objection subject to appropriate conditions.

3.5 NCC- Planning Obligations  Request the following planning obligations: Education £344, 138;
   Libraries £3, 600, and; Green Infrastructure £3000.

3.6 Ecologist  No objection subject to a condition requiring an ecological mitigation plan to be submitted.

3.7 SNC: Planning Policy  Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not
   be considered up-to-date if there is no demonstrable five-year supply. Other plan policies are not implicated in this
   statement. The addition of 60 dwellings will have a limited beneficial effect on South Norfolk’s five-year supply of
   housing land. This benefit, like all others, must be weighed against the negative impacts of any scheme.

3.8 SNC: Landscape Officer  To be reported.

3.9 SNC: Design Officer  Support the scheme (as amended), which now scores highly when assessed against the revised Building for Life criteria.

3.10 Norfolk Wildlife Trust  No comments received

3.11 SNC: Housing Strategy Manager  Support, having agreed an in principle mix and tenure for the 33%
   affordable housing proposed.

3.12 Historic Environment Service  No objection subject to a condition requiring the submission, agreement and implementation of a written scheme of investigation.

3.13 Anglian Water Services Ltd  No objection.

3.14 Environment Agency  No objection, subject to appropriate conditions.
3.15 NCC Highways

Concern is expressed about the sustainability of this site and that there are other sites that should be developed ahead of this site. However, subject to the creation of a right hand turn lane at the entrance to the site, no technical objection is raised.

3.16 Local Residents

17 individual letters of objection received to original plans

- traffic impact on the B1332
- would not embrace village identity
- will make drainage issues worse
- noise pollution
- impact on the capacity of the school
- location of the site is too far from local services
- not enough parking for commercial units
- design of properties is alien to their surroundings
- additional bus stop will add to traffic issues
- poor design
- site is not allocated and application is premature
- will add to ribbon development of Poringland
- lack of social integration with rest of village
- loss of natural habitat
- wider buffer to the Ramblers needed
- no local support for the development
- no requirement for industrial units in the area
- lack of benefit to the wider community

1 letter of support
- will help to create additional employment opportunities

4. Assessment

4.1 This outline application seeks consent for a mix of employment and residential uses including the erection of up to 60 dwellings on a site just to the north of Poringland / Framingham Earl. The 2.9 hectare site actually falls within the parish of Bixley, although in terms of planning policy, the site is read as part of Poringland / Framingham Earl. The proposals also include the provision of affordable housing (33%), and a new vehicular access from Bungay Road. The proposed density of development would be approx. 25 dwellings per hectare. A location plan of the site is attached as appendix 1, and a summary of the proposals is attached as appendix 2 to this report.

4.2 The site is bounded by the B1332 to the east and existing housing to the south, known as The Ramblers. The village of Arminghall is approx. 0.5km away to the north beyond farmland. The existing land north of The Ramblers is distinctly rural in character comprising fields and hedgerows interspersed with trees.

4.3 As the site is located outside the current development boundary in an area of open countryside (as defined by the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003), the application is clearly contrary to saved local plan 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 taken into account:

- The provisions of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS), which allocates Poringland / Framingham Earl for further development of 100 - 200 dwellings during the period 2011 to 2026.
There is an acknowledged lack of a 5-year housing supply within the Norwich Policy Area. (There is 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 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 sustainability of the site's location, adjacent a Key Service Centre (as defined in Policy 14 of the JCS).
- The site appears to be deliverable (as defined by section 6 of the NPPF) in that it is available now and offers a reasonable prospect of being delivered within the next 5 years).
- Other relevant sections of the NPPF as set out in par. 1.1 above.

4.4 It will be noted from section 3 above that there has been a significant amount of objection to the proposal from local residents raising a number of issues. In my opinion, the critical issue that members need to address is the principle of the development having regard to:

- The provisions of the NPPF, the adopted JCS, and the requirement to achieve a 5-year land supply of housing.
- The suitability of the site having regard to its sustainability and the impact on the landscape and ecology.
- Drainage & flood risk
- Highway Impact
- Indicative design and layout

NPPF, JCS & the 5-year land supply of housing

4.5 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 planning policies referred to need to be up-to-date. The GNDP has accepted that there is a 5-year land supply deficit within the Norwich Policy Area, 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’.

4.6 In allocating Poringland (including Framingham Earl) as a key service centre, JCS Policy 14 acknowledges that the community has a dispersed provision of local shops and services, as well as a high school and a primary school. They also have key public transport services for journeys to work and leisure purposes. Due to the significant amount of housing commitments (as of 2008) not built, this community only has an allocation of between 100 - 200 dwellings (plus an amount of the floating 1800 district requirement to be decided), and the proposed development fits within this range.

4.7 It is noted that many residents feel that the site should not be considered ahead of specific sites having been allocated for development through the Local Development Framework process. However, taking the above into account I feel that the proposed development cannot be dismissed purely on the grounds of prematurity, and that the demonstrable lack of a 5-year housing supply carries significant weight in the consideration of the application.
The suitability of the site having regard to its sustainability and the impact on the landscape and ecology

4.8 In terms of location, the site is adjacent a Key Service Centre that by definition is considered to be sustainable both economically and socially. In this case the site is also located close to the secondary school, shop and post office. The applicants also make the point that the site is closer to Norwich than other potential housing sites and therefore journey times for the commute to Norwich would be less, and that there would be less traffic impact on the ‘five ways’ roundabout than other preferred sites to the south. A disadvantage to this site however, is that it is located at the northern end of the built-up area, away from some of the services located in the central / southern area of Poringland / Framingham Earl. The applicants also point out that the development of this site would bring with it the opportunity to secure future access to Poringland Wood for 25 additional years (currently benefiting from a 25 year access agreement expiring in 2025, and managed by South Norfolk Council).

4.9 A landscape and visual impact assessment has been submitted with the application that concludes that long open views of this site would be interrupted by woodland, hedgerows and settlement. The undulating nature of the landform and the presence of woodland blocks to the north of the site restrict direct views to and from Norwich, and views within this plateau farmland landscape would be uncompromised. I would concur with this view. Furthermore, in my opinion the existing northern boundary of the Ramblers development (currently forming the defined edge of the settlement) is poor visually, and a sensitive development of this site incorporating a degree of planting could enhance this settlement edge. When viewed from the Arminghall direction the landscape quality would not be harmed by development of the site.

4.10 Overall I have concluded that the development of the site, subject to an appropriately design scheme, is capable of being sustainable in terms of landscape impact.

4.11 The ecological survey submitted with the scheme indicates that the development of the site will result in the loss of an arable field of generally low ecological value, with some loss of habitat for breeding birds, roosting/foraging for bats, and reptiles (a population of grass snakes was found on site). Mitigation will therefore be required, and the District Ecologist is content that the Masterplan for the site can accommodate this and recommends a suitably worded condition to be applied to any approval granted. It is also recommended that the applicant considers the wider ecological landscape and the opportunities for green infrastructure provision to offset the loss of farmland habitat (a requirement of Section 11 of the NPPF and Policy 1 of the JCS). In this case, there are opportunities for hedgerow enhancement/provision between the pockets of woodland close to the site, and this could be required by condition.

4.12 Taking into account the above, I consider the site to be sustainable and capable of contribution towards the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF.

Drainage & flood risk

4.13 The applicants have submitted a drainage scheme and flood risk assessment that has taken account of the Poringland Integrated Urban Drainage Pilot Study, and proposes a sustainable drainage solution that utilises existing natural catchment areas. The surface water run-off from this development will be managed so as not to exceed existing Greenfield run-off rates, utilising permeable paving, swales, pipes and an attenuation pond with restricted outfall. Both the Environment Agency and the Council's Flood Defence Officer have no objection to this approach, which is considered to accord with Section 10 of the NPPF.
Highway Impact

4.14 It will be noted that NCC: Highways question the sustainability of building to the north of Poringland, and maintain the view that other sites in Poringland should be developed ahead of this site. However, they also acknowledge that subject to the creation of a right turn lane, and the extension of the 30mph limit, there is no technical objection to the development of the site. Although local residents have expressed concern at the potential impact on the Bungay Road in terms of additional traffic movements, NCC: highways do not consider this to be a significant concern.

4.15 As already outlined above, I feel that having due regard to the NPPF, the site is in a sustainable location. As there is no technical highway objection to the scheme, subject to appropriate conditions requiring appropriate off-site highway works, the development would not have a significant adverse impact on the highway network and accords with saved local plan policy IMP8.

Indicative design and layout

4.16 The applicants have submitted an indicative Masterplan for the site that shows how the site could be developed taking account of its context and the character and appearance of the area. Following recent amendments to the scheme, the Design Officer has assessed the application having regard to the design criteria set out in the Building for Life guidance (as required by JCS Policy 2). The site layout responds positively to the existing residential development to the south by continuing the incremental growth of the settlement from the urban edge into a more agricultural character. The pattern of development along Bungay Road follows a sequence of buildings that provide a strong street presence that responds to the incremental growth of Poringland. Commercial buildings are proposed opposite the existing barn complex, reflecting the existing uses in this area.

4.17 The design principles for the proposal have been developed out of a desire to better connect the site with the surrounding landscape and to closer reflect the agricultural character of surrounding buildings. The overall concept brings together landscape and built form, through a regular site layout and architectural style that aim to reflect the more functional character of farm buildings, as well as trying to create an informal landscape that connects views of the countryside with the site. The scheme has also broadly taken into account the guidance contained within the Council’s recently adopted Place making Guide.

4.18 The comments of local residents in respect of amenity impact is noted, however I am satisfied that the Masterplan layout shows how the site can be developed without significantly harming the amenities of neighbouring residents.

4.19 Overall, it is felt that the revised Masterplan for the site will enable a high quality design to be submitted at reserved matters stage, appropriate for the site’s setting and context. Although in outline form only, the application is considered to accord with the required design approach required by JCS Policy 2.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 It is accepted that there is not a five year supply of sites within the Norwich Policy Area. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear and explicit that in such circumstances Local Planning Authorities should consider favourably sustainable development that would address that deficit. The demonstrable lack of a 5-year housing supply carries significant weight in the consideration of the 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 in scale to two-storey in height and in numbers to 60 dwellings, can be accepted as a departure from local saved plan policy ENV8, which is given due weight as it remains partly consistent with the published NPPF. In all other respects, and subject to appropriate conditions, the proposed development is in accordance with Sections 6, 7, 10 & 11 of the NPPF, and relevant policies the Joint Core Strategy.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Gary Hancox 01508 533841 ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No**: 2012/1702  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name: NPS Property Consultants Ltd  
Site Address: Land Between Burdock Close And Blackthorn Road Wymondham Norfolk, NR18 0YE  
Proposal: Outline planning application for residential development (37 dwellings) and associated works including new access

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

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 1: Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 3: Energy and water  
Policy 4: Housing delivery  
Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 10: Locations for major new or expanded communities in the Norwich Policy Area  
Policy 13: Main Towns

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  
TRA 19: Parking standards  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
LEI 7: Open space provision in new development  
LEI 8: Loss of recreational or amenity land
2. Planning History

2.1 1994/1706/O Persimmon Homes Site Approved
Harts Farm Road
Wymondham - Residential development; erection of community centre, shops, and school; commercial buildings for the purposes of use classes B1, B2 and/or B8; and provision of open space

3. Consultations

3.1 Wymondham Town Council Approve

3.2 District Member: Cllr Hornby To be determined by committee:
- there may be possible overlooking of houses on Gatekeeper Close

3.3 NCC- Planning Obligations No objections

3.4 NCC Highways No objection. Conditions recommended

3.5 Keith Mitchell - Housing Strategy Manager No objections

3.6 Environmental Protection – Flood Defence Officer No objections

3.7 Ecologist No objections.

3.8 Local Residents There have been 15 letters of representation made on the planning application. 14 of these letters are objections, they raise the following issues:

- The surrounding roads are not wide enough to accommodate the development and the current on street parking issues
- How can a site be too small for a school but accommodate 37 dwellings
- Construction management issues regarding noise, dust, traffic.
- Accumulative development impacts with supermarket(s)
- Capacity at Wymondham High
- Loss of residential amenity (privacy and daylight)
- Density of the proposal is too high
- The application site is good for wildlife and children’s play area
- The development will negatively impact on local services
- The negative impact on residential amenity that the development would have on those who live directly opposite the proposed access point.
- The access should be opposite one of the other junctions it is contrary to Saved Policy IMP8
- Flooding concerns
- Disappointment at the school not being built
One letter of was received which advised of support for the development provided that the existing play area was expanded/improved and that only 37 houses were built.

4. **Assessment**

   **Site Context**

4.1 The application site has an area of 0.81 hectares (2.0 acres) and is located to the south eastern end of the town, to the south of Harts Farm Road. The site is bounded by existing residential development to the north, east and west, with a footway and children’s play area to the south.

