Development Management Committee
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs L Neal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr T Palmer</td>
<td></td>
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Please note that item numbers 3-14 will **not** be heard by the Committee before 3.00 pm

Pool of Substitutes

Leslie Dale
Nigel Legg
Brian Riches
Vivienne Bell

Pre-Committee Members' Question Time

12.00pm – 12.30pm Council Chamber

Date
Wednesday 30 January 2013

Time
1.00 pm

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

Contact
Sue Elliott  tel (01508) 533663
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 or 2, and arrive at 3.00 pm if you intend to speak on items 3 - 14.

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

22/01/2013
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.
# A G E N D A

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

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

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

4. Minutes of the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 9 January 2013;
   (attached – page 9)

5. Planning Applications and Other Development Control Matters;
   (attached – page 23)

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>2012/1880/O</td>
<td>COLNEY</td>
<td>Land Adjacent Norfolk And Norwich University Hospital Colney Lane</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2011/1804/O</td>
<td>HETHERSETT</td>
<td>Land North Of Hethersett Village Centre, Little Melton Road (including Extension To Thickthorn Park &amp; Ride)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2010/1175/F</td>
<td>BUNWELL</td>
<td>Frank Dale Foods Ltd Little Green Bunwell Street</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2011/1736/F</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Green Dragon Public House, 6 Church Street</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2012/1640/F</td>
<td>CRINGLEFORD</td>
<td>Land North of 29 Newfound Drive</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2012/1620/F</td>
<td>SCOLE</td>
<td>Warehouse At Waveney View Waterloo Lane</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2012/1865/H</td>
<td>TROWSE WITH NEWTON</td>
<td>5 The Paddock</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2012/1996/O</td>
<td>GISSING</td>
<td>Village Hall Rectory Road</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2012/2036/H</td>
<td>LITTLE MELTON</td>
<td>2 Birch Close</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2012/2152/H</td>
<td>ROYDON</td>
<td>Asante High Road</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2012/2203/H</td>
<td>GREAT MELTON</td>
<td>Melton Beck Bawburgh Road</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2012/2246/H</td>
<td>WORTWELL</td>
<td>Says Farmhouse 11 Low Road</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2012/2248/LB</td>
<td>WORTWELL</td>
<td>Says Farmhouse 11 Low Road</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2013/0013/F</td>
<td>LONG STRATTON</td>
<td>69 Field Acre Way</td>
<td>141</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 144)

8. **Enforcement Proceedings - Progress Report** (attached – page 147)

9. **Planning Appeals (for information)** (attached – page 153)

10. **Date of next scheduled meeting** – Wednesday 27 February 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.

Please note: In accordance with the Council’s constitution no one may make photographs, film, video or other electronic recordings of the meeting without the Chairman’s consent
### 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>A</th>
<th>Advert</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Proposal by Government Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Certificate of Alternative Development</td>
<td>HZ</td>
<td>Hazardous Substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>Listed Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Change of Use</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Existing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Reserved Matters</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Proposed development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Detail following outline consent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Full (details included)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Outline (details reserved for later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Householder – Full application relating to residential property</td>
<td>RVC</td>
<td>Removal/Variation of Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Application to be determined by County Council</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Proposal by Statutory Undertaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.P</th>
<th>Structure Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
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Report of Director of Development and Environment

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

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

Key to abbreviations used in Recommendations

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

1. **Appl. No**: 2012/1880/O  
   **Parish**: COLNEY

   **Applicants Name**: Bullen Developments Ltd  
   **Site Address**: Land Adjacent Norfolk And Norwich University Hospital Colney Lane Colney Norfolk NR4 7UY

   **Proposal**: Proposed offices, laboratories and academic space for principally research and development activities, buildings for health and health related uses and buildings for further ancillary uses. Associated car parking, access, infrastructure, internal access roads and strategic landscaping

   **Recommendation**: Approve with Conditions

   1. Outline permission time limit 14 years
   2. Standard outline requiring RM
   3. In accordance with approved details
   4. Surface water drainage
   5. Foul Sewage
   6. Standard Outline Condition Highways
   7. Provision of cycleways and footpaths
   8. Construction Traffic (Parking)
   9. Construction Traffic Management and Rout
   10. Wheel Cleaning Facilities Temporary
   11. Overarching Travel Plan
   12. Overarching Travel Plan part 2
   13. Use class floor provision
   14. Phasing plan
   15. Lighting
   16. Materials
   17. Fire Hydrants
   18. Landscaping
   19. Tree protection
   20. Construction Environmental Management Pl
   21. Archaeology
   22. Public Realm Strategy

The application is recommended for approval subject to a Sec 106 to cover a Travel Plan and Phasing Plan.

1. **Planning Policies**

   1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
   NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
   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  
   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 5: The Economy  
   Policy 9: Strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area
1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan
   ENV 9: Nationally and locally important archaeological remains (Part Consistent)
   ENV 14: Habitat protection
   ENV 15: Species protection
   IMP 2: Landscaping
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
   IMP 9: Residential amenity
   IMP 10: Noise
   IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings
   EMP 1: Employment land allocations
   COL 1: Research and development uses at Norwich Research Park
   COL 2: Norwich Research Park, contingency reserve
   COL 3: Norwich Research Park, transportation issues
   COL 4: Expansion of the new Norfolk and Norwich Hospital
   TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links
   TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities
   TRA 18: Off street parking provision
   TRA 19: Parking standards

2. Planning History

2.1 2012/1269 Provision of a temporary 350 space car park for the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital
     Approved

2.2 2012/1547 Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission 2007/0554/F - to allow continued use of temporary offices beyond 01/09/2012
     Approved

2.3 2012/1200 Build new linear accelerator suite adjacent to helicopter & within the grounds. New link corridor to run from main hospital to new suite and where breaking into existing building new aos treatment room to be created and accessed from ward area. New plant area positioned above linear accelerator suite to house mechanical and electrical equipment to service the medical areas below
     Approved

2.4 2010/1916 New independent building within the hospital A & E car park, with link corridor to existing building. Re-arrangement and re-provision of car parking and cycle storage. New building to contain a new MRI and CT scanner with their ancillary spaces.
     Approved

2.5 2003/1950 Proposed erection of children’s nursery & daycare centre
     Approved

2.6 2000/1867 Erection of 4 storey building comprising teaching, social and dining facilities, academic accommodation and admin support space
     Approved

2.7 2000/1069 Residential accommodation for the new Norfolk and Norwich Hospital including two storey houses, common room, car parking, hard & soft landscaping (Resubmission of approval 99/1760/D)
     Approved
3. Consultations

3.1 Colney Parish Council

Supports the NRP development in principle but has concerns regarding:

- More floorspace proposed than allocated through the SPD
- The TA makes assumptions which may not be valid
- The TA does not take account of Colney Hall and altogether there would be 4000 new car parking spaces
- The TA does not take account of the traffic from proposed developments and Costessey and Easton
- The ratio of car drivers to car parking is imbalanced and will result in many cars not being accommodated for on site
- The TA proposes that 1700 cycle users will be added to the morning traffic. Are the proposals adequate to accommodate such a large volume of cycle users?
- The recent addendum appears to be a theoretical assessment and does not acknowledge the existing traffic conditions that already adversely affect the operation of this junction with A47 trunk road.
- Technical Note 04 in Appendix B presents graphic illustrations of the adverse effect on traffic in the area by 2014. The NNUH roundabout and every junction along the B1108 from the A47 interchange to Fiveways roundabout will be close to or exceed design capacities. Road improvement will be required at all these junctions for planned developments; but even with improvements it is anticipated by completion the junctions will be at or exceed capacities in the morning peak which will last from 7.00am to 10.00am.
- Cringleford and Little Melton parishes have already expressed similar concerns to Colney about the integration of traffic through their areas. Colney feels that, in view of the concerns expressed in this response, there should be a formal meeting between the affected parishes, the NRP applicants, the SNC planning authorities, the Highways Authority and with AECOM. Given that traffic assessments are essential components of obtaining planning permission and of any alteration of the SPD, we regard such a meeting as essential if the planning process is to be legitimate and a democratic input is to be guaranteed.

The Parish cannot support the application in its current format and object to its approval.

Cringleford Parish Council

The Parish Council recommend refusal. The main concerns are related to transport implications and that the TA has not fully considered the Cringleford area and focuses mainly on the B1108.

Little Melton Parish Council

The Parish Council is concerned with the combined effects of the traffic from the NRP South and North; housing developments within the area and the dualling of the A11.

Cycling will only be viable if the route is safe and attractive to use. Concerns existing regarding the gap in cycle path provision between NRP South and Hethersett North.
The Parish Council wants reassurance that there will be a joined up traffic plan for the surrounding area which discourages rat running and commuting through Little Melton.

3.2 District Members:
Cllr C Kemp
To be reported if appropriate
Cllr G Wheatley
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Norwich City Council
The council are very supportive of the principles of this scheme, which is of significant strategic importance to the City, and the whole of the Norwich policy area.

Our main concern is to ensure that the expansion at the Norwich Research park is fully accessible to the residents of the City, many of who are likely to be working there, and that the consequential impact of their travel arrangements does not unduly impact on the City transport network. We have particular concerns about the impact of additional traffic on the Five Ways junction, but fully agree with the Transport Consultants view that undertaking works at this junction to accommodate increased traffic would be unacceptable on environmental grounds, and would have unacceptable consequences for the strategic road network as a whole across this part of the City. Consequently, the strategy to encourage the use of sustainable transport to the site is supported. Residents of Norwich must be readily able to access the site on foot, by cycle and by public transport if the traffic impact within the urban area is to be kept to a minimum.

It is therefore important to ensure that the site is fully accessible to sustainable transport modes throughout its construction, and that on completion, the development is an integral part of the urban environment. Significant effort has been made to ensure that the development is internally permeable, but it is not considered that the links to the surrounding area (especially to the north and east) for walking cycling and public transport are strong enough, or that the layout as currently proposed ensure that these links can be properly provided as the development progresses. NRP needs to be seen as more than a destination in its own right, and public transport routes need to both access the site, and progress through it to pick up other destinations and populations if they are to offer a truly attractive transport option. Similarly, significant cycle and pedestrian routes need to allow access through the development to key locations in the vicinity.

This is particularly important as the Transport Assessment is predicated on a challenging target for reducing reliance on the private car, including significant parking restraint on the site, particularly in the latter stages of the development. Failing to achieve these targets, or attempting to resolve immediate issues by providing further car parking on the site will result in unacceptable levels of traffic congestion across the western part of the City and into the County. This would seriously undermine the potential for the success of the NRP and the economy of the City as a whole.

The City Council is therefore keen to work with the developers and other Local Authorities to ensure that the Norwich Research Park is fully accessible, particularly from the urban area of the City. In certain respects it regards the current proposals as being deficient
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in this respect but suggests that this would be best addressed by continuing dialogue between the developers and the local authorities, possibly in the context of a City Deal, to maximise the potential of this strategically exceptionally important development.

3.4  Planning Policy

No objections have been raised. The following comments have been provided:

The application site is allocated principally for B1(b) uses under saved South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) allocation COL1 and COL2, as part of the wider Norwich Research Park (NRP) allocation, and for expansion of the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital (NNUH) under saved Policy COL4. Transport issues related to the NRP allocations are covered by saved Policy COL3. The aims of Policies COL1 to 4 are expanded upon in the 'NRP Development Framework – Supplementary Planning Document (SPD - March 2009)'. The fundamental aspirations of the NRP allocation have subsequently been reiterated in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (March 2011), restating the emphasis on B1(b) and ancillary uses (Policies 5 and 9).

The emerging Site Specific Policies and Allocations element of the new Local Plan currently carries limited weight, however the intention of the proposed allocations for these sites is to continue to focus on B1(b) research and development uses and the potential expansion of the hospital(s), with other complementary uses remaining ancillary to these primary functions.

The uses set out in the application broadly mirror those identified in the SPD. Whilst the detail will be established through later reserved matter applications, it will be important to ensure that research and development uses (particularly those related to the health, life and environmental sciences of the existing institutes), and other health related uses (such as hospitals, clinics and education/training facilities), remain the focus of the NRP. An over emphasis on broader C2/D1 uses, such as nursing/care homes and day centres, would dilute the science park nature of the allocation. Supporting ancillary A1/A3 elements would also need to clearly perform the function of servicing other development on site, rather than attracting off-site visitors.

The SPD sets out parameters for the development density of the site, linked to the accompanying Transport Assessment, which envisages an overall development of 123,150m² across the allocated sites. The application proposes almost 100,000m² of development, whilst the adjoining planning application for NRP North (ref. 2012/1477) promotes up to 65,000m² of floorspace, both of which are in addition to any proposals at Colney Hall (also the subject of a current planning application). Whilst this is greater than the SPD suggests, the SPD figures do not include any floorspace at the UEA ‘triangle’ site (which is now included as part of the NRP North proposals) and the NRP North proposals also include an element of demolition of existing buildings. As sections 2.3 and 2.4 of the SPD emphasise, it is important that the traffic implication of the density of development proposed is assessed in the context of the ‘mixed public transport and car access strategy’ that forms the basis of the SPD, rather than 123,150m² being considered a ceiling. It is particularly welcome that a joint design approach is being taken...
with NRP North, which includes looking at the combined impacts of the schemes through the Transport Assessment and Environmental Statement processes.

The application also needs to be tested against other relevant requirements of the Development Plan and SPD.

The Government’s National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that proposals that accord with the policies of the development plan should be approved without delay (para. 14). The NPPF also states that planning should ‘proactively drive and support sustainable economic development’ (para 17), ‘support existing business sectors’ and ‘plan positively for the … expansion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven … industries’ (para 21).

3.5 Economic Development Manager

No objections have been raised. The following comments have been provided:

The future development of NRP is a very key part of the Council's economic development strategy and the growth that can be accommodated there has the potential to deliver a significant number of new, and importantly higher value, jobs. Although the development aspirations for NRP have been known by the market for a long time, the granting of outline planning consent for the larger scale development of the park would help to secure greater interest from businesses and investors. This, in turn, will help to catalyse construction, which will move the whole site forward and enable new occupiers to be secured. It is these new occupiers that will generate the new jobs and business opportunities and attracting them is key to the economic growth of the district.

It is important to note that the Council's aspiration for NRP is that it develops as a research and development park, with appropriate support services and associated uses. The uses on NRP South are more closely aligned with the medical activities at Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital than the activities proposed for NRP North and this differentiation helps to define the two related but separate parts of the overall NRP site. The range of uses proposed, such as a hotel and restaurant, do support the main research and development, medical and educational activities proposed for both NRP North and South as it is important to offer overnight accommodation and catering facilities if significant conferences and training events are to be hosted at the Park. However, it is important to ensure that the integrity of NRP is retained and that its defining offer as a research and development park is not diluted by the inclusion of too much or inappropriate ancillary/secondary uses.

It is also important to reiterate that the master plan for NRP South has been prepared contemporaneously with a master plan for NRP North. This has been done to ensure that the development of each site complements the other and that the wider NRP site is developed in a way that maximises the economic and social benefits to be achieved across the site. This inter-relationship between the two sites should be recognised in both the application for NRP South and in the Council's assessment of it.
3.6 Landscape Officer  No objection. Concern regarding the loss of some hedging and a specific tree on Hethersett Lane have been raised. However, overall there is no objection and the application details the retention of many trees.

3.7 Conservation and Design Officer  The D & A Statement covers a range of issues including the South Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment, access & movement, sunlight & daylight, scale, height & form along with heritage issues. The statement also explains the design concept and how it has evolved in response to the context and in particular the relationship and integration with the NRP North development. The layout takes advantage of the southerly aspect of the site and a high degree of connectivity is proposed with existing and future developments including pedestrians, cycles and vehicles. There is an aspiration to create a high quality development including public spaces, landscape and buildings along with energy efficient design.

There are a number of listed buildings to the north east which are outside of the site and the proposed development with not adversely impact on their setting. Colney Hall to the north west of the site is also listed within a parkland setting. The view from Colney Hall towards the proposal will change as a result of the proposed development with new buildings on the horizon. However this is some distance away and mitigation measures to minimise this impact include detailed design and screen planting.

Overall, my view is that the proposed scheme has positively responded to the character of the site with a view to creating a development with a high degree of connectivity through cycle, pedestrian, vehicular and public transport access, high quality design of buildings and spaces with a strong sense of place and integration with the proposed NRP North development and I would therefore recommend approval

3.8 Environmental Services (Protection)  No objections.

3.9 Environmental Services (Flood Defence)  No objections.

3.10 Highways Agency  No objection subject to a Travel Plan being agreed.

3.11 Historic Environment Service  A phased programme of archaeological evaluation has been carried out at the proposed development site including geophysical survey, fieldwalking survey and trial trenching.

The results of the geophysical and fieldwalking surveys identified a ring ditch possibly relating to a Bronze Age round barrow, undated linear features and a scatters of prehistoric worked flints. The preapplication trial trenching was confined to the eastern part of the proposed development site and confirmed the presence of subsurface archaeological features at the location of the ring ditch identified by the geophysical survey. There is potential that the significance of heritage assets with archaeological interest (both known and as yet unidentified buried archaeological remains) at the site will be adversely affected by the proposed development.
If outline planning permission is granted, we therefore ask that this be subject to a condition to enable programmes of archaeological work to be carried out in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework para. 135 & 141.

3.12 English Heritage  No objections.

3.13 Natural England  No objection

3.14 Anglian Water Services Ltd  No objections subject to conditions.

3.15 Environment Agency  No objections subject to conditions.

3.16 NCC Highways  All the supporting information has been reviewed and after many meetings with the applicant and his advisors an acceptable package of mitigation measures has been agreed. The development is proposed to be developed over three phases with various elements of the mitigation package being delivered before/during each phase. It is considered that the development is in a sustainable location close to the bus service hub at the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital. It is within easy walking and cycling distance of existing and future major housing development and this development will link into and add to the existing walking and cycling infrastructure in the area.

A travel plan will be an integral part of this development and will be able to build on the success of the NNUH and UEA Travel Plans and it is hoped to create an area wide travel plan for the benefit of all the developments in the area.

Consequently the Highway Authority has no transport objection to the application subject to a S106 securing the Travel Plan funding and the highway works associated with the improvement of the Colney Lane / Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital roundabout shown indicatively on Drawing 60237873_038 Rev D.

No more than 4,536 sq m gross internal area (GIA) of development on NRP South should be occupied until the works set out above a constructed.

The highway works associated with Phases 2 and 3 of development as stated in the Joint Phasing Plan for Highway Network Improvements NRP North and South can be made the subject of a separate phasing plan condition.

3.17 Norfolk Police  No comments received

3.18 Highways Agency  No objection, subject to a Travel Plan being agreed.

3.19 NCC Planning Obligations  No obligations required.

3.20 NCC Minerals and Waste  No objections
3.21 Local Residents  Five letters of representation have been received.

Two letters of objection from the same person have been received and they raise the following issues:

- NRP North and the eastern part of the proposal should provide a suitable amount of land for development without the western section.
- The development of the western section of the application would be detrimental to the rural scene and have serious environmental impacts.
- The development would merge Hethersett and Wymondham further with the NRP to the detriment of the rural area.
- The Fiveways junction is at capacity and as such the alternative bus route proposed at peak times through the UEA campus is not satisfactory due to the speed restrictions imposed in the locality.
- The NRP should expand towards the UEA upon the under used sports fields.
- Amendments have been filed just before Christmas and this has not given people enough time to review the amendments.

Three letters of support have been received including one from the agent representing Colney Hall.

4. Assessment

Site Context

4.1 The application site is located within the Parish of Colney and adjacent to the Parish of Cringleford and approximately 5 kilometres to the west of Norwich City Centre.

4.2 The site measures 30 hectares in size and is currently used largely for agricultural purposes with a number of sizeable woodland features. The majority of the farmland is classified as grade 3 agriculture quality and is identified in the South Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment as being in the Yare Tributary Farmland with Parkland character area. To the north of the site is the River Yare and the Yare Valley, due to the surrounding land form the site is not visible from the valley floor.

4.3 The South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP) allocates the application site for research and development, hospital and hospital related use, and ancillary uses. The site is located directly adjacent to the existing Norwich Research Park to the north and to the west of the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital (NNUH) To the west and south the site is bounded by open fields which are bisected by the A 47. To the north west is the Watton Road, and beyond further farmland, residential properties and the densely wooded Colney Hall.

4.4 The existing Norwich Research Park (NRP) northern developments are visible from the application site as is the hospital to the east. The two developments vary in style and density with the hospital comprising a single, dense core design with peripheral parking and the northern developments occurring through an organic growth pattern. However, the two development clusters both contain similarities in the building heights.

4.5 The site is served by a series of key roads including the B1108 Watton Road linking between Norwich City centre and the A47 Norwich Southern bypass. The recently improved Colney Lane links Watton Road through the Research Park and Cringleford to the A47/A11 junction at Thickthorn. The junction of the NNUH and Colney Lane is a key link for the NRP South development. Hethersett Lane bisects the application site and links the NRP cluster to the village of Hethersett to the south west. There are no public footpaths on the site and the site is currently accessed via farm access points and tracks.
The site's topography falls gently from a central ridge point to the south towards the northern boundary of the site and on to the valley bottom to the north and beyond the NRP North site. The lowest part of the site is situated in the north eastern corner directly adjacent to the existing JIC and NNUH sites.

The site is located within Flood Zone 1, classed as being low risk on the Environment Agency Flood Zone Map with less than a 0.1% annual probability of flooding.

The NRP South site does not contain any historic buildings and is not within a conservation area. However, there are listed buildings and structures within close proximity to the application. These include the Grade II* Listed Old Rectory and Old Hall, Colney which are located to the north of B1108 opposite Hethersett Lane (the boundary walls, gates and piers are also Grade II listed), Grade II* Listed St Andrews Church to the north east of the site and Grade II listed Colney Hall approximately 1 km to the north west.

Proposal

The main components of the proposed outline planning application are the following:

- Provision of up to 99,166 sq m of floorspace
- Associated infrastructure, including landscape, services and plant
- Maximum of 1,724 car parking spaces car parking spaces and 345 disability parking spaces
- Access to Colney Lane will be achieved via an improved roundabout junction
- New roundabout from Hethersett Lane adjacent to the southern boundary of the site
- New roundabout from Hethersett Lane in the heart of the NRP South site
- Internal road networks within the eastern and western parcels of the site
- New access on Watton Road at the point of Colney Hall's existing access

It is estimated that the proposed 99,166 sq m of floorspace could potentially be made up of the following uses:

- B1 (b) Research and Development - 60,387 sq m
- C2/D1 (residential and non- residential institutions) - 29,849 sq m
- Ancillary uses - 8,930 sq m

Based on the estimated floorspace provisions the application details that the development could provide for approximately 3,000 full time jobs.

The application details the creation of over 2,000 car parking spaces, which are shown on the indicative site layout to be in the peripheral areas of the site. It should also be noted that the indicative site layout plan details that in the south eastern portion of the site there would be a multi storey car park.

The planning application and environmental statement provides parameter plans which detail the land use elements, pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and bus routes, maximum building heights and envelopes, building density, landscaping and ecology, build out/phasing. These parameter plans would fix their respective elements of the proposal and should approval be forthcoming all reserved matters submissions in respect of the outline planning permission must accord with their content.

The parameter plans detail that the development would be built out from east to west. It is proposed that within the first phase of construction the hospital related uses would be provided for on approximately 4.2 ha of land within the eastern area. The remainder of the site would consist of research and development use, health related uses, complimentary uses to one of the main anchor institutions of the NRP and ancillary uses to the research and development functions.

The density parameter plan details that the overall site density would be approximately 35%. With the most open space areas being in the central area of the site.
4.16 The build out/phasing plan anticipates that the development would be carried out in three stages and concluded by 2026. The landscaping plans detail that much of the mature tree planting along the site boundaries will be retained with supplementary planting incorporated. It is also indicated that in order to minimise excavation, the building form will follow the natural contours of the land.

4.17 All matters are reserved except from the access arrangements and detailed drawings related to vehicular access points have been provided as part of the application.

Principle of development

4.18 The application site is located within the development limits of Colney as identified through the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP). Colney is regarded within the South Norfolk Local Plan as being a main strategic location for new employment in the Norwich Policy Area.

4.19 The site has land use allocations within the SNLP of COL1/EMP1, COL2 and COL 4. The eastern area of the site is divided between COL1/EMP1 and COL 4, with the western section all allocated as COL2.

4.20 COL1 - Research and Development directs that development will be approved within the NRP area provided that it is acceptable in relation to design and layout and that the development would provide for B 1(b) use and others which would be ancillary to that use. This policy direction is a detailed reflection of Saved Policy EMP1.

4.21 COL4 is an area of land covering 5ha which would allow for expansion of the hospital towards Hethersett Lane. The policy specifically states that the land is allocated for hospital and hospital related activities in addition to research and development uses permitted by policy COL1 at the Norwich Research Park.

4.22 The 14ha western COL2 land allocation is detailed within the SNLP as land which is a contingency reserve for the Norwich Research Park. In this regard the policy directs the following conditions to development of the site:

- The uses proposed cannot be located on other allocated land by reason of site size, or detailed end user requirements, or other sites are committed.
- The design and layout of all development respects the scale layout and quality of the existing research park buildings and landscape setting.
- The use will be restricted to Class B1(b), or to that which is ancillary to existing buildings and uses on the same site.

4.23 These policies are considered to be consistent with the aims and objectives of JCS Policy 5 which encourages the increase in higher value, knowledge economy jobs and JCS Policy 9 which identifies the growth of the NRP area as a fundamental part of the economic strategy for the area.

4.24 The NPPF also encourages the local authorities to plan positively and in a flexible manner for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries.

4.25 The parameter plans which accompany the development proposal detail that the hospital related uses would be positioned along the eastern boundary of the application site. This is not fully in accordance with the COL4 land allocation as it is positioned along the southern boundary.

4.26 This reconfiguration of the land allocation within the planning application is considered acceptable as it would allow for the hospital related uses to remain as close as possible to the hospital complex and furthermore the application does not propose to increase the land area allocated through the SNLP for these uses.
The remaining land area within the eastern area of the application site is split between COL1 uses and those ancillary to those uses. The parameter plan details the associated/ancillary uses to be those as outlined in the SPD:

- Research and development
- Health related uses
- Patient hotels, recuperative/respite care;
- Education and training facilities;
- Social/networking and conference facilities to encourage and develop knowledge transfer;
- Residential institutions linked to research and development uses on site e.g. short stay accommodation for scientists/suppliers etc;
- Small scale retail/shop provision to serve NRP workers e.g. convenience store, post office, hairdresser, dry cleaner;
- Café/restaurant/sandwich bar;
- Supporting business infrastructure e.g. lawyers,
- Banking facilities etc.

The contingency land area allocated to the west would be developed as part of the later phases of development, again these would encompass a mixture of the acceptable and ancillary uses detailed above. The later development of this area of the application site would accord with the direction of the Policy COL2.