4.2 There are no existing trees or soft landscape features within the site. The boundaries of the site include 1.8 metre high timber close boarded fencing to the northern and eastern boundaries, with timber post and rail fencing to the southern and western boundaries.

4.3 The application site was originally allocated through the Harts Farm development for a school. This option has not been taken forward by the County Council as the site is considered to be too small for a new school. The land currently is in the ownership of South Norfolk Council with a legal agreement in place that should the land be sold all receipts will be transferred to the County Council to fund further educational developments.

**Proposal**

4.4 The application seeks outline planning permission for the erection of residential development on the site, with all matters reserved apart from access. The application is accompanied by an illustrative site layout plan demonstrating how the site could be developed with residential development of 37 dwellings (45 dwellings per hectare).

4.5 The access is proposed to be taken on the western boundary directly onto Blackthorn Road.

**Principle of Development**

4.6 Policies 9, 10 and 13 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sets clear targets for growth in the Norwich Policy Area, which includes Wymondham. It is expected that Wymondham will provide at least 2200 new dwellings in the period up to 2026. Given the scale of proposed growth, the Council published the first stage of its Area Action Plan (AAP) for the town early in 2012. This document is not expected to be adopted until sometime in 2013 and therefore no specific sites have been allocated.

4.7 The application site is identified as falling within the defined settlement limit/development boundary with no other environmental or planning designation. As such the principle of the development is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the growth objectives of JCS Policies 9, 10 and 13.

4.8 Saved policy HOU4 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) states that residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements (which includes the town of Wymondham) will be permitted subject to it not prejudicing the supply of land for other purposes.
4.9 The application site lies within the existing defined development limit for the town of Wymondham with no environmental or planning designation. The site lies within a new housing estate with the surrounding pattern of development including residential to the north, east and west, with a footway and children's play area/open space to the south. The use of the site for a residential use will not therefore have any impact on the neighbouring uses and will not prejudice the supply of land for other uses. The principle of a residential use on the site is therefore considered to be in accordance with Saved Policy HOU4 of the SNLP.

Sustainable development

4.10 The NPPF requires for there to be a presumption in favour of sustainable development and identifies that there are three dimensions to sustainable development. These are listed as economic, social and environmental. Furthermore the NPPF clearly directs that where there is no conflict with planning policy development should be approved without delay.

4.11 The location of the site within the development limits ensures that the site is considered to have good access to services and transport links and in regard to those factors is considered to be sustainable and in accordance with the direction of the NPPF and JCS Policy 7.

4.12 The application is accompanied by ecological documentation which demonstrates that the development could be carried out without any significant negative impact to biodiversity and therefore the intent of JCS Policy 1 can be successfully adhered to.

Design

4.13 Policies 1 and 2 of the JCS and NPPF Section 7 require for all new development to be built to the highest possible standards creating a strong sense of place, located and designed to use resources efficiently, minimise greenhouse gas emissions and be adapted to a changing climate and more extreme weather.

4.14 Policy 3 of the JCS also requires for all new major developments to minimise the reliance on non-renewable high carbon energy sources and maximise the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy sources and sustainable construction techniques.

4.15 The application is in outline form but is however accompanied by parameter plans and an indicative layout which show that 37 dwellings can be accommodated on site in a density not dissimilar to that surrounding, which will therefore allow for a high level of design standards to be implemented at the reserved matter stage. The detailed matters regarding the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy sources and sustainable construction techniques will also be addressed at the reserved matter stage and there is nothing within the current application which would indicate that these requirements cannot be successfully incorporated into the development.

4.16 Saved Policy IMP2 of the SNLP seeks to ensure that all new development incorporates a high standard of landscaping to ensure the development will integrate into its surroundings.

4.17 Details of the proposed site layout which will include details of landscaping is reserved for later consideration and there is not considered to be any conflict with Saved Policy IMP2 of the SNLP.

Highways

4.18 Saved Policy TRA19 of the SNLP states that planning permission will not be granted for development unless provision is made for parking, loading and turning areas in accordance with the County Council's adopted car parking standards. Should approval be forthcoming, these standards will form one of the main factors in the design of the overall layout at reserved matters.
4.19 Saved Policy IMP8 of the SNLP states that planning permission will not be granted for development which would endanger highway safety or prejudice the free flow of traffic on the highway network.

4.20 The Highway Authority has not objected to the development in relation to the access proposed. They have suggested some considerations for the applicant to take into account when designing the final layout. These considerations relate to the current on street parking issues and would aim to ensure that the proposed development would not exacerbate an existing problem. The development is therefore considered to comply with the requirements of Saved Policy IMP8.

Residential amenity

4.21 In accordance with saved policy IMP9 of the SNLP, planning permission will only be granted for new development where there is no significant adverse impact on the amenity of residents through overlooking, overshadowing, setting of adjacent buildings or other impact on the privacy and amenity of nearby dwellings.

4.22 The application is only in outline form but the density proposed is similar to the developments surrounding. It is considered that the future site layout can be designed in such a manner to avoid any direct overlooking or impact in terms of overshadowing of habitable rooms of the adjacent residential properties to the north, east and west, or any other impact by way of privacy and amenity of these properties. The indicative site layout is considered to demonstrate this appropriately.

Open Space and Play Provision

4.23 The applicants have undertaken pre-application discussions with the Council regarding the provision of play facilities in accordance with the requirements of Saved Policy LEI7. It has been agreed that a financial contribution to upgrade the children's play area to the south of the site and a further contribution made for the off site provision for older children's play space. The Council is in agreement to this approach and the application therefore complies with Saved Policy LEI7.

4.24 It should be noted that the application site has never been considered to be an amenity or recreational site. The application does therefore not conflict with the Saved Policy LEI8 which seeks to protect areas of amenity and recreational ground.

Affordable Housing

4.25 The site has an area of 0.81 hectares and therefore is required under policy 4 of the JCS to include 33% affordable housing (85% social rented and 15% intermediate). The applicant has provided details of the mix of house type and tenure and provided their agreement to enter into a Section 106 agreement to secure this provision. The application is therefore considered to meet with the requirements of JCS Policy 4.

Drainage

4.26 The Highway Authority and the Councils Flood Defence Officer have both advised that the drainage system proposed in the application documents may not be the best solution to surface water run off issues and therefore requested that should the development be approved that a condition should be attached requiring that full drainage details be submitted to and approved by the Local Authority.

Conclusion

4.27 The principle of the residential development is considered to acceptable by virtue of the site being located within the development limits of Wymondham and Norfolk County Council not taking the option to provide a school on the site due its size limitations.
4.28 The development density proposed is of a scale which is considered to be in keeping with the characteristics of the locality and the indicative layout plan demonstrates that the development could be established without eroding the existing residential amenity.

4.29 The Highway Authority has confirmed that the estate roads are capable of absorbing the proposed increase in traffic volume and suggestions have been made regarding the future layout of the site which should aid the current on street parking and traffic flow issues.

4.30 The application is considered to comply with the intent of the development quality aims and growth objectives of the NPPF and JCS and in particular policies 9, 10 and 13.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The application site is within the development limits of Wymondham and therefore by virtue of its location the principle of development is considered to accord with aims and objectives of the NPPF, JCS Policies 9, 10 and 13 and SNLP Saved Policy HOU4.

5.2 The development proposed is at density which is in keeping with the locality and the indicative masterplan for the site has confirmed that the site can accommodate the proposed level of development without conflicting with the intent of NPPF Section 7, JCS Policies 1 and 2 and SNLP Saved Policies IMP2 and IMP9.

5.3 The local highway network can accommodate the increased level of traffic which would result from the development and the layout can be designed to ensure that the proposal aids the functionality of the highway network in relation to parked cars in accordance with SNLP Saved Policies TRA19 and IMP8.

5.4 The development will provide for a mix and tenure type of affordable dwellings in accordance with the requirements of JCS Policy 4.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Ian Reilly 01508 533674
and E-mail: ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Application Referred back to Committee

5. Appl. No : 2011/1082/F
Parish : WACTON

Applicants Name : Mr Brian Beadle
Site Address : Land adj. 31 Hall Lane, Wacton, Norfolk, NR15 2UH
Proposal : Proposed erection of two storey detached dwelling and detached garage building

Recommendation : Refuse

1 Contrary to JCS Policy 17 & SNLP policy ENV8
2 Outside development boundary
3 Poor design – contrary to JCS policy 2

1. Introduction and Update

1.1 This application was heard by members at the meeting of the Planning Committee on 17 August 2011. The application was recommended for refusal on the grounds of the site being outside of any development boundaries; within a flood risk zone and on a site that failed the sequential test, and due to concerns regarding the design of the proposed dwelling. Members voted to defer consideration of the application to allow the applicant the opportunity to resolve the issues of flood risk and the design.

1.2 The applicant has submitted additional information to the Environment Agency which demonstrates that the area of built development within the site is not within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 and therefore there is no requirement to carry out a sequential test. The Environment Agency are satisfied that the information submitted is correct and have therefore removed their objection, subject to a condition requiring minimum floor levels to be set at a minimum of 40.059mAOD in the event that permission is granted. Taking this into account, the reason for refusal on the original recommendation relating to flood risk is no longer applicable.

1.3 In regard to the design of the proposed dwelling, the applicant has addressed the two main concerns in the committee report of August 2011 by altering the profile of the roof to be hipped only, in keeping with adjoining properties and by revising the siting of the building of the site. Although set slightly further forward than the immediately adjoining property to the south, its position is not out of the context of the building line as a whole of the dwellings on this side of Hall Lane. However, there remain some concerns relating to the fenestration which remain unresolved and therefore the reason for refusal in regard to design remains included in the recommendation.

1.4 The applicant has therefore gone some way to address the concerns outlined in the previous committee report. However, the site remains outside of any development boundaries by virtue of Wacton’s classification in the Joint Core Strategy as a Smaller Rural Community in which new residential development would not normally be permitted unless there was special justification, such as for an agricultural worker who needed to be on site at all times for example. No such justification has been submitted and therefore the application remains contrary to Policy 17.

1.5 It is therefore recommended that the application is refused for the following reasons:

1) The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2011 and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 including, in particular, Policies 2 and 17 of the JCS and policy ENV8 of the Local Plan which can be given due weight as it remains consistent with the aims of the NPPF in regard to residential development.

2) The proposal does not accord with the above Policy 17 of the JCS and policy ENV8 of the Local Plan as the site is located outside of a development limit or village boundary and is not to provide affordable housing to meet a specific local need, connected with agriculture or forestry, justified to sustain economic and social activity in a rural community and demanding a rural location, or for adaptation and re-use of an existing rural community.
The proposal is considered contrary to the above Policy 2 of the JCS as the design of the fenestration is considered to result in a poor design.

Previous Report and Assessment

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Policy
PPS25 – Development and flood risk

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 17: Smaller Rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside

2. Planning History

2.1 1984/1821 Erection of garage Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council : No response received

3.2 District Members
Cllr Andrew Pond : To be determined by Committee
• I believe this is a suitable building for infill
Cllr Terry Blowfield : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : Conditional support

3.4 Environment Agency : Object
• Site within flood risk zones 2 & 3 and therefore local planning authority must conduct a sequential test

3.5 Environmental Services (Protection) : No response received

3.6 Landscape Officer : No objections

3.7 Local Residents : No response received

4. Assessment

4.1 The application is for the erection of a dwelling in what is currently part of the garden of 31 Hall Lane. The plot is to the side of the existing dwelling which fronts onto Hall Lane. The site frontage of the plot is currently largely marked by a mature hedge.

4.2 Upon adoption of the Joint Core Strategy in March, the development boundary for Wacton was removed. Wacton now falls under Policy 17 of the JCS and is not defined as a main town, key service centre, service village or other village in which residential development would be permitted. Policy 17 restricts development unless it is affordable housing or is required to maintain or enhance the rural economy. Policy ENV8 of the South Norfolk

4.3 Local Plan similarly does not permit residential development unless it is required for agriculture or forestry, is justified to sustain economic and social activities in rural communities and demands a rural location, or is for the re-use of redundant rural buildings. None of these exceptions in either policy is applicable in this case and therefore the proposal is clearly contrary to policy.
4.4 The site is also predominantly within Flood Risks Zones 2 and 3. Paragraph D5 of PPS25 requires decision-makers to steer new development to areas at the lowest probability of flooding by applying a sequential test. This demonstrates that there are infill sites in settlements within development boundaries that are preferred locations for new development. As a consequence, the proposal fails the sequential test and is considered contrary to PPS25.

4.5 There are also concerns with the design of the dwelling. In particular, the positioning of the site does not respect the building line established by properties to the south along Hall Lane whilst the profile of the roof which combines both a hipped and gable element combined with the detailed fenestration result in a substandard design which is not considered to comply with Policy 2 of the JCS which requires that development being of the highest possible standard and creates a strong sense of place.

4.6 Whilst it may be possible to address the design concerns, it is not considered that the site’s location within flood risk zones 2 and 3 and in a settlement without a development boundary can be rectified and therefore the proposal is recommended for refusal.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2011 and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 including, in particular, Policies 2 and 17 of the JCS and policy ENV8 of the Local Plan.

5.2 The proposal does not accord with the above Policy 17 of the JCS and policy ENV8 of the Local Plan as the site is located outside of a development limit or village boundary and is not to provide affordable housing to meet a specific local need, connected with agriculture or forestry, justified to sustain economic and social activity in a rural community and demanding a rural location, or for adaptation and re-use of an existing rural community.

5.3 The proposal is considered contrary to the above Policy 2 of the JCS as the design of the roof and fenestration and positioning of the dwelling on the site are considered to result in a poor design that does not relate well to the existing pattern of development.

5.4 Furthermore, the majority of the site lies within Flood Risk Zone 2 and 3 and therefore subject the application of a Sequential Test under Paragraph D5 of PPS25. This application fails the Sequential Test as there are reasonably available alternative sites within the development boundaries of nearby settlements which are in areas at lower risk of flooding to which development of the type proposed should be guided. The application is therefore contrary to PPS25.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Tim Barker, 01508 533801, tbarker@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other Applications

6. **Appl. No**: 2012/1308
   **Parish**: TOPCROFT

   **Applicants Name**: Ms A Noakes
   **Site Address**: Puffa Meadow Rectory Road Topcroft Norfolk NR35 2BP
   **Proposal**: Retrospective application for change of use to permit horses, ponies, and donkeys to be kept on the site and permission to retain caravan used to store animal feed and bedding

   **Recommendation**: Approve with conditions
      1. In accordance with amendments
      2. Removal of manure
      3. No commercial use
      4. Full details of external lighting

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   LEI 14: Keeping of horses for recreational purposes (Part Consistent)
   IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No relevant history

4. **Consultations**

3.1 **Parish Council**
   Revised drawings
   Refuse
   - Site totally unsuitable for siting of a caravan which will became permanent and used for residential use
   - Sewage and dirty water run off has not been addressed
   - Land floods making it unsuitable for animal use in winter
   - Issue of manure storage has not been addresses
   - Shed should be used for storage rather than a caravan
   - Applicant sought to mislead planning authority by omitting buildings
   - No permission was gained for existing building on the site

   Original proposal
   Refuse
   - A caravan is not suitable for feed or bedding storage
   - Concerns regarding number of livestock and whether site is suitable for this number
   - Consider plans are incomplete as do not show existing buildings on site

3.2 **District Member**
   Totally agree with the Parish Council that a caravan is inappropriate for storing animal feed and bedding, and unacceptable in the countryside, so I cannot agree with this aspect of the application. Otherwise, no objection
3.3 Environmental Services (Protection)  Support conditionally

3.4 NCC Highways  Does not wish to restrict the grant of permission

3.5 Local Residents  13 letters received
8 of which have no objection to the use of the land
All letters raise objections to the retention of the caravan

- Full support of the use
- Application misleading as does not include all development taken place on the land
- Do not approve of a caravan - Concern if land is sold on other people may keep caravans
- Caravan may be used for accommodation if needs arise or circumstances change
- Understand the caravan is being used for accommodation on an occasional basis
- Wholly opposed to caravan irrespective of intended use as granting such permission could pave the way for a larger caravan site which would be alien to our local environment and amenity
- Caravan not in keeping with rural setting - already very large metal container adjacent to caravan more than ample for food storage
- Allowing a caravan could create a precedent for any future owner of the land having a legal right to a caravan
- If permission granted should be restriction to prevent caravan from being used as accommodation at any time
- Further shed or barn would satisfy the need for further hay or feed storage rather than a caravan
- No concerns about additional storage but do not feel a caravan is necessary or appropriate for this
- Adequate buildings on site for storage
- Concerned about number of animals and fowl
- Ask for a restriction on numbers of animals kept on the land
- The number of structures on the site are slowly and irreversibly changing the character of the site from a pleasant agricultural field to an untidy, unsightly collection of random buildings and structures
- Surrounded by farm land, what is stopping other neighbours from putting caravans on their land and allowing people to live in them - It is agricultural land not a caravan
- Happy for the animals to be cared for and horses to graze but not a caravan
- Owner could find other ways around overnight animal care
- No issue whatsoever with use of the meadow to permit horses, donkeys etc but wholly opposed to the retention of a caravan. Could lead to unwelcome expansion of this meadow as a caravan site. Examples of this locally and the impact to local communities has been unacceptable

A detailed letter from the immediate neighbour, Mr McNiff is on the website and Members are requested to read it in full
4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application relates to an 'L' shaped piece of land, approximately 2.835 Hectares. The site is well screened from the road and in wider views by mature hedging and trees, which also run along the south and west boundaries of the adjacent site, Manor Farm, with the dwelling being, at its closest point, approximately 30 metres away.

4.2 The site is currently being used to keep livestock, horses, ponies and donkeys. In 2007 it was divided into areas by stock fencing, and 3 stables were erected, along with a small number of other small wooden structures. In addition, a green metal shipping container and touring caravan were brought onto the land for storage.

4.3 Planning permission is required for the use of the land to include the keeping of livestock, horses, ponies and donkeys. The wooden structures and green metal container, however, have been on the land for more than 4 years and are therefore immune from any planning enforcement action. With regards to the caravan, although it is being used in association with the permitted agricultural use of the land, it is also being used for storage in association with the horses, ponies and donkeys which, at present, do not benefit from planning permission. Members will be aware that there are many caravans on land in the district being used incidental to the use of the land, which do not require planning permission.

4.4 The application is assessed against policies IMP9 and LEI14, where the keeping of horses for recreational purposes is permitted provided the proposal does not have an adverse effect upon the character of the landscape, wildlife habitat, highway safety and residential amenity. 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 LEI14 is only partially consistent as the NPPF is less restrictive.

4.5 The main issue with this application is the intended use of the caravan on the site and concerns have been raised that, if permitted, its current use as storage could change to accommodation. The caravan is a small touring type, in not particularly good order. At the time of my site visit, it was quite clearly being used for storage of animal feed and bedding, and not for living accommodation, although the applicant has confirmed that she has spent some nights at the site when there have been sick animals. If Members are minded to approve the application, it would not permit the caravan to be used for anything other than that in association with the use of the land, and not for residential accommodation.

4.6 Any change in the use would require a further planning application and would need to be considered on its own merits. The main planning reason for refusing the caravan for use incidental to the use of the land would be its visual impact on the landscape. Members should be aware that if the change of use is granted and a caravan is then brought onto the land it would not require consent, although any other permanent structure would require planning permission. Given the siting of the caravan immediately adjacent to the hedgerow along the northern boundary, I do not consider the caravan has such an adverse impact on the existing landscape to justify recommending refusal.

4.7 The detailed letter from the immediate neighbour, included the following concerns:
- The 'conditions' identified in the report do not make clear what the applicant is or is not permitted to do.
- Existing commercial activity on the land.
- Lighting on site.
- Animal needs and welfare issues – failing to have proper and effective regard to the application of criminal legislation. References to DEFRA.
- The use and suitability of the caravan.
- Flooding of the land.
- Pollution of ditches.
In light of the seriousness of the contents of the letter, a legal opinion has been sought and my response is as follows:

- Conditions in the committee report are headings only and the drafting of conditions on all resolutions to approve is delegated to officers
- I am not aware of any commercial activity or undertaking associated with the development or proposal, there is no evidence of such activity and none has been brought to the Councils’ attention
- The recommended lighting condition is to retain an intrinsically dark landscape, as set out in the paragraph 125 of the NPPF
- The use of the caravan for storage of animal feed is ancillary to the change of use. There is no reason to believe that the caravan would be used for any purpose other than that stated.
- The site is not within any Flood Zones as defined by the Environment Agency. Therefore the Environment Agency has not been consulted as part of the application.
- In relation to the concerns of the number of animals on the land, and animal welfare issues and needs. Environmental Services has advised that with regards to animal welfare, the RSPCA or the police should be contacted. In respect of potential pollution from animal waste into the natural water courses the Environment Agency should be contacted. With regards to licensing and nuisance this is dealt with by officers of Environmental Services. Whilst I fully appreciate the concerns that have been raised in respect of the above, these are not material planning considerations.

Environmental Services: Protection has been consulted as part of the application process and has commented that the applicant has arrangements in place for the disposal of manure, but if the situation should change it is recommended that a condition is imposed for the precise details of the interim storage, removal frequency and disposal arrangements of manure to be submitted and approved by the Local planning.

As part of the assessment of this application I have visited the property immediately adjacent to the application site, Manor Farm, in order to assess the visual impact of the development from the rear garden of this dwelling. Whilst I acknowledge the concerns of the neighbour, given the distance between the dwelling and the site, and the amount of screening along the mutual boundaries and within the Manor Farm site, I do not consider that the development results in an adverse impact to the existing residential amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of Manor Farm.

Although it is unfortunate that a retrospective application has been sought, I consider that the scale of development on the site is commensurate with the size of the plot and the keeping of the animals is neither unusual nor inappropriate in this context either. It is my opinion that the form and size of the caravan is acceptable in this location too. I therefore consider the development accords with the above-mentioned policies and that it does not adversely affect the character of the landscape, wildlife habitat, highway safety or residential amenity.

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 LEI14-Keeping of horses for recreational purposes, IMP9-Residential amenity and IMP8-Safe and free flow of traffic of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework. Policy LEI14 is only partially consistent as the NPPF is less restrictive.
5.2 The development accords with the above policies as it does not adversely affect the setting of the site, the character of the surrounding local landscape, important wildlife habitats, highway safety, or the residential amenity of the neighbouring residents to a material degree.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  Rachel Flaxman 01508 533960
and E-mail: rflaxman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2012/1359  
**Parish**: FORNCETT

**Applicants Name**: Mr B Temple  
**Site Address**: 8 Orchard Close Forncett St. Peter Norwich NR16 1HS  
**Proposal**: Proposed single storey Annexe with link to existing dwelling in the rear garden

**Recommendation**: Approve with Conditions

- 1 Standard Time Limit  
- 2 In accordance with submitted drawings  
- 3 External Materials to be Agreed  
- 4 Annexe use only  
- 5 Implementation of boundary treatment

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  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
HOU 21: Annexes

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No recent planning history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
(NOTE: The Parish Council comments to the original scheme were not received by the planning department. These comments were submitted following the amendments to the scheme)

- concerns about the impact on the neighbouring properties;  
- revised application has increased the gap but it would still be dominant from the neighbouring property;  
- PC would like to see the extension moved more centrally in the applicant’s garden;  
- concern over the size of the annexe and if planning permission is granted it should include a condition to restrict its sale separately from the main dwelling

3.2 District Member  
Original scheme:

- application to be referred to committee  
- lobbied by applicant and there are "well-being" issues that need to be considered  
- DM intends, if possible, to support the application if it goes to committee
3.3 Local Residents

Original scheme - 1x letter of no comment, 3x objections from 2 properties:

- understand the need and have no objection to the principle of an annexe but the overall size and scale are too large;
- overdevelopment of the garden plot;
- [no. 9] will suffer from a loss of light during winter months due to the ridge height, creating a grey area and reducing ambient light;
- to maintain our privacy consideration should be given to the number, shape and glazing of the windows in the south-east elevation;
- eaves and fascias could be kept as low as possible and angle of roof pitch lowered;
- would like to ensure that the use of the the annexe remains in the title as one unit, not sub-divisable, only for occupation by the family and not for open market rental;
- the annexe could be moved over away from the boundary line & turned in an anti-clockwise direction in line with no. 8 which would reduce the visual impact for no. 9;
- O.S. map does not show the correct position of no. 9 in relation to the boundary or the extension to no. 9 and shows a garage which has been removed from the site;
- the development does not fall within the definition of an annexe;
- the footprint of the new extension is equivalent to or even larger than that of the existing dwelling & provides accommodation sufficient for another stand-alone bungalow; and
- the current proposal is excessively large & intrusive for a back garden extension in a residential area and it should be reconsidered in terms of its size and position before planning permission is granted.

Amended scheme - 2x objections:

- original comments still hold true (i.e., effectively a stand alone bungalow rather than an extension and excessive size for back garden location);
- the footprint is still only marginally smaller than that of the existing dwelling;
- rearranging the existing single storey attachments to create a single storey bedroom/ bathroom extension would be more appropriate in scale and a far more acceptable solution;
- site plan size & position of no. 9 now accurately shown but all original objections still stand;
- light to the kitchen of no. 9 will now be more compromised by the annexe moving further south and not moving it far enough away from the boundary;
- the annexe/ bungalow is still too large for the garden plot and should be built, attached and incorporated into the existing structure of the dwelling and to the rear of the property

4. Assessment

4.1 No. 8 Orchard Close is a detached chalet bungalow which is located at the turning head of Orchard Close. The property occupies a larger than average sized plot within the street. There is an integral flat roof garage located to the west of the application dwelling and a number of large outbuildings to the rear of the property, along the west boundary of the plot. The application site is within the Development Limits of Forncett.
4.2 The outbuildings along the west boundary are of timber construction and are substantial in size. The boundary to the west is marked by trees and vegetation to the rear of these outbuildings. The boundary that extends in a north easterly direction from the site frontage comprises a combination of hedgerow and fence panels of various heights. The rear boundary of the site is a combination of hedging and fencing.