NRP Development Framework - Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted in March 2009 and directs that a holistic approach should be taken to the development of the NRP with the creation of a masterplan document, which the applicant has produced.

The SPD also sets out guidance on parameters and principles for development within the allocated land areas which form the allocated NRP area and contains the following statement regarding floorspace and transport:

…..Framework has not sought to prescribe square metres of development to individual parts of the allocation but it is important that the overall level of development of 123,150 m2 is recognised to respect the reasoning behind the figures in the Transport Assessment.

The 123,150 sq m referred to is the level of development which was considered acceptable over the entire COL1, COL2 and COL 4 land allocations when assessed against a specific transport assessment. This development proposal accounts for part of the COL1 land allocation and all of the COL2 and COL4 allocations.

The current application is accompanied by a Transport Assessment commissioned for this and the NRP North proposal. The submitted Transport Assessment recommends that the floorspace proposed through NRP North and South can be accommodated for through a series of mitigation measures.

The SPD also identifies a need to be flexible in any approach to transport implications and development. The SPD states that should a developer want to increase the site capacity then they would need to demonstrate that the proposal is acceptable in terms of their traffic management proposals and the trip generations which would be experienced.

Strategically it is clear that the JCS, SPD and Saved Local Plan Policies COL1, COL 2 and COL4 provide for a large quantum of development to take place at the NRP and that the acceptability, or otherwise, of the proposal should be based on the merits of the proposal and the aims, objectives and intent of the relevant planning policies.

The uses proposed within the application site and their timing and distribution across the land mass is considered to be in accordance with the SPD and the Saved Policies COL1, COL2 and COL4. It is acknowledged that the orientation of the hospital related activities
has been proposed in a manner which is not fully consistent with the land allocation, however it is considered that this outcome has obvious benefits to the hospital complex management. It should also be noted that the proposal to re-orientate the COL4 land area was brought forward after consultation with the hospital.

4.36 The SPD also seeks to establish the following principles:

- High quality design
- Take account of the overall transport implications of the site
- Be an exemplar of sustainability
- Ensure accessibility and connectivity with the existing site and the remaining allocated areas
- Take into consideration the recommended density ratio and ensure that individual applications do not hinder the rest of the site being brought forward
- That the use class of development be for B1 (b) use and other uses which could be considered directly related or ancillary

4.37 These principles are considered to be consistent with the aims and objectives of the NPPF, JCS and Saved Local Plan policies and will be evaluated in further detail below.

**Economic Development**

4.38 The mix of land uses and the phased delivery of those uses is considered to be consistent with the principles established by Saved Policies COL1, COL2 and COL4. The application details that the development could provide approximately 99,166 sq m of floorspace of the following uses:

- B1 (b) Research and Development - 60,387 sq m
- C2/D1 (residential and non-residential institutions) - 29,849 sq m
- Ancillary uses - 8,930 sq m

4.39 The delivery of these developments would potentially provide for up to 3,000 jobs within a range of industries, the most dominant across the site would be those associated research and development and hospital related activities.

4.40 JCS Policy 5 - Economic Growth recognises that the growth strategy is to provide for an increase in the proportion of high value, knowledge economy jobs while ensuring that opportunities are available for the development of all types and levels of jobs in all sectors of the economy and for all the workforce. In achieving this aim JCS Policy 9 - strategy for growth in the Norwich Policy Area states the following:

*An expansion of NRP is a fundamental part of the economic strategy for the [Norwich] area. NRP will be developed to provide a 'Next Generation' science park seeking to maximise the commercial potential of intellectual property emanating from the research and innovation taking place there, and through attracting inward investment. A first phase of around 55ha will provide around 100,000m² of B1(b) development plus ancillary uses such as restaurants, accommodation, medical, educational, leisure and conference facilities set within landscaped public spaces and recreational areas. Large-scale general employment development will detract from the unique offer and will not be appropriate. A second phase will be released if the initial development fulfils the vision for a science park.*

4.41 This development proposal and the NRP North proposal would provide for the first phase of the Next Generation Science Park. The NRP North and South applications would occupy a site area of approximately 60ha and provide accumulatively 164,000 sq m of floorspace.

4.42 Also of material consideration is the NPPF Section 1 which provides the following commentary regarding economic growth:
The Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system.

4.43 The NPPF also directs that local authorities should plan positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries.

4.44 It is recognised that the development proposal and that which forms the NRP North application would provide for more floorspace and occupy an area greater than that detailed in JCS Policy 9. However, the intent of the accumulative proposal is consistent with JCS Policies 5 and 9 and their acceptability should be determined on their merits. The NPPF clearly advises that local authorities should promote the expansion of employment clusters such as the research park and hospital.

4.45 It is considered that the provided that the application can be demonstrated to have no significantly adverse sustainability impacts it clearly complies with the intent and direction provided through the relevant economic growth policy documents and will be a major contributor to the economic growth of the Norwich Policy Area.

Highways

4.46 Saved Local Plan policy TRA 1 (provision of pedestrian links) seeks to promote safe and convenient pedestrian access. Policy TRA 3 (provision of cycling facilities) seeks to promote cycle infrastructure to cater for demand created by new development. Policy IMP 8 (safe and free flow of traffic) seeks to ensure that new development does not endanger highway safety or prejudice the free flow of traffic.

4.47 Policies TRA 18 (off-street parking provision) seeks to ensure appropriate levels of car parking including appropriate landscaping and disabled parking. Policy TRA 19 (parking standards) sets maximum parking standards for the County.

4.48 Saved Policy COL 3 (Norwich Research Park, transportation issues) relates specifically to the NRP site, and explains that the following transport improvements will be required:

- Footway/cycleway links within Norwich Research Park, with the new hospital, and to major areas of housing such as Bowthorpe and Cringleford;
- Public transport services particularly to the City Centre, to major areas of housing such as Bowthorpe and Cringleford and to Costessey and Cringleford Park and Ride sites;
- Green Travel Plans to reduce traffic generation to the minimum possible;
- Highway improvements to the B1108 Watton Road from Hethersett Lane to the A47 Southern Bypass;
- Further improvements to the Watton Road/Hethersett Lane junction and Hethersett Lane itself, over and above that associated with the current Colney Developments planning permission;
- Traffic management measures into the City Centre.

4.49 Furthermore the need to promote sustainable transport is encouraged through Section 4 of the NPPF. Importantly the NPPF advocates a pragmatic approach to transport, recognising that:

"that different policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas"
4.50 The Transport Assessment (TA) formulation was guided with consultation with the Highway Authority and through this interaction it was agreed that the TA should take account of planned developments in the locality of the NRP which could have an impact on the highway functionality. The developments which were considered to help form the baseline background data included the following:

- Bowthorpe Residential Development
- Hethersett North Residential Development
- Roundhouse Park Residential Development
- Colney Hall Redevelopment
- UEA Triangle site development
- An allocation of 1,200 Houses in Cringleford, to be accessed from Round House Way; Housing allocations in Wymondham (where relevant).

4.51 The trip generation of the proposed development and that of the adjacent NRP North development was then identified to provide a cumulative assessment of the impacts on the highway network in the vicinity of the site. The TA provides for mitigation methods which have been based on the cumulative impacts of NRP North and South and are to be delivered as a partnership.

4.52 To accommodate the anticipated expansion of the NRP South site the hospital roundabout on Colney Lane would be upgraded, a new access point would be created from the private hospital road, internal access roads would be created onto Hethersett Lane (which could require two roundabouts to be constructed), and a new access point at Watton Road would be introduced opposite the existing Colney Hall access.

4.53 Concurrent to these improvements, a series of off-site junction improvements are being assessed. These improvements include a variety of highway modifications to the B1108 (Watton Road), Colney Lane, Hethersett Lane and the Old Watton Road. The Highway Authority have also advised that they are planning to upgrade the Watton Road. The proposed development includes 2069 new car parking spaces which represents a parking ratio of approximately 1:60 for the new development, which is in accordance with the SPD.

4.54 Pedestrian and cycling access routes are planned to ensure connectivity with the NRP North site and the wider locality. Provision for footpath and cycling access will be established to connect with the desire lines identified as:

- North towards Bowthorpe and Costessey;
- East towards the University of East Anglia and Norwich city centre;
- South-east towards Cringleford and Eaton; and,
- South-west of the site along Hethersett Lane, towards Hethersett and Little Melton.

4.55 The provision of cycle paths and footpaths will be subject to ongoing discussion with the developers surrounding and their connectivity will be a consideration within those application sites.

4.56 The site is considered to be currently well serviced by bus routes/stops. The new access and internal road arrangements have been designed to accommodate a bus route through the proposed NRP North and South developments, however it is acknowledged that the provision of a bus route through the NRP site is commercial matter for the bus operator(s) and outside of the control of the applicant.

4.57 It is also proposed to establish an Area Travel Plan for the combined NRP North and South developments to promote sustainable transport.
The application has been referred to the Highway Authority and the Highways Agency and no objections have been raised subject to conditions being attached to any grant of approval. These conditions will include a phasing plan to demonstrate in terms of floorspace, location and time which identify improvements to be implemented and who would be responsible for the improvement works.

It is considered that through the controlled implementation of the mitigation works identified in the TA and the use of appropriate conditions the application is compliant with the aims and objectives of Saved Local Plan Policies TRA1, TRA 3, IMP8 and COL3. The development also proposes a level of car parking in accordance with the SPD and Saved Policies TRA18 and TRA 19.

Design

NPPF Section 7 and JCS Policy 2 (promoting good design) seek to ensure that development proposals respect local distinctiveness, including landscape setting and character, townscape and use of sustainable materials. Additionally design guidance is also provided through the South Norfolk Place Making Guide SPD.

JCS Policy 2 also requires that development which would consist of more than 50,000 sq m of non-residential floorspace should be masterplanned to ensure that it is well related to adjacent development and infrastructure. Therefore in order to comply with this requirement the NRP North and South representative bodies carried out a series of workshops in order to agree principles regarding design, scale, connectivity, drainage and transport. These collective agreed principles and themes run through both planning applications to provide for a comprehensive development structure over both sites.

In terms of scale it is proposed through the building heights parameter plans to maintain the low-medium height scales which exist within the hospital and NRP North area. Should approval be forthcoming the detailed design and appearance of buildings will be considered further at reserved matter stage.

It is considered that the proposed layout allows for a high degree of connectivity with existing and future developments. Furthermore the overall vision and concept builds upon the existing layout and orientation of the hospital complex to provide for excellent opportunities for public spaces, landscaping and buildings to maximise daylight and sunlight penetration.

The application is submitted in outline and form and as such the precise details of the appearance and orientation of the buildings is not under consideration. The parameter plans and layout plan demonstrate that the development could provide for the level of floorspace proposed in a form which would have regard to the established design principles of the locality and provide for enhancement opportunities.

The development is considered to comply with the aims and objectives of NPPF Section 7 and JCS Policy 2 (promoting good design).

Landscape

Saved Policy IMP 2 (landscaping) specifically seeks to ensure that new development incorporates a high standard of landscape so that proposals are well integrated within the surrounding landscape setting. It is also noted that proposals should reflect the character and distinctiveness and make use of native species, include new tree planting and maximise nature conservation and environmental value of the new landscape. This policy is consistent with Section 7 of the NPPF which recognises landscape as one of the key facets of good design.

The site is identified within the South Norfolk Landscape Assessment (SNLA) as being within the Yare Tributary Farmland and Parkland (YTFP) with the area to the north being within the Yare Valley Urban Fringe (YVUF) Character Area.
The landscape strategy for the YTFP is focused on the conservation and enhancement of narrow tributary corridors and historic parkland and design landscapes. The landscape strategy for the YVUF is the conservation and management of existing semi-natural woodland and wetland habitats to enhance the ecological and visual qualities of the valley.

The SNLA also identifies a number of relevant development considerations within the YVUF and YTFP which include the maintaining of the Yare Valleys as a limit to the southern suburbs of Norwich, respecting the settled character of the area and the presence of large institutional buildings including new hospital and areas of the Research Park at Colney.

The development proposal is considered to take account of these development considerations by respecting the current scale and orientation of the research park and hospital buildings and providing for potential open landscaped areas.

The proposed development is also considered to not be of detrimental impact on the important landscape features within the YVUF and YTFP. This is in part due to the development site not including the more sensitive Colney Hall location and that the design of the development layout allows for the retention of existing landscaping and the introduction of new planting; acting as mitigation against the development impacts on the characteristics of the settled areas in the locality.

Until full design details for buildings would be submitted it is not possible to anticipate the exact amount of tree loss within the application site. One of the main aims of the landscaping strategy accompanying the application is the retention of as many of the existing trees as possible. Should approval be forthcoming this should be a key component of the detailed landscape plans.

The application has been referred to the Councils Landscape Officer and no objection has been raised, accordingly the application is considered to comply with the intent of saved Policy IMP2 and the landscape design elements of Section 7 of the NPPF.

Ecology

SNLP seeks to protect local habitats and encourage biodiversity through Saved Policy IMP 3 (protection of important species) and Saved Policy IMP2 (landscaping). Saved Policy ENV 14 (habitat protection) and Saved Policy ENV15 (species protection), which afford protection to species protected under British or European Law, are also of note. The SNLP saved policies are consistent with Section 11 of the NPPF, which sets out the government's approach to minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide enhancement measures and the ecological elements of JCS Policy 1.

There are no statutory designated sites within the immediate locality of the application site. However, there are two local nature reserves and eleven County Wildlife Sites within 2km of the application site.

The Environmental Statement finds that the application site consists of a range of habitats, including arable croplands, hedgerows, trees, mixed plantation woodland and grassland. Within the site bat, bird and invertebrate activity have all been recorded.

The ecology report submitted with the application advises that the development of the site will be subject to an ongoing Environmental Construction Management Plan and that replacement habitats will be created for birds. It is also considered that the landscape strategy which is being promoted through the application details would also provide for an enhanced level of green infrastructure and habitats.

The proposal has the potential to add net value to the green infrastructure of the locality in accordance with the aims and objectives of the relevant planning policies.
Drainage and Flood Risk

4.79 The site is located within Flood Zone 1, classed as being low risk on the Environment Agency Flood Zone Map with less than a 0.1% annual probability of flooding.

4.80 The application proposes that a system of soakaways will be used to attenuate and store water. In addition, the landscape strategy for the site seeks to provide a range of measures such as new planting and green infrastructure to absorb excess water.

4.81 Should approval be forthcoming any future applications will require to be supported by an appropriate sustainable drainage strategy. This will ensure the risk of flooding to adjacent areas is also minimised.

4.82 The Environment Agency have examined the details of the Environmental Statement and advised that they have no objections to the development proposal subject to a series of conditions. The application is therefore considered to comply with section 10 of the NPPF which seeks to ensure that appropriate development is provided in suitable areas and that adequate mitigation measures are used to limit any damage from flooding.

4.83 Anglian Water have given consideration to NRP North, NRP South and potential development at Colney Hall and have advised that capacity is available for the developments at Whittingham Sewage Treatment Works, however there would be an upgrade of the Yare Valley Trunk Sewer required. Anglian Water have advised of a cooperative method of working between NRP North and South to achieve the necessary sewer upgrade and should approval be forthcoming the details of this agreed solution will be conditioned.

4.84 It is considered that through the imposition of appropriate conditions, and the approval of the details submitted for consideration, the development could be approved without any detrimental impacts being experienced which would be associated with flooding, pollution or inadequate foul sewerage connections.

Historical Assets

4.85 Saved Policy IMP15 (setting of listed buildings) seeks to protect listed buildings and their setting, which is consistent with paragraph 132 of the NPPF which seeks to preserve heritage assets.

4.86 The application site does not contain any listed buildings and it is not within a conservation area. The impact of the proposal on the local listed buildings and structures has been examined through the Environmental Statement.

4.87 It is considered that the landscape planting and the proposed siting of buildings, detailed within the parameter plans, is sufficient to ensure that there would not be significant adverse impacts upon the built historical assets.

4.88 Saved Policy ENV9 (nationally and locally important archaeological remains) states that where a proposal would cause significant alteration, damage, or have a significant impact on the setting of archaeological remains there will be a presumption against development. The policy goes on to state that development affecting sites of local importance will only be permitted if the need for development outweighs the local value of the remains. The policy concludes that if preservation in-situ is not merited planning permission can be subject to appropriate archaeological conditions. The NPPF and SPD also identify that an archaeological desk study should be prepared.

4.89 The applicant submitted a desk based archaeological survey which was required by Norfolk County Council Historic Environment Service (NCC HES) to be supplemented with further information obtained from digging trial trenches. This work was undertaken under the supervision of the NCC HES and no objections to the development have subsequently been raised subject to the imposition of a condition.
Amenity

4.90 Saved Policy IMP9 of the SNLP states that 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.

4.91 It is considered that the development would not have any negative impact on the residential amenity of any dwelling in the locality in terms of overlooking or overshadowing.

4.92 Saved Policy IMP10 (Noise) states that development would not be permitted if it would create significant noise impacts on sensitive receptors. Consideration would therefore need to be given to the noise associated with plant and traffic. The Environmental Statement concludes that there would be no significant adverse impact on residential amenity in relation to noise from the development, and the Council's Environmental Protection Team have not objected to the development either.

Sustainability

4.93 JCS Policies 1 (addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets) and 3 (energy and water) both require a high level of sustainability to be achieved. Policy 3 of the JCS places a specific requirement for all major development proposals to include sources of decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy providing at least 10% of the scheme's expected energy requirements. Furthermore the SPD sets a requirement for new development on the NRP site to obtain a BREEAM rating of excellent to very good.

4.94 The applicant has acknowledged the planning policy requirements within their Environmental Statement and has made several suggestions to achieving the BREEAM standards and 10% renewable/low carbon energy aims. This includes the potential to create an energy strategy with the NRP North development proposal to take forward the implementation of low carbon energy centres.

4.95 The precise details of the mechanisms to achieve the planning policy requirements will require to be addressed as part of any future reserved matters application.

Conclusion

4.96 The principle of the development is considered to be consistent with the planning policy land allocations and could provide up to 3000 full time jobs with or associated with a high value, knowledge driven industry. The nature of the potential jobs and the planned growth of this sector are directly in accordance with the aspirations of the NPPF, JCS and associated SPD.

4.97 The applicants for NRP North and South have worked jointly to produce an overall Transport Assessment that examines the cumulative effects of the development and those which are surrounding (approved and planned). The Transport Assessment has proposed a series of highway works to address the inevitable increase in the use of the site by all forms of transport. The improvements are wide ranging and aim to ensure that the flow of traffic is not impeded and that all alternative modes of transport are promoted and accommodated for. To provide these upgrade works a phasing plan has been agreed between the applicants which stipulates the location, and quantum of development required to trigger certain works. The draft Phasing Plan is attached as appendix 2. The phasing plan is recommended to be conditioned and the first phase of works encompassed within the Section 106 agreement.
4.98 The development is in outline form and as such the built environment and landscaping strategy are only detailed through parameter plans and indicative strategies to achieve the aims and objectives of the relevant planning policies. The baseline principles which the application seeks to establish for development are considered to provide for extensive opportunities to create high quality working environments, increased quality of green infrastructure and the development of sustainable buildings and transport infrastructure.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The application is considered to accord with the intent of the Saved Policies EMP1, COL1, COL2 and COL4 as the development would provide for high knowledge sector employment within the B1(b) use class, or ancillary uses, within the allocated land. Furthermore the use classes proposed meet with the aims and objectives identified in the Norwich Research Park SPD, JCS Policy 5 and NPPF section 1 with regard to employment provision and planning for growth.

5.2 The quantum of development proposed is considered to be acceptable in scale to that which has been promoted through JCS Policy 9 and the Norwich Research Park SPD.

5.3 The development proposal is subject to the implementation of highway improvements and works which ensure that the flow of traffic is not impeded and that all alternative modes of transport are promoted and accommodated for in accordance with the requirements of Saved Policies IMP8 and COL3 and the transport elements of the Norwich Research Park SPD.

5.4 The parameter, layout and landscaping plans demonstrate that the development could provide for the level of floorspace proposed in a form which would have regard to the current research park locality, provide for enhancement opportunities and not be detrimental to existing landscape character in accordance with the aims and objectives of NPPF Section 7 and JCS Policy 2 and Saved Policy IMP2.

5.5 The application details principles of sustainable development which accord with the objectives stated within JCS Policies 1 and 3 and the Norwich Research Park SPD to provide for 10% of energy use from low carbon/renewable resources and achieve a high standard of BREEAM rating.

5.6 The development proposal demonstrates through the indicative landscape masterplan and strategy that the surrounding listed structures will be effectively screened to ensure that their setting and views to and from them, are not negatively impacted upon in accordance with Saved Policy IMP15 and the NPPF.

5.7 The development proposal offers opportunities to enhance the green infrastructure of the locality through increased planting and other mitigation measures which accord with the intent of Saved Policies IMP 2, IMP3, ENV 14 and ENV15 and JCS Policy 1.

5.8 Through the use of appropriate conditions the development can be provided without any increased risk to flooding, ground water pollution or over burden on the foul sewerage capacity in accordance with the aims and objectives of JCS Policy 1 and NPPF Section 10.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail:
Ian Reilly 01508 533674 ireilly@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Joint Phasing Plan for Highway Network Improvements NRP North and South

The Joint Transport Assessment Proposed Expansion of NRP, Colney, Norwich – Transport Assessment (August 2012) was submitted in support of the planning applications for NRP North (Planning Application No. 2012/1477) and NRP South (Planning Application No. 2012/1880).

The Joint Transport Assessment identifies the phasing strategy for transport improvements proposed to support the NRP based on the following development phasing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>2016 (Cumulative sqm Delivered) GEA</th>
<th>2021 (Cumulative sqm Delivered) GEA</th>
<th>2026 Total (Cumulative sqm Delivered) GEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NRP North East Site</td>
<td>4,339</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>24,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRP North West Site</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>33,909</td>
<td>43,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative NRP North</td>
<td>14,739</td>
<td>35,710</td>
<td>68,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRP South East Site</td>
<td>22,965</td>
<td>54,410</td>
<td>56,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRP South West Site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative NRP South</td>
<td>22,965</td>
<td>54,410</td>
<td>104,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Phasing of Transport Improvements

Implemented for Phase 1: 37,704 sqm GEA of cumulative new development across NRP (estimated at 2016)
- Colney Lane / NRP North Site Access Junction (Drawing 60237873_045)
- Colney Lane / NNUH Access Junction (Drawing 60237873_038)
- Pedestrian and cycle route along the eastern side of Hethersett Lane along NRP North frontage from the B1108 Watton
- Road to the proposed NRP Access junction (Drawing 60237873_101).
- Pedestrian and cycle route along the western side of Hethersett Lane for the extents of the NRP North site frontage constructed as part of the junction works undertaken on this section of Hethersett Lane (Drawing 60237873_102).
- New NRP North accesses onto Hethersett Lane (Drawing 60237873_101)
- New NRP South access onto Hospital Road (Drawing 60237873_076)
- B1108 Watton Road / Hethersett Lane (for access and safety reasons) (Drawing 60237873_036)
- Additional pedestrian and cycle signage along the routes in the vicinity of the site.
- Shower facilities, bicycle parking & bicycle storage lockers
- Colney Lane Bus Stop Upgrade (Bus Stop A) (2 shelters, 2 seats, Passenger Information, Possible Real time passenger information at two stops.)
- Area Travel Plan Coordinator

Implemented for Phase 2: 90,120 sqm GEA of cumulative new development across NRP (estimated at 2021)
- B1108 Watton Road / Colney Lane (Drawing 60237873_039)
- CCTV at B1108 Watton Road / Colney Lane junction
- NRP South access roundabouts onto Hethersett Lane (Drawing 60237873_077 & 60237873_078)
- Potential improvement of surface quality and provision of lighting along the foot/cycleway from the IFR site to the Cross Valley Path
- Shower facilities, bicycle parking & bicycle storage lockers
- Bicycle Sharing Scheme Bicycles
- Provision of new onsite Bus Stop (Bus Stop B) (2 shelters, 2 seats, Passenger Information, Possible Real time passenger information at two stops.)
- Pedestrian and cycle route along the western side of Hethersett Lane along NRP South frontage from southern extents of the scheme constructed in Phase 1, to the A47 (Drawing 60237873_102).
Implemented for Phase 3: 172,635 sqm GEA of cumulative new development across NRP (estimated at 2026)

- B1108 Watton Road / Old Watton Road (Drawing 60237873_037)
- CCTV at B1108 / Old Watton Road junction
- NRP South access onto Watton Road at Colney Hall and associated link road (Drawing 60237873_078)
- Toucan Crossing of B1108 Watton Road at existing bus stops from NRP North Site (Drawing 60237873_037)
- Upgrades to existing bus stops on Watton Road (between Old Watton Road and Colney Lane) with bus shelters, seating and passenger information.
- Upgrade northern footpath from the existing Watton Road bus stops to the B1108 Watton Road/ Old Watton Road junction for shared pedestrian and cycle use. (Drawing 60237873_037)
- Shower facilities, bicycle parking & bicycle storage lockers
- Watton Road Bus Stop Upgrade (Bus Stop D) (2 shelters, 2 seats, Passenger Information.)
- New Bus Stops Watton Road (Bus Stop C) (2 shelters, 2 seats, Passenger Information)

Refined Phasing of Highway Network Improvements
A refined phasing strategy for the junction improvement works proposed as part of the mitigation strategy is outlined below. This identifies more detailed trigger points than those outlined in the Joint Transport Assessment.

Phase 1 - Refined Phasing of Highway Network Improvements (2012-2016)
1.1 No more than 4,536 sqm gross internal area (GIA) of development on NRP North shall be occupied until up the following junction improvement and site access works have been designed, constructed and made available for use:

- Colney Lane / NRP North Site Access Junction (Drawing 60237873_045)
- B1108 Watton Road / Hethersett Lane (Drawing 60237873_036)
- Hethersett Lane / NRP North Site Access Junction (Drawing 60237873_101)

1.2 No more than 4,536 sqm gross internal area (GIA) of development on NRP North and 4,902 sqm gross internal area (GIA) of development on NRP South shall be occupied until up the Colney Lane / Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital (Drawing 60237873_038) Access Junction Improvement works have been designed, constructed and made available for use.

Phase 2 - Refined Phasing of Highway Network Improvements (2016-2021)
2.1 No more than 22,026 sqm gross internal area (GIA) of development on NRP North and 33,850 sqm gross internal area (GIA) of development on NRP South shall be occupied until up the B1108 Watton Road / Colney Lane junction improvements works (Drawing 60237873_039) have been designed, constructed and made available for use.

Phase 3 - Refined Phasing of Highway Network Improvements (2021-2026)
3.1 No more than 40,208 sqm gross internal area (GIA) of development on NRP North and 61,338 sqm gross internal area (GIA) of development on NRP South shall be occupied until up the B1108 Watton Road / Old Watton Road improvements works (Drawing 60237873_037) have been designed, constructed and made available for use.
2. **Appl. No**: 2011/1804/O  
**Parish**: HETHERSETT

**Applicants Name**: Hethersett Land Ltd & Landowners  
**Site Address**: Land North Of Hethersett Village Centre, Little Melton Road (including Extension To Thickthorn Park & Ride) Hethersett

**Proposal**: Residential led mixed use development of 1196 dwellings and associated uses including Primary School, Local Services (up to 1,850 square metres (GIA) of A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1 & B1 uses) comprising shops, small business units, community facilities/doctors surgeries, sports pitches, recreational space, equipped areas of play and informal recreation spaces. Extension to Thickthorn Park and Ride including new dedicated slip road from A11.

**Recommendation**: Approve with conditions

1. Outline Permission Time Limit  
2. Standard outline requiring RM (RM’s to include, siting, design, layout, landscaping, and phasing)  
3. In accordance with submitted drawings  
4. Design Code to be submitted and approved prior to submission of reserved matters  
5. Detailed phasing plan for open space provision to be submitted and agreed  
6. External materials to be agreed  
7. Surface water drainage  
8. Foul water strategy  
9. Archaeological work to be agreed  
10. Off-site highway works (Thickthorn)  
11. Ecological management strategy TBA  
12. Details of estate roads  
13. Estate road details for each phase TBA  
14. Construction Traffic parking TBA  
15. Construction Traffic Route TBA  
16. Details of wheel cleaning facilities TBA  
17. Travel Plan  
18. Development limited to 1196 dwellings  
19. Landscaping scheme TBA  
20. Retention of trees and hedges  
21. Tree protection  
22. Contamination - detailed scheme TBA  
23. Details of flood lighting to be agreed  
24. Fire hydrants  
25. Individual reserved matters – levels  
26. No residential development to the east of Burnthouse Lane until strategic gap agreed  
27. Amended Masterplan detailing additional buffer planting to Colney Lane (to accommodate additional mitigation for newts) to submitted and agreed

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, local centre (including retail and small business units and community facilities), and safe and direct cycle and pedestrian routes.
1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework

NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy
NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport
NPPF 06: Delivering a wide choice of high quality home
NPPF 07: Requiring good design
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities
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 4: Housing delivery
Policy 5: The Economy
Policy 6: Access and Transportation
Policy 7: Supporting Communities
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 14: Key Service Centres
Policy 20: Implementation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan

ENV 2: Areas of open land which maintain a physical separation between settlements within the Norwich Area (Part Consistent)
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)
ENV 13: Sites of regional and local nature conservation interest and geological/geomorphological value (Part Consistent)
ENV 14: Habitat protection
ENV 15: Species protection
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic
IMP 9: Residential amenity
HOU 3: Strategic Land Reserve (Part Consistent)
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes
IMP 2: Landscaping
IMP 10: Noise
IMP 25: Outdoor lighting

2. Planning History

2.1 2011/1489 Formal EIA Scoping Opinion for proposed residential Led mixed use development for 1196 dwellings, local centre, community facilities and associated infrastructure, including extension to Thickthorn Park & Ride

Approve with no conditions

3. Consultations

3.1 Great Melton Parish Council

Refuse

- No assurances of adequate drainage facilities.
- Not apparent how sewage will be dealt with
- Road systems not adequate
- No guarantees that the infrastructure in the area will be able to cope
- Light ad noise pollution
- Loss of green belt land
- Increased security risk to Great Melton residents
- Large scale development should not be considered until LDF consultations have been completed
- The numbers of dwellings proposed is too much for a village

Little Melton Parish Council

Original plans

The emphasis on green space, cycling and walking is to be commended and if done properly the development could be an exemplar of sustainable transport.

However, have raised the following concerns:
- Traffic studies have ignored the roads to Little Melton
- Phase 1 and 2 should be reversed and the cycleways and roads put in place first
- Impact on Infrastructure
- Back Lane can not take construction vehicles
- Off-ride cycle route need to join up with the UEA cycle route
- Would want to see provision for a public house.

Amended plans
- Who will provide the missing section of Cycle Route between Braymeadow Lane and the bridge over the A47? The cycle path should be completed within the first phase of development. A safe cycle route should be seen as a selling point for the new houses.
- Money should be provided for traffic calming measures in Little Melton, that slow down the traffic and make through journeys unattractive.
- Consideration should be given to providing traffic lights at the junction of New Road and the B1172 as it will be very difficult for traffic to turn right at peak hours without them and this will lead to rat running.
- Why is there no sheltered housing being proposed within the development?

There should be an additional doctors surgery within the development.

Hethersett Parish Council

Original Plans – Refuse

- Application is premature
- Shortage in five year land supply should not be considered a material consideration when assessing this planning application (following legal rulings)
- Contrary to JCS ‘Strategic Gap’ policy
- Outside the development boundary
- Should not Hethersett have had an Area Action Plan, as is the case for Wymondham?

Detailed comments

- Should the development be approved, Henstead Road needs significant improvement.
The rear access to the High School from Back Lane should be investigated in order to alleviate increased traffic in Queen’s Road.

There should be no road access/exit to new Road at the Great Melton/ New Road junction.

Significant improvements required to Colney Lane to support an increase in traffic.

All proposed community facilities should be provided in full and on time.

Is there sufficient capacity in the current water infrastructure to meet the demands of the proposed development?

Will appropriate health facilities be provided in accordance with the JCS?

Will education provision be developed adequately to accommodate the large increase in pupil numbers arising from the development?

Amended plans – Refuse

The use of Henstead Road as a primary access/exit to the site is unacceptable, unworkable, unsafe and will cause major congestion in the area.

How can access to Henstead Road be ‘limited’ as the applicant’s suggest?

The developer should be made to construct an access road for construction vehicles to Colney Lane, and not us Churchfields as suggested.

Traffic controls, traffic lights / roundabout need to be put in place at the New Road/B1172 junction to cope with additional traffic from the development.

The access road at the west end of the development site should link directly with the New Road/Great Melton Road junction with associated traffic control.

Can assurances be given that provision for surface water drainage has been adequately addressed?

Object

Traffic

Erosion of gaps between villages

Loss of productive farmland and reduction of biodiversity

Development alternatives have not been considered

Plans are lacking in detail regarding sewage, drainage and landscape issues

Application should be determined by members of committee to allow for the examination of the impact on the existing community, to assess the proposed planning gains, and to ensure those are secured in perpetuity. To check that the housing accords with the LDP and the GNDP requirements for the provision of affordable housing.

Has also raised many concerns and queries in respect of the environmental impact of the development, particularly regarding the traffic impact of the proposals and its effect on the local road network. The applicant has responded to these queries, and the majority of them have been answered satisfactorily through further explanation.
3.8 SNC: Planning Policy

Strategic Gap

The applicant's Design and Access Statement (DAS) suggests that Saved Local Plan Policy ENV2 is 'out of date'. We have recently received updated advice from landscape consultants which confirms the importance of the strategic gap between Cringleford and Hethersett. This reinforces Saved Local Plan Policy ENV2 which protects the physical separation between settlements, and will inform emerging policy. Technically, parts of this site intrude into the strategic gap. The relocation of the sports pitches to the east of the site lessens the visual impact of the proposed development when approaching from Colney Lane, and this move is appreciated. However, the latest version of the Illustrative Masterplan shows housing and apartments to the east of Burnthouse Lane, i.e. within the strategic gap.

Northern Site Boundary

The preferred site for development, as recently featured in South Norfolk's Site Specific Allocations consultation, stops south of the applicant's proposed site boundary, in order to avoid the overhead cables. While it is recognised that the application is in outline form and the Illustrative Masterplan indicates a non-residential buffer to the north of the site, the northerly extent of the site and potential proximity of housing to the overhead cables is a concern. Additionally, the proximity of the site to Little Melton prompted a draft policy requirement for strategic landscaping to the north of the site, which appears to be addressed in the Illustrative Masterplan.

Proposed Number of Dwellings

JCS policies 10 and 14 identify 'at least 1,000 dwellings' at Hethersett, along with open space, community facilities and housing with care. The draft Site Specific Allocations document proposes around 1,200 dwellings for the village, but this includes land outside the application site. The application therefore represents a higher
number of dwellings than the equivalent preferred site. However, Hethersett is in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) and there is an acknowledged shortage of housing supply in the NPA.

Green Infrastructure/Pedestrian and Cycle Access
JCS policy 10 calls for green infrastructure to provide enhanced public access from Hethersett into the countryside. The Illustrative Masterplan appears to provide several green corridors to address this requirement. The emerging Site Specific Allocations document also sets out draft policy requirements for footpath/cycle links to NRP and Little Melton.

Other Policy Requirements
The emerging Site Specific Allocations document sets out draft policy requirements for the sites in Hethersett, including that they should be masterplanned together. It is recognised that this application has been developed over a significant period of time, and at this advanced stage, the Illustrative Masterplan can possibly only allow for development on adjacent sites, which it seems to do. Additionally, community facilities and open space seem to accord with those needs already identified by local residents, and outlined in the emerging Site Specific Allocations document.

3.9 Landscape Officer  No objection subject to appropriate conditions.

3.10 SNC: Economic Dev  It is important that employment opportunities and commercial development are recognised and included in this substantial site – no objections are raised to the application.

3.11 Environmental Services (Protection)  No objection subject to appropriate conditions that deal with any possible ground contamination.

3.12 NCC – Planning Obligations  1 form entry Primary School required – costs to be met by the developer (£5 million)

A pro-rata contribution towards the build costs of extending the school would be required. (Plus additional land for a larger school.)

£1,737,054 contribution towards secondary and sixth form provision required.

A minimum of 25 fire hydrants.

£71,760 towards library provision (£60 / dwelling)

3.13 National Planning Casework Unit  No comments received

3.14 Norfolk Wildlife Trust  Concerns over the impact on Beckhithe Meadow CWS. A management plan directing walkers away from sensitive areas should be submitted. Measures should be put in place to minimise light pollution. Green Infrastructure?
3.15 Fisher German (Gov. Pipeline) The applicants have taken their requirements into consideration, and the proposal is broadly acceptable subject to conditions requiring the precise location of the pipeline to be located on site using trial holes; there shall be no construction works within 10 feet of the pipeline; proposed road and service crossings to the required standards with consent from the S0S for Defence.

3.16 Highways Agency No objection, subject to appropriate conditions.

3.17 The Ramblers (Norfolk Area) No comments received

3.18 Ministry Of Defence No objection

3.19 Police Architectural Liaison Officer No comments received

3.20 Norfolk Gardens Trust No comments received

3.21 Housing Strategy Manager After extensive discussion and negotiation with the applicants based on detailed financial appraisal we have reached agreement on the affordable housing aspects of this application, which will be enforced through a S106 Agreement covering the following:

- Affordable housing will comprise 20% of the dwellings to be built
- 70% of the affordable housing will be for rent and 30% will be for sale
- The mix of property types and tenures meets needs, and will be located throughout the site
- There will be a clawback arrangement so that additional affordable housing will be funded through commuted sums if property values increase
- The Council will have the option to buy land at a fixed price, providing the possibility of increasing the amount of affordable housing on the site towards the policy target of 33%

On this basis I am satisfied with the affordable housing aspects of the application.

3.22 Sport England Open space provision for football could preclude provision for rugby or cricket. Suggest flexibility in terms of pitch provision.

Contributions should be made towards the improvement of existing indoor sport provision (as none is proposed on site). Pro Rata costs set out in SE response.

3.23 NCC: Historic Environment Service No objection, subject to conditions.

3.24 English Heritage General advice, but in particular they raise the issue of floodlighting to the sports pitches and its potential impact on the heritage assets to the north of the site.

3.25 Natural England General advice regarding protected species, County Wildlife Sites and Green Infrastructure.
3.26 Anglian Water Services Ltd
Upgrading the existing network and a new pumping station and sewers is required. The development will also need to contribute to upsizing of the Yare Valley Sewer to mitigate spills at the Trowse Lane pumping station overflow.

These works are outlined within the FRA and should be conditioned.

A drainage strategy has been agreed with the developers which will ensure that there is no downstream flooding from the foul sewerage network. Full details of this strategy will need to be secured by condition.

3.27 Environment Agency
No objection, subject to appropriate conditions.

3.28 NCC Highways
No transport objection to the application subject to a S106 securing the Travel Plan funding and appropriate conditions requiring various off-site highway works.

3.29 Garden History Society
No comments received

3.30 Hethersett Society
Object
- Infrastructure would be unable to cope
- Moving Hethersett closer to Cringleford

3.31 National Grid
No comments received

3.32 Play And Amenities Area Officer
No comments received

3.33 SNC: Ecologist
Considers the broad principle of the development and its impact on ecology acceptable, subject to the approval of an appropriate ecological management plan, and the following:

- The applicant may need a slight tweak to the illustrative masterplan to include a buffer for Great Crested Newts down the side of the eastern section (currently in the strategic gap) of 20-30m. The buffer zone will need to include amphibian fencing and tunnels under the three site access roads along the boundary of eastern development, alongside Colney Lane. If this is not possible the applicant needs to consider an offsetting scheme. This will form part of the Natural England licence application.

- Before a licence is applied for the applicant needs to prepare a methods statement for Great Crested Newts work. A site for the compensation pond and terrestrial habitat creation/enhancement will have to be confirmed before the licence is applied for. SuDS should be left out of the newt licence mitigation.

- An Ecological Management Plan be made into part of a Section 106 agreement, containing methodology of the maintenance of each informal recreation, green spaces and networks of corridors and woodland buffers and SuDS, to be submitted and signed off in by South Norfolk District Council. This plan will be separate to the newt licence mitigation plans.
3.34 First Eastern Counties (bus service) Raise concerns with some of the proposed junction arrangements causing significant delays for the buses.

3.35 County Council – Minerals and Waste No objection. The requirements of Policy CS16 of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy have been met.

3.36 Local Residents 118 individual letters of objection received raising a number of issues.

A representation has also been received from a group of concerned residents collectively known as ‘Hethersett Our Way’. The comments made by this group are a fair reflection of the concerns raised by individual local residents, and for information I have attached the response as appendix 2 to this report.

4. Assessment

The Site and Proposal

4.1 The site has a total area of 86.25 ha. There are 2 main elements, the first is the main development area situated to the north of Hethersett; the second is a proposed extension to the Thickthorn Park and Ride site. A site location plan is attached as appendix 1.

4.2 The land to the north of Hethersett proposed as the village extension has a development area of approximately 83.59ha. It is an arable landscape with fields separated by hedgerows and / or drainage ditches. In the eastern part hedgerows have been degraded and lost, some having been replaced by lines of bramble. This area is more level where it is close to the village edge, but falls away towards the watercourse valleys to the north and west. The land rises again to the north of this site.

4.3 A further 2.66ha is outlined for a proposed extension to the existing Thickthorn Park and Ride site to provide up to 250 additional spaces and additional land to be used as a dedicated slip road off the A11 and for further possible expansion of the site in the future. The site falls away from the village towards the A11 to the south. The gentle, but frequent, undulation in the landform in this area creates an intimate scale to local views and, when combined with vegetation, results in a small visual envelope of the proposal site. Significant views of the eastern part of the proposed site can be afforded from Colney Lane.

4.4 The Planning Application proposes a residential led mixed use development on the land to include the following:

- Up to 1,196 dwellings;
- Local Centre;
- New primary school;
- Extension to existing secondary school;
- Sports pitches, recreational spaces, equipped areas of play and informal recreation spaces;
- Associated highway infrastructure, including land for an extension to the Thickthorn Park and Ride, and land for a new slip road from the A11 directly into the Park and Ride site.

4.5 The application is in outline form only, which reserves the details of all matters (except for access) for determination at a later date. This application includes plans and supporting information that indicate the broad parameters of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of the proposed development.
The original application submitted in October 2011 was amended in October 2012, as a consequence of further design work following the public consultation exercise; progress with adjacent development sites (i.e. the Gladedale site, Great Melton Road); discussions between the Council and the applicant and additional technical work. The changes were consulted upon during October/Early November 2012, and they included the following:

- Small area to the south of the Colney Lane/Braymeadow Lane junction. This is to ensure the cycle route is on Highways land/ Landowners Consortium land in this location;
- Small area around the Colney Lane/Norwich Road junction to accommodate cycle provision;
- Site access from Great Melton Road to reflect Gladedale’s proposed latest vehicular access arrangement – this change has resulted in the site area being reduced slightly (by approx. 0.8ha) from that originally submitted.
- Hethersett Athletic Football Club and public sports pitches are proposed to be relocated to the east, the flattest area of the site, reducing earthworks and providing a gateway to development, to act as an interface between the village and the open countryside;
- A new area of housing proposed where the football pitches were previously located
- Reduced development density in the parcel adjacent to Colney Lane the site to reflect a more rural character;
- Revised SUDS strategy to reflect further discussions with the Environment Agency, and the changes in layout.

The proposed development is expected to be delivered in phases. The following phasing has been suggested in order to provide some indication of what could be the anticipated development programme and phasing for the proposed development.

- Phase 1 (2013-2017) incorporating 371 dwellings in two sub-phases, land for a mixed-use centre, primary school, secondary school extension, shared-space on Back Lane between the secondary school and development area, traffic calming on Little Melton Road/Henstead Road, a new southern access link road between the site and Back Lane/Churchfields and the provision of 2.66 hectares of land for an extension of the Park & Ride site and the provision of land for a dedicated slip-road access from the northbound A11;
- Phase 2 (2017-2018) incorporating 99 dwellings in two sub-phases, diversion of Burnthouse Lane to form a new eastern access road linking to Colney Lane through the development area, provision of football pitch and club house for Hethersett Athletic Football Club, downgrading of existing Back Lane to pedestrian/cycleway link, signalisation of B1172 Norwich Road/Colney Lane junction and Colney Lane cycle link; and
- Phase 3 (2018-2021) incorporating 299 dwellings in two sub-phases, provision of contribution towards improvements at the B1108 Watton Road/Hethersett Lane junction, provision of additional football pitches and internal network connections;
- Phase 4 (2021-2023) incorporating 216 dwellings and internal network connections, provision of land for Park & Ride extension and its access; and
- Phase 5 (2023-2025) incorporating 211 dwellings, community gardens and allotments, and a new western access link road forming a junction with Great Melton Road/New Road.

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 in this case:

- The provisions of the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS), which allocates Hethersett for further development of at least 1000 dwellings during the period 2011 to 2026.
• There is an acknowledged lack of a 5-year housing supply within the Norwich Policy Area (currently 68.3% 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 also includes an additional buffer of 5%.

• The sustainability of the site's location, having regard to Hethersett being a location for major expanded communities as set out in Policy 10 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 significant levels of housing being delivered within the next 5 years).

• Other relevant sections of the NPPF.

4.9 It is noted that there has been a significant amount of objection to the proposal from local residents and Parish Councils raising a number of issues. In view of this, the representation of the ‘Hethersett Our Way’ group is attached in Appendix 3 being typical of the range of objections received. Local members have also raised a number of concerns. Taking on board the comments raised, 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, the identification of the majority of the site as a preferred allocation for residential development, and the requirement to achieve a 5-year land supply of housing.
• Development within a ‘strategic gap’
• The suitability of the site having regard to its sustainability and the impact on the landscape and ecology
• Drainage & flood risk
• Highway Impact (including cycleway and pedestrian links)
• Education
• Proposed community facilities
• Green infrastructure
• Layout and design
• Jobs and economic growth

4.10 Other environmental issues that need to be considered include the proximity of a Government pipeline, HV electricity cables and pylons, archaeology and heritage impacts, and wider green infrastructure implications.

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

4.11 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 with 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'.

4.12 In terms of sustainability, the site is well located in relation to the secondary school, whose playing fields are adjacent to the site’s boundary, and other facilities including the village hall. The village has a range of local facilities dispersed throughout it with there being two clusters of facilities located on the convergence of routes. The primary cluster is located around Queen's Road, Great Melton Road and Henstead Road, which is within walking/cycling distance of the site. The second cluster is located at the Norwich Road end of Queen's Road.
4.13 Hethersett has good bus links to Norwich and Wymondham, and it is well located for the Norwich Research Park, Norfolk & Norwich University Hospital, the University of East Anglia to the north-east of Hethersett, and Longwater Business and Retail Park to the north.

4.14 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 development cannot be dismissed purely on the grounds of prematurity, and that the demonstrable lack of a housing supply carries significant weight in the consideration of the application. The proposal meets the NPPF’s key objectives for sustainable development, including promoting sustainable development, delivering a wide choice of high quality homes, good design, taking account of climate change, dealing with flood risk and conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

**Strategic Gap**

4.15 The existing Strategic Gap is defined on the Local Plan Proposals Map by Local Plan Policy ENV2. This includes a green wedge to the east of Hethersett to maintain a gap with Cringleford, and a wedge to the southwest of Hethersett to maintain a gap with Wymondham. The policy states that “inappropriate development” and other development which would erode the gaps between the built up limits of settlements, or which would otherwise undermine the general quality of openness of these gaps, will not be permitted.

4.16 However, to some extent it can be said that policy ENV2 is out of date, as we are currently re-assessing the geographical boundaries of the Strategic Gap in order to prepare the final version of the Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD & Development Management Policies DPD. Consideration should also be given to the fact that the Council is seeking to allocate part of the existing Strategic Gap for development.

4.17 The applicants have undertaken a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) that assessed the local landscape and townscape in and around the proposed development site to the north of Hethersett and also the proposed extension to the Thickthorn Park and Ride. It evaluated the potential effects of the proposed development upon the landscape resources and visual receptors and identifies appropriate mitigation where there are residual effects. The overall conclusions are that the visual impacts are most apparent at viewpoints closest to the development site, which would be as expected. From most other viewpoints, including towards Little Melton and Great Melton the impacts were assessed as low or negligible, with the occasional moderate adverse impact from certain viewpoints.

4.18 The LVIA also confirms that the development maintains a physical and visual separation between Hethersett and Little Melton which is reinforced by the electricity pylons running to the north of the site; and Hethersett and Wymondham to the west. I would concur with these conclusions.

4.19 Although the majority of the proposed development accords with the preferred allocation, the proposed development to the east of Burnthouse Lane (approx. 100 dwellings as well as playing fields and the proposed new football club house), is located outside this preferred area, and within the Strategic Gap. This designation seeks to maintain a visual gap with Cringleford to the east, and therefore the assessment of the impact of this development needs to consider the extent to which it would erode this gap.

4.20 This impact causes me some concern, as the development breaks out beyond Burnthouse Lane, which I consider to be a natural boundary to the larger development, minimising its impact on the strategic gap with Cringleford. The applicants have recognised this concern, and have offered a compromise solution that would preclude residential development on land currently identified in the emerging Strategic Gap designation to the west of Colney Lane (including the part of the site to the east of Burnthouse Lane), for 3 years and until such time as the emerging strategic gap policy is tested and adopted through the Local Plan process. This provision can be set out in a condition or section 106 legal agreement.
Subject to the condition outlined above, I am satisfied that the development can take place without significantly eroding or undermining the general quality of openness of the gaps between Hethersett and Little Melton, Wymondham and Cringleford, and in accordance with the aims of JCS Policy 10 and local Plan policy ENV2.

**Infrastructure**

As I have already stated, Hethersett is a location for major expanded communities as set out in Policy 10 of the JCS, and is therefore considered to be sustainable location for development. However, JCS Policy 20 requires development to bring with it infrastructure essential to secure sustainable development. The applicant’s response to this requirement can be summarised in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Requirements</th>
<th>Infrastructure Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate transport infrastructure including the implementation of NATS and the construction of the NDR and improved public transport.</td>
<td>Land for extension to the Thickthorn Park and Ride, and a new slip road from the A11. New and improved, frequent bus services. Pedestrian and cycle routes on and off site. Junction improvements to B1172 Norwich Road/Colney Lane junction and B1108 Watton Road/Hethersett Lane junction. Financial contributions – to be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable or supported housing</td>
<td>Up to 33% affordable housing provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social infrastructure, including education, healthcare, police and emergency services,</td>
<td>Education provision – primary school including pre-school provision, and secondary school expansion. Financial contributions for services and facilities where required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community facilities.</td>
<td>Local Centre including D1 community facility or doctor’s surgery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and renewable energy generation.</td>
<td>20.5% of energy provided through renewable sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water conservation measures.</td>
<td>Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 for water achievable. Mitigation measures ensure a 20% reduction in water demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).</td>
<td>Masterplan incorporates SuDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic sewers.</td>
<td>Financial contributions towards upgrades off-site. Provision of sewers on-site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space and green infrastructure, including habitat creation, pedestrian and cycle links, allotments, recreation facilities, parks, trees, hedgerows, woodland and landscaping.</td>
<td>A total of 24.87 ha of open and recreation space provided as part of the development including general leisure and informal children’s play areas, formal children’s play areas, woodland, allotments, community gardens and orchards and sports pitches. Pedestrian and cycle routes on and off site. Structural landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Utilities, including waste management/recycling/composting facilities.</td>
<td>To be finalised at detailed design stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street furniture.</td>
<td>To be finalised at detailed design stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public art.</td>
<td>To be finalised at detailed design stage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ecology

4.23 Policy 1 of the JCS, and local plan policies ENV13 and ENV14 requires development to have no impact on European protected species and habitats, and to seek to maintain and enhance existing biodiversity. Development should also contribute towards a wider Green Infrastructure network allowing for wider access to the countryside.

4.24 The Masterplan Process considered ecology throughout by designing out areas of potential conflict so aspects of the scheme provide potential beneficial ecological enhancements, which are integral to the scheme, rather than being mitigation for the scheme. The assessment of the site identifies the following important species and habitats:

- River Wensum Special Area of Conservation (SAC), 5.5 km to the north (international significance);
- Eaton Chalk Pit Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), 3.1 km to the east (national significance);
- 11 County Wildlife Sites (CWSs) within 2km of the Development Area (the nearest is Beckhithe Meadow, adjacent to the north-west boundary of the site) (County significance)
- Common and pipistrelle bats (District significance);
- Barbastelle and brown long-eared bats (Local-District significance).

4.25 The Masterplan for the site has considered ecology throughout by designing out areas of potential conflict so aspects of the scheme provide potential beneficial ecological enhancements, which are integral to the scheme, rather than being mitigation for the scheme. As a result, the assessment demonstrates that there are no unacceptable effects on these receptors.

4.26 Although there are some areas of UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority habitat at the site, the assessment considers that none are considered to be particularly high quality examples when judged against others within Norfolk. Although there is the loss of some UK BAP hedgerows, other UK BAP habitats on the site, such as a block of lowland woodland and a pond, will be enhanced by the scheme.