4.3 To the south east of the application site is a semi-detached single storey dwelling. No. 9 Orchard Close has previously been extended to within 2.6 metres of the boundary between the properties. The dwellings to the rear are two storey in height.

4.4 The application proposes a linked single storey annexe to the rear of the existing dwelling. The existing boundary fence extending between nos. 8 and 9 Orchard Close would be replaced with a timber panel fence measuring 2 metres in height from ground level. The annexe would run parallel to the boundary between the two properties. It would have a pitched roof with clay pantiles. The main structure would be constructed of a timber frame with timber cladding. The existing dwelling is of standard red brick and concrete roof tile construction.

4.5 The annexe would consist of two bedrooms as well as a separate living room and dining area, kitchen and bathroom. The rooms have been designed to allow for wheelchair access and movement. There is no separately designated parking or garden amenity space proposed for the annexe.

4.6 Following officer concerns the scheme has been amended. The alterations include a reduction in scale and size as well as minor repositioning so that the development is positioned slightly further from the boundary with no. 8 Orchard Close. The applicant has also lowered the windows in the south east elevation and increased the length of the boundary fence in order to address the concerns that have arisen about overlooking and loss of privacy. It was suggested by officer's that the proposals may benefit from relocation to a more central position within the application site but the applicant does not wish to pursue this option.

4.7 The annexe is larger than may be expected and it is acknowledged that the proposed footprint may be considered similar to that of a modest dwelling. However, whilst the application site is within the defined Development Limits and therefore the principle of new residential development would be acceptable, the site is constrained and an application for a new dwelling would not receive officer support.

4.8 The annexe will provide accommodation for the elderly parents of the applicant, enabling them to be cared for by family members and the proximity of the existing dwelling to the annexe ensures that the annexe will remain ancillary to the main house. Should planning permission be forthcoming a condition restricting the future subdivision of the site in terms of both ownership and occupation should be imposed.

4.9 The scale and form of the proposal is considered to be acceptable in relation to the size of the application site as well as its proximity to the main dwelling and the boundaries. The annexe will have an eaves height of approximately 2.2 metres and an overall ridge height of 4.2 metres. The overall height of the extension is not considered to be excessive or atypical of a single storey extension to a detached dwelling. On balance the length of the building is also considered to be commensurate to the proposed use and the level of accommodation to be provided and would accord with Policy HOU21 which relates to the scale and use of annexes.

4.10 Concerns have also been received about loss of light and visual impact on the occupiers of no. 9 Orchard Close. Due to the orientation of the dwellings, including the extension to no. 9 and the position of the windows, the overall impact is not considered to result in material harm to the outlook from this property. Furthermore it is noted that the application site is to the north west of no. 9 and any loss of light or additional shadowing resulting from the development will therefore be limited.
4.11 The windows in the south east elevation have been lowered to reduce the potential for overlooking. In addition, due to the single storey form of the proposed annexe and its distance from the adjacent dwellings to the rear and west the proposal will not result in an undue loss of privacy for these neighbours either.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The development will provide ancillary accommodation to allow for close care of elderly relatives and has been sited so that it may only be used as an annexe to the existing dwelling. It is acknowledged that the annexe is significant in size and has a footprint greater than is usual however, on balance, the overall height of the annexe is similar to a single storey extension and the length of the annexe is commensurate to the proposed use of the structure. Whilst the outlook from no. 9 will be affected by the development it is not considered to be to a detrimental degree the additional overshadowing will not result in material harm and it is therefore considered that the development accords with the principles of Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy and saved Policies HOU21 and IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above because those policies remain consistent (or part consistent where noted) with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number          Kate Fisher 01508 533985
and E-mail:                               kfisher@s-norfolk.gov.uk
8. **Appl. No**: 2012/1545  
**Parish**: ASLACTON

Applicants Name: Mr James Griffiths  
Site Address: Pearl Farm The Street Aslacton NR15 2JW  

Recommendation: Approve with Conditionhs

1. Listed Building Time Limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. Window details to be agreed  
4. External materials to be agreed

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPFF 07: Requiring good design  
NPFF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

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

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

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/0914  
Proposed rear extension, double garage, front porch and refurbishment of existing farmhouse  
Withdrawn

2.2 2011/0913  
Proposed rear extension, double garage, front porch and refurbishment of existing farmhouse  
Withdrawn

2.3 2003/0500  
Conversion of barn to dwelling  
Approved

2.4 2001/1194  
Conversion of barn to dwelling  
Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Approve subject to changes  
- Roof lights inappropriate for listed building  
- Overlooking  
- Size of window dictates a view of neighbours properties  
- Suggest three dormers to the front elevation or window in gable wall and small roof light  
- All other renovations/alterations recommended for approval

3.2 District Member  
To be reported if appropriate.
3.3 Conservation Officer

Original plans
- No objection in principle
- Roof lights to big and type needs to be agreed
- Question number of roof lights
- Details of new windows

Amended plans
- roof lights acceptable
- Agree roof tiles and details of replacement windows

3.4 Local Residents

2 letters of objection
- Impact on listed building
- Roof lights out of character
- Light Pollution
- Loss of privacy

No objection to repair and renovation

4. Assessment

4.1 The property is a Grade II listed building located outside any development limits.

4.2 Policies in the Joint Core Strategy, Local Plan and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework seek to ensure that the proposal is of a good design and the works will preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the building. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policy in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above as the policy remains part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 This application is for listed building approval as the works to be carried out do not require full planning permission. I have noted the concerns of the Parish Council and neighbouring occupiers but the determination of this application can only consider the merits of the affect of the proposed works on the special architectural and historic interest of the buildings and its setting.

4.4 There is mention that the property was once thatched but this was replaced by interlocking tiles before the property was listed. The existing windows are plastic and the applicant wishes to replace with timber and also resolve a major structural problem on the south west gable.

4.5 The repair work to the gable was urgently required to avoid a collapse and the Conservation Officer considered the specification submitted reasonable and therefore this work has commenced.

4.6 The original plans submitted with the application showed 3 rooflights within the main roof and two within the roof of the lean to element. The main roof lights were 1400mm by 780mm which the Conservation Officer considered to be to large. An amended plan has been submitted shows the two roof lights in the lean to removed with an additional small roof light in the main roof. The size of the 3 larger roof lights have now been reduced to 1180 by 660 which is the smallest size that will comply with means of escape. The Conservation Officer has no issues with the new size of rooflight but requires a condition to agree the make of roof light to be used. The neighbours and Parish Council have concerns with the number of new openings and their impact on the listed building. The Conservation Officer considers that the use of roof lights is acceptable and will not adversely affect the historic interest of the building.
5. **Reasons for Approval**

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 1 - Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets, Policy 2 - Promoting good design of the Joint Core Strategy and IMP13 - Alterations to a listed building of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policy in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above as the policy remains part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The development is considered to accord with Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policy IMP13 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as it has been designed to ensure that it would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Lynn Armes 01508 533821 larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No**: 2012/1638  
**Parish**: BAWBURGH

Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs T Hubbard  
Site Address : Hillside Stocks Hill Bawburgh Norfolk NR9 3LL  
Proposal : Sub-division of garden and change of use, including extension of outbuilding to dwelling and ancillary works.

Recommendation : Approve with Conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accord with submitted drawings  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Joinery details  
5. No PD for Classes ABCDE & G  
6. Ecology Mitigation  
7. On site car parking  
8. Surface Water  
9. In accordance with Sound attenuation  
10. Boundary treatment  
11. Slab levels to be agreed  
12. Details of retaining works  
13. New Water Efficiency

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
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 16 : Other Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 7: Development within defined boundaries of small villages (Non Consistent)  
HOU 10: Adaptation and re-use of existing rural buildings for residential purposes (Part Consistent)  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 3: Protection of important spaces (Part Consistent)  
IMP 4: Important frontages (Part Consistent)  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 10: Noise  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
IMP 17: Alterations and extensions in Conservation Areas (Part Consistent)  
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/0600  
Sub-division of garden and change of use, including extension of outbuilding to dwelling and ancillary works.  
Refused
2.2 2009/0457 Erection of two storey dwelling and garage  Not yet determined

5. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  No Objections

3.2 District Member  To Committee
- Proposals for this site have aroused considerable interest from local residents and a public examination will be expected.

3.3 NCC Highways  Support Conditionally subject to adequate parking and turning on site.

3.4 Ecologist  Support conditionally - to accord with the mitigating measures as detailed in the Ecology Report

3.5 Environmental Services (Protection)  No objections subject to the scheme being constructed in accordance with the Acoustic report.

3.6 Conservation Officer  No objections raised to previous proposal amended scheme retains the boundary wall an uses the existing access. Reassessed the proposal in view of the amendments and consider that the scheme accords with NPPF, comments remain as dated 5 December 2011.

3.7 Local Residents  39 Letters of objection received points raised are as follows:
- Adverse impact on the character of the Conservation Area from the increase in ridge height.
- Area is Her heritage Asset this proposal will destroy this character, and impact on the appearance of Forge Cottage.
- Car Port out of character with the area.
- modern Glass front not in keeping with character of Conservation Area.
- Adverse impact on the residential amenities of Forge Cottage fencing will increase enclosure.
- Light from Car Port will be visible from bedroom window.
- Forge Cottage will appear subservient to the new dwelling.
- Noise, dust and disturbance to Forge Cottage during construction work
- Shared access will result in Highways safety issues.
- Widening the entrance will allow the new building to be more visible.

1 Letter of support
Previous objection to entrance through the wall have been addressed, The look of the Conservation Area has already been changed since the quirky modern extension to the last cottage on Church Street.
4. **Assessment**

4.1 **Introduction**

The proposal is for the partial re-build and the extension of the existing Coach House within the curtilage of Hillside Stocks Hill Bawburgh to provide a new dwelling. The site falls within the Development Limits and the Conservation Area of Bawburgh. The existing building adjoins a neighbouring property Forge Cottage. A previous scheme for the proposal was submitted in 2011 which removed a section of the boundary wall of Hillside to allow for a vehicular access to the proposed dwelling. A substantial number of objections were received stating that the wall was a significant feature within the village and was a major factor of the character of the Conservation Area. Concern was also raised by local residents to the visual impact the proposed re-development of the Coach House would have not only on the character of the Conservation Area but also the neighbouring property Forge Cottage. For ease of reference a copy of the previous report is attached as Appendix No 2. Although the report is lengthy I consider it necessary to include as an appendix to allow members the opportunity to be familiar with the issues which were raised before in terms of the impact on the Conservation Area from the re-building/extension of the Coach House and from the vehicular access point. Members will note the extensive coverage and assessment on the importance of the Conservation Area, the potential for Forge Cottage to be a Statutory Listed Building which was not adopted by English Heritage and the concluding reasons why the previous proposal was considered to be acceptable development with an officer recommendation of approval. However, the scheme was refused and a copy of the refusal notice is also attached as Appendix 3. The scheme was refused on two grounds, the first reason has been addressed by the revised proposal currently being considered relocating the vehicular access to the existing access used by Hillside. The second reason the previous scheme was refused on was harm to residential amenities on properties opposite the proposed access from headlights of vehicles leaving the site. In addition harm to the residential amenities of Forge Cottage from the sense of enclosure resulting from the larger size of the replacement building and from the internal walls/fencing forming the boundaries.

4.2 **Assessment**

The proposed re-build and extension of the Coach House to provide a new dwelling has not changed since the last application. It was concluded previously that, although visible within the Conservation Area, the conversion and extension does not result in any significant harm to the Conservation Area, indeed the scheme will improve the visual aspect of this gable wall of the existing cottage and make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. This aspect of the proposal is therefore considered to accord with the above policies.

4.3 **Design**

The scale, design and merits of the proposal were fully assessed under the previous reference 2011/0600. The previous committee report recommended approval, as there is no change to these aspects of the proposal I consider that the scheme still accords with all the policies above and recommend approval as previously.

4.4 **Conservation Area**

No objections were raised by officers to the previous proposal which has now been amended and resubmitted using the existing access rather than forming a new opening in the boundary wall. The scheme has now been reassessed in view of the amendments made and against the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework on conserving and enhancing the historic environment. The Conservation Officer's assessment of the impact of the proposed works to the building and lean-to on the Conservation Area and the setting of adjacent listed buildings remain as previous comments dated 5 December 2011 and included on the report attached as Appendix No 2.
4.5 As noted, this part of the Conservation Area and Church Street in particular is of mixed character with a number of listed buildings alongside more modern dwellings and a predominance of pantile as the roofing material. The development is of an appropriate scale and form and the materials used will reinforce the existing character especially the pantiled roof. This will not adversely impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings and will positively contribute to local character and distinctiveness in accordance with para 131 of the NPPF.