4.27 Local Plan Policy IMP25 requires proposals involving outdoor lighting schemes to demonstrate that the proposed lighting has no detrimental impact on sites of nature conservation value. The Ecology assessment considered the likely impact of proposed new lighting on ecology. Myotis, barbastelle and brown long-eared bats (and some invertebrates) are sensitive to artificial light, so the presence of artificial lighting would result in the displacement of these light sensitive species. However, as explained above, the scheme has designed in appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures. For example, the north planting screen and attenuation ponds will provide some additional habitat along the northern fringe that will not be directly illuminated, thus it should be suitable for the rarer, light sensitive bats.

4.28 The District Ecologist has assessed the scheme, and, subject to some minor amendments and additional mitigation (including additional provision for reptiles and amphibians), and subject to the submission of an appropriate ecological management plan, raises no objection to the principle of development, which is considered to accord with relevant development plan policy, as well as the requirements of Section 11 of the NPPF.

Landscape impact

4.29 Local Plan Policy ENV 8 requires that development outside of development limits in the countryside must respect the intrinsic beauty and diversity of the landscape, and be sensitively integrated into its rural surroundings in terms of siting, scale and design. Local Plan Policy IMP2 requires all new development to incorporate a high standard of landscaping to ensure that the development will be integrated into its surroundings. JCS Policy 1 also requires development to contribute towards providing a multi-functional green infrastructure network, open space and wildlife resources and links between them both on and off site and integral to the development.
4.30 The applicants have suggested that the undulating nature of the local landscape and the frequent occurrence of hedgerows, trees and woodland, mean that the visual envelope of the proposed residential development is constrained to views in close proximity to the edge of the site. They are not proposing to screen out the proposed residential development using planting but rather to soften its visual impact and to aid its integration with the existing development and landscape through the creation of a strong green network and the use of well-designed buildings that contribute positively to local character. I would generally agree with this approach, and that the wider landscape impact of this proposal is unlikely to be significant. However, the development within the strategic gap should minimised, so as to restrict the visual impact of the development when viewed from Colney Lane. I therefore reiterate my previous comment that development to the west of Burnthouse Lane should only come forward after the emerging strategic gap policy has been tested and adopted through the Local Plan process.

4.31 The visual envelope of the proposed extension to the Park and Ride site reduces its visual impact due to the screening effects of the existing planting. Lighting columns may extend beyond the tree canopy, however, this is seen in context of the existing Park and Ride site and neighbouring road services area.

4.32 Local Plan Policy IMP25 requires proposals involving outdoor lighting schemes to demonstrate that light spillage and glare are minimised, particularly in areas of open countryside or on the edge of settlements. The effect of lighting on the night-time scene was assessed in the applicant’s Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), and the impacts upon night-time views will be primarily limited to those views from which the development is directly visible. It is considered that it may be possible to see some light spill and glow from distant views but these would be seen within the context of the existing glow from Hethersett and the Park and Ride. I would concur with the assessment’s conclusion that the careful use of lighting that reduces light spill and glare associated with residential developments would reduce any likely impact on night-time views.

4.33 Taking the above into account I feel that the proposed development is capable of being sensitively integrated into its rural surroundings in terms of siting, design and the provision of a high standard of landscaping, in accordance with Local Plan policies ENV 8, IMP 2, IMP25, and JCS Policy 1.

4.34 Taking into account the infrastructure to be provided / enhanced with the development, and the acceptable impact in terms of landscape and ecology, 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

SURFACE WATER

4.35 As part of the environmental impact assessment the applicant’s have been able to confirm that the site is not at risk of flooding (i.e. being located within Flood Zone 1, low risk). The assessment has also resulted in a surface water drainage strategy being produced, to which the Environment Agency raise no objection.

4.36 The strategy allows attenuation of the storm water spread across the site via a system of 11 balancing ponds. The ponds have been strategically placed to provide catchment to mimic pre-development runoff and to suit the phasing of the proposed construction. Currently there are three existing watercourses which are responsible for the greenfield runoff, two of which are all believed to be tributaries of the River Yare. The final outfalls into the three existing watercourses each represent greenfield runoff calculations.
Consideration has been given to the impact the development may have on third parties, particularly with regard to surface water runoff. Due to the underlying soils being of clay strata, the permeability of the soils is likely to be relatively poor, thus the provision of soakaways will be potentially isolated and less efficient. Although SuDS will be sued where possible, the majority of drainage will be provided through attenuation to balancing ponds.

It is intended that the storm water drainage within the public highways on site will be adopted by Anglian Water. The balancing ponds will be adopted either by Anglian Water or the Lead Local Flood Authority (County Council) following the establishment of a SuDS Approving Body. Anglian Water shall also be adopting private drainage. It has been demonstrated that the site will not suffer flooding in the future as a result of surcharge from the nearby watercourses or drainage systems proposed within the proposal. The Environment Agency have confirmed the proposed rates of discharge to the existing watercourses will be at a controlled rate and that betterment will be achieved from the existing situation, and that the ponds are sized to ensure that they can cater for the 1 in 100 year storm event.

The surface water drainage for the extension to the Park & Ride site will be dealt with via shallow soakaways and permeable paving, and the Environment Agency raise no objection to this approach.

FOUL WATER

Anglian Water has confirmed that the wastewater treatment works at Whittingham has capacity to accommodate the proposed development. They have also confirmed that the existing sewerage network will need upgrading and that a new Section 98 pumping station and sewers will be required, along with a contribution towards the upsizing of the Yare Valley Sewer. These required works are outlined in the developer’s Flood Risk Assessment, which is supported by Anglian Water. Taking the above into account I am satisfied that the proposal accords with the requirements of JCS Policy 1 and Section 10 of the NPPF.

Highway Impact (including cycleway and pedestrian links)

Local Plan Policy IMP8 and Section 4 of the NPPF require the consideration of traffic generation and that development should not endanger highway safety or prejudice the free flow of traffic on the highway network.

The design of the new transport infrastructure supporting the proposal has been considered with regards to minimising the impact of the development on the existing highway network. This includes measures to encourage reduced car usage, and the provision of sufficient infrastructure to ensure the highway network can accommodate additional traffic requirements. A significant amount of modelling (particularly in respect of the Thickthorn junction and other key junctions on the network) and design work has been undertaken in order to demonstrate that the transport strategy is capable of mitigating the traffic impact from the development.

The development is proposed to be developed over five phases with various elements of the mitigation package being delivered before/during each phase. It is considered that the development is in a sustainable location with bus services that can be diverted into the site and enhanced as per the submitted Bus Strategy. The site is within easy walking and cycling distance of facilities within Hethersett and improvements to the walking and cycling infrastructure are proposed as part of a submitted Pedestrian and Cycle Strategy, and will include the following:

- Back Lane re-designated between Colney Lane and Churchfields to a pedestrian and cycle route;
- Cycle and pedestrian routes provided along Colney Lane towards Norwich Research Park;
• Cycle provision at the Colney Lane/B1172 junction;
• Little Melton Road improved with pedestrian footpath and cycleway;
• Pedestrian links to connect to existing footpaths and Rights of Way for access to the countryside;
• Footpath and cycle route to Hethersett village centre.

4.44 In terms of traffic the three main access points to the development will be from Churchfields, off Colney Lane and off Great Melton Road. The access points will be linked by a spine road though the site off which all other access will be taken. Limited access is proposed off Henstead Lane. Off-site highway improvements are proposed at the Norwich Road/Colney Lane/Station Road crossroads which will be signalised. Improvements to Great Melton Road and to the New Road junction will also be required.

4.45 A travel plan will be an integral part of this development, helping to reduce the reliance on the car. To further enhance sustainable transport land is also being made available to expand the Thickthorn Park & ride site.

4.46 NCC: Highways has accepted the proposed access arrangements and do not raise any objections in principle. The Highways Agency also accepts the strategy and supporting modelling work. Both authorities have now confirmed that an acceptable package of mitigation measures has been agreed, and that the traffic flow and junction capacity assessments demonstrate that the proposed vehicular traffic generation can be accommodated within the highway network.

4.47 Subject to securing the required Travel Plan funding, and the package of off-site highway improvement works, the development accords with the requirements of Local Plan Policy IMP8 and Section 4 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Education

4.48 JCS Policy 10 states in relation to growth at Hethersett that "education provision remains to be resolved but may require the relocation of the existing junior school and/or high school to new sites plus additional pre-school and primary provision". The supporting text (paragraph 6.22 of the JCS) explains that the secondary school at Hethersett is on a constrained site and on-site expansion is difficult. A solution will need to ensure that children have the opportunity to attend school local to where they live. It states that new primary schools and pre-school provision will be required for all the growth locations.

4.49 These education requirements for Hethersett were identified by the Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study and are included at Appendix 7 to the JCS as "priority 2" projects:

• 60 place pre-school (Ref ED7) to be provided by developer contributions between 2016 and 2021;
• 1 FE place primary school (Ref ED8) to be provided by developer contributions between 2016 and 2021;
• Expanded secondary school provision (Ref ED10) to be provided by developer contributions between 2016 and 2021.

4.50 It is evident that there is not sufficient capacity at pre-school, primary or secondary school levels to accommodate the likely school age children arising from the proposed development seeking State sector places and that further school capacity will need to be provided at all levels to accommodate the needs of the proposed development. Therefore, the proposed development incorporates land for a new primary school incorporating pre-school provision, with additional land reserved for further expansion of the primary school. The developer will bear the costs of providing a 1-form entry Primary School, and a pro-rata contribution towards the build costs of extending the school will also be required.
4.51 The development also includes provision of land for the expansion of the High School, with additional land reserved for further expansion of the High School should this be deemed necessary to address wider deficiencies. A £1.7 million pro-rata contribution towards the build costs of extending the school will also be required.

4.52 Subject to the above provisions, the application accords with the requirements of JCS Policy 10.

Proposed community facilities (inc. recreation space and open space provision)

4.53 JCS Policy 10 requires the expansion of the existing village services. The Masterplan includes the provision of a Local Centre with uses that are complementary to Hethersett Village, including approximately 1200 sqm of retail floor space, 350 sqm of small business units (B1a), and 300 sqm of floor space for a community facility (D1 or D2), such as a doctor’s surgery, or for indoor sports. Housing with accommodation to encourage home working is also proposed.

4.54 This provision of retail floor space is also in accordance with LP Policy SHO9, which requires sites to be reserved for local shopping uses in major residential development.

4.55 The development accords with Local Plan Policy LEI7 by providing a total of 24.87 ha of open space, 2.72 ha in excess of the Council's standards. Furthermore, taking into account SuDs, school playing fields (and reserved playing pitch areas) and the proposed Hethersett FC football pitch (secured site) the amount of multifunctional green space provided in the development is 34.66 hectares which is around 41% of the site. This goes beyond Natural England's aspiration for 40% of new development to be multifunctional green space. Including private gardens would bring the figure to way over 40% multifunctional green space aspirations. Over 75% of the multifunctional open space will be publicly accessible, above Natural England's aspiration of 50% publicly accessible land.

4.56 The 24.84ha of open space and recreation provision can be broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Open and Recreational Space</th>
<th>Area in hectares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Leisure/Informal Children’s Play</td>
<td>15.44 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Children's Play</td>
<td>0.74 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Children's Play within Development Parcels</td>
<td>0.15 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>3.19 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotment/Community Gardens/Orchards</td>
<td>0.9 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hethersett Athletic Club Shared Pitches with Public</td>
<td>3.24 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squares</td>
<td>1.21 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.87 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.57 Again, subject to the provision of the above facilities, the application accords with the requirements of JCS Policy 10.

Green infrastructure

4.58 The landscape strategy for the site aims to retain the majority of existing vegetation and boundary trees and integrate these elements with the Masterplan proposals. It also aims to enhance the existing open boundaries of the site with proposed woodland buffer planting to help integrate the development into the surrounding countryside to the north.
4.59 As well as promoting a wide natural buffer area to the north of the main built up area, the landscape strategy creates three large parkland areas, the western area being a ‘growing’ park providing allotments and orchards. The central area of open space will be developed as a formal leisure park. The eastern open space area will be mostly laid out to sports pitches. All the open space areas will be easily accessed by a comprehensive footpath and cycleway network, linking in to existing rights of way and providing opportunities to access into the wider countryside and Norwich Fringe in accordance with the requirements of Policy LEI10.

4.60 It is intended that a key part of the landscape strategy will be ecological mitigation. Where possible the landscape will be designed to provide wildlife habitat, including the use of plants known to be of wildlife value. The SuDS network will provide additional wetland habitat, ultimately forming a network within the site with links to the wider countryside and Norwich Fringe.

4.61 Subject to the provision of an appropriate ecological management strategy, I consider the proposals to be in general accordance with all relevant policies relating to the provision of green infrastructure, open and recreational space.

Government pipeline

4.62 Local Plan policy UTL12 requires that all development takes full account of underground pipelines, so as to avoid any additional public risk. A Government Oil Pipeline passes by the eastern tip of the development area, crossing in a north westerly direction. There is a 3 metre construction easement for the outside face of the pipeline in both directions. This easement has been accommodated as a constraint in the Masterplan, and this will help to ensure that the pipeline is adequately addressed in any detailed planning proposals forthcoming in the area. The application therefore accords with the requirements of policy UTL12.

HV Electricity pylons

4.63 There are high voltage electricity pylons to the north of the proposed development area. The National Grid have confirmed that there is no legislation in place regarding the distance of development adjacent to, and under High Voltage overhead power lines, and their association with Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMFs). However, they will require allowable working zones.

4.64 This zone has been accommodated as a constraint in the Masterplan, and will be considered during the construction works. The area of the site closest to the high voltage electricity pylons is set out as a linear park providing a buffer zone between the overhead lines and development. The nearest residential development is more than 80 metres distant from the pylons, with the majority of development in excess of 200 metres from the pylons.

Layout & design (inc. housing mix)

4.65 As this is an outline planning application, the assessment of design and layout issues can only be undertaken at a broad strategic level on the basis of the submitted Masterplan and the Parameter Plans at this stage. The submission of later reserved matters applications for the detailed design and layout within each development phase will allow opportunity for detailed evaluation of proposals against the design principles set out in the Masterplan, Parameter Plans and Design & Access statement as and when schemes are submitted. Any outline approval will also require a detailed Masterplan/Design Code to be submitted and approved for each development phase.
JCS Policies 2 and 10 requires that major growth, such as that at Hethersett, will be master-planned as attractive, well-serviced, integrated, mixed use development of the highest possible standards, well related to existing development, and creating a strong sense of place. Local people should be given the opportunity to shape development. JCS Policy 1 requires development to be located and designed to address climate change.

Local Plan Policies TRA1, 2 and 3 require that the siting, layout and design of development makes provision for and safeguards pedestrian and cycle links to improve accessibility by non-car means.

The recently adopted South Norfolk Place-Making Guide requires new development to be designed to have a positive character that is appropriate for the place where it is located, the type of development to be provided, and the likely lifestyle of occupiers.

Generally the Masterplan incorporates a clear and well-connected layout, offering a variety of experience and character, while maintaining an overall coherence. The "character area" approach has been adopted to divide the larger site into neighbourhoods of distinct identity, with Community Hubs, to ensure Hethersett North will be an engaging and varied place with a distinct range of places.

The layout incorporates sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) of swales, pools and ponds, which enhance the amenity of the development. Green spaces and squares provide major focal points within the development, acting as meeting places and sources of orientation.

The design principles for the Masterplan have been developed out of an appraisal of the character of Hethersett and its immediate setting. The overall design concept is based on a strong landscape strategy that aims to enhance the existing natural features of the site, through a network of green corridors and open spaces that link to Hethersett and the countryside beyond. Within this framework the development establishes three anchor parks, each with a distinct character based on their use and a neighbourhood hub that strengthens the existing community cluster of the village. In addition to these, a connected series of community focal points is created that establishes a hierarchy of greens, new town gardens, greened streets and squares. While the landscape strategy begins to establish some of the main components of these areas the Masterplan or a subsequent Design Code will need establish the detailed design of these components to ensure that they function as attractive and usable spaces that enhance the overall character of the development.

Although the Masterplan indicates that provision will be made for single storey dwellings if and where considered appropriate, there is a commitment to meeting the 16 Lifetime Homes criteria, which will help to ensure that a high proportion of new homes will be able to support the changing needs of individuals and families at different stages of life.

Pedestrian and cycle routes provide connections to essential facilities and amenities between the development areas and into the neighbouring village of Hethersett. Walking routes where possible have been designed to accommodate convenient access through the development with connections into the surrounding pedestrian and cycle infrastructure, including the provision of an off-road cycle route on Colney Lane, offering the potential to link into the NRP and N&NUH.

The existing settlement edge of Hethersett forms the southern boundary of the site and is defined by suburban 1980s/90s housing, some early local authority housing, 20th and 21st century housing and the edge of playing fields associated with Hethersett Secondary School. The proposed development appears to respect these edges by proposing a linear corridor of open space and landscaping along the edges of the existing built up areas and by providing a site for additional playing fields adjacent to the school. The proposed corridor helps to protect the visual amenity of the existing properties and integrate the site into the existing settlement.
4.75 The design of parking will ensure the streets are safe and attractive, ensuring the visual impact of cars are kept to a minimum, in accordance with Local Plan Policy IMP6.

4.76 The Council’s Design Officer has assessed the scheme against the 12 Building for Life criteria, and has concluded that, subject to the further submission of a Design Code, the Masterplan for the site will enable high quality designs 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.

Archaeology and heritage impact

4.77 An Archaeological Assessment has been undertaken to assess the likely significant effects of the proposed development on archaeological remains. The site has been the subject of two phases of archaeological field evaluation, and the results of the first phase accompany the application. Norfolk Historic Environment Services (NHES) have confirmed that there are no deposits of national significance likely to preclude development within the application boundary. NHES are happy for the further field evaluation work on the results of less than national significance to be required by condition, in accordance with par. 141 of Section 12 of the NPPF.

4.78 The LVIA identifies a Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAM) to the south west of Hethersett on the edge of Wymondham and to the south of Thickthorn roundabout. There are a number of Listed Buildings in the area, mostly Grade II. The LVIA considered the potential impact on the Listed Building on Cedar Road, which is located on the opposite side of the road to the southern boundary, but is screened from the proposed development by the existing tree belt. The assessment confirms that there would be no adverse impact on the visual setting of Listed Buildings or SAMs. I have received no objection from the Conservation Officer, and I am satisfied that the development can be accommodated without having a significant impact on any heritage assets, in accordance with Section 12 of the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

4.79 Local Plan Policy IMP9 requires that new development does not have a significantly adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents. Other Local Plan policies relating to impact on residential amenity include LP Policy IMP10 (Noise) and IMP25 (Outdoor lighting). Although any direct impact on residential amenity from development will be assessed at the reserved matters stage, it is important to consider the more general impacts in terms of noise, lighting, and air/quality.

4.80 The Noise Assessment demonstrates there will be only slight impact on existing residents from traffic noise as a result of the development of the main site and that the Park and Ride extension will have negligible impact. The assessment also confirms that there is little potential for residents of the new development being affected by existing noise sources e.g. from existing roads or the factory to the north of the site. SNC: Environmental Services raise no objection to the scheme in this respect.

4.81 The Air Quality Assessment demonstrates there will no unacceptable impact on health or residential amenity from changes in air quality as a result of the construction of the development, or from traffic or energy generation following completion of the development. The assessment also confirms that the potential for residents of the new development being affected by odours from Little Melton Food Park is not significant. It has also been demonstrated that the new residents of the proposed development would have an acceptable standard of residential amenity in terms of noise, air quality/odour and external lighting.
4.82 Again SNC: Environmental Services raise no objection to the scheme in this regard, and therefore in general terms I am satisfied that the proposed development will not significantly harm the residential amenity of nearby residents from noise, air quality/odour, or lighting, and so is in accordance with Local Plan Policies IMP9, IMP10 and IMP25.

Planning Obligations

4.83 In order to achieve the infrastructure improvements required by JCS Policy 10, the developers will be required to enter into a S106 legal agreement that will help to provide for off-site highway improvements, local centre (including retail and small business units and community facilities), education provision, enhanced bus services, safe and direct cycle and pedestrian routes, and enhanced public access to the countryside. The completed legal agreement will also include trigger points for provision of the enhanced facilities or financial contributions, which will enable them to be brought forward through the progression of the development.

4.84 Affordable housing (20% of the development) will be secured within the agreement, along with a 70/30 split of rent and shared ownership, with affordability in perpetuity. There will also be a clawback arrangement so that additional affordable housing will be funded through commuted sums if property values increase.

5. Conclusions

5.1 The development conforms to Policy 10 of the JCS as it proposes a level of growth in a Norwich Policy Area settlement that is identified as a Key Service Centre for at least 1,000 homes. The evaluation of the proposal against local Development Plan polices would suggest that the proposal meets the majority of relevant JCS and Saved Local Plan policies. It is accepted that the site would constitute development currently outside of the village's existing development boundary, however, the adoption of the JCS; the lack of five year housing land supply; the Government’s commitment to a “presumption in favour of sustainable development” in the NPPF; the GNDP’s own evidence which confirms that land north of Hethersett is the most appropriate direction for growth; and the acknowledgement that development to the North of Hethersett for over 1000 homes is its ‘preferred option’ for growth.

5.2 It has been demonstrated that land to the north of Hethersett is a sustainable location for the development. It is within close proximity to the existing services and facilities at Hethersett and can be accommodated without eroding the openness of the gap between adjacent settlements. The site delivers the necessary improvements to infrastructure needed to support a sustainable development, including school expansion land, highways improvements, drainage and community facilities. An assessment of alternative locations for development around Hethersett also helps to demonstrate that Hethersett North is the most appropriate location for growth. Development to the north of Hethersett would therefore meet the objectives of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF, and the benefits of allowing the principle of this development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any adverse impacts.

Jobs and economic growth

5.3 Section 1 of the NPPF requires the planning system to do everything it can to support sustainable economic growth, as well as to promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities. This is further supported by the requirements set out in JCS Policy 5. The development of this site would create jobs (estimated by the applicants as 99 FTE construction jobs). Further jobs would be created upon completion of the development, through local shops and services. A development of this size will over time, help to sustain and grow existing facilities, as well as providing for new facilities for existing and new residents of the town.
5.4 The development of this site clearly accords with the requirements of Section 1 of the NPPF and Policy 5 of the JCS.

6. Reasons for Approval

6.1 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. The development conforms to Policy 10 of the JCS as it proposes a level of growth in a Norwich Policy Area settlement that is identified as a Key Service Centre for at least 1,000 homes.

6.2 The requirements of the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development outweigh other material considerations and that the proposed development, can be accepted as a departure from local saved plan policy ENV8 and ENV 2, which are given due weight as they remain partly consistent with the published NPPF. In all other respects, and subject to appropriate conditions, the proposed development is in accordance with Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14 and 20 of the NPPF, and relevant policies the Joint Core Strategy.
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Objection Statement

With respect to:

Application reference: 2011/1804

Concerning Land north of Hethersett Village Centre, Little Melton Road, including extension to Thickthorn Park & Ride, Hethersett for:

'Residential led mixed use development of 1196 dwellings and associated uses including Primary School, Local Services (up to 1,880 sq. mtrs (GIA) of A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1 & B1 uses) comprising shops, small business units, community facilities/doctors surgeries, sports pitches, recreational space, equipped areas of play and informal recreation spaces. Extension to Thickthorn Park and Ride including new dedicated slip road from A11'

Representation prepared on behalf of 'Hethersett Our Way'
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Introduction

This document has been prepared on behalf of ‘Hethersett Our Way’ (HOW) in response to the outline planning application submitted by Hethersett Land Ltd & Landowners for the erection of a residential led mixed use development of 1,196 dwellings and associated commercial, leisure and community uses and the extension to Thickthorn Park and Ride relating to land north of Hethersett Village Centre, Little Melton Road.

The proposed development will stretch approximately 2km across the north of Hethersett village.

HOW seeks to protect the character of Hethersett and its rural setting and ensure that any new development is sustainable and does not have a negative impact on the quality of life for either existing or new residents of the village.

HOW is active in voicing its concerns over the current planning application by Hethersett Land Ltd & Landowners. Whilst HOW recognises that Hethersett has been identified to accommodate new housing, it wishes to ensure that the any such development is subject to due process and is of an acceptable scale for Hethersett.

The current application has been submitted in advance of an adopted Site Specific Policies and Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). Accordingly, there has only been limited consultation to date from the Local Planning Authority (LPA) with respect to how this allocation should be distributed, where it should go and how this might be best achieved.

HOW objects to the timing of the current planning application and believes that it has been brought forward in order to take advantage of the LPA’s current position with respect to limited progress made on the Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD.

HOW acknowledges that the proposed application is a departure from the Development Plan and would therefore be referred to the Secretary of State should the LPA be minded to approve planning permission.

At the time of writing, several documents were unavailable to view via the LPA’s on-line planning system including elements of the Environmental Statement, Design and Access Statement and Visual Impact Assessment. Accordingly, HOW reserves the right to make additional comments based on this information becoming available in the future by SNDC.
Planning Considerations

HOW have a number of concerns relating to the posed development with respect to its potential impact on Hethersett village, existing and new residents and the surrounding countryside including flora and fauna. These are discussed in detail within the consultation response and fall under the following headings:

- Principle of Development
- Quantum of Development and 5 Year Housing Supply
- Strategic Gaps & Landscape Impact
- Health
- Infrastructure /Drainage & Flooding
- Highways & Parking
- Service Centre
- Ecology
- Phasing Plan
- Recreation & Open Space
Principle of Development

The proposed application seeks to provide a total of 1,196 new dwellings within Hethersett.

Hethersett village is identified as a Key Service Centre within the recently adopted Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) Joint Core Strategy (JCS) 2011. Hethersett is allocated at least 1,000 dwellings and may be suitable to accommodate a proportion of a floating requirement for an additional 1,800 dwellings within the Norwich Policy Area (NPA).

South Norfolk Council is currently consulting on its South Norfolk Site Specific Policies and Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) as part of its ongoing Local Development Framework process. This document, when published, will inform how the above allocation will be accommodated within Hethersett.

It is accepted by HOW that Hethersett, as a Key Service Centre, must play its part in meeting the identified housing need as set out within the JCS. However, this process must be subject to the full Local Development Framework (LDF) process which involves the production of the Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD. This document will be subject to full public consultation by the LPA and independent examination by the Planning Inspectorate prior to adoption.

Given the size and strategic significance of the proposed application, it is considered to be premature with respect to the preparation of the Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD and should not be considered favourably by the LPA until this document has been subject to full consultation and independent examination.
Quantum of Development and 5 Year Housing Supply

Whilst HOW accepts the principle of new housing within Hethersett, the proposed quantum of housing at this location (which exceeds the JCS allocation by almost 200 dwellings) is not considered to be appropriate in planning terms for the various reasons set out within this statement.

HOW is aware that the GNDP cannot, overall, demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply within the NPA (which includes Hethersett). However, to place this figure into context, paragraph 11 of the GNDP Five Year Supply of Housing Assessment Base Date 1st April 2010 (February 2011) confirms this figure reflects the fact that Local Plans for the area made allocations on the basis of achieving the 1999 Norfolk Structure Plan target of 1,195 units per annum in the NPA, rather than the higher EoEP and JCS requirements. However, it is anticipated that once new site allocations are made to accommodate the JCS level of growth, the level of delivery will also increase significantly.

In identifying and maintaining a rolling 5 year supply, paragraph 54 of PPS3 ‘Housing’ requires LPA’s to include sites which are:

- Available – available for development now;
- Suitable – in a suitable location that would contribute to sustainable, mixed communities;
- Achievable – there is a reasonable prospect of housing being delivered in a five year period.

Paragraph 69 of PPS3 provides guidance to LPA’s in determining planning applications. It advises that regard should be had to:

- Achieving high quality housing;
- Ensuring developments achieve a good mix of housing reflecting the accommodation requirements of specific groups, in particular, families and older people;
- The suitability of a site for housing, including its environmental sustainability;
- Using land effectively and efficiently; and
- Ensuring the proposed development is in line with planning for housing objectives, reflecting the need and demand for housing in, and the spatial vision for, the area and does not undermine wider policy objectives e.g addressing housing market renewal issues.

Paragraph 71 of PPS3 confirms that where an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites cannot be demonstrated, LPA’s should consider favourably planning applications for housing, having regard to the policies in PPS3 including the considerations set out in paragraph 69 (above).

In assessing the proposed development against the above policies, the benefits of a development and its proposed contribution towards addressing any shortfall in housing supply must be weighed against the criteria in paragraph 69 of PPS3 and relevant material considerations.

In this case, HOW acknowledges the proposed development would provide a significant contribution towards the GNDP identified housing targets. However, the quantum of development is considered to represent an overdevelopment of the village and fails to comply with criteria within paragraph 69 of the PPS3 as set out within this Statement.

Furthermore, due to the size of the proposed development, it is not considered to create a sustainable development in accordance with the objectives of paragraph 54 of PPS3 or the Government’s draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This was published by the Coalition Government for consultation on 25th July 2011 and forms a material consideration in the determination of this application.
Strategic Gaps & Landscape Impact

Strategic Gaps

Saved policy ENV2 of the Local Plan Proposals Map identifies Strategic Gaps around Hethersett which maintain a physical separation between settlements within the Norwich Area. Policy ENV2 confirms that:

"Inappropriate development" and other development which would erode the gaps, identified on the Proposals Map, between the built up limits of settlements, or which would otherwise undermine the general quality of openness of these gaps, will not be permitted.

Insert Map 31A above shows the extent of this Strategic Gap (shown as brown hatching). This policy is now out of date and is being replaced by emerging policy within the Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD.

JCS Policy 2 'Promoting Good Design' states that all development proposals will respect local distinctiveness, the historic hierarchy of villages and their landscape; and maintain important strategic gaps.

JCS Policy 10 specifically identifies the importance of maintaining strategic gaps between Wymondham, Hethersett and Cringleford.

The emerging Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD aims to reinforce the objectives of the above policies and shows the suggested extent of the strategic gaps between Wymondham, Hethersett and Cringleford on Map B (shown below). The suggested 'Draft Strategic Gaps/Important Breaks' policy states:

'Development which would erode, or otherwise undermine the openness of the Strategic Gaps / Important Breaks, identified on the Proposals Map, between the development boundaries of the settlements (Wymondham – Hethersett and Hethersett – Cringleford) will not be permitted.'
The proposed Strategic Gaps remain as per Insert Map 31A under saved policy ENV2. In consideration of the above, the proposed application would occupy a large area of land to the North West corner which is identified as part of the Strategic Gap. In particular, this relates to land forming part of Phase 2 of the development for 257 Dwellings.

According to the proposed Master Plan layout, the majority of this land would be built development (i.e. housing) and is considered to undermine the openness of the Strategic Gap in relation to both Cringleford and Little Melton contrary to the aims and objectives of criteria set out within paragraph 69 of PPS3; saved policy ENV2, JCS policies 2 and 10 and the emerging Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD.

HOW would like to see the removal of the area of land identified as Phase 2 of the development as part of a revised Master Plan layout.

Landscape impact

Saved policy ENV 8 states that all development in the countryside must respect the intrinsic beauty and diversity of the landscape and the ecological, agricultural and recreational value of the countryside. It must also be sensitively integrated into its rural surroundings in terms of siting, scale and design, while avoiding creating ribbon development or an unduly fragmented pattern of development.

Saved policy IMP 2 requires all new development to incorporate a high standard of landscaping to ensure that the development will be integrated into its surroundings. In particular, landscaping schemes should:

i) Include a site survey of existing landscape features on the site, and proposals for the protection, conservation, or enhancement of those that make a positive contribution to the area;
ii) Reflect the character and distinctiveness of the local landscape;
iii) Make use of native species to help integrate developments ecologically into their setting;
iv) Include the planting of new trees;
v) Maximise the nature conservation and environmental value of the new landscape;
vi) Ensure that proposals respect local topography in terms of height, gradient, scale and shape; and
vii) Include measures to ensure the establishment and future maintenance of the landscaped areas.

It is acknowledged that a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been submitted by the applicant in order to assess the potential impact of the development on the surrounding countryside and to the existing townscape. However, HOW does not accept the findings of the LVIA with respect to the impact of the proposed development and its assessment against saved policy ENV2 which concludes “…the development can take place in accordance with the aims of LP Policy EN2, without eroding the gap or undermining the general quality of openness of the gaps between Hethersett and Little Melton, Wymondham and Cringleford” (P.36).

HOW believes that the proposed development would have a significant impact on the character of the surrounding countryside and would erode a large area of land falling within the Strategic Gap designation which serves a vital spatial planning function and is specifically protected under saved policy ENV2. In particular, HOW are concerned that the proposed development would result in:

- A significant erosion of the Strategic Gap between Hethersett and Cringleford; effectively extending the village by approximately 0.5km to the east towards Cringleford; and
- A significant erosion of the Strategic Gap between Hethersett and Little Melton to the north which would be reduced from over 1km to approximately 570m from dwellings to the south of the village along Burnthouse Lane.
Health

Doctor's Surgery

Information provided within the Environmental Statement and Planning Statement concludes that the proposed application would have a negligible impact in terms of health services and facilities within Hethersett and the wider Greater Norwich Sub Region.

In particular, the Planning Statement (Paragraph’s 10.45 & 10.46) confirms the potential impact of the development has been assessed by reviewing the current healthcare facilities and demands within the local area and assessing the likely demand of the new population on the capacity of these facilities. It concludes that taking into account the existing capacity identified within the Hethersett Surgery, the proposed development would result in a requirement for extra capacity to be created at the Surgery for 1-1.5 FTE GPs to meet the needs of the proposed development.

The proposal makes an indicative provision for a Doctor's Surgery of 300sqm identified within the Local Centre.

HOW is concerned that whilst these assumptions are based on the Norwich Growth Area Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study they do not in fact reflect an accurate picture of the current levels of demand on the Doctor’s Surgery at Hethersett. HOW is also concerned that these figures fail to take into consideration the consequential impact of an additional 1,196 new dwellings to the existing Surgery and the health needs of individual villagers.

HOW have consulted directly with the Surgery's Practice Manager on this issue to identify existing capacity and explore options for expansion/re-location. The Surgery confirmed it has a large catchment area which extends well beyond Hethersett including numerous surrounding villages. It is currently struggling to cope with existing demand and is not convinced that the estimated figure of an increase of 1-1.5 FTE GPs would be sufficient to adequately address the increase in patients arising from the proposed additional new housing. It has also confirmed that patients moving to the 'Whispering Oaks' development at Wymondham are registering at Hethersett surgery rather than medical centres in Wymondham. This is placing even more pressure on facilities in Hethersett.

Notwithstanding the proposed additional 300sqm, it is considered that due to the large scale of development being proposed at Hethersett, there would appear to be insufficient capacity at the Doctor’s Surgery to deal with the increase in population from the proposed development which would have a detrimental impact on the delivery of health services and patient care.

The Surgery has indicated that ideally they would need to move into larger premises. However, the Surgery has limited scope for expansion due to the nature of the existing premises. Any expansion plans would involve building into the adjacent car park area which would reduce the number of car parking spaces at the practice. Re-location is also difficult as there are limited opportunities within Hethersett which would be as accessible as the current location.

Due to these constraints, it is considered that the most appropriate scenario would be to maintain the existing surgery and to have an additional small walk-in surgery forming part of the new Local Centre as proposed. This would help to provide more equal access to health care services for new residents and help reduce demand on the existing Surgery.
HOW acknowledges that at Paragraph 10.48 of the Planning Statement, the applicant confirms discussions are on-going with the Hethersett Surgery’s Practice Manager to consider how best to deliver expanded surgery facilities. It is recommended that such discussions continue with a genuine commitment to ensure that the provision of health care services within Hethersett do not suffer as a result of the proposed development.

High Voltage Power Lines

The submitted Master Plan layout proposes to locate residential properties within less than 100m of high voltage (400KV) National Grid power lines. The row of pylons are located north of the application site and run east-west between Hethersett Little Melton.

For over the last 30 years, scientific research has been conducted on Extremely Low Frequency Electric and Magnetic Fields (ELF EMFs) and childhood leukaemia. Continued research in this field has shown evidence of an association between childhood leukaemia and power lines. In recognition of this, a Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAGE) was set up in 2004 to investigate the supposed link. SAGE is made up from stakeholders representing a broad spectrum of views, including campaign groups, relevant industries, and the Government. It brings together many areas of expertise, including those with significant expertise in scientific and policy-making disciplines, as well as voices representing sections of the public. SAGE is funded equally by Government, the electricity industry, and the charity CHILDREN with LEUKAEMIA.

The SAGE report considered what precautionary measures should be considered in relation to ELF Electromagnetic Radiation. A key recommendation was to introduce a moratorium on building new homes and schools within 60m of high voltage power lines to protect children from the increased risk of leukaemia. To date, this has not been implemented by the Government.

In 2005 the British Medical Journal published a paper ‘Childhood cancer in relation to distance from high voltage power lines in England and Wales: a case-control study’. The study found that children living within 200m of high-voltage power lines were 70% more likely to develop leukaemia than similar children living more than 600m away. And those living between 200-600m away had a 20% increased risk.

In 2007 Dr Howard Moate, the Dartford Labour MP who chaired the SAGE group, said the Government should act on their advice and adopt the precautionary principle in this instance.

He said: “The most recent scientific research has indicated that there may be a link between childhood leukaemia and proximity to electricity pylons. It would be wrong to wait any longer before taking action.”

Given the potential significance of this issue to public health, it is noted that there is no reference to Electromagnetic Radiation within the applicant’s Environmental Statement. A brief sentence (Paragraph 4.41) within the ES Non-Technical Summary refers to the pylons but only in the context of their visual appearance. As a minimum requirement, this should be addressed within the ES and the applicant should provide an Electromagnetic Impact Assessment in order to enable the LPA to fully assess this issue and the risk to human health.
Drainage

Foul Sewerage Treatment

HOW understands that sufficient capacity exists at the Whitligham Sewage Treatment Works subject to the upgrading of relevant sewer infrastructure and that site falls within this catchment area. Accordingly, there are no objections raised in relation to this issue.

Foul Drainage/Flooding

Anglia Water has confirmed that the development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. It has requested that a drainage strategy will need to be prepared in consultation with Anglian Water to determine mitigation measures.

However, the ES confirms that the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has shown the proposed development site is not at risk of flooding now or in the future as a result of surcharge from nearby watercourses or drainage systems. The mitigation proposed will also improve the current situation for local residents with regards to localised surface water flooding (Paragraph 4.25).

HOW would like clarification from the applicant and the LPA with respect to how this issue will be addressed as part of the proposed application.

Surface Water Drainage/Flooding

The ES Non-Technical Summary states that consideration has been given to the impact the proposed development may have on third parties, particularly with regard to surface water run-off. It confirms that the drainage strategy for the main site includes soakaways and storm water attenuation via a total of 10 balancing ponds (Paragraph 4.36).

Hethersett has a history of flooding from surface water drainage. HOW is concerned that the proposed development would only exacerbate this problem. It is considered that there is insufficient information provided within the FRA and Drainage Strategy with regards to this issue.

Sustainable Urban Drainage systems (SUDS)

As identified above, the proposed development seeks to utilise a number of balancing ponds as part of its SUDS strategy. HOW is concerned over the issue of standing water and the potential of these ponds to smell during summer months. In particular, where these are located adjacent or close to residential areas, recreation areas or areas adjacent walkways/footpaths. Furthermore, HOW wish to know how these ponds would be maintained with respect to the collection of rubbish. If the intention is for these to be fenced to prevent the collection of debris and for Health and Safety reasons the design and visual impact of this should be discussed within the application submission.
Highways & Parking

Thickthorn Interchange

HOW understands that, as part of the proposed development, the applicant would be expected to make a financial contribution towards capacity improvements to the Thickthorn (A11/A47) Junction as required by LCS policy 10 and the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATS). The Greater Norwich Infrastructure Needs and Funding Study confirms the anticipated improvement works to the junction will amount to a cost of £45m.

HOW would like clarification from the LPA/Highways Authority as to the level of contribution sought from the applicant as part of the proposed application.

Access off Colney Lane

The junction of Colney Lane and Norwich Road (B1172) is intended to provide a primary vehicular route into the eastern side of the proposed development.

Colney Lane itself is considered to be a narrow road and is not well suited to deal with increased traffic flows which would include the addition of bus services making passing difficult.

The Transport Assessment (TA) confirms that, at certain times, capacity constraints are already present at the junction of Colney Lane and Norwich Road (B1172) and that mitigation work will be required irrespective of the proposed development (Paragraph 17.24).

Paragraph 17.91 proposes modifications incorporating signalisation of the junction as mitigation against the proposed development. Paragraph 17.92 concludes that: ‘The physical constraints of the publicly maintainable highway at this junction restrict the ability to provide a larger signalised junction, nevertheless as the existing junction would already be experiencing severe capacity constraints in 2026 without the proposed development and associated measures, the cumulative impact of the proposals upon traffic flows at this location is considered to be negligible.’

The ES Non-Technical Summary goes further to say that the TA concludes: ‘The proposed mitigation measures offered will have an overall beneficial impact upon transport and movement up to 2026 as they will help offset capacity problems that would, in part, take place irrespective of whether Hethersett North is developed’ (Paragraph 4.68).

HOW is aware that this junction is constrained by private land to the east, west and south. This effectively limits opportunities for any significant alterations at this location. Given that the junction is already in need of modification due to existing capacity issues, the increase in use from the additional dwellings would only exacerbate the problem. The proposed traffic lights are not considered to be sufficient mitigation on their own. The junction clearly needs to be expanded to accommodate peak traffic with the addition of a turning lane. However, as identified above, there appears to be insufficient land to accommodate this. Accordingly, HOW is very concerned that the junction would become congested and unsafe based on the current proposals.

Furthermore, HOW does not accept the conclusion of the TA that the cumulative impact of proposals upon traffic flows at this location is negligible in light of future traffic growth up to 2026 not associated with the proposed development and its impact on the junction. It also strongly
refutes that the proposed mitigation would have a beneficial impact on transport and movement up to 2026. Clearly, the addition of traffic from the proposed development compacted by inadequate mitigation would have a significant impact on the capacity of the junction and the resulting congestion and safety of road users. For example, Phases 1 (2013-2016) & 2 (2016-2018) of the proposed development on their own form over 50% of the total development and would add significant new capacity to the junction by 2018.

HOW considers that that this issue has not been adequately addressed within the TA and fails to take account of the full impact of the proposal to this junction.

The applicant’s red line drawing includes land forming part of the garden of the old Police House dwelling and land to the east of Colney Lane. HOW would like clarification form the applicant that this land is indeed available in order to demonstrate that the development can be implemented as proposed.

**Intensification of Churchfields Road**

Whilst a primary vehicular route is proposed to the eastern part of the new development from Colney Lane, it would appear from the proposed Movement and Access (Drawing No: 005) layout that Churchfields Road will also become a primary vehicular route serving the centre of the new development. This road is relatively narrow and has unrestricted parking resulting in vehicular obstruction. Furthermore, it is already a busy bus route and HOW is concerned about its ability to cope with additional traffic (both construction and operational) due to the scale of development proposed and the potential negative impact that this intensification may have on road safety and congestions during peak hours, particularly at the junction with Norwich Road.

**Access to Henstead Road**

The proposed Master Plan for the site confirms that there will be limited access to Henstead Road from the new development. The PS and ES Non-Technical Summary also confirm that traffic calming measures are proposed on Little Melton Road/Henstead Road as part of Phase 1 of the development (2013-2016).

HOW is concerned that restricting access from Henstead Road would only create problems, particularly for new residents whom will naturally wish to access services within the existing center of Hethersett. Henstead Road would also be used by residents of the existing village to access the new service centre (or other facilities) and restricting access will create poor permeability between the existing and new parts of Hethersett and force traffic into using other, less direct, roads.

Whilst traffic calming measures are acknowledged, HOW would not wish to see access to Henstead Road restricted as is currently proposed. Instead, in order to accommodate an increase in traffic from the proposed development, road surface improvements would be required.

**Creation of a Ring Road**

The proposed access restrictions at Henstead Road could also lead to the creation of a Ring Road around the proposed new part of Hethersett. The GNDP Design Review Panel provided feedback to the applicants following a presentation in September 2010. One of the key recommendations within
their feedback was that the proposed development did not result in the creation of a Ring Road which: ‘...could become a rat run causing a barrier through the development’.

HOW would like assurances from the applicant and the Highways Authority that the proposed restricted access to Hanstead Road will not result in the creation of a Ring Road.

Existing Road Network

HOW notes that no improvements to road infrastructure within the existing village is planned as part of the proposed application. Given that there would be a considerable increase in the number of vehicle movements to the existing roads in Hethersett, it would seem appropriate that the proposed development should help contribute towards a scheme of highways improvements.

Cumulative Impact

The TA does not appear to take into consideration the cumulative highway impacts from the delivery of other strategic growth within the GNMP area and neighbouring authorities, along the A11 corridor. For example, future development at Wymondham is likely to comprise in excess of 2,000 new dwellings and Cringleford has been identified for approximately 1,200 new dwellings. This will add a significant volume of traffic to the A11, particularly during peak hours and will impact upon the junctions at Churchfields and Colney Lane.

HOW would like to see additional consideration of cumulative impact addressed within the TA.

Manual for Streets

HOW would like confirmation from the applicant and the Highways Authority that the proposed application is compliant with the current version of Manual for Streets with respect to proposed:

- roads & junctions;
- parking spaces and layouts;
- turning areas; and
- surfacing materials

Parking

Whilst it is recognised that the level of car parking within the development will be subject to detailed design, HOW is concerned over the impact of additional car ownership on existing facilities within Hethersett as a result of the proposals. For example, the local Tesco store has limited car parking facilities and would naturally become a destination choice of many new residents. This could well lead to an increase in on-street parking and result in road safety issues and increased congestion within the village. Similar concerns are raised in relation to the Library.

HOW wish to see this issue and associated mitigation measures addressed within the TA.
Neighborhood Centre

Location and Accessibility

The proposed neighborhood centre will contain shops and essential village services and facilities to principally serve the residents of the new development. This has been located at north of Hanstead Road and would sit within the western side of the new development.

HOW have reservations about the siting and resulting accessibility of the local centre for new residents. For example, dwellings located close to Colney Lane to the east of the application site forming part of Phase 2 of the development will be located approximately 1.2km away from the new local centre. This is not considered to be 'local' to these occupiers and is beyond a reasonable walking distance.

HOW proposes that due to the size of the development (2km in length) even if the centre was re-located to the middle of the new development, dwellings at the edge would still have to travel approximately 1km to access these services. HOW considers this layout to be unsustainable as it will only encourage use of the private motor vehicle and demonstrates further evidence of why this proposal is overdevelopment.

Furthermore, HOW is concerned that the size and range of facilities at the new centre will be insufficient to serve the amount of new residents resulting from the proposed development. As Hethersett has expanded over the years, the range of local facilities has not grown accordingly leaving an existing shortfall in provision. Accordingly, the new development is likely to further increase the need to travel and would not accord with the government's objective of creating sustainable communities.
Ecology

The ES does not appear to identify any significant ecological features on the application site. Table 6.1: Summary of Residual Impacts (Page 25) of the ES Non-Technical Summary confirms the loss of hedgerows at the site would only have a ‘minor adverse’ ecological significance and any loss or disturbance to habitats would be minor adverse or negligible. It states that there will be a minor ‘net gain’ benefit with respect to new foraging habitat.

Paragraph 4.30 of the ES Non-Technical Summary acknowledges that several areas of habitat on the application site qualify as UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority habitat. However, it states: ‘none of the areas are considered to be particularly high quality examples when judged against others within Norfolk’.

Furthermore, paragraph 4.32 states that: ‘Overall, the development will result in a minor adverse impact on a small number of the VERs but some impacts are likely to be beneficial’.

HOW is concerned over the substantial loss of BAP habitat hedgerows as a result of the proposed development and at the way in which the quality of this BAP habitat has been assessed within the ES. It is not considered appropriate to dismiss the significance of the habitat quality on the basis of comparisons elsewhere within the county. Clearly, the BAP habitat must be assessed with respect to its local significance and the direct impact of its loss to wildlife within both the application site and the surrounding area.

HOW wishes to support the formal consultation response from Natural England that ‘like for like’ hedgerow replacement planting be incorporated into the proposed Master Plan layout.

Norfolk Wildlife Trust (NWT) has commented on the application. HOW wishes to support the concerns of NWT with respect to the absence of a site wide Management Plan. This should demonstrate how the proposed mitigation measures would be implemented. Without, such a document, it is not clear how or by what mechanism the suggested enhancements would take place.

HOW is also supportive of NWT’s comments regarding the promotion of green infrastructure from within the proposed development site to surrounding countryside. Green infrastructure is specifically encouraged within JCS policy 10 to ensure the long-term sustainability of proposed development areas such as Hethersett (Paragraph 6.24). HOW would wish to see continued discussions from the applicant with the Green Infrastructure Steering Group should the LPA be minded to approve this application.
Phasing Plan

Phasing Options

The proposed Phasing Plan shows the central area of the site being development as part of Phase 1. It is understood that previous phasing plans presented to the community showed land to the east of the site being developed in the first instance. HOW is concerned that should the proposed development be approved and not proceed as planned, the village could be left with a blighted scheme. The main access route to the development is expected to be via Colney Lane but the access roads from this are set to be delivered as part of Phase 2 and not Phase 1.

Construction Traffic Routes

It is not clear from the submission documents which road(s) would be used to provide access for construction traffic as part of Phase 1 but it is assumed that either Back Lane and/or Churchfields are the most likely.

HOW seeks clarification from the applicant on this issue and would strongly object to the use of Churchfields as a construction access to the site. This road is within a residential area with numerous young families and is already a busy route with existing bus services. Accordingly, it would be unsuitable to accommodate additional heavy construction traffic which would result in noise nuisance and disturbance, road muck and traffic safety issues.

HOW would prefer construction traffic to access Phase 1 of the site via Colney Lane and Back Lane.
Recreation & Open Space

Sports Pitches

It is noted that there is a total of 8 new sports pitches proposed as part of the new development. Of these, 2 are designated for the existing Secondary School; 3 are designated to Hethersett Athletic FC and a further 3 to the general public as part of a neighborhood park. Given the relative size of Hethersett (including the proposed development) this is considered by HOW to be an overprovision of sports pitches. Concentrating a disproportionate number of sports pitched within a small area of the site is not considered to represent good use of space or principles of good urban design.

HOW acknowledges that feedback given by the community during the public consultation events favoured additional recreation provision over a new county park. However, HOW would like to see a more diverse range of informal and formal recreational uses which would appeal to a larger spectrum of the community particularly at the eastern end of the development.

In particular, there are many young children within Hethersett and the provision of a skate park should be considered by the applicant in conjunction with additional community consultation.

Secondary School Extension

HOW acknowledges that additional playing fields have been provided to the exiting Secondary School to enable future development on the existing grounds. However, they are very concerned over potential road safety issues arising from students having to cross Back Lane.

Whilst a pedestrian crossing is shown on the Master Plan, HOW does not consider this to be either practical or safe as students would inevitably attempt to cross unsupervised. Accordingly, HOW would like to see a small footbridge provided at this location in order to secure a 100% safe means of crossing Back Lane.

Allotment Provision

A local Action Group within Hethersett has been seeking new allotment land for a number of years. Over 40 people have expressed an interest in having an allotment. Parish Councillor, Jackie Sutton, has been helping to identify appropriate sites but there has been little success to date.

HOW therefore welcomes the provision of allotments within the proposed development. However, these are considered to be poorly located at the far North West corner of the site and would be inaccessible to a large number of residents (both existing and proposed). Given existing demand within the village the proposed area of allotments would be insufficient. It is understood that allotment were shown on previous Master Plan drawings within the green buffer zone for the existing village following a meeting in March 2010.

HOW suggests that an additional area of land is allocated for allotments to improve accessibility from both new and existing residents and to cater for existing and future demand. This is specifically encouraged within Objective 9 and policy 20 of the JCS as part of providing green infrastructure within new development and by helping to secure sustainable development.
Planning Considerations Summary

Principle of Development

HOW does not object in principle to the location of new housing development within Hethersett as identified within the GNOP JCS. The current proposal seeks to force the LPA to determine the application before it has had the opportunity to prepare its Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD in accordance with government requirements. However, due to the quantum of development proposed, HOW considers the proposed application to be premature with respect to the preparation of the Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD and should not be considered favourably by the LPA until this document has been subject to consultation and independent examination.

Quantum of Development and 5 Year Housing Supply

HOW objects to the scale of the proposed development which exceeds the target set out within the JCS by approximately 200 dwellings. Notwithstanding the fact that there is not a 5 year housing supply within the NPA, the resulting scheme is considered to be unsustainable overdevelopment and conflicts with wider strategic objectives such as maintaining an important Strategic Gap between Hethersett and Cringleford contrary to guidance within both PPS1; PPS3; the saved Local Plan; and emerging local and national planning policy.

Strategic Gaps & Landscape Impact

A large area of the proposed site (particularly Phase 2) would fall within a Strategic Gap as identified within both saved policy ENV2 of the Local Plan Proposals Map and the emerging Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD. HOW considers this would undermine the openness of the Strategic Gap which serves a vital spatial planning function and have a significant impact on the character of the surrounding countryside in relation to both Cringleford and Little Melton contrary to the aims and objectives of saved policy ENV2, JCS policies 2 and 10 and the emerging Site Specific Policies and Allocations DPD.

To this end, HOW wish to see the removal of the area of land identified as Phase 2 of the development as part of a revised Master Plan.