4.6 Residential Amenities
As previously noted the scheme proposed an increase in the ridge height of the resulting dwelling by approximately 0.5 of a metre moving the ridge height to the South and away from Forge Cottage, therefore as previously stated I do not consider that there is any adverse impact in terms of loss of light or privacy to the neighbouring property.

4.7 At present an existing hedge forms the boundary between the courtyard area of Forge Cottage and the elevated garden area of Hillside. The existing retaining wall has partly collapsed. The new scheme proposes to build a new retaining wall on top of which will be placed a fence to the same height as the existing hedge therefore retaining the privacy of Forge Cottage and the proposed new dwelling. Concern has been raised by the neighbour and other local residents about the increased sense of enclosure to the occupiers of Forge Cottage by the new boundary treatment. However, as neither properties are listed buildings, the occupiers of Hillside could erect a 2 metre fence without the need for permission. I consider that taking into account the design of the dwelling, and the boundary treatments proposed, there will not be significant harm to the residential amenities or loss of privacy to the neighbouring property, the scheme therefore accords with policy IMP9 of the SNLP.

4.8 Highways
The revised scheme proposes to share the vehicular access point to Hillside rather than removing a section of the boundary wall of Hillside to make provision for vehicular access. This is a significant change to the scheme and addresses the first reason of refusal. The existing access is thought to have originally served not only Hillside, but would have been the vehicular access to the Coach House, the subject of this application. The shared and improved access arrangement proposed for this scheme has been granted on five occasions which date back to 1987 when permission was first granted for a new dwelling on the site. This has been noted by the Highways Authority and while they state that there is little that could be achieved to improve the Highway Safety for the proposed access they accept it would be difficult to raise objection to the proposal. Therefore, subject to the above condition, the Highways Authority raise no objections to the proposal as submitted.

4.9 Ecology
A full Ecology Report has been re-submitted and assessed as part of this application, although there are Bats roosting in the roof of Hillside, there is no evidence of bats in the Coach House, therefore the Ecologist raises no objection to the proposal, but requires the mitigating measures as suggested in the report to be conditioned, these relate to the time of year any work should be undertaken. The proposal accords with the requirements of Policies ENV14 and ENV15 of the SNLP.

4.10 Drainage
Drainage from the proposed site has been designed to include soakaways to accommodate all surface water, full details would need to be submitted to comply with Building Regulations. The foul drainage is to be connected to main sewerage system.

4.11 Noise
The Acoustic report has been resubmitted. The previous application had led to extensive consultations between Building Control, Environmental Services and the agent to achieve a revised Acoustic Report to demonstrate adequate measures could be achieved to ensure that the development would not result in adverse noise to the neighbouring property, Environmental Services raise no objections to the revised application as this aspect of the proposal remains unchanged.
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, 3 and 16 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies HOU7, HOU10, ENV14, ENV15, IMP2, IMP3, IMP4, IMP8, IMP9, IMP10, IMP15, IMP17 and IMP18 of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The site forms an important part of the Conservation Area, the Coach House is in a poor state of repair which detracts from the overall appearance of the Conservation Area. The scale and design of the re-built and extended Coach House is considered to be appropriate for the area with no adverse impact on the adjacent neighbouring property. The retention of the boundary wall retains the residential amenities to properties opposite the site.

5.3 The revised position of the access to share the existing access of Hillside is not considered to result in any adverse highway safety issues and accords with the requirements of policy IMP8 of the SNLP.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837 jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Application referred to Site Panel

1. Appl. No : 2011/0600/F
Parish : BAWBURGH
Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs T and J Hubbard
Site Address : Hillside, Stocks Hill, Bawburgh NR9 3GG
Proposal : Sub-division of garden and change of use, including extension of outbuilding to dwelling and ancillary works.
Recommendation : Approve with conditions

Introduction

This application and the following report were considered by the Third Wednesday Planning Committee on the 18th April when it was resolved to defer determination to enable the Site Panel to visit the site. The visit is scheduled for the 9th May which is after these Committee papers are prepared so any necessary update following the visit will be given orally at the Committee meeting.

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework – which replaces:
National Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5) : Planning for the Historic Environment
National Planning Policy Statement 9 (PPS9): Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
Section 7 – Design
Section 11 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
Section 12 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1 – Climate Change
Policy 2 – Promoting Good Design
Policy 3 - Water Efficiency
Policy 16 – Other Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
HOU7 – Development within Defined Boundaries of Small Villages
HOU 10: Adaptation and re-use of existing rural buildings for residential purposes
ENV14: Habitat Protection
2. Planning History

2.1 2009/0457/F Erection of two storey dwelling and garage Not Yet Determined

2.2 2004/0904/F Erection of one two storey dwelling Approved

2.3 2002/1128/F Erection of two single storey dwellings Refused

2.4 2000/1966/F Erection of 2 single storey dwellings Withdrawn

2.5 1999/0122/F Renewal of permission 04/0081/F – Erection of 2 storey dwelling and garage Approved

2.6 1994/0081/F Renewal of permission 89/0271/F Erection of 2 storey dwelling and garage Approved

2.7 1989/0271/F Erection of one 2 storey dwelling and garage as approved on 07/87/1580/F Approved

2.8 1987/0580/F Erection of new house and garage Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council : In view of the complexity of the application the Parish Council decided it was unable to put a decision forward to the South Norfolk Planning Committee on this occasion

3.2 District Member : To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways : The amended plan provides the requested improved visibility splay, and subject to other conditions relating to parking and turning and the construction of the access, the scheme is now considered acceptable.

3.4 Environmental Services : No objections are raised following the revised Acoustic Report

3.5 CNC Building Control : No objection to revised Acoustic Report

3.6 CPRE : Original comments withdrawn; Following further detailed consideration of the issues involved CPRE Norfolk Branch is not able to provide a definite opinion either for or against the proposal.

3.7 Norfolk County Council Historic Environment Officer : The scheme will have a detrimental effect on the significant historical assets of the area and the proposal will put at risk the Conservation Area.
3.8 South Norfolk Conservation Officer: The opening in the wall to create a new access and the rebuilding of the Coach House to create a new dwelling is not considered to have an adverse impact on the overall character of the Conservation Area. In addition, following the conclusion from English Heritage on the proposal, together with their findings that Forge Cottage, The Coach House and the wall are not of significant interest to add to the statutory list and remains of local interest only, the scheme is considered to be an acceptable proposal for the Conservation Area.

3.9 English Heritage: No objections raised. Site area significantly less than 1000 sq metres and would expect schemes of this scale to be considered by South Norfolk’s in house specialist and in accordance with National and Local Planning Policies. Any specific aspects of the scheme can be raised and if necessary English Heritage would discuss these direct with Mr Edleston.

3.10 Ecologist: No objection
- Bat roost is present in the adjacent property known as Hillside, no evidence of bats was found in any of the buildings affected by the proposal. The proposal is unlikely to adversely affect this maternity colony.
- Mitigation measures suggested and the inclusion of 4 bird boxes, 2 being open fronted.

3.11 Local Residents: 2 letters of no objection
76 Letters of objection
371 Signature petition

Reasons of objection:
Conservation Area Impact
- Application has not assessed the heritage assets of the site and surrounding area.
  Submitted details appears to be a series of subjective and often misleading opinions in favour of the development. Conclusion of minimal impact of the proposed development and enhancement of the Conservation Area is not supported by the evidence provided.
- Heritage analysis takes no account of the impact of the proposed development on the listed buildings in close proximity to the development.
- The existing wall is an important feature within the village and the conservation area, the breaking through the wall and the erection of a new dwelling and parking will ruin this ensemble.
- Wall of development should be part of the protected character of the conservation area
- The Conservation Area Character Appraisal 2001 clearly illustrates and marks “significant views” in and around the area of the proposed development, part of which would appear to include the wall of which a substantial section is to be demolished to create a new entrance for the new dwelling. It is difficult to see how this action accords with The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Section 72, which requires special attention to be paid to preserving or enhancing the nature of a Conservation Area. The scale and scope of the proposed development will significantly and permanently alter the views on Church Street and on a prominent corner at the entrance to the village which the whole community enjoys.
- The existing structure is proposed to be substantially rebuilt i.e. the eastern gable and the roof will have to be taken down so the height of the building can be increased, therefore this warrants an application to be made for conservation area consent.
- The development and improvement of Church Street has been done over the years with strict adherence to the ethos of conservation of the village. The current proposal is not for domestic/family home improvement, but for commercial exploitation of a garden.
- Many visitors to Bawburgh come not only to enjoy the riverside, but to stroll up Church Street on the way to visit the Church and historic St Walstan’s Well.
Design issues
- Design of new dwelling out of character with the conservation area and Forge Cottage. The overall height will be the same as Forge Cottage, but wider. Historically the barn attached to Forge Cottage has been subservient and formed the historical relationship of the two buildings. The new dwelling will dominate the views of this corner of the Conservation Area.
- Forge Cottage will lose its detached importance and become a semi-detached dwelling, which it has not historically been.
- The erection of a car port attached to Forge Cottage does not as suggested "restore the architectural heritage and leave a reference to the historical layout for all to see" it will be clearly visible over the wall.
- The modern glazed bay area and contemporary style will appear completely out of keeping with the period buildings that surround it and those in the nearby locality. How does this add interest to the Conservation Area?
- Even with the use of sensitive materials, it will adversely affect the appearance of the adjoining flint cottage.
- Scale of development too large. No objection to an extension to existing dwelling.
- Noise from air source heat exchanger
- Loss of light and privacy to adjacent properties
- Layout of new dwelling is insensitive as the kitchen and bathroom are adjacent to quiet living area of the adjoining property.
- Proposed construction method of stud walls will not provide full noise insulation.
- Destroys the detached aspect of the adjacent property
- Gutters extend over neighbouring property
- New major retaining wall behind Forge Cottage. The soil behind Forge Cottage is not stable and therefore the wall and associated construction for the new dwelling may have unforeseen consequences for the transmission of water and structural stability of adjacent land and foundations.
- Shadowing diagrams relate to only one month ie March, not the usual 3 different months 21 March, 21 June and 21 December, so cannot be considered a thorough shadow and daylight assessment.
- No assessment been given to the effects of the garden and associated private amenity space of Forge Cottage. Due to the location of the proposal and the increase in height of the new fence the development will adversely affect the amount of daylight and sunlight enjoyed by the garden of Forge Cottage. A material consideration to the scheme.
- Party wall issues remain outstanding.

Access Issues
- Wall is an important feature in this location and the partial demolition to create a new access for 6 cars will be detrimental to the character of the area and highway safety.
- Increase in traffic movements to and from the new access will result in further traffic hazards in this location on a blind bend
- Church Street is a narrow historic street with occasional parking, which helps to slow traffic on the approach to the junction.
- Noise of shingle proposed for drive will cause disturbance to neighbours

Other issues
- Application promoted as a consequence to a previous application in 2009 for a new dwelling adjacent to the existing house. This scheme is being promoted by the applicant’s agents as a preferred option.
- In June 2010, PPS3 was amended to provide Local Planning Authorities greater powers to refuse so called "Garden Grabbing" ie back garden development
- Proposal is behind the building line and may set a precedent for other neglected sheds and barns for which planning has previously been refused.
- Contrary to policies of South Norfolk Local Plan
- Heritage Asset report submitted by the agent does not take account of the requirements of PPS5 which, together with other opposing expert opinions and the overwhelming negative response of local people needs to be given full consideration when deciding the proposal.
Development Management Committee 5 December 2012

Third Wednesday Planning Committee 16 May 2012

- Loss of value to adjoining property (Forge Cottage)
- No Ecology survey with application: Bats occupy the building and the development would have a detrimental impact on the bats
- Loss of trees on site
- Localism Bill and PPS5 (paragraph HE7.2) identify the importance of considering the views of local people. Given the number of objections raised and the petition provided to the Council, this is another materials consideration officers and members need to give due weight to when determining the application.

10 letters of Support
- Outline planning permission already granted for adjacent building plot. Building should be designed to be in keeping with the area. Accept that changes to the area will take time to get used to.
- Design although modern, existing materials will also be reused. Opening and rebuilding of the wall will screen much of the dwelling from view
- Care has been taken in the design of the proposed extension to the building.

4. Assessment

4.1 Members may recall that a previous application for the renewal of a planning application for the erection of a detached two storey dwelling and garage was submitted in 2009 (2009/0457). The 2009 application was presented to Planning Committee but was deferred for further discussion regarding design. Members should be aware that the 2009 application remains undetermined, however the current application is to be considered on its own merit and not as an alternative to the scheme proposed in the 2009 application.