Health

Due to the large scale of development proposed at Hethersett, there would appear to be insufficient capacity at the Doctor's Surgery to deal with the increase in population. HOW is very concerned that this would have a detrimental impact on the delivery of health services and patient care.

The siting of new housing within less than 100m from High Voltage (400KV) National Grid power lines is considered to present potentially significant health concerns to future residents. In particular, the potential link between Extremely Low Frequency Electric and Magnetic Fields (ELF EMFs) and childhood leukaemia.

Infrastructure /Drainage & Flooding

Anglia Water has confirmed that the development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. Hethersett also has a history of flooding from surface water drainage which appears
to have not been sufficiently addressed within the FRA. HOW is concerned that the proposed
development would exacerbate these problems.

The proposed development seeks to utilise a number of balancing ponds as part of its SUDS strategy.
HOW is concerned over the issue of standing water and the potential of these ponds to smell during
summer months and their potential to collect rubbish and present a health and safety hazard to
children.

Highways & Parking

HOW is very concerned that the proposed mitigation measures to the junction of Colney Lane and
Norwich Road (B1172) will be inadequate to address the increased capacity pressures which would
result from the proposed development. In particular, concerns are raised that the junction would
become congested and unsafe based on the current proposals.

HOW have reservations over the deliverability of the proposed development based on the need to
widens parts of Colney Lane using land to the east for which ownership is currently unclear.

HOW is concerned about the ability of Churchfields Road to cope with additional traffic and the
potential negative impact that this intensification may have on road safety and congestion during
peak hours, particularly at the junction with Norwich Road.

HOW is concerned that restricting access from Henstead Road would prevent new residents from
accessing services within the existing center of Hethersett. It would also be used by residents of the
existing village to access the new service centre (or other facilities) and restricting access will create
poor permeability between the existing and new parts of Hethersett and force traffic into using
other, less direct, roads.

The proposed access restrictions could also lead to the creation of a Ring Road around the proposed
new part of Hethersett which was specifically discouraged by the GNDP Design Review Panel
provided feedback in September 2010.

Given the considerable increase in the number of vehicle movements to the existing roads in
Hethersett from the proposed development, HOW would expect the applicant to make appropriate
financial contributions towards a scheme of highways improvements.

The cumulative impact of other future large scale developments along the A11 corridor is considered
by HOW to further increase capacity issues at both Churchfields and Colney Lane Junctions with
Norwich Road.

Neighborhood Centre

HOW has reservations about the siting and resulting accessibility of the proposed local centre for
new residents. Residents of Phase 2 of the development will be located approximately 1.2km away
which would not be sustainable as it will only encourage use of the private motor vehicle and
demonstrates further evidence that this proposal is overdevelopment.
HOW is also concerned over the lack of local facilities (shops and services) proposed as part of the
development and the potential impact this may have on increased use of the private motor vehicle
contrary to the principles of sustainable development.

Ecology

HOW is concerned over the substantial loss of BAP habitat hedgerows as a result of the proposed
development and at the way in which the quality of this BAP habitat has been assessed within the
ES. HOW wishes to support the formal consultation response from Natural England that ‘like for
like’ hedgerow replacement planting be incorporated into the proposed Master Plan layout.

HOW wishes to support the concerns of NWT with respect to the absence of a site wide
Management Plan to demonstrate how the proposed mitigation measures would be implemented.

HOW is also supportive of NWT’s comments regarding the promotion of green infrastructure from
within the proposed development site to surrounding countryside as encouraged within JCS policy
10 to ensure the long-term sustainability of proposed development areas such as Hethersett.

Phasing Plan

The proposed Phasing Plan shows the central area of the site being development as part of Phase 1.
HOW is concerned that should the proposed development be approved and not proceed as planned,
the village could be left with a blighted scheme as access provision to Colney Road is not included as
part of Phase 1.

HOW strongly objects to the use of Churchfields as a construction access to the site due to its
proximity to residential dwellings and existing bus services. HOW seeks clarification from the
applicant concerning proposed construction traffic routes under each phasing plan.

Recreation & Open Space

HOW considers there is an overprovision of sports pitches within the Master Plan proposals. HOW
would like to see a more diverse range of informal and formal recreational uses which would appeal
to a larger spectrum of the community particularly at the eastern end of the development. This
may, for example, include provision of a skate park subject to additional community consultation.

HOW are very concerned over potential road safety issues arising from students having to cross Back
Lane to access the proposed new playfields. HOW would like to see a small footbridge provided at
this location in order to secure a 100% safe means of crossing Back Lane.

HOW considers there is an under provision of allotments within the development and the proposed
allotments are poorly located and inaccessible to a large number of residents. HOW suggests an
additional area of land is allocated for allotments to improve accessibility from both new and
existing residents and to cater for existing and future demand. This is specifically encouraged within
Objective 9 and policy 20 of the JCS as part of providing green infrastructure within new
development and by helping to secure sustainable development.
Conclusion

Overall, HOW has serious reservations over the impact of a development of this scale upon the quality of life for both existing and future residents and to the surrounding environment including flora and fauna.

For the various reasons identified above, the proposed scheme, which exceeds the JCS allocation by approximately 200 dwellings, is considered to represent an overdevelopment of the village. It would be unsustainable and would clearly erode an important Strategic Gap having a detrimental impact to the character of the countryside.

There is a clear lack of integration between both existing and new parts of the village and also within the new development itself as evidenced by the poor location of Allotments and Neighborhood Centre. In particular, the proposals provide very little in the way of genuine benefit to the existing villagers who as a group will be the most affected by the proposed development.

The majority of benefits would effectively be felt by new residents although there are serious concerns over the location of dwellings along the northern edge of the development within close proximity to High Voltage power lines and the overall provision of shops and services to cater for a scheme of this size.

HOW wishes to see these concerns addressed as part of a revised Master Plan layout which reduces the overall size of the development to an acceptable level which can be supported by the infrastructure, facilities and physical environment of Hethersett for the benefit of all. Only in this way can a successful development be achieved which delivers sustainable and healthy communities as required by the JCS.
Applications Referred back to Committee

3. **Appl. No**: 2010/1175/F  
   **Parish**: BUNWELL  
   Applicants Name: Mr Robert Dale  
   Site Address: Frank Dale Foods Ltd Little Green Bunwell Street Bunwell NR16 1SH  
   Proposal: Variation of condition 2 of planning permission 2006/2246 (Refurbish existing building to a food manufacturing use) to allow 24 hour operating Monday to Saturday and 6.00am to 6.00pm on a Sunday.

   **Recommendation**: Approve with Conditions
   1. Temporary Permission – 12 months
   2. Conditions on previous permission
   3. No shift change after 22:00 or before 06
   4. Parking layout details
   5. Details of alternative smoking shelter

Introduction

This application was presented to the North and West Area Planning Committee in October 2010, where the Committee deferred consideration of the application to allow Officers to consider potential breaches of conditions associated with the previous planning permission. Details were submitted in relation to conditions attached to planning permission 2006/2246/CU and these were considered by Environmental Health Officers. While the details submitted were not considered to fully address the requirements of the conditions, Environmental Health Officers have been monitoring the operation of the site, particularly in relation to noise concerns, but have also now assessed details relating to odour controls. The details as submitted, following the monitoring period have now been confirmed as acceptable and the application is therefore presented to this committee for determination.

The applicant has also recently sought to extend the Sunday working to 6pm. Given the time that has elapsed and revisions to the application, the report has been updated to reflect the current policy context and planning history.

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   NPPF 01: Building a strong competitive economy  
   NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 5: The Economy  
   Policy 6: Access and Transportation

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   EMP 4: Employment development outside the Development Limits and Village Boundaries of identified towns and villages (Non Consistent)  
   EMP 6: Alterations and extensions to existing business premises  
   ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
   IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
   IMP 9: Residential amenity  
   IMP 10: Noise

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2010/1380/F  
   New industrial unit to accommodate an eco-friendly motor car design & assembly business  
   Approved
2.2 2006/2246 Refurbish existing building to a food manufacturing use  
Approved

2.3 2001/0286 Use of premises by Ketts Products to continue and agricultural machinery sales, stores and service depot with retail sales of associated products  
Approved

2.4 1992/1137/F Erection of extension  
Approved

2.5 1985/2454/F Variation of Condition 2 on 07/77/2561/F  
[Restricted use of machinery outside the building to between 7am and 6pm. Removed restriction on machinery within the building]  
Approved

2.6 1979/4048/F Extensions To Existing Workshop.  
Approved

2.7 1977/2561/F Building Of Agricultural Workshop - To Plans Received By Local Planning Authority On 27th October 1977.  
[Condition 2 restricted use of machinery to between 7am and 6pm]  
Approved

4. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council  
Approve
- Increases employment in the area without increasing lorry traffic or movements during the night
- Concern that it may set a precedent for 24 hour working in other industrial or engineering

3.2 District Member  
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Environmental Services (Protection)  
Initially commented regarding noise levels
Recommend additional smoking shelter and retention of other conditions on 2006/2246

Following deferral of application, have considered submitted details regarding previous permission and monitored operation of site and confirm details submitted regarding current operation are acceptable.

With regard to amended hours:

3.4 NCC Highways  
No objections

Following amended hours:
No objection

3.5 Local Residents  
11 letters of objection to initial application
- Original conditions were imposed to safeguard area, which is quiet, particularly at night
- Will result in additional vehicular activity
- Disturbance from reversing horns and vehicle lights
- Disturbance from refrigeration units - more detailed study regarding noise levels should be undertaken
- Proximity of flues to neighbouring dwelling and associated disturbance
- Increase in odours
- Concerns regarding level of lighting
- Increased disturbance from shift changes - proximity to neighbouring dwellings
- Disturbance from smoking shelter
- Currently breaching existing conditions - working from 4.30am to 12.30 mid night
- Shouldn’t work Sundays

3 letters of objection following amended hours:
- Site in a rural residential hamlet, not an industrial estate. While there is disturbance from agricultural activities this is seasonal.
- The impact of a food factory is not comparable to farming. The road use and noise disturbance are the main concerns, with HGV’s arriving at unsociable hours.
- Have highway concerns regarding the junction of Church Lane and Bunwell Street. The use will increase vehicular activity.
- Since deferral of application there has been no attempt to allay residents concerns or explain the need for longer hours
- Houses were there before the factory. Residents rights to undisturbed sleep and evening relaxation should be protected.
- Should consider other ways to meet demand before approving 24 hour working.
- 3 main bedroom windows are 15m from car park and entrance
- 6am shift arrives at 5.15am and disturbs neighbours by staff talking etc
- Shift change over takes an hour with staff arriving sand departing.
- 7 day working is not acceptable

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application is to vary condition 2 of the planning application 2006/2246 which restricted the working hours of the premises. The applicant has requested the revision for the whole year but comments that the need for the additional hours predominantly relates to the summer and Christmas period. The application was initially submitted to allow 24 hour operating Monday to Saturday and 6.00am to 4.00pm on a Sunday, but has recently requested that the Sunday working is extended to 6pm.

4.2 The site is located outside the Village Boundary for Bunwell, however the site has been used for commercial purposes since 1977 and the current occupiers were granted planning permission for their use in 2006. The principle of the use is therefore acceptable and the issues for consideration in relation to this application relate to the implications of extending the working hours. Since the consideration of the application in 2010, the Joint Core Strategy has been adopted and the National Planning Policy Framework has been published. These both contain policies which support the development of the rural economy subject to it not adversely affecting the character of the area.
4.3 In considering this application it is necessary to balance the economic benefits to the company and the wider economy against the potential impacts on the amenities of neighbouring residents and the implications for highway safety in the vicinity of the site.

4.4 The current operation has two shift changes with production staff starting at 6am with a change over at 2pm and finishing at 10pm. At present this only results in two shifts being present at any one time at the change over at 2pm. The proposed variation in hours would result in shift change overs at 6am, 2pm and 10pm.

4.5 The car parking area is at the front of the building and is close to the neighbouring bungalow. Concerns have been raised about the increase in disturbance resulting from more vehicular activity and increase in staff on site at any one time. Discussions have taken place with the applicant regarding revisions to parking arrangements to try to minimise this disruption. In this context, I consider that it would be reasonable to agree a parking layout which reduces activity close to the neighbours boundary and ensure that there is no change in shifts between 22:00 and 06:00.

4.6 The applicant has confirmed that there will be no requirement to change delivery times and that the increase in production will not result in a significant increase in delivery / collection vehicles as the vehicles which currently service the site currently have spare capacity. It should be noted that at present, other than a restriction on the hours of such activities there are no controls over the number of such vehicles and I therefore consider that provided that the company operate within the existing restriction relating to deliveries (7am to 6pm Monday to Saturday) that the additional working hours will not result in a significant increase in disturbance from commercial vehicles. The Highway Authority has raised no objection.

4.7 Concerns have been raised about the operation of existing plant and increase in disturbance from the operation of plant over night. While the majority of activities take place within the building, which is insulated, there are a number of air conditioning units etc along the eastern elevation of the building. Details of this plant, together with any attenuation, should have been approved by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) prior to installation, and these have now been considered following the Committees deferral of this application in October 2010. The applicants have confirmed that the additional working hours will not result in this plant running any longer than at present. Environmental Services Officers have monitored the operation of the site over this period and have confirmed that they do not consider that the operations would result in a statutory nuisance.

4.8 I understand that a refrigerated lorry back was placed on the site to provide additional storage and that this caused a noise nuisance. This has now been replaced by a more modern cold store.

4.9 A smoking shelter has been erected along the western boundary without consent. This is accessed by a gravel path and neighbours have complained regarding disturbance from its use. I consider that if a night shift is to operate, then the use of this existing shelter is likely result in increased disturbance to the neighbouring properties and consequently an alternative provision should be made.

4.10 I consider that, from the information submitted, the operation of a night shift could be undertaken without significantly increasing disturbance, however, I consider that this will be affected by issues such as where parking takes place and how the change of shifts etc is managed. The applicants have submitted details of occasions over the last year where they have operated outside the current authorised hours in order that Officers could assess neighbours comments in the context of how the site has been operating. The majority of activities which have been identified by the applicant do not relate to production activities and could take place within the parameters of the current planning permission. I therefore consider that it is reasonable to grant a temporary planning permission to monitor how the increase in hours operates and what its effects are and recommend that this is for 1 year, which will allow for peak production periods to be included.
5. **Reasons for Approval**

5.1 Subject to a temporary trial period, the proposed increase in hours of use is potentially acceptable in respect of the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to accord with Sections 1 and 3 of the NPPF, Policy 5 and Policy 6 of the JCS and policies EMP6, IMP8, IMP9, IMP10 of the SNLP. The nature of the use, together with existing controls have the potential not to result in a significant increase in disturbance for neighbouring properties or adversely affect the character of the area or highway safety.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Stuart Pontin 01508 533796 spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk
4. **Appl. No**: 2011/1736/F  
**Parish**: WYMONDHAM  

**Applicants Name**: Admiral Taverns  
**Site Address**: Green Dragon Public House 6 Church Street Wymondham NR18 0PH  
**Proposal**: Alterations to first floor to create function room, alterations to ground floor kitchen store, construction of timber framed garden shelters and retrospective permission for timber decking to rear of garden.

**Recommendation**: Approve with Conditions

1. **Introduction**

1.1 This application was originally considered by Development Management Committee on the 7 March 2012, it was resolved to approve the application subject to a condition to control music events in the beer garden to protect the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties. The original report is attached as Appendix 2.

1.2 Condition (4) was to have been imposed prohibiting loudspeakers and amplified music. Since that time discussions have been held with the applicants, the Council's Licensing Department and Environmental Services Officer on the most appropriate way forward with regard to the appropriate wording of the condition to ensure it is clear so the applicants understand its limitations, that it is adequate to protect the amenities of the neighbours and that is it enforceable.

2. **Additional Assessment**

2.1 The nature of the music events held in the beer garden include a wide range of musical instruments and singers some of which need amplification in order to provide a good quality of sound, this does not necessarily mean that all types of instruments are loud, but some acoustic or wind instruments require amplification to provide good quality sound. Through discussion with the applicant, it is apparent that the range of music events held in the beer garden is varied but the pub plays an important part in both the community and the commercial aspect of the town. During music events, such as the Jazz festival, it is important the pub can continue to play an active role within the community, as it has in the past.

2.2 The pub has a long established use and has no previous planning restrictions which controlled the level or type of events occurring in the beer garden. The proposed application included the retention of decking and provided for a covered area. While this may slightly increase the opportunity for the number of events, this is not significantly different to the existing authorised use of the beer garden. It is, therefore, questionable whether prohibition of loudspeakers and amplification is justified simply because decking and garden shelters are being approved. Such a restriction could be regarded as excessive in view of the established lawful use of the pub garden and, therefore, unreasonable.

2.3 If a condition were to prohibit the use of amplified music or the use of loudspeakers, it would not protect the neighbours against disturbance from music events which do not require amplification, therefore the proposed condition cannot achieve the protection for neighbouring properties that was intended. For these reasons the proposed condition is not an effective method of controlling any noise disturbance.
2.4 It should also be remembered that the beer garden lends itself to large numbers of people gathering in good weather which will generate high levels of noise and disturbance none of which can be controlled by planning conditions, but has the potential to cause some level of disturbance to the neighbouring properties. The hours of use of the beer garden are controlled by the Licence the details of which are contained in the main report attached as Appendix 2.

2.5 As noted above discussions have already taken place with Environmental Services Officers to ascertain what measures are in place to control noise disturbance to neighbours should the case arise and if the condition were not imposed. We have been advised by Environmental Services that should a Statutory Nuisance be proved then there is Legislation in place to control this issue and protect the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

3. Conclusion

3.1 Taking into account the existing established lawful use of the beer garden, the lack of protection for residential amenities the condition would provide neighbours together with the difficulty of enforcing the condition, I conclude on further consideration that the condition is not reasonable, precise or enforceable and that should a Statutory Noise nuisance occur it would be better controlled by Environmental Services, therefore the condition should not be included as part of the decision.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number & E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837 jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Appl. No : 2011/1736/F  
Parish : WYMONDHAM

Applicants Name : Admiral Taverns  
Site Address : Green Dragon Public House, 6 Church Street, Wymondham  
Proposal : Alterations to first floor to create function room, alterations to ground floor kitchen store, construction of timber framed garden shelters and retrospective permission for timber decking to rear of garden.

Recommendation : Approve with conditions

1. Planning Permission Time Limit
2. In accordance with submitted drawings
3. External materials to be agreed
4. No loudspeaker etc. outside building
5. Use of fire escape for staff and emergencies only

1. Planning Policies

1.1 National Planning Policy Statement 5 – Planning for the Historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 1 Addressing climate change and protecting environmental assets
Policy 2 Promoting Good Design
Policy 5 The Economy

13 South Norfolk Local Plan
IMP 9: Residential amenity
IMP 10: Noise
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings
IMP 18: Development in Conservation Areas.

2. Planning History

2.1 2003/1190/LB External repairs and redecoration Approved

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council : Approve
  - Subject to views of Conservation Officer

3.2 District Member : To be determined by Committee
  - Possible detriment to residential amenities,
  - Development in Conservation Area

3.3 English Heritage : Support the reinstatement of the first floor to function room which will increase the use and viability of this hugely important building. No objection to the regularisation of the covered decking area in the rear yard.

3.4 Conservation Officer : The internal alterations to the first floor will reinstate the original large room which will greatly improve the internal character of the building.
Subject to amended plans to ensure that the proposed shelters are below the existing boundary wall then these will sit comfortably in the rear garden with no adverse impact on the character of the listed building and wider conservation area.

3.5 Environmental Services : Comment regarding potential for disturbance from music activities in external area. Recommend conditions.

3.6 Local Residents : 2 letters of objection received on original scheme
• Accept inevitable nuisance a public house can create we believe the level of disturbance presently experienced is in danger of becoming entirely out of proportion to its situation in a largely residential conservation area within the precincts of Wymondham Abbey.
• Proposal for development within the grounds would facilitate the use of the area for the sale of alcohol and live music.
• Proposed garden shelter appears to extend above the existing boundary wall. How will this void between the roof of the shelter and the garden wall be treated?
• Existing noise levels last summer already distressing therefore suggest restricted use of garden shelters until 10.30pm, with complete cessation of use (including clearing of crockery and glasses) by 11pm.
• The decking acts as a sounding board for noise and substantially increases the proposed level of the roof above the wall, and further emphasises our anxieties regarding any change to the present licence.
• The garden shelters will further extend the comfortable use of the garden, the nuisance this will create and perhaps should lead to a revision of the current licensing hours.
• Currently there is light and smell pollution which is likely to be exacerbated by the creation of a function room.
• Accept that the function room will require emergency access but trust that the present route down the stairs to the garden will be used solely for this purpose.

1 letter of objection on amended proposal for the reduced height of the garden shelters,
• maintains objections relating to the disturbance from customers into the evening.

1 letter received removing objection if:
• the roof slopes away from the rear boundary wall,
• that the use of the fire escape is for emergency use only, and
• that there is no amplified music in the garden.

4. Assessment

4.1 The proposal is for the internal alterations to convert the B & B rooms at first floor back to a function room, alterations to an internal wall on the ground floor kitchen, retention of the decking at the rear of the beer garden and for the erection of two garden shelters, one of which is to cover the existing decking.
4.2 The property is a Grade II* listed building, within the conservation area and within the Development limits of Wymondham. The site is outside the Primary Shopping Area, but within the Central Business Area. It is joined on three sides by residential properties and part of an office building at 4a Church Street.

4.3 The proposal is assessed against the principles of Policy 5 of the Joint Core Strategy which seeks to promote the economy in both urban and rural areas. Policy 1 of the JCS and Policies IMP13 and IMP18 of the South Norfolk Local Plan seek to ensure that all development and alterations to listed buildings and within Conservation areas have regard to the special architectural character of the building, its setting and preserve or enhance the conservation areas. Policies IMP9 and IMP10 of the Local Plan seek to ensure that development has regard to the residential amenities and privacy of neighbouring properties.

4.4 Planning permission was granted in 1989 for the change of use of the first floor restaurant to 3 bedrooms with en-suite bathrooms and change an existing garage into a restaurant. The current application is to convert these bedrooms back into a function room which will allow the existing character of the room to be re-instated which includes a fireplace on the north west wall.

4.5 At ground floor level, the proposed alteration to an internal wall in the kitchen will allow the boiler and water tanks to be separated off from the main kitchen, and allow better circulation space for the kitchen/store room. The internal revisions proposed are supported by the Council’s Conservation Officer and English Heritage and I consider that these works respect the character and historic integrity of the building.

4.6 With regard to the potential of noise disturbance from the function room to the adjacent neighbours, there are no windows on the north east elevation closest to the neighbouring residential property (No 4 church Street) and with the exception of the fire escape there are no openings on the north west elevation. Part of the building adjacent to the function room (No4a Church Street) is a commercial premises, however, from discussion with the applicant the function room is likely to be let for training, meetings and functions of this nature during the day, with parties etc more likely to take place in evenings/weekends which will not conflict with the use of the adjacent office building. However, I do not feel it necessary to control this use by way of condition.

4.7 I note that from the platform of the fire escape it is possible to look over the boundary wall into No 4, however, if the use of this escape is restricted to that of emergency use only and for staff who will need to attend the fireplace and bar, then I consider that the potential of overlooking and loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties will be minimal and not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy.

4.8 I understand from the applicants that the fire escape was previously used by occupants of the B & B rooms and the intensification of use for this proposal will not be more than previously experienced. I consider that the proposal to convert the first floor back to a function room subject to the suggested condition to restrict the use of the fire escape is unlikely to result in any significant loss of residential amenities to the adjacent neighbouring properties, while improving the vitality and viability of the existing premises.

4.9 Comment has been made verbally regarding the light on the building above the fire escape and its impact on the bedroom window of No 4, however, I understand that this has to remain in this position and at this level of illumination to meet the requirements of fire regulations for the emergency exit.

4.10 The scheme also includes the retention of the decking which has been installed in the beer garden and runs the entire length of the rear boundary wall. A section of the decking is already covered by an existing 6 metre mono pitch roof. This is situated in the corner of the site and is against the rear wall and the boundary wall of No 4 Church Street, this portion of covering is to remain in situ. The height of the rear and side boundary wall measures approximately 2.8 metres.
4.11 The scheme for the garden shelters as originally submitted proposed a pitch roof over the remaining length of the decking, but did not cover the entire width. The height was proposed to be 3.3 metres and projected above the boundary walls. Concerns were raised regarding how the gap between the roof and the wall of the shelter would be treated to prevent noise, light pollution and rubbish from spilling over into the neighbours garden.

4.12 Discussions have since taken place with the applicants and the agent to reassess the covered areas in the rear garden. Amended plans have now been submitted which provide a flat roof section above the decking which does not project above the boundary wall. The width of the roof has also been extended to cover the whole of the decking to ensure that it does not become slippery from rain for safety reasons.

4.13 The roof will slope from the boundary wall to the front and the guttering will be concealed behind the front fascia therefore improving the visual appearance of the structure within the setting of the listed building. Further plans detailing the cross section of this and the details for the disposal of the surface water have been requested. No issues have been raised by any party regarding the second flat roof shelter which is to be used for storage and situated on the south west boundary of the site. I consider that the design of these elements is acceptable in terms of the setting of the Listed Building and character of the Conservation Area.

4.14 The main issue relating to the covering of the decking relates to the potential for the increased use of the existing garden and the potential increase in disturbance to the neighbouring properties, compared to how this differs from the lawful use of the same garden area at present.

4.15 The beer garden prior to the installation of the decking was covered in grass, and uneven paved areas, with a range of picnic tables around the site. The licensing hours of use of the beer garden were and remain the same as the main pub Monday to Wednesday 10.00am to 11.30pm, Thursday to Saturday 10.00am to 12.30am and Sunday Noon to 11.00pm. The serving of alcohol ceases 0.30 minutes prior to the opening hours. There is no planning restriction on the hours of use.

4.16 The concern raised by neighbours is that the provision of such a large covered area will provide the opportunity to increase the use of the garden, beyond the time of year when beer gardens are most popular and increase the time into the evening that the garden will be used. It is also considered possible that the area will be used for music events thus further increasing the disturbance to the residential properties.

4.17 It has been suggested from one of the neighbours as a compromise that the garden should be closed earlier to reduce the noise to the neighbouring properties. Indeed it is acknowledged that the covered area will provide the opportunity for customers to sit outside later into the year than otherwise would be considered seasonal use of the garden and will concentrate the use of the garden against the rear wall of the adjacent properties.

4.18 The covered areas will be enclosed at the rear adjacent to the boundary wall which will project any noise back into the beer garden; the design of the covered area will also ensure there is no significant light pollution into the neighbour’s properties. I consider that later in the year, neighbours are unlikely to be using their garden areas as intensively and windows are more likely to be closed and therefore, on balance I feel that the level of additional disturbance to the neighbouring properties resulting from the proposed scheme would not justify refusal. In this instance I do not consider that a condition to control the hours of use within the garden is necessary, when considered against the existing lawful use of the garden, and the existing licensing hours.
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 and 5 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies IMP9, IMP10, IMP13 and IMP18 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

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 and not considered to result in significant detrimental impacts on the adjacent neighbouring properties.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson, 01508 533837, jjackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
5. **App. No**: 2012/1640/F  
**Parish**: CRINGLEFORD  

Applicants Name: Mr D Jackson  
Site Address: Land North of 29 Newfound Drive Cringleford Norfolk NR4 7RY  
Proposal: Erection of detached 4 bedroom house with separate double garage  

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions  

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. Plans as submitted  
3. Materials  
4. Boundary Treatment  
5. PD Rights removed for Roof alterations  
6. First floor window in North elevation  
7. Water efficiency  
8. Highways parking

**Introduction**

This application was considered by the Committee on 9th January 2013 when it was resolved to authorise the Director to approve the application subject to negotiation to seek agreement between the applicant and adjacent occupier on the form of the garage roof. It was noted that the submitted pyramidal roof could be amended to a gabled roof and thereby increase its screening effect to the benefit of the adjacent occupier, who had raised objection regarding overlooking from the new dwelling.

It has not proved possible to instigate direct discussion between the parties, so an amended plan showing the garage with a gabled roof has been requested and submitted. Comments from the neighbouring occupier on this amendment have been requested. At the time of writing the outcome of this consultation is not known, but the matter is referred back to Committee to avoid further delay in the event that agreement between the parties is not achieved. The outcome of the consultation will be reported to the Committee.

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 12: The remainder of the Norwich Urban area, including the fringe parishes

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 4: Residential development within the defined Development Limits of the Norwich Policy Area settlements, and at selected locations along strategic routes  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
ENV 14: Habitat protection  
ENV 15: Species protection  
IMP 2: Landscaping
2. Planning History

2.1 2004/1306 Demolition of existing garage and reconstruction of garage with bedroom above

3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council Refuse
Dominant on site. Lower roof height and loss of privacy to neighbouring property.

3.2 District Members
Cllr C Kemp To be determined by Planning Committee
Cllr Wheatley To be determined by Planning Committee: Situated at a point where the style of dwelling changes from houses to bungalows and at a point where Newfound Drive turns through 90 degrees. The massing and orientation of any dwelling on this site must be sympathetic to its surroundings if considerable loss of amenity is not to be suffered by the neighbours. In my opinion the proposal will not achieve that.

3.3 Shirley Bishop No objections but offer advisory note regarding disposal of surface water.

3.4 Landscape Officer No objections

3.5 NCC Highways Support conditionally

3.6 Local Residents 10 Letters of objection
- Loss of privacy and residential amenities from windows at front of property
- Scale of proposed dwelling not in keeping with others in the area.
- Height of the roof is unnecessarily high.
- Siting of garage is visually intrusive other garages in Newfound Drive are integral or of a scale set well back from the road.
- Dwelling is in front of building line of Nos 19 – 29.
- Plot is in the corner and proposed dwelling is not in keeping with the area.
- Unsuitable for parking on Newfound Drive as it narrows past nos 22 and 14 unsuitable for construction traffic.
- Close board fencing should be constructed on boundary of 29 to ensure privacy before occupation.
- Loss of habitat for wildlife - site has already been cleared.
- Newfound Drive is a private road and its upkeep is the responsibility of the residents.

4 letters of support
- Plot has been vacant for some time.
- When No 20 was purchased in 1974 was aware that plot would be developed.
- No objection to development on site but roof height should be reduced.
- Slight concern over construction traffic.
4. **Assessment**

4.1 The proposal is for the erection of a two storey detached dwelling with a detached garage close to the boundary of No 22. Properties at the section of Newfound Drive at the end of the cul de sac are single storey properties, No 22 on the north east boundary of the site is single storey dwelling while No 29 on the South East boundary of the site is a two storey property which has been extended with a full two storey extension. On the North west boundary is a two storey property which is off an adjacent road St Lawrence Drive. Access to the site is off newfound Drive which is a private road and I understand that the upkeep being the shared responsibility of the residents. The site is within the Development Limits of Cringleford but is outside the Conservation Area.

4.2 Policies in the JCS, Local Plan and requirements of the NPPF seek to ensure that proposals are for an appropriate use, are of good design and do not adversely affect the overall character of the area, or the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Pan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent/part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 The main issue raised by the Parish Council and the neighbouring properties is that of scale rather than the principle of the plot being developed and the impact the proposed dwelling will have on the privacy and amenities of the adjacent single storey dwelling and the character of the immediate area.

4.4 Newfound Drive is a mix of single storey and two storey dwellings. The immediate neighbouring property No 29 is a two storey property which has been extended with a two storey extension. The resulting property has a ridge height similar to that of the proposed dwelling. The orientation of the proposed property will front No 22 which is a single storey property. The width of the plot is similar to the majority of other plots in Newfound Drive, while No 29 is set within a double plot therefore providing more space around the property even as extended.

4.5 The proposed dwelling is a 4 bedroom property with a lounge and kitchen to the rear of the site and study and dining room to the front of the dwelling. Concern has been raised about the ridge height of the proposed dwelling, however, this is similar to that of No 29, while the property is not reflective of the majority of the properties in Newfound Drive, I do not consider that the overall height of the property is inappropriate for the plot.

4.6 First floor bedroom windows are situated to the front and rear of the property, with a study and dining room window at ground floor. The neighbour has raised concern about loss of privacy and amenities to the lounge and garden of No 22. The lounge windows of No 22 are full length, and the main garden area is situated to the side of No22 immediately adjacent to the boundary of the proposed plot. An existing hedge forms the boundary but will not provide complete screening to the proposal. A section of this hedge closest to the road has been allowed to grow to provide some privacy from No 29's first floor windows. The proposed garage situated on the boundary will provide a minimal amount of screening from the proposed windows, however there will still be a degree of overlooking from the first floor windows of the proposed dwelling. The distance from the proposed dwelling to the site boundary at the closest point is 17 metres and the distance between the walls of the proposed dwelling and No 22 at the closest point is 35 metres. The main living areas of the proposed dwelling face the rear of the site and, although there may be some overlooking of No 22, there is already some overlooking from existing properties. In these circumstances and at these distances, the degree of privacy and residential amenities lost from this proposal is not so significant as to justify refusal on grounds of the scale of the property or loss of privacy. A condition is suggested to require the first floor window in the north elevation to be obscure glazed with only a top light opening which has to be 1.7 above the finished first floor level to ensure that there is no overlooking to the rear garden of the property in St Lawrence Drive, this is necessary as the orientation of the existing neighbouring property and the proposed dwelling could result in overlooking from this side facing window.
The proposed garage is situated to the front of the property, it is separated from the property due to a large water main running through the plot, the position of the dwelling and garage ensure that the area of the water main remains unaffected. While many other properties in the area either have integral garage or garages which are set back from the road, in this instance the design, siting and scale of the garage is acceptable in this location, and it does provide a degree of screening between the proposed dwelling and the adjacent property.

The issue has been raised about the loss of wildlife habitat on the plot although this has already been cleared. There are mature trees on the neighbouring boundary of the site together with other hedging which surrounds parts of the plot, so there remains some habitat close to the site but outside the applicant’s control. There is no justification to require any additional surveys, as there is no reason to suspect the presence of protected species on the site and therefore no necessity for mitigating measures to be imposed as a condition.

An Arboricultural Survey has been carried out to assess the potential impact of the proposal on the neighbouring trees. Care has been taken to ensure that the siting of the property does not impact on the root system of the neighbouring trees. The Council’s Landscape Officer has been consulted and raises no objections to the proposal.

Subject to the above conditions to ensure that the levels of the proposed dwelling are as shown on the plans, and that the boundary treatments are in place prior to the occupation of the dwelling, then the scale, design and the siting of the proposed dwelling accord with the policies as set out above.

Reasons for Approval

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 12 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies HOU4, IMP2, IMP8, IMP9, ENV14 and ENV15 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.

The scale, design and siting of the proposed dwelling is acceptable in this location and has minimal impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties as proposed. The conditions ensure that the privacy of neighbours remains protected from any additional overlooking by requiring further permission if there are any changes proposed to the roof which would include additional windows. Access and turning to the site is already in place and there is adequate space on the site for the required level of parking and turning to ensure that on street parking is not an issue for other road users. The proposal accords with the requirements of the above policies.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Jacqui Jackson 01508 533837 jackson@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Other Applications

6. **Appl. No**: 2012/1620/F  
   **Parish**: SCOLE

   **Applicants Name**: Mrs Marion Bartrum  
   **Site Address**: Warehouse At Waveney View Waterloo Lane Scole Norfolk IP21 4DJ

   **Proposal**: New extension to existing warehousing.

   **Recommendation**: Approve with Conditions

   1. Full Planning permission time limit  
   2. In accord with submitted drawings  
   3. Specific use - Storage and distribution  
   4. Reporting of unexpected contamination  
   5. Hours of use - as requested by applicant  
   6. Full details of external lighting  
   7. No power tools outside building  
   8. Provision of parking, service  
   9. Surface water drainage to be agreed  
   10. Integrity of septic tank to be investigation

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
   NPPF 03: Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
   NPPF 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
   Policy 2: Promoting good design  
   Policy 5: The Economy

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

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2008/1108 Change of use from B8 (storage and distribution) to B1 (industrial use). Approved

2.2 2007/2148 Change of use from storage and distribution depot to storage maintenance and hire of plant and vehicles. Refused

2.3 2007/2092 Certificate of lawful use: Use as and for storage and distribution in connection with the retailing of fruit and vegetables. Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council: Approve: Subject to condition requiring markings on the road so vehicles are unable to turn left at junction as this is a very dangerous turn
3.2 District Member  To be determined by committee
Application supports employment. There is now a speed limit on this stretch of road, to make safer access to this site.

3.3 Historic Environment Service  To be reported

3.4 Environmental Services (Protection)  No comments received

3.5 NCC Highways  Conditional support

3.6 Economic Development Manager  Approve
Proposed extension will allow local business to consolidate its activities onto one site, allowing some activities to be relocated from Eye. Will help secure 4 existing jobs at the current site and create 3 new ones.

3.7 Environment Agency  No comments received

3.8 Local Residents  2 letters of support
1 letter of no comment

4. Assessment

4.1 This application seeks full planning permission for a large extension to an existing storage building at Waterloo Lane, Scole. The application site is located off the A1066 and Waterloo Lane, residential properties are situated to the north of the site and either side of the access drive.

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

4.3 The site has historically been used for storage and distribution of fruit and vegetables. The current occupiers are Kombat whom are military equipment importers and wholesalers for distribution to Army surplus type shops. The company occupied the site in 2009 and their business has grown with the assistance of additional storage space rented at Eye. They currently employ 4 staff. This proposal seeks consent for the extension of the existing storage building which will enable the company to relocate storage from Eye. The extended premises and reduced rental cost will enable the number of staff employed to be increased to 7.

4.4 I consider that the proposal accords with policy as it retains and provides employment in a rural area, the design of the extension is in keeping with the existing building, and its surroundings; the existing landscaping of the site will not be compromised; all necessary parking, servicing and circulation can be accommodated on the site for both the existing and the increased accommodation; and the amenities of nearby residential properties will not be effected to an unacceptable degree.

4.5 The Historic Environment Service required an archaeological evaluation to be carried out in accordance with NPPF, this has now been done and I will update the committee of the HES revised comments.
4.6 No objections have been received to the proposal, however the Parish Council wishes a condition preventing vehicles turning left as set out in their comments above. The highway officer has supported the proposal provided that the use of the buildings is limited to storage and distribution for the benefit of Kombat only. He considers it is important for road safety reasons that the traffic levels from the site do not increase over and above the traditional levels. He is concerned that the extension is large and whilst the proposed use by Kombat does not involve a great deal of traffic movements, should the site be taken over by another business this could increase. He does not however require any changes to the present road layout and therefore whilst I fully appreciate the Parish Council's concerns, I do not consider a condition can be imposed preventing vehicles turning left.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 Promoting good design and Policy 5 The Economy of the Joint Core Strategy and IMP8 safe and free flow of traffic and EMP6 - Alterations and extensions to existing business premises of that plan. It accords with the National Planning Policy Framework - Section 3: Supporting a prosperous rural economy.

5.2 The proposal accords with Policy 5, Policy 2, EMP6 and IMP8, as the design of the extension is in keeping with the existing building, and its surroundings; the existing landscaping of the site will not be compromised; all necessary parking, servicing and circulation can be accommodated on the site for both the existing and the increased accommodation; and the amenities of nearby residential properties will not be effected to an unacceptable degree.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number Claire Curtis 01508 533788
and E-mail: ccurtis@s-norfolk.gov.uk
7. **Appl. No**: 2012/1865/H  
**Parish**: TROWSE WITH NEWTON

Applicants Name: Mr Mark Prentice And Kerry Walker  
Site Address: 5 The Paddock Trowse Norfolk NR14 8TD  
Proposal: Erection of rear extension

Recommendation: Approve

* 1 Full Planning permission time limit  
* 2 In accordance with amendments  
* 3 Materials to be agreed  
* 4 Slab level to be agreed

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
NPPF 7: Requiring good design

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 19: Extensions to existing dwellings  
HOU 14: Extensions to dwellings in the open countryside  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 17: Alterations and extensions in conservation areas

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2011/1948 Part replacement/part new build single storey and new first floor rear extension. Refuse

2.2 1999/0680 Retention of satellite dish on dwelling Refuse

2.3 1998/1181 Single-storey extension to rear of dwelling Approve

2.4 1996/1363 Retention of existing conservatory with its further extension & insertion of new window Approve

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Revised drawings Approve  
Original proposal Approve

3.2 District Member  
Revised drawings  
Note that the revised plans are more neighbourly, in that the elevation towards Tas Lodge is reduced and moved further away  
Original proposal  
Should only be determined by the Committee because of conservation area status and possible affect on neighbouring properties
3.3 Local Residents

Objection letters received from the occupier of the adjoining dwelling Tas Lodge, of which a summary is set out below. However, the neighbour has requested that Members view her letters in full on the website.

Revised drawings
Proposal is incorrect – it is a front extension.
Application submitted 3 times as an incorrect proposal.
Needs to be reconsidered and involve more scrutiny and attention due to significance of it being a front extension proposal.
Easy to imagine what this substantial and extravagant extension, viewed from Tas Lodge as a solid mass of brick, wood boarding and tiles would do to my amenities, especially as I face northwest.
The extension being on the front makes the large measurements even more inappropriate, and reveal the very detrimental effects and loss of amenities to Tas Lodge and the surrounding area.
The modest modifications on a 62% increase in volume extension on the front of an original, small, inner terrace, 1 bedroom barn conversion, within a conservation area are almost insulting in thinking this would eliminate the previous reasons for refusal.
Would be very sad to see this attractive row of six barn and stable conversions changed into something they were never meant to be, and the amenities of residents greatly reduced by unneighbourly extensions.
Glass conservatory at Tas Lodge projects 3m and 3.6m wide (incorrect on block plan) – Light and sunshine able to travel straight through, unimpeded, ensuring no offence given to neighbours.
Inconsiderate and unneighbourly act both for Tas Lodge and this attractive terrace of Norfolk barn conversion dwellings in a conservation area.
Great relief and comfort to know that the living conditions I have enjoyed for 30 years are protected by the planning permission legislation and policies of S.N.C.
No worthwhile or significant reasons present themselves in this 3rd proposal, to address and overcome the initial reasons for refusal

Original proposal
New scheme no way an improvement on first application and makes no difference whatsoever to the detrimental effects on Tas Lodge.
No reasons present themselves to overcome the initial refusal.
The development will still be in conflict with the planning policies and more from NPPF.
Incorrect and untrue answers/statements on the application form.
To approve the application for this huge extension on an already large extension would have too many detrimental effects both to this attractive row of dwellings situated in the conservation area and to the neighbours, especially Tas Lodge.
The massive, ugly, oppressive walls extending both horizontally and vertically would have a very big impact on me at Tas Lodge.
The single storey wall running along my boundary would be 2.5 ft from my nearest window. It would extend 4.8m from the front of my house and be 2.6m high.
Would severely limit the supply of brightness, light, sunshine and warmth to my already shaded property.
Existing extension has unattractive wall 9ft along boundary resulting in loss of light and sunshine so the kitchen light has to be put on, and the additional over shadowing and gloom has resulted in the paving pathways to my front door becoming very slippery.
Proposed extension would be put on the narrowest plot in this row of 6 barn conversion dwellings and think this would make it the largest dwelling in the row.
Greater flood risk as proposal extends down the garden and closer to the stream.
Inappropriately proposed extension would change no 5 into something it was never meant to be. Do not expect this to happen in a conservation area.
Could set a precedent for the other properties, regardless of detrimental effects on their neighbours and appearance of the row.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The dwelling is a mid terrace within a range of converted farm buildings, situated immediately adjacent to and at a lower level than the road. The site is within the village conservation area, and falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3. It is outside the village development limits.

4.2 This is an unusual situation in that the proposal is sited on what is considered to be the principal elevation of the dwelling, but is not fronting the highway. It is not visible in key views within the Conservation Area. The application has been assessed paying due regard to the design and impact on the existing building, its setting, and the existing amenities of the neighbours irrespective of whether it has been described as a front or rear extension.

4.3 There is an existing lean to, kitchen extension on the northeast end of the principal elevation of the dwelling, with an adjoining, flat roof conservatory on the southwest end. The extensions span the entire width of the elevation, and project approximately 2.9m along both side boundaries. Conifer hedges and trees form the remainder of side boundaries, providing screening.

4.4 Policies in the NPPF, JCS and SNLP seek to ensure that proposals are of a good design and do not adversely affect the existing amenities of the locality. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.5 This application has been submitted following the refusal of a previous scheme (2011/1948) which comprised of two flat roof extensions either side of a centrally sited, two storey gable extension. It was considered that the development was over dominant and unneighbourly to the adjoining dwelling, with increased overshadowing, and that the design and scale was not subordinate to the existing dwelling, appearing incompatible with the scale and features of the existing dwelling, resulting in detriment to its character and appearance.

4.6 This scheme originally showed the flat roof element projecting approximately 4.6m with a height of approximately 2.6m along the southwest side boundary of the adjoining dwelling, Tas Lodge. The two storey, gable element was approximately 2.7m from the immediate southwest side boundary of Tas Lodge and on the immediate northeast boundary of no 4. It projected approximately 4.8m, with a ridge height of approximately 5.7m.

4.7 Following Officer concerns that the proposal still appeared dominant and unneighbourly, in such close proximity to the adjoining properties, and discussions between Officers and the applicants and agent, a further amendment to the scheme has been submitted.
4.8 The projection of the flat roof, single storey element has been reduced by approximately 500mm and by approximately 200mm in height. The two storey element remains the same distance from the side boundary of Tas Lodge but is now approximately 1.1m from the side boundary of no 4. The ridge height has been reduced by approximately 200mm. However, the main change is that it now has a hipped end with central dormer. This reduces the bulk and dominance of the two storey element, which, on balance, I consider, will not result in an unacceptable level of dominance to the occupiers of the adjoining dwellings.

4.9 In addition, I consider that the design and scale of the proposal is now more in proportion with the scale and features of the existing dwelling.

4.10 I acknowledge the concerns of the occupier of Tas Lodge. However, given the orientation of the existing buildings, and, the conifer hedge and trees along the boundary, there is already limited sunlight to the kitchen and conservatory. Therefore, on balance, I do not consider that the proposal will result in additional loss of light, significant enough to justify refusal on overshadowing and loss of light.

4.11 Although as a rule the Design and Conservation team is not consulted when proposals are not visible in important views, within a conservation area, their views have been sought and they raise no objections to the proposal.

4.12 As the site falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3, a flood risk assessment has been submitted in support of the application. I consider the proposed flood proofing/resilience/resistance measures are satisfactory and meet the requirements set out in NPPF10 and the technical guidance to the NPPF.

4.13 All other issues raised by the objector have been taken into account when reaching this recommendation although they may not have been specifically referred to in the assessment above.

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 of the Joint Core Strategy, and, HOU14-Extensions to dwellings in the open countryside, HOU19-Extensions to existing dwellings, IMP9-Residential amenity and IMP17-Alterations and extensions in conservation areas 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/partially consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The development as amended is considered to accord with the above policies as it has been designed to ensure that the parking and access to the dwelling will be maintained, that the existing amenities of nearby residents will not be adversely affected to a material degree, and, that it respects the character and appearance of the dwelling and its setting.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Rachel Flaxman 01508 533960 rflaxman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
8. **Appl. No**: 2012/1996/O  
**Parish**: GISSING

Applicants Name: Dr J Philip  
Site Address: Village Hall Rectory Road Gissing Norfolk IP22 5XB  
Proposal: Demolition of village hall and replacement with a dwelling

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 04: Promoting sustainable transport  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design  
NPPF 08: Promoting healthy communities  
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 7: Supporting Communities  
Policy 8: Culture, leisure and entertainment  
Policy 17: Small rural communities and the countryside

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
ENV 8: Development in the open countryside (Part Consistent)  
IMP 2: Landscaping  
IMP 8: Safe and free flow traffic  
IMP 9: Residential amenity  
IMP 15: Setting of Listed Buildings  
LEI 8: Loss of recreational or amenity land  
UTL 14: Waste collection and recycling  
TRA 1: Provision of pedestrian links  
TRA 3: Provision of cycling facilities  
TRA 19: Parking standards

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2980/1023 Extension Approved

2.2 1978/0656 Change of use from church hall to public hall and provision of new access Approved
3. Consultations

3.1 Parish Council
No comments received

3.2 District Member
Delegated if officers minded to approve
- Demolition of hall would provide a brownfield site suitable for a dwelling.
- Hall is old and dated.
- Major services are on site
- Hall is under-used
- Parking at hall can be a problem
- Traffic movement will be improved
- Similar to Pulham Market where permission granted to demolish village hall to develop housing to finance Pennoyers Centre

3.3 NCC Highways
Recommends conditions regarding gates to be set back, and laying out of parking/access.

3.4 Mrs Shirley Bishop
Advice re foul and surface water drainage.

3.5 Landscape Officer
- There are some mature and significant trees on neighbouring land.
- Do not envisage the new building causing particular issues for the trees.
- Concern regarding whether foul sewage and underground services can be achieved without detriment to trees.
- Object pending additional information to address above.

3.6 Local Residents
2 letters of objection from one property making the following comments:
- Loss of village hall
- Noise disturbance during demolition and construction
- Impact badly on residential and visual amenity of Old Rectory
- Loss of village history
- Loss of focal point for village
- Dwelling will impact on environment
- Additional traffic
- Loss of peace, tranquillity and natural surroundings to Old Rectory

4. Assessment

4.1 Gissing Village Hall dates back to 1906. It is a painted timber clad building with a pitched and tiled roof with a later brick and flat roof single storey extension.

4.2 This application to demolish the hall and replace it with a dwelling is in outline with all matters reserved.

4.3 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 / part consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.4 The main issues in this case are: the principle of development; character and appearance of area; residential amenity; highway safety; and servicing.
4.5 Principle of development
The site is located outside the Development Limits designated in the SNLP and is remote from the main built up area of the village.

4.6 The village of Gissing is now using the old school to provide village hall facilities. The old school facility is superior to the existing village hall. Therefore, the village has sufficient provision of a village hall type facility without the need for the existing village hall. Consequently the loss of village hall would not leave the village with insufficient provision.

4.7 The existing building can therefore, be treated as a redundant rural building. Development Plan policies allow for the conversion and re-use of such buildings. However, these policies do not promote the replacement of such buildings. Consequently the application is for a new dwelling in the countryside and as such is a departure from adopted Development Plan policy. Applications for planning permission should be determined in accordance with adopted Development Plan Policy unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case there are other relevant material considerations including:
- Revenue from sale of the site will be recouped by the parish council and therefore used for the benefit of the community;
- There are initial plans to improve the village facilities based at the old school building. Although these are not at a stage where weight can be specifically attributed to those proposals;
- The number of trips associated with a single dwelling would be less than those associated with a village hall, therefore, although this is an unsustainable location the proposed use would not be any less sustainable than the existing use; and
- One of the core principles of the NPPF is to encourage the reuse of brownfield land.
- For these reasons, the principle of the proposal would provide benefits to the locality and would not result in such harm as to undermine the principle of sustainable development to warrant refusal in this case.

4.8 Character and appearance of area
The site is in an isolated location. The existing building is visible from the road. Given the existing scale of the village hall building, there is potential for a dwelling to be accommodated on the site without having significantly greater impact on the character or appearance of the area.

4.9 There, are existing mature and significant trees on neighbouring land. Safeguarding of these trees could be secured by condition.

4.10 There is a listed building opposite the site. The replacement of the existing hall with a dwelling should not adversely affect the setting of the listed building provided the design of the dwelling is appropriate to the location.

4.11 Residential amenity
The noise and disturbance associated with one dwelling would normally be less than that associated with a village hall. The proposed dwelling could be designed and located in a manner that would safeguard the residential amenities of neighbouring residential properties.

4.12 Highway safety
Given that the proposed use is of a lower intensity that the existing use the proposal should not result in a hazard or inconvenience to users of the public highway. There is adequate space on site to accommodate parking and turning on site.

4.13 Servicing
There is adequate space on site to accommodate the storage of bins and bicycles. Water efficiency can be secured by condition.
4.14 Conclusion
The proposal should not result in harm to any identified interests as set out above and in this case there are other material considerations that outweigh the presumption of determining applications in accordance with the Development Plan. Consequently the application is recommended for approval.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 Whilst the principle of the proposal does not comply with adopted Development Plan Policy, the principle of the proposal would provide benefits to the locality and would not result in such harm as to undermine the principle of sustainable development. Revenue from sale of the site will be recouped by the parish council and therefore used for the benefit of the community; The number of trips associated with a single dwelling would be less than those associated with a village hall, therefore, although this is an unsustainable location the proposed use would not be any less sustainable than the existing use; and one of the core principles of the NPPF is to encourage the reuse of brownfield land. In the opinion of the local panning authority the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy 3 of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies IMP2, IMP8, IMP9, IMP15, UTL14 and TRA19 of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Michelle Lyon 01508 533681 mlyon@s-norfolk.gov.uk
9. **Appl. No**: 2012/2036/H  
**Parish**: LITTLE MELTON

Applicants Name: Miss L Garratt  
Site Address: 2 Birch Close Little Melton Norfolk NR9 3QX  
Proposal: Single storey rear extension

Recommendation: Approve with Conditions

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

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

2. **Planning History**

2.1 No relevant history

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Original submission  
- Extension will have major impact on neighbouring property.  
- Feeling of being overlooked  
- Amenity value of the garden would be reduced  
- Lower roof line should be designed

Amended submission  
- Only lowers roof height by a small amount  
- Oppressive and causes unacceptable loss of amenity to No.1  
- Proposal is contrary to original design of the estate  
- Additional roof window will further increase feeling of being overlooked

3.2 District Member  
To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Conservation Officer  
Case Officer to assess

3.4 Local Residents  
Original submission

1 letter of support

3 letters of objection  
- Intrusive and detrimental affect  
- Loss of value of property  
- Effect residential amenity of neighbours  
- Overbearing, out of scale, out of character with existing development in vicinity
- Over development adverse impact on open aspect of estate
- Enclosure of neighbours garden no natural light to rear ground floor rooms

Amended submission
- Scale and massing disproportionate
- Overbearing and out of character with existing development in vicinity
- Adversely effect residential amenity
- No change to overbearing extension to roof line
- Possibility roof space may be used to even further over development of site
- Intrusively overbearing to neighbour
- Why is a pitched roof required
- Should not be approved while application includes a pitch roof.