4.2 The proposal is for the conversion / rebuild of an existing coach house within the curtilage of Hillside, currently used as a store/workshop and is attached to the rear elevation of an adjacent property known as Forge Cottage off Church Street. The scheme also includes the removal of a section of boundary wall on Church Street to facilitate a new access for the proposed dwelling and provides up to six parking spaces and turning space within the site.

4.3 The site is within the Development limits of Bawburgh and within the Conservation Area. The properties are not listed buildings. It should be noted that a number of separate reports have been submitted with this application which deal with specific aspects and these have been publicly available. These have not been reproduced as part of this report, but have been taken into account through out the assessment and in consultation with other officers.

Policies

4.4 The main policies against which the proposal was assessed by consulees are listed above, including PPS5, Policy HE7 which sets out the principles for determination of applications relating to heritage assets, in particular HE7.1 relating to significance, HE7.2 on the consideration of impact and HE7.5 regarding the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment.

4.5 Policy HE9.1 notes a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets with any harmful impact on significance being justified in accordance with Policy HE9.2 (substantial harm or total loss) or Policy HE9.4 (less than substantial harm).

4.6 These Planning Policy Statements have now been replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework, however Section 12 : Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (paragraphs 126 – 141) retain the above considerations.
4.7 Policies 2 & 3 of the Joint Core Strategy which seek to ensure that all new development is of a high standard and that measures are taken within the design to promote efficient use of renewable energy and water use. With regard to saved Policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan, HOU7 permits new dwellings within the Defined Boundaries of Small Villages if in keeping with the form and character of the village and its setting, while HOU10 permits the adaptation and re-use of existing rural buildings for residential purposes. Other important policies are IMP15, IMP17 and IMP18 all of which seek to ensure that development which affects Conservation area or listed buildings respects the historical character and context of the buildings and surrounding area. Policies IMP8, IMP9 and IMP10 seek to ensure that development have no significant adverse impact on the safe and free flow of traffic, or the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 referred to because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

Conservation

4.8 One of the key assessments to be made regarding this proposal is its impact on the heritage assets and Conservation Area and this particular aspect has raised a significant number of objections from the local residents. Appendix 2 shows the extent of the Conservation Area and position of listed buildings in the vicinity of the site.

4.9 Although not a Statutory Consultee the Norfolk County Council Historic Buildings Officer became aware of the application and as a result of noting the absence of a Heritage Assessment Statement with the application provided a "report to fulfill this requirement". With the exception of photographs and maps the following text is the direct quotes taken directly from the report from the Historic Buildings Officer. The full report can be viewed on the Council’s website.

4.10 Forge Cottage is on the South side of Church Road which rises away from the river valley, the property cuts into the hill slightly and the land is held back by a ha-ha which is in a state of collapse. Adjacent to Forge Cottage is the reading room belonging to the adjacent Methodist Chapel; the reading room now forms part of Forge Cottage. Attached to the back of Forge Cottage is a derelict Coach House, which forms the site of the application being considered.

4.11 The cottage is a good example of a simple 3-cell house with gable-end stacks a central straight stair and a symmetrical façade of three bays. The fabric is of knapped flint with brick dressings. The large flints are roughly knapped to reveal a smooth surface and area carefully laid in a random bond. The brick dressings are keyed and form the quoins as well as the opening reveals. The central doorway has a small porch with a roof of pantiles and latticed sides in keeping, in keeping with the date of the cottage. The roof is of shallow pitch with a covering of pantiles. The fenestration is of 3-light mullion-and-transom windows mostly original apart from the glazing which would have been leaded. The ground floor windows are beneath fine deep segmental arches. On the west gable-end is a raised cement panel which looks as if it displayed an advertisement.

4.12 Attached to the north east corner of the cottage is a tall brick boundary wall which curves round towards Stock's Hill. It is of tightly joined brickwork with occasional black headers and has a moulded brick coping. At present it is overgrown.

4.13 Forge Cottage is not officially designated yet it is clearly a heritage asset in its own right and especially as a key building in the Church Street Section of the Bawburgh Conservation Area. It furnishes the narrow part of the lane with the officially designated buildings opposite and is an important element in the group of attractive and historic buildings focusing on this section of the street. The boundary is also an important part of the Conservation Area as it borders the splayed opening to the street emphasising it and announcing the village street appearance of the buildings with Forge Cottage in the forefront.
4.14 The proposed development would put at risk the Conservation Area by removing a section of boundary wall and by revealing a rebuilt, greatly enlarged and heightened former coach house. Attention is drawn to the Government’s Planning Policy Statement 5, in particular policy HE6.1 where local planning authorities should require an applicant to provide a description of the heritage assets affected by the proposed development. The assessment reveals that Forge Cottage and the boundary wall adjoining it are significant heritage assets in a sensitive and valuable part of the Conservation Area. The proposed development would have a detrimental effect on the assets:

- By demolishing part of the boundary wall
- By converting a derelict former coach house to residential which involves the rebuilding and enlargement which will make it prominent in the streetscape.
- By overshadowing and further enclosing Forge Cottage which is a significant heritage asset.

In relation to the lack of information provided with the application attention is drawn to policy HE6.3: Local Planning Authorities should not validate applications where the extent of the impact of the proposal on the significance of any heritage assets affected cannot adequately be understood from the application and supporting documents. It is hoped that this report helps to redress the lacuna and is of assistance to the local planning authority when it comes to make a decision.

4.15 South Norfolk’s Conservation Officer has also assessed the Conservation area, the listed buildings which are in close proximity to the site and how the proposal will impact on the overall character of the heritage assets of the area. The following text forms the Conservation Officer comments on the proposal:

4.16 The development site and Forge Cottage are located within the Bawburgh Conservation Area. Although not listed, both Forge Cottage, including the attached coach house to the rear and the brick boundary wall to Hillside are identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal dated January 2001 as being of townscape significance. i.e. they make a positive contribution to the character of the area. The appraisal also notes that Church Street is of mixed character with a number of listed buildings as well as more modern dwellings, with a predominance of pantile as the roofing material.

4.17 In July 2011, an application was submitted to English Heritage requesting that Forge Cottage, adjoining wall and attached outbuilding be assessed for adding to the statutory list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest. However, on 9 August English Heritage confirmed that they were not considered to be of sufficient interest to add to the statutory list. The structures therefore remain of local interest only in terms of their contribution to the character of the Conservation Area.

4.18 The proposal involves the conversion and in part rebuilding of the existing attached outbuilding, reconstruction of the mono-pitched structure to the east end of Forge Cottage and the formation of an opening in the existing boundary wall to create a new vehicular access. Key considerations will be the significance of the Conservation Area as a designated heritage asset along with the significance of the structures affected, being of local interest (non-designated heritage assets). The impact of the proposal on this significance will need to be assessed against policies in PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment and saved policies IMP17: Alterations and extensions in Conservation Areas, IMP18: Development in Conservation Areas and IMP15: Setting of Listed Buildings of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

4.19 Following several discussions and negotiations, amended drawings have now been submitted to address the issues raised along with a report setting out the significance of the heritage assets affected and the impact of the works proposed. Neither the boundary wall nor the structures affected by this proposal are designated heritage assets in their own right, as confirmed by the response from English Heritage to the request for additions to the statutory list. However, it is acknowledged that they are of local interest and make a contribution to the character of the Conservation Area which is a designated heritage asset.
4.20 Policy HE7 of PPS5 sets out the principles for determination of applications relating to heritage assets, in particular HE7.1 relating to significance, HE7.2 on the consideration of impact and HE7.5 regarding the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment.

Policy HE9.1 notes a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets with any harmful impact on significance being justified in accordance with Policy HE9.2 (substantial harm or total loss) or Policy HE9.4 (less than substantial harm).

This does not therefore mean that any change is unacceptable, but a critical assessment has to be made on the degree of harm (if any), on the character of the Conservation Area, balanced alongside any benefits of the development proposed as well as any harm caused to the setting of adjacent listed buildings, as follows :-

Impact of proposed works to building and lean-to

4.21 The existing attached outbuilding to the rear of Forge Cottage is currently in a poor state of repair and the former lean-to adjacent to the eastern gable of the cottage has been dismantled, leaving the area in a particularly untidy state. The proposal involves reconstruction of the lean-to to create a car-port and following negotiation, its height has been reduced so that the view from the street will be similar to the former structure. Although it is proposed to increase the height of the ridge to the gable of the outbuilding, this is no greater than the height of the ridge to Forge Cottage and will not dominate the cottage when viewed from the street due to its increased distance away from the street. Although the design of the building has a more contemporary approach to some elements, such as the glazed facade to the dining area, this reinforces the existing mixed character of the street, particularly as the development uses traditional materials including pantiles, noted as being the predominant roofing material within the street. With these issues in mind and in particular the benefits that will be derived from a positive use of this building and the visual improvements that will be achieved in comparison with the existing situation, my conclusion is that it will enhance the character of the Conservation Area.

Impact of new opening in boundary wall

4.22 The existing boundary wall does form a strong degree of enclosure at the entrance to Church Street. However, the extent of removal of brickwork is restricted to the minimum required to form a vehicular access and the position of the opening has taken account of the existing brick buttresses as features on either side and a substantial part of the wall will remain in place. Furthermore, when viewed in perspective the sense of enclosure will remain and the design of the curved walls reduces the apparent width of the opening. Although this does involve the loss of some historic fabric it could be argued that there is some minor harm as a result, taking the above issues into account, my view is that the proposals are acceptable on the basis that the creation of an access facilitates the positive re-use of the building which will enhance the character of the area.

Impact on setting of adjacent listed buildings

4.23 There are a number of listed buildings on the opposite side of Church Street. However, it is necessary to walk some distance away from the site before the proposed works can be seen in the context of the listed buildings. At this point the visual impact of the new opening and the alterations to the building will be minimal and accordingly, in my opinion will not adversely impact on the setting of the listed buildings. My conclusion is that the proposals are in accordance with policies in PPS5 and saved policies IMP15, 17 and 18 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and I would therefore recommend approval.
4.24 Having assessed the comments made by The County Historic Buildings Officer the assessment appears to focus on the character of Forge Cottage and the general street scene of Church Lane rather than how the proposal will impact on the heritage assets of the Conservation Area. I acknowledge that Forge Cottage is important within the street scene, this point is also acknowledged by the South Norfolk's Conservation Officer, however I also note that the English Heritage consider that the building is of local importance and not of significant interest to be added to the statutory list. There are wider issues which need to be given weight in line with the requirements of policy in terms of the proposal and its impact on the Conservation Area, the setting of the listed buildings within the area situated immediately opposite the proposed access and to the west of the junction of Hockering Lane.

4.25 I have given full consideration to the visual contribution the existing Coach House and the boundary wall make to the overall character of the area. The loss of the Coach House as seen at the present time and how the proposed scheme will impact on the heritage assets of the locality in line with National Policy. On balance I feel that the scheme although making changes to the visual appearance of the Conservation Area, is sympathetic in terms of design and scale to the heritage assets of the area and will enhance the existing site from its current appearance. I therefore consider that the views of South Norfolk Council's Conservation Officer are based on a more in depth assessment of the character of the area as a whole and in the wider context and his conclusions are based in line with the National Planning Policy Framework, the JCS and the saved policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Design

4.26 The attached outbuilding to the rear of Forge Cottage is currently in a poor state of repair and the former lean-to adjacent to the eastern gable of the cottage has been dismantled, leaving the area particularly untidy state.

4.27 The scheme is for the part conversion, part re-building of a derelict Coach House which is attached to the rear wall of Forge Cottage and for a section of the adjoining boundary wall to be removed to allow for a new vehicular access. The proposal will provide a single, one and a half storey dwelling with front facing dormer windows, a sunroom which projects into the rear garden and a glazed aspect to the front (east) elevation. In addition the scheme includes a free standing mono pitch roof car port on the east elevation of Forge Cottage. However, this will appear when viewed from the street to be attached to Forge Cottage. The existing garden of Hillside will be sub-divided which will involve extensive engineering works including a retaining wall due to the development cutting into a steep bank at the rear of the site.

4.28 The scale of the proposal includes an increase in the ridge height of the main dwelling when compared to that of the existing coach house, however the resulting ridge height is no greater than Forge Cottage and will not dominate the Forge Cottage or the immediate area when viewed from the street due to its increased distance away from the street.

4.29 The re-construction of the lean-to on the east elevation to create a car-port been reduced in height from 4.4 metres to 3.8 metres following negotiation. This amendment to the scheme is now considered to relate more sympathetically to that of the original structure and not have a significant impact on the overall character of the Conservation Area.

Residential Amenities

4.30 With regard to the residential amenities of the proposal and how this will impact on the neighbouring property consideration has been given to the scale of the proposed dwelling, the position of the rear facing velux windows and any necessary boundary screening.

4.31 There is an increase in the ridge height of the proposed dwelling to that of the existing coach house, however, the increase is approximately 0.5 of a metre in height moving the resulting ridge to the south and away from Forge Cottage. For this reason I do not consider that this increase will have an unacceptable impact on either privacy or loss of light to the existing dwelling, or the adjacent courtyard area.
Development Management Committee  
5 December 2012

Third Wednesday Planning Committee  16 May 2012

4.32 The proposal when first submitted included six roof lights in the rear roof which adjoins Forge Cottage, two of which would have opened directly opposite an existing roof light serving the kitchen of Forge Cottage. These have been replaced with sun tubes allowing the same natural light levels for the new dwelling, but without the impact on the neighbouring property. I consider that by virtue of the design and orientation of the proposal relative to the neighbouring dwellings that there will not be significant overlooking of habitable rooms or amenity areas.

4.33 At present an existing hedge forms the boundary between the courtyard area of Forge Cottage and the elevated garden area of Hillside. The existing retaining wall has partly collapsed and the new scheme proposes to erect a new retaining wall to be built in front of the existing wall, on top of which will be erected a new fence to the same height as the existing hedge. I consider that this will continue to provide privacy to the adjacent neighbouring property and should be conditioned to be complete prior to the occupation of the property.

4.34 At the time of submission the scheme included amongst other sustainable methods of insulation and light, an Air Source Heat Pump. Consideration was given to the potential of noise impact on the neighbouring property and as no suitable alternative location for the Air Source heat Pump could be found this has now been deleted from the scheme.

4.35 The new access is proposed to be surfaced with shingle, this has raised concern with the neighbour with regard to the level of noise resulting from traffic movements to and from the site. On balance, I consider that the level of noise resulting from the gravelled drive would not result in a sufficient level of disturbance to require an alternative surface material. I would expect the first 2 metres from the carriageway edge to be of a solid surface to prevent gravel from being dragged onto the highway. No objections on this point have been raised by the Highways Officer.

Highway

4.36 It is acknowledged that a new access in this location causes concern on safety grounds for the local residents. However, following an amended plan to adjust the section of wall to be removed and improve the visibility splay in both directions, the revised scheme now meets the requirement of the County Highways Officer. Subject to the suggested conditions above which ensure that there is adequate turning space within the site and that the access point is constructed in the manner shown on the plans, the Highway Authority now considers the scheme acceptable.

Ecology

4.37 At the time the application was submitted no Ecology Survey was included. The Council received reports of bats being seen in the vicinity of the application site and as a result of this, the agent was requested to commission an Ecology Survey. As a result of this survey bats and any other protected species were assessed. The survey noted that a Soprano Pipistrelle maternity roost is present in the adjacent property (Hillside), but no evidence of bats was found in any of the outbuildings affected by the proposal. The proposal is therefore unlikely to adversely affect this maternity colony.

4.38 Mitigation measures are suggested, which relate to clearance work on site and provision of bird boxes. The report, mitigating measures and the enhancement opportunities are supported by the District Ecologist, and therefore comply with the requirements of policies ENV14, and ENV15 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

Landscaping

4.39 Concern has been raised by some of the local residents to the loss of trees on the site, and that no survey has been submitted. From my site visit I note that the only trees which have been removed are either fruit trees, or other smaller trees which do not make a significant contribution to the overall landscape of the site and do not need any form of consent to be removed.
With regard to the large area of wall to the front of the site which is currently covered in Whisteria, this is considered by many to be an asset within the locality. While I acknowledge that this does contribute to the area, it should be noted that no permission is required to either cut or remove this should the applicant so wish and although the loss of this shrub would be unfortunate, it cannot be controlled through the planning process.

Drainage

Drainage from the proposed site has been designed to include three soakaways to accommodate all the surface water from the site. These are to be positioned to the east of the new access. A slot / channel drain will be constructed around the patio to take all surface water and feed into the soakaway system. Full details of this will need to be submitted as part of the Building Regulation process. The foul drainage will connect to the main sewerage system.

Noise

Significant consultation has taken place on the acoustic levels which can be achieved to ensure that the new dwelling will have no unacceptable impact on the amenities of the adjacent property as the rear wall of Forge Cottage will adjoin the new dwelling. An acoustic report has been submitted which included the repair of cracks to the existing flank wall between the two properties, however, concerns raised by Environmental Services regarding the potential for the repairs not to meet the required standards lead to a revised Acoustic system being designed and a revised report submitted.

The revised scheme proposes a free standing wall in addition to the existing wall. The level of attenuation required by Building Regulation for a new build scheme is 45dB. Environmental Services comment that the new report, demonstrates that the proposed party wall can exceed the noise attenuation performance for new dwellings by a significant margin, to give protection to the amenities of the neighbours from noise generated within the new dwelling. Based on the comments from Building Control and Environmental Services, I consider the scheme now accords with the principles of policy IMP10 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The site forms an important part of the Conservation Area, however at the present time the poor state of the Coach House detracts from the overall appearance of the area. The scheme as submitted has been designed to take account of the character of the Conservation Area and the surrounding Listed Buildings and takes into account the impact the proposal will have on the adjoining property. The scheme is considered to accord with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies in the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan and will enhance the character of the Conservation Area by re-building an existing derelict building.

5.2 The alterations to the existing boundary wall have been designed to ensure that there is adequate visibility for traffic to access and egress from the site and to ensure that there is adequate space within the site to allow vehicles to turn and leave the site in a forward gear. The scheme is acceptable in terms of the requirements of highway safety and accords with the principles of policy IMP8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003.

5.3 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 Jackson, 01508 533837, and E-mail: jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Development & Environment
Swan Lane Long Stratton Norwich NR15 2XE
Tel: 01508 533633 Fax: 01508 533625
Minicom 01508 533622 Answerphone 01508 533649 Email
planning@s-norfolk.gov.uk

REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

Agent
David Futter Associates Ltd
Arkitech House
35 Whiffier Road
Norwich
NR3 2AW

Applicant
Mr & Mrs T and J Hubbard
c/o David Futter Associates LTD

Location: Hillside, Stocks Hill, Bawburgh

Proposal: Sub-division of garden and change of use, including extension of outbuilding to dwelling and ancillary works.

Particulars of decision: The District Council hereby give notice in pursuance of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that full permission has been refused for the carrying out of the development referred to above for the following reasons:

1. The site is within the Bawburgh Conservation Area of which the existing frontage boundary wall forms an important feature within the street scene. The scheme proposes to remove a section of this wall on Church Street to form a new vehicular access to the development. The interruption in the continuous line of the wall would detract from the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area and therefore be contrary to policy IMP18 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003, and Section 12 (paragraph 129) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The scheme is considered to result in harm to the residential amenities of the property opposite the proposed access due headlights of the vehicles leaving the proposed site. In addition the residential amenities to Forge Cottage and Hillside will be adversely affected by the increased sense of enclosure from the larger size of the replacement building and the dividing wall/fence forming the internal site boundary. The proposal is consequently in conflict with policy IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 which remains consistent with the Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The attached notes are also part of this decision notice.

[Signature]

on behalf of the Council

Date of Application: 14/04/2011
Date of Decision: 06/06/2012
10. Appl. No : 2012/1658
Parish : ROYDON

Applicants Name : Mr S Osborne
Site Address : Land Next To Manor Lodge Manor Road Roydon Norfolk IP22 5QS
Proposal : Proposed detached bungalow with associated parking area

Recommendation : Refuse

1 Detrimental to character and visual amenities

1. Planning Policies

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

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 15 : Service Villages

1.3 South Norfolk Place-Making Guide
A5: Waveney Rural River Valley

1.4 South Norfolk Local Plan
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. Planning History

2.1 2008/1299 Additional new access Approved
2.2 2007/2214 Change of vehicular access Withdrawn
2.3 2007/1134 Change of vehicular access Refused
2.4 2003/0834 Proposed erection of 1 no. dwelling Refused and Dismissed at appeal
2.5 2001/0174 Provision of new vehicular access Withdrawn
2.6 1999/1044 Erection of one dwelling with existing access Refused
2.7 1998/1698 Erection of two dwellings with access Withdrawn

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Response to amended plans to be reported

Original scheme:
Refuse
The planning inspectors decision for the last application for this site is still valid and hence the application should be refused
3.2 District Member  
To be determined by committee:  
The site had a long history before divided into two  
The planning inspector's most recent ruling related to the whole site  
Consider planning policy has changed sufficiently for SNDC to  
consider the application in a new light and whether the  
circumstances have changed.

3.3 Landscape Officer  
Conditional support

3.4 Environmental services - Shirley Bishop  
Conditional support

3.5 Environmental services – Protection  
To be reported

3.6 NCC Highways  
Conditional support

3.7 Local Residents  
4 letters of support:  
- Would hope that bungalow would be in keeping of the present  
houses/cottages and rural area  
- Often wondered what would happen to this piece of land, as it at  
present doesn't seem to be used for much at all  
- A bungalow would be quite suitable  
5 letters of objection:  
- Will be dominant when approaching Brewers Green along  
Manor road  
- The inspector's decision is still relevant, nothing has changed  
- Outbuildings which are being used to justify the development  
have been built under permitted development rights and  
therefore no planning consent was applied for or required  
- In the wrong place and the site should not be developed  
- Would spoil the open rural aspect of the area especially when  
viewed from the north, over the pond and green and from the  
south  
- Concern in respect of the use of soakaways and drainage into  
eexisting ditch  
- Concern re impact on existing trees which provide a reasonable  
screen  
- Overlooking  
- Create denser housing on a sensitive and environmentally  
attractive location  
- Land was previously part of the garden to Manor Lodge and  
used by previous owner to deposit debris

4. Assessment

4.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the erection of a single storey dwelling  
on land adjacent to Manor Lodge, with residential properties located to the northwest,  
west/southwest and east of the site.

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

4.3 This site has had a number of applications for residential development in the past with the  
2003/0834 outline application for 1 dwelling being dismissed at appeal. A copy of the  
Inspector's decision is attached as appendix 2 for information.
4.4 Whilst the site is within the development boundary in my opinion the application needs to be assessed on its impact on the character and visual amenities of the area and indeed whether the site is in principle suitable for residential development at all.

4.5 This shallow site is a prominent within the existing street scene, particularly when viewed from the south and is in close proximity to The Common, which I consider adds to the open character of the area. The South Norfolk Place-Making Guide refers to a key characteristic of this area (A5: Waveney Rural River Valley) as being 'open grassy commons of many of the village centres are a reminder of the historic landscape', which should be protected in my opinion. I consider that a dwelling on the site would be harmful to the open character of the area. I acknowledge that planning policies have changed since the last application, however the importance of the impact of a development on the character of an area has not, and if anything this has been strengthened. I also consider the Inspector's assessment and decision are still very relevant to this application and is a significant material consideration when determining this application.

4.6 The other issues raised by local residents as set out above in terms of use of soakaways can be satisfactorily dealt with via conditions and also the existing trees can be protected also via a condition and therefore I do not consider the application could be refused on these grounds.

4.7 Whilst the applicant has submitted a full application with its associated details and has in his opinion overcome the concerns raised, I do not consider that the site is appropriate for development due to the harm it will cause to the character of the area and therefore recommend refusal.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The proposed dwelling would, due to the prominent nature of the application site, the open nature of the character of the area and its location close to The Common, give rise to a visual intrusive form of development, detrimental to the character and visual amenities of this part of Roydon, contrary to Policy 2 - Promoting Good design of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Place-Making Guide 2012.

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

Site visit made on 5 January 2004

by D E Morden MRTP

an Inspector appointed by the First Secretary of State

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/A/03/1127278

Land adjacent to Manor Lodge, Manor Road, Roydon, Diss, IP22 5QS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs E Banks-Callaby against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
- The application (Ref. SW07/03/0834/0), dated 23/4/03, was refused by notice dated 5/6/03.
- The development proposed is the erection of one dwelling off existing access.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is dismissed as set out in the Formal Decision at paragraph 8 below.

Procedural Matters

1. The application was submitted in outline and the only matter not reserved for subsequent approval was the means of access which was proposed to be shared with the existing access to Manor Lodge. The application also included a statement that the existing garage on the appeal site would be widened to form a double garage for the new dwelling. There was no indication as to whether the new dwelling would be one or two storeys high. I shall, therefore, deal with the appeal on that basis.

Planning Policy

2. The Development Plan for the area consists of the Norfolk Structure Plan (NSP) adopted in 1999 and the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) adopted in March 2003. NSP Policy H7 states that within villages, housing development will be limited to individual dwellings or small groups of houses which enhance the form and character of the village and its setting. Policy HOU6D in the SNLP is similarly worded. Policy BEN2 in the SNLP requires all new development to be of a high standard of design in terms, amongst other things, of scale, siting, massing, form and character. It also requires new development to be in keeping with its surroundings in terms of urban townscape or rural setting, local building traditions and materials. These policies are up to date and considerable weight should be afforded to their objectives.