4. Assessment

4.1 The application site is a detached property set within an estate location within the Development Boundary for Little Melton. The property is a bungalow with houses on either side and a bungalow to the rear.

4.2 The application proposes a single storey pitched roof extension on the rear of the property replacing a flat roofed conservatory. The original plans submitted proposed the ridge height to be the same as the original dwelling. This has now been amended to a ridge height of 4.75 metres reducing the height by 480 mm.

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

4.4 Three objection letters have been received from neighbouring properties and also the Parish Council have objections to the proposal concerned with the height of the extension and its impact on the surrounding area and the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties.

4.5 The rear garden of the property has close boarded fencing on the side and rear boundaries. The property to the north west and rear of the site, which is a bungalow, is approximately 11 metres from the boundary with the site with the extension being approximately 5 metres from the boundary. The two storey dwelling to the south of the site is approximately 10 metres from the boundary with a space of 1 metre between the proposed extension and the boundary. Although the proposal will be visible from the neighbouring properties, its impact is reduced by the position of the neighbouring properties which are to the south and west of the site, the distance between the dwellings and the single storey scale of the extension. I do not consider that the impact of shadowing or feeling of enclosure is significant enough to warrant refusing the application.

4.6 The roof windows within the extension are of such a height that there will be no overlooking from them causing loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties. Were a floor to be inserted in the future, then the roof space is of such limited size that the space created would be unlikely to be used other than for storage or similar ancillary purpose.
4.7 Due to the position of the proposal on the rear of the property obscured from the street scene and the location of the other properties within the vicinity which surround the application site, I do not consider that there will be an adverse impact on the setting of the dwelling or the surrounding area.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 - Promoting good design of the Joint Core Strategy and Hou19 - Extension to existing dwelling, IMP9 - Residential amenity of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The amended plans are considered to accord with the above policies as the extension has been designed to ensure that the character and appearance of the original dwelling will not be adversely affected to a material degree. Due to the design and position of the proposal it will not have a significant impact on nearby resident’s amenity through overlooking or overshadowing and will not damage the setting of the existing building.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Lynn Armes 01508 533821 larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk
10. **Appl. No**: 2012/2152/H  
    **Parish**: ROYDON

Applicants Name: Mr Billson  
Site Address: Asante High Road Roydon Norfolk IP22 5RB  
Proposal: Proposed rear extension to provide an annexe and covered patio area

Recommendation: Approve with conditions

1. Full Planning permission time limit  
2. In accordance with amended drawings  
3. Matching Materials  
4. Annexe  
5. No additional windows

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 National Planning Policy Framework  
   paragraph 50 - providing a wide choice of residential accommodation.

1.2 Joint Core Strategy  
   Policy 2: Promoting good design

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
   HOU 19: Extensions to existing dwellings
   HOU 21: Annexes

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2007/1176 Erection of detached dwelling Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council Object: Overdevelopment of site and overlooking.

3.2 District Member To be determined by committee: proposal too large for the site, overbearing development for the adjacent resident.

3.3 Local Residents 1 letter of objection:  
   Will overshadow windows and patio, new windows in side cause overlooking, not good design, too dominant height and mass, plans incorrect and site will be grossly overdeveloped.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The proposal is for a rear extension to the southern elevation of the property, close to the boundary with the neighbouring bungalow to the east, to provide an annexe extension for an elderly relation. It is to have a low hipped roof and will be constructed using matching materials. In addition, there is to be a covered garden area, open to the sides with a roof light to the western side of the annexe.

4.2 The dwelling is a detached bungalow erected in 2007, fronting the highway to the north situated within the development limits for the parish of Roydon with bungalows either side.
4.3 The proposal is assessed against policies HOU19 and HOU21 of the South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP). The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the SNLP referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Policy HOU21 is consistent with paragraph 50 of the NPPF in providing a wide choice of residential accommodation.

4.4 Policy HOU21 requires any proposal for an annexe to be designed to be ancillary to the main dwelling and capable of being used as part of the original dwelling when the specific need for the annexe ceases to exist. The layout of this proposal does not lend itself to a separation of garden, access and parking which would be necessary should the annexe be put in separate ownership or occupation and the planning permission could provide a condition prohibiting such a separation, restricting its use to ancillary accommodation. I am of the opinion that the proposed extension to the annexe accords with Policy HOU21.

4.5 The district member has requested the application be determined by committee as he considers the proposal too large for the site which will result in an overbearing development for the adjacent resident. The Parish Council have also objected citing overdevelopment and overlooking.

4.6 The neighbouring occupiers have objected to the annexe stating that its height, mass and dominance will result in overshadowing of rooms and rear patio area in addition to the overlooking from the window in the side elevation, detrimental to their amenities. They further maintain that it is not a good design in view of its scale, dominance and mass and that it is a gross overdevelopment particularly as the original plans include an area of garden that the applicant was hoping to purchase but has not yet acquired. They would not object to a shorter flat roof extension.

4.7 The boundary between the two properties is a 1.8m high close boarded panel fence, the annexe is single storey with one kitchen window in the side elevation, there are already two windows in the side elevation of the existing bungalow. A condition can be imposed removing the permitted development rights to insert any new windows or doors in the side elevation and any roof alterations. As a result, I am of the view there will be minimal additional loss of privacy.

4.8 The annexe extension is 4 metres in height but hipped and pitched away from the neighbouring bungalow to the east. A shadow drawing has been produced that demonstrates the increase in overshadowing caused by the annexe, over and above the overshadowing caused by the existing fence is minimal. I concur that the dwelling is not in a large plot and that the annexe extension with the covered garden area extends significantly into the rear garden, however I am of the view that there is still sufficient amenity space at the front and rear.

4.9 Considering the height the position of the annexe and the intervening fence I am of the view there will be minimal increase in any overshadowing or loss of privacy and on balance consider that the proposal accords with Policy HOU19.

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 Policy2 - Promoting good design of the Joint Core Strategy and with Policies HOU19 - Extensions to existing dwellings and HOU21 - Annexes of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

5.2 The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.
5.3 The development is considered to accord with Policy HOU19 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the extension has been designed to ensure that the parking and access to the dwelling will be maintained, and that neither the character and appearance of the dwelling nor the amenities of nearby residents will be adversely affected to a material degree and with Policy HOU21 as the annexe has been designed to be ancillary to the main dwelling and capable of being used as part of the original dwelling when the specific need ceases.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number: Helen Cox 01508 533832
and E-mail: hcox@s-norfolk.gov.uk
11. Appl. No : 2012/2203/H
Parish     : GREAT MELTON

Applicants Name : Mr & Mrs Quinn
Site Address : Melton Beck Bawburgh Road Great Melton Norfolk NR9 3PE
Proposal : First floor extension over garage with infill section to adjoin the dwelling. New rear dormers. Replacement of concrete tile hanging to existing walls with timber feather edged boarding.

Recommendation : Approve with Conditions

1  Full Planning permission time limit
2  In accord with submitted drawings
3  No additional windows at first floor

1. Planning Policies
1.1 National Planning Policy Framework
NPPF 07: Requiring good design

1.2 Joint Core Strategy
Policy 2 : Promoting good design

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

2. Planning History

2.1 2010/1091 Proposed two storey extension to existing dwelling replacing an existing single storey high garage. Approved

2.2 2007/0617 Proposed alterations and extension to dwelling Refused

2.3 2005/1334 Single storey rear first floor extension Approved

3. Consultations
3.1 Parish Council No response
3.2 District Member To be reported if appropriate
3.3 Local Residents No response

4. Assessment
4.1 This proposal is for the extension to the rear of a detached dwelling which is located outside any development boundaries and in an isolated position with only one neighbouring property to the north-west of the site. There has been a previous application which was approved for a similar size extension but which included demolition of the garage. The current proposal incorporates the existing garage within the extension.
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 will not adversely impact on the landscape setting of the dwelling or the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above as these policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 The property is set at a higher level than the neighbouring property which is to the north-west of the site. The proposed extension is approximately 14 metres from the boundary between the two properties which is marked by a 2 metre fence, with the neighbouring dwelling set forward from the position of the extension at a distance of approximately 10 metres from the boundary. The neighbouring property has a first floor window in the side elevation facing the application site. There is an escape roof window proposed in the roof elevation facing the neighbour, but I consider that due to the distance between the properties there will not be a significant adverse impact on the neighbouring property through overlooking or overshadowing. I also note that there is an existing window at first floor level in the gable of the neighbouring dwelling which overlooks the application site. The proposed extension will increase the scale of the existing dwelling, but due to the location of the proposal on the rear of the property and the incorporation of the existing garage, I consider that the extension remains subordinate to the original dwelling and will not adversely affect the character or appearance of the dwelling or its landscape setting to a material degree.

4.4 The proposed change to the front and side elevations by the removal of the concrete hanging tiles and their replacement with treated weather boarding will change the appearance of the dwelling, but the proposed material to be used is more in keeping with the rural location of the property and will not harm the landscape setting of the property.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 - Promoting good design of the Joint Core Strategy and HOU14 - Extension to dwelling in the open countryside, IMP9 - Residential amenity of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above as these policies remain consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The development is considered to accord with Policy HOU14 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as the dwelling has a lawful permanent residential use and the extension has been designed to be subordinate to the dwelling and to respect its landscape setting.

5.3 The development is considered to accord with Policy IMP9 of the South Norfolk Local Plan as it has been designed and positioned to ensure that there will be no significant adverse impact on the nearby residents through overlooking or overshadowing.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Lynn Armes 01508 533821 larmes@s-norfolk.gov.uk
12. **Appl. No**: 2012/2246/H  
**Parish**: WORTWELL  
**Applicants Name**: Miss Pauline Allen  
**Site Address**: Says Farmhouse 11 Low Road Wortwell Norfolk IP20 0HJ  
**Proposal**: Replace existing greenhouse and erect new summerhouse  
**Recommendation**: Approve with Conditions  
1. Full Planning Permission Time Limit  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings

13. **Appl. No**: 2012/2248/LB  
**Parish**: WORTWELL  
**Applicants Name**: Miss Pauline Allen  
**Site Address**: Says Farmhouse 11 Low Road Wortwell Norfolk IP20 0HJ  
**Proposal**: Replace existing greenhouse and erect new summerhouse  
**Recommendation**: Approve with Conditions  
1. Listed Building Time Limit  
2. In accordance with submitted drawings

1. **Planning Policies**

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

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

1.3 South Norfolk Local Plan  
HOU 19: Extensions to existing dwellings  
IMP 13: Alteration of Listed Buildings (Part Consistent)  
IMP 15: Setting of listed buildings

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2002/0757 Alteration of 2no tie-beams and creation of additional living space in attic  
Approved

2.2 1996/0618 Alterations to rear of house & demolition of timber garage  
Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council  
Approve  
- Application is well suited to the property and will enhance it

3.2 Conservation Officer  
No objections

3.3 Local Residents  
No letters received
4  Assessment

4.1 The house is an impressive grade 2 listed building, an earlier 17th century framed house with a 19th century brick outer face. The house is set back from the street with a variety of outbuildings to the north and to the rear of the house.

4.2 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 partially consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

4.3 The application includes the replacement of a lean-to, timber greenhouse, in need of repair/rebuild, in the same siting, against the gable end of a small outbuilding at the rear of the dwelling. The Conservation Officer and I consider the proposal to be acceptable, with no adverse impact on the building or its setting.

4.4 Also included in the application is the erection of a summer house within the rear garden, to the side of the dwelling. It will be screened by existing trees and shrubs within the garden, and also by a brick wall on the front boundary. The Conservation Officer and I consider the design to be good quality, of a modest scale, and in a position that would have little impact on the rear aspect of the house.

4.5 Neither proposal would be seen from the street or in the context of the principle elevation of the house.

4.6 There have been no conflicting opinions from any third parties.

5. Reasons for Approval 2012/2246/H

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) of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies IMP13 (Alterations of listed buildings) and IMP15 (Setting of listed buildings) and HOU19 (Extensions to existing dwellings) 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 and partially consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

5.2 The development is considered to accord with the above policies as it has been designed to respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and its setting.

6. Reasons for Approval 2012/2248/LB

6.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 1 (Addressing Climate Change and protecting environmental assets) of the Joint Core Strategy and Policies IMP13 (Alterations of listed buildings) and IMP15 (Setting of listed buildings) of the South Norfolk Local Plan. The assessment of this application gives due weight to the saved policies in the South Norfolk Local Plan referred to above, because those policies remain partially consistent with the published National Planning Policy Framework.

6.2 The development is considered to accord with the above policies as it has been designed to ensure that it would preserve the special architectural or historic interest of the building and its setting.

Contact Officer, Telephone Number and E-mail: Rachel Flaxman 01508 533960 rflaxman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
14. **Appl. No**: 2013/0013/F  
**Parish**: LONG STRATTON

Applicants Name: Mr Rory Ringer  
Site Address: 69 Field Acre Way Long Stratton Norfolk NR15 2WE  
Proposal: Retrospective application for extension to residential curtilage

Recommendation: Approve with conditions

1. **Painting of fence** within 3 months

1. **Planning Policies**

1.1 **Joint Core Strategy**  
Policy 2: Promoting good design

2. **Planning History**

2.1 2000/1063 Erection of 58 dwellings, garages, public open space and associated roadworks (plot nos 47-113) Approved

3. **Consultations**

3.1 Parish Council To be reported

3.2 District Members  
Cllr Terry Blowfield To be reported if appropriate  
Cllr Andrew Pond To be reported if appropriate

3.3 Landscape Officer To be reported

3.4 Local Residents To be reported.

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The application relates to 69 Field Acre Way which is a detached dwelling which backs onto farm land. This is a retrospective application to extend the residential curtilage. A fence approximately 1.8 metres in high has been erected along the new rear boundary of the property.

4.2 The land subject to this application was intended to form part of the landscape belt which was part of the residential development permission. Landscaping including bunding have been provided to the rear other properties but not behind 67 and 69. It appears that this section of landscaping was sold to the applicant when they purchased the property. Due to the layout of the dwellings only a narrow section of landscaping was proposed in this location.

4.3 The main consideration is the impact that the extension of residential curtilage has on the local landscape. On balance I do not consider that the development has a significant adverse impact on the local landscape. The layout of the estate and the presence of bunding behind other properties mean a precedent would only be set for one other property. The fence has been stained a red/orange colour which is unfortunate as it makes it unduly prominent in the landscape. I therefore, propose a condition requiring the fence to be stained a darker colour to be agreed within 3 months of the date of the permission.
4.4 The extension of the curtilage does not raise any amenity issues for neighbouring properties.

5. Reasons for Approval

5.1 The proposal is acceptable in respect of the aims of the Joint Core Strategy and South Norfolk Local Plan 2003 and in particular is considered to be in accordance with Policy 2 – Promoting good design of the Joint Core Strategy.

5.2 The extension to the residential curtilage subject to the fence being re-stained would not have an adverse impact on the local landscape or the amenity of neighbouring properties.

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

Report of The Development Control Services Manager

1. Enforcement Ref : 2012/8036
Parish : DISS
Site : 42 Denmark Street
  Diss
  Norfolk
  IP22 4BE
Development : Unauthorised satellite dish and fence
Developer : Wendy Ralph

1. Background

1.1 It was brought to the Council’s attention that a satellite dish and close-boarded wooden fence had been erected to the rear of the property without the benefit of listed building consent.

1.2 Since the matter was first brought to our attention the satellite dish has been re-located to the north side of the east elevation of the single storey flat roofed extension.

1.3 The fence has been in situ for approximately 10 years. It ranges from 1.2 metres (m) to 1.8 metres (m) close-boarded wooden fence with concrete posts and gravel boards. It has been stained blue. The fence requires listed building consent because it has been attached to the listed building.

1.4 The owner of the property was invited to submit an application for listed building consent to regularise the situation, however an application has not been forthcoming.

2. Planning Policies

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework
  Policy 12 – Paragraph 132

2.2 South Norfolk Local Plan
  IMP13 – Alteration of Listed Buildings

3. Consultations

3.1 Town Council : No comments received to date.

3.2 Local Members
  Cllr K Kiddie : No comments received.
  Cllr T Palmer : No comments received
  Cllr G Walden : No comments received

3.3 Conservation Officer : • whilst fencing is not generally in keeping with the character and appearance of the houses, none of the changes are visible in any important views of the buildings which are listed more for their group value than for their significance individually
  • no objection to the satellite dish located on the flat roof rear extension
3.4 Local Residents: One letter of objection received
- use of concrete posts, concrete gravel boards and thick wooden slats represents a material change to the look of the grade II listed cottages.
- fence in keeping with the cottages
- fence is excessively harsh and would be more suited to an inner city building than a fence separating a grade II listed terraced cottage garden in a conservation area
- no objection to the satellite dish in its current location

4. **Assessment**

4.1 The property is a Grade II listed building located within the Conservation Area for Diss. The fence and satellite dish are located to the rear of the property and are not visible in any important views of the buildings.

4.2 Whilst the fence could be of a more appropriate design and be more in keeping with the character and appearance of the properties it is not considered to have such an impact that the Council would seek to take formal action to require it being removed or altered.

4.3 The satellite dish is located on a later single storey flat roofed extension at ground floor level. It is not visible in any important views of the buildings and is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the historic interest of the buildings.

5. **Recommendation**

5.1 That no further action should be taken on the matter.
PLANNING APPEALS
Appeals received from 15 December 2012 to 16 January 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Parish/Site</th>
<th>Appellant</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/1729</td>
<td>WICKLEWOOD 2 Milestone Lane</td>
<td>Mrs J Parker</td>
<td>Proposed two storey extension and alterations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appeal decisions from 15 December 2012 to 16 January 2013

<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>2011/1957</td>
<td>DITCHINGHAM Amenity Land West of Station Road, Yarmouth Road</td>
<td>Mr S Johnson</td>
<td>Install access and field gate onto pasture land</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Appeal Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/0856</td>
<td>HETHERSETT 88 Ketts Oak</td>
<td>Mr D Bain</td>
<td>Outline planning application for the erection of a detached single storey dwelling house with rooms in roof and detached garage including means of access</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Appeal Dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/0983</td>
<td>WYMONDHAM Land at Oaklands East, Morley Lane</td>
<td>Mr S Rudling</td>
<td>Outline planning application for the erection of a detached single storey dwelling house with rooms in roof including means of access</td>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Appeal Dismissed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This report schedules progress on outstanding enforcement cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ALLEGED BREACH</th>
<th>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIVETSHALL ST MARY Mardle Hall Rectory Road 2004/0238</td>
<td>Unauthorised Building</td>
<td>07.12.04</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served. Compliance date 04.02.06. Permission granted for replacement building. Further enforcement action delayed until replacement building complete. Further visit to be carried out in next few weeks to check on position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORTWELL Station Farm High Road 2004/0254</td>
<td>Standing of a caravan</td>
<td>15.06.11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notices served. Compliance date extended one year to 14/09/15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORTWELL Station Farm High Road 2004/0254</td>
<td>Untidy Land</td>
<td>15.06.11</td>
<td>Section 215 Notice complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICKLEBURGH Beeches Farm Norwich Road 2007/8036</td>
<td>Material change of use Breach of a condition Operational development</td>
<td>24.04.07</td>
<td>Enforcement Notices served Compliance date 06.11.07 - Notice served 09.07.07 Compliance dates: Materials condition 06.09.07 - Demolition condition 06.02.08 Landscaping condition 06.09.07 - Storage condition 09.11.07 Machinery condition 06.09.07 - Access condition 09.11.07 Slurry pit condition 09.11.07 - Notice served 09.07.07 Compliance date 09.11.07 - Some works carried out to protect Listed Building. Works have ceased. Recent fire – site up for sale Applications submitted and ongoing investigation regarding outstanding issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARLESTON</td>
<td>Breach of condition – provision of footpath</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Breach of condition notice served. Effective immediately. Negotiations underway with Norfolk County Council for resolution under Harleston Walking and Cycling Strategy. Norfolk County Council now owners and outstanding issues are being addressed by them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharton’s Nurseries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/8109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROOKE</td>
<td>Erection of fence</td>
<td>10.07.08</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served. Planning Permission granted NFA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/8123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLACTON</td>
<td>Standing of residential caravans</td>
<td>24.02.09</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served. Compliance date 31/07/15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/8368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEETHING</td>
<td>Use of land as a travellers site</td>
<td>24.06.09</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served. Compliance Date extended 31/01/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land off Harveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/0014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodden Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/8097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORNCETT ST PETER</td>
<td>Change of use of land. Standing of residential caravans</td>
<td>Emergency Authority 20.04.10</td>
<td>Human Rights Assessment completed. Enforcement Notice served. Appeal submitted and allowed for four year temporary permission. Compliance date 11/05/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilderswood Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/8027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CARLETON RODE  
Land adj. to Fen Road  
2006/0269 | Change of use of land. | 21.07.10 | Enforcement Notice served.  
Compliance date 29.12.11.  
Ongoing |
| COLTON  
The Ugly Bug Inn  
High House Farm Lane  
2009/8337 | Change of use of land for the standing of a shipping container | 06.09.10 | Enforcement Notice Complied with NFA |
| GELDESTON  
72 The Street  
2009/8178 | Breach of Planning condition | 25.10.10 | Enforcement Notice served.  
Compliance dates 13.03.11 and 13.04.11.  
Further visit to be carried out in next few weeks to check on position. |
| HEMPNALL  
Pevensey House  
The Street  
2009/8010 | Unauthorised works to a listed building | 12.04.10 | Listed Building Enforcement Notice served.  
Appeal dismissed.  
Compliance date 27.01.12.  
Ongoing negotiations |
| HEMPNALL  
Pevensey House  
The Street  
2009/8010 | Erection of lean to structure | 12.04.10 | Enforcement Notice served.  
Appeal dismissed.  
Compliance date 27.01.12.  
Ongoing negotiations |
| THORPE ABBOTTS  
The Glebe School Lane  
2008/8372 | Change of use of land for standing of residential caravan | 05.07.10 | Enforcement Notice Complied with NFA |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ALLEGED BREACH</th>
<th>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</th>
<th>ACTION TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DENTON</td>
<td>Change of use of barn and Building works to barn</td>
<td>16.02.11</td>
<td>2 Enforcement Notices served. Appeal decided, one notice upheld with compliance date of 20/06/12 One notice dismissed. Ongoing enquiries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/8155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNDHAM</td>
<td>Change of use of ancillary building/annexe in curtilage of dwelling house to a dwelling house</td>
<td>02.02.11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice Complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Barn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratshole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/8249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUTON</td>
<td>Unauthorised works to roof.</td>
<td>06.07.11</td>
<td>Appeal succeeds, Notice quashed Planning Permission granted NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitegates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suton Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/8041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROWNTHORPE</td>
<td>Formation of Access</td>
<td>16/11/11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 27/10/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Drift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crownthorpe Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/8025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROWNTHORPE</td>
<td>Change of use of land from residential curtilage to land and building used for storage, display, sale and repair of vehicles and scrap metal</td>
<td>16/11/11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice Complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Drift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crownthorpe Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/8025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEYWOOD</td>
<td>Change of use of curtilage building to separate dwelling house</td>
<td>02/09/11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice Complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Welsh Barn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burston Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/8335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLETON RODE</td>
<td>Erection of building</td>
<td>21/12/11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliant date 05/06/12 Ongoing enquiries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Meadow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgate Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/8096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLETON RODE</td>
<td>Change of use of land and buildings from agricultural to standing of mobile home</td>
<td>21/12/11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliant date 05/06/12 Partially complied with, ongoing enquiries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Meadow</td>
<td>and portacabin from residential purposes and domestic storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgate Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/8096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLACTON</td>
<td>Erection of buildings not connected to agricultural use</td>
<td>21/12/11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliant date 31/07/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land off Grays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/8368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LODDON</td>
<td>Erection of fence adjacent to a highway</td>
<td>09/06/11</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliant date 01/09/12 Partially complied with, application to be submitted to cover outstanding issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at 3 Norton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/8057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORNCETT St PETER</td>
<td>Change of use of agricultural land to mixed use as residential caravan standing</td>
<td>01/02/12</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice Complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Grove Farm</td>
<td>and agricultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wacton Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/8042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARFORD</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the standing and occupation of residential caravans</td>
<td>01/02/12</td>
<td>2 Enforcement Notices served Compliance date 31/07/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mud Walls Farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watton Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/8175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARNHAM</td>
<td>Creation of Independent dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement Notice Complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROOK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 Norwich Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/8207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEYWOOD</td>
<td>Erection of ancillary building</td>
<td>06/06/12</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolsey Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance date after appeal 01/07/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barns Burston Road 2012/8141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Unauthorised works to Listed Building (Insertion of UPVC windows)</td>
<td>02/05/12</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Damgate Street 2011/8281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notice Appealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Erection of gates in excess of one metre in height adjacent to highway and within curtilage of Listed Building</td>
<td>17/10/12</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice Complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Damgate Street 2011/8189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYMONDHAM</td>
<td>Erection of Car Port within curtilage of Listed Building</td>
<td>05/12/12</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice Complied with NFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Damgate Street 2011/8281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAXLINGHAM</td>
<td>Change of use of land for the storage of a caravan</td>
<td>20/06/12</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THORPE Land on the North side of Windy Lane, Foxhole 2010/8302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notice appealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PULHAM ST MARY</td>
<td>Condition of building</td>
<td>15/08/12</td>
<td>Notice served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Head Inn The Street 2012/8193</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notice appealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>ALLEGED BREACH</td>
<td>DATE OF COMMITTEE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>ACTION TAKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT MOULTON Meadow View The Haulage Yard Broadgate Lane 2012/8018</td>
<td>Change of use of agricultural land</td>
<td>18/07/12</td>
<td>Enforcement Notice served Compliance date 12/02/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enforcement Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of complaints</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Notices Issued</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of Condition Notices Issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 215 Notices Issued</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary stop notices issued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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