Main Issue

3. I consider that the main issue in this case, in the light of the prevailing policies, is whether the development would materially harm the character or appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The site is currently part of the large side garden of Manor Lodge and the whole depth of the plot is sited well forward of the pair of semi detached houses to the south located on the west side of Manor Road between the appeal site and Queensway. On the other side of
Manor Road the dwellings are also set well back from the frontage giving a very open appearance as one travels northwards to the open land. In front of Manor Lodge in the triangular area formed by the curve in the road and the front boundary of Manor Lodge is a fairly large pond adding to the openness of the general area. Manor Lodge itself is a bungalow and like most of the dwellings around it is set back some distance (in the case of Manor Lodge about 20 metres) from the highway. This set back is necessary in my view as the bends in the road at this point would result in any dwelling located close to the road being intrusive and appearing very much out of character with the general street pattern.

5. Whether the appellants intend a single or two storey dwelling is immaterial in my opinion; any dwelling located on this plot would, in my view, be materially harmful to the open character of the area at this point, particularly when looking north towards the common land and the generally more open vistas. I acknowledge the appellants' intention to undertake a sympathetic design in terms of the details of the dwelling to be erected but this would not overcome the fundamental objection to any dwelling located in this prominent position.

6. The appellants also referred to other recent developments nearby but having looked at these none, in my view, are in any way similar to this case and the considerations involved are different. They are not located in prominent locations nor close to the road as is proposed here.

Conclusions

7. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Formal Decision

8. In exercise of the powers transferred to me, I dismiss this appeal.

Q. E. Marsden

INSPECTOR

Information

A separate note is attached setting out the circumstances in which the validity of this decision may be challenged by making an application to the High Court.
11. **Appl. No**: 2012/1740  
**Parish**: TASBURGH

Applicants Name: Mr & Mrs Haines  
Site Address: Watermill House Low Road Tasburgh Norfolk NR15 1AR  
Proposal: Revised application for design of new entrance door and surround

Recommendation: Refuse

1. **Planning Policies**
   
1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
Heritage Assets – Paragraph 128 & 132

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

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

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/1406 Alterations and improvements to existing dwelling Approved

2.2 2006/0425 0426 Proposed erection of sun room Approved

2.3 2005/2608 2610 Erection of a single storey timber framed glazed conservatory Approved

2.4 2005/2072 2073 Part demolition of store with extension to form double garage & store Approved

2.5 2004/2427 2429 Proposed erection of glazed conservatory to side of dwelling Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council Approve

3.2 District Member To Committee  
Consideration needs to be given to Conservation Policies

3.3 Conservation Officer Refuse  
Inappropriate design  
Absence of information

3.4 Local Residents No comments received

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application relates to Watermill House a Grade II Listed Mill with early c19 house frontage. The building is used as a domestic dwelling and is set in a mixed street scene within the village of Tasburgh.

4.2 This proposal relates to a revised application for the design of the new entrance door and surround. An application was previously approved for the same scheme but without the classical entrance details.
4.3 The existing classical door surround was installed in the building in the early c20 but actually dates from the c19 and is of a high quality. The surround is clearly on part of the building that forms part of the domestic architecture, the weather boarded section of the north elevation clearly defining the Mill section of the building to the rear of the house. Any new door entrance here should be relatively plain so that it is in keeping with the existing character on the north side of the building, something similar to what has previously been approved.

4.4 The applicant submitted a pre-application proposal and the advice of the Conservation Officer was sought. The applicant was advised that it was not appropriate to have a classically detailed door entrance at the proposed location as it would not sit comfortably with the non-domestic character of the Mill section of the building. The Conservation Officer and I have requested amendments however these have not been forthcoming and the applicant wishes the application to be determined as submitted.

4.5 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. While heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Policy 12 paragraph 128 states:

"Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with architectural interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation"

4.6 Notwithstanding the concerns with respect to the design of the door entrance the Design and Access statement does not provide any information explaining the significance of the existing building as is required under policies in the National Planning Policy Framework relating to heritage assets. It also does not show how this significance has been taken into account in the proposal. Without this information the application cannot be fully assessed as careful consideration needs to be given to the new door entrance to ensure the proposals are in keeping with the existing character on the north side of the building.

4.7 This proposal is in conflict with NPPF policy 12 paragraphs 128 and 132, Joint Core Strategy - Policy 2 Promoting good design and policy IMP 13 (part consistent) of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

5. Reasons for Refusal

5.1 The proposal for the design of a new entrance door and surround does not comply with NPPF policies relating to Heritage Assets paragraph 128 & 132, Joint Core Strategy Policy 2 Promoting good design and contrary to policy IMP 13 Alteration of Listed Buildings (part consistent) of the Local Plan.

5.2 The proposal site is a Grade II listed converted c18 Mill with early c19 house frontage. The proposed classically detailed door entrance of the Mill section of the building would not sit comfortably with the non-domestic character of the Mill and would therefore be detrimental to the special architectural interest of this listed building.

5.3 The Design & Access Statement also not provide any information explaining the significance of the existing building as is required under polices in the National Planning Policy Framework relating to heritage assets. It also does not show how this significance has been taken into account in the proposal.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Chrissy Briggs 01508 533832 cbriggs@s-norfolk.gov.uk
12. **Appl. No:** 2012/1951  
**Parish:** DISS

Applicants Name: Saffron Housing Trust  
Site Address: 23 Willbye Avenue Diss Norfolk IP22 4NN  
Proposal: Proposed 8 new dwellings - 4 no. dwellings on the West of Willbye Avenue and 4 no. dwellings on the East of Willbye Avenue

Recommendation: Approve with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amendments  
3. External materials to be agreed  
4. Surface Water  
5. Details of foul water disposal  
6. Standard Estate Road  
7. Standard Estate Road  
8. Visibility splay, approved plan  
9. Landscaping scheme to be submitted  
10. No additional windows at first floor

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design  
Policy 4: Housing delivery

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity

2. **Planning History**

2.1 None relevant.

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: To be reported.

3.2 District Members
   - Cllr Walden: Can be a delegated decision  
   - Cllr Kiddie: Can be a delegated decision  
   - Cllr Palmer: To be reported if appropriate

3.3 NCC Highways: To be reported.

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection): To be reported.

3.5 Environment Agency: No objection.

3.6 Conservation Officer: Approve, subject to minor design amendments.
3.7 Anglian Water Services Ltd
To be reported.

3.8 Landscape Officer
To be reported.

3.9 SNC: Housing Strategy Manager
Support

3.10 Local Residents
1 letter of objection received
- loss of parking and noise impact

4. Assessment

4.1 This application relates to two sites containing garage blocks and communal parking located to the rear of properties at Uplands Way and Willbye Avenue. Both sites are accessed from Willbye Avenue via narrow entrance drives. Both sites have a northern boundary with Diss High school, and are surrounded by existing development to the east, west and south. The east site contains two blocks of garages, with the west site containing a single garage block. Together the sites contain 32 communal garages. A site location plan is attached as appendix 1.

4.2 The application proposes the removal of the garages, and the redevelopment of the sites with a total of 8 new affordable dwellings. Access to the site would be as existing. A site layout plan and example elevations are attached as appendix 2 to this report. As all dwellings are proposed to be affordable, the application accords with JCS Policy 4 minimum requirement of 20% affordable housing on sites for 5 – 9 dwellings.

4.3 The application sites are within the development boundary of Diss, where there is a principle in favour of residential development. JCS Policy 13 also allocates Diss as a main town where additional housing is expected. Taking this into account, the principle of development is acceptable and in accordance with these policies.

4.4 The applicants have undertaken two parking surveys, in 2009 and 2012, which established that there was a maximum of 5 vehicles across both sites requiring parking spaces. In addition to this, two Saffron controlled properties also required parking spaces to the rear of their properties, making a total of 7 required spaces. Of the 32 garages across the two sites, 21 were either empty or used for storage, and only 11 were used to park a vehicle. On investigation, these 11 properties either already had curtilage parking, or could be made to have curtilage parking by providing dropped kerbs. In conclusion, the impact of the removal of these areas for general parking would be limited.

4.5 The remaining issues for consideration are the:
- Design, layout and impact on residential amenity, and;
- Highway impact.

Design & Layout and impact on residential amenity

4.6 The proposed dwellings have been designed to fit in with their context in terms of scale, layout and appearance, to avoid overbearing and overlooking neighbouring properties. As both sites are set back from the main road along an access drive, the views into the site are limited, but where they existing along the access drives, they are framed by feature gables and windows. Although the Design Officer has requested some minor amendments to the scheme, particularly in respect of boundary treatment, the scale and form of development makes a positive contribution to its context and has successfully overcome issues of overlooking and loss of residential amenity.
4.7 Subject to minor amendments to the scheme being received, the application is considered to accord with the requirements of JCS Policy 2 (Design) and local plan policy IMP9 (Residential Amenity).

Highway impact

4.8 As the two sites have been used by vehicles for many years, it is unlikely that traffic serving 8 dwellings (4 in each site) would give rise to highway safety issues. However, at the time of writing highway comments are still awaited, so a verbal update will be given at committee. Subject to their being no objections raised by NCC: Highways, then the application is considered compliant with local plan policy IMP8 (Safe & Free Flow of Traffic).

5. Reason for Approval

5.1 The layout of the site and the design and form of the dwellings is appropriate for its context and will not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal is also acceptable in terms of highway safety. The proposal therefore accords with the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) 2003 and in particular is considered to accord with JCS Policies 2, 4, and 13, SNLP policies IMP8 and IMP9, and sections 6 and 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework. 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 and E-mail: Gary Hancox 01508 533841 ghancox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Enforcement Report
Report of The Development Control Services Manager

1. Enforcement Ref : 2012/8281
Parish : WYMONDHAM
Site Address : 70 Damgate Street, Wymondham, Norfolk, NR18 0BH,
Development : Erection of Car Port
Developer : Ms T A LUISKA

1. Background

1.1 It has been brought to the Councils attention that the owner of 70 Damgate Street has erected a white car port with a Perspex roof on the side of the property which can be clearly seen from the adjacent 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. The site is also within the Conservation Area of Wymondham.

1.3 Members may recall that this address has been brought to their attention on a number of occasions earlier this year as a result of unauthorised replacement UPVC windows which resulted in the service of a Listed Building Enforcement Notice and the erection of entrance gates which resulted in the Council serving a Listed Building Enforcement Notice.

1.4 The execution of any works to a listed building for its alteration or extension in any manner which would affect its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest, and the works are not authorised, constitutes a criminal offence.

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 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 The Conservation Officer has assessed the development and stated the design and material finish of the completed structure is not in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing listed building and this part of the Wymondham Conservation Area and would therefore not support a retrospective application for its retention.
3.3 Comments received from residents of Wymondham state:

- Monstrous construction and a terrible eyesore.
- Unsightly and not in keeping with the period character of the property and it is disappointing that the owner, despite previous guidance, continues to work on a listed building which is detrimental to its character.
- Totally out of character for a conservation area.

3.4 It is concluded that the significance of the heritage asset has been eroded by the erection of the car port. In view of this it is considered expedient to request authorisation to secure the removal of the car port and the making good of the wall of the Listed Building.

4. Recommendation

4.1 That, subject to legal advice, enforcement action is taken requiring the removal of the car port and the making good of the wall of the Listed Building and that subject to legal advice legal action be commenced against the owner of the property for the unauthorised works which have been undertaken to the Listed Building.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number  
Martin Burrows 01508 533843
and E-mail: mburrows@s-norfolk.gov.uk
## PLANNING APPEALS
Appeals received from 26 October 2012 to 22 November 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish/Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011/0607</td>
<td>THORPE NEXT HADDISCOE Willow Farm, North End</td>
<td>Fuelsell Ltd</td>
<td>Use as fuel supply business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/0951</td>
<td>PULHAM ST MARY Landlords Flat at Kings Head Inn, The Street</td>
<td>Mr Graham Scott</td>
<td>Removal of condition 3 of planning permission 1998/1012/F - to allow flat to be either sold or leased separately from the public house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/1009</td>
<td>PULHAM ST MARY Kings Head Inn The Street</td>
<td>Mr Graham Scott</td>
<td>Block up two toilet windows on west elevation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appeal decisions from 26 October 2012 to 22 November 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>2011/2059</td>
<td>THORPE ABBOTTS Annexe at Haggle House, Scole Road</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs C Lister</td>
<td>Use of existing residential annexe as a separate dwelling house</td>
<td>Third Wed Planning Committee</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/0005</td>
<td>SPOONER ROW Land east of Pightle and rear of Chestnut Cottage, Guilers Lane</td>
<td>Mr E Peters &amp; Mr R Evans</td>
<td>Continued use of land as residential curtilage without compliance with conditions attached to planning permission 2044/0963/CU</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Appeal part allowed, part dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/0413</td>
<td>DISS Caxton House, 146C Victoria Road</td>
<td>Parson Ltd</td>
<td>Retrospective application for replacement fascia signs</td>
<td>First Wed Planning Committee</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Appeal Allowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